



Elson S. Floyd College of Medicine

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

Advisory Guideline Title:

Guidelines for the Promotion of Career Track Faculty: Scholar Sub-Track

Applies to: Career Track Faculty: Scholar Sub-Track including those on full or part-time appointments eligible for promotion.

Career Track: Scholar Sub-Track Introduction

Career track faculty may hold continuous, one (1) to five (5) year fixed term (with or without a rolling horizon), or contingent contracts. Appointments are renewable, contingent upon the needs of the department and the college, and satisfactory annual performance. Career track appointments must include a specified sub-track title and rank in the appointment (e.g., *scholar* assistant professor, *scholar* associate professor, *scholar* professor). The scholar sub-track provides for advancement in rank from assistant to associate to full professor. All career track appointments should align with current Washington Administrative Code Regulations (WAC250-61-100).

Faculty in the scholar sub-track are non-tenure track appointees who have significant responsibilities in at least two of the following areas: (a) teaching, (b) student advising, (c) research/scholarship, (d) creative activity, (e) outreach, (f) practice, (g) educational leadership, (h) administration, or (i) academic service. For faculty with a portion of their time allocated to teaching, such teaching may involve teaching in a clinical setting. Faculty with a portion of their time allocated to research are expected to conduct research, scholarship, and/or creative activity (e.g., translational research performed with community organizations, entrepreneurial activities, commercialization activities) and may serve as principal or co-principal investigators on grants or contracts administered by the University. Notably, departments and the college may expect these faculty members to provide all or significant portions of their own salary through extramural funding. The terms for start-up, space, and salary will generally be negotiated during the hiring process, although those terms may be renegotiated by the institution and/or the faculty member. These faculty may also play a role in the pre-clinical/pre-clerkship phases of the professional curriculum and/or perform clinical research. Scholar sub-track faculty must always be assessed in accordance with the expectations of this sub-track and must be concordant with the percentage of their workload assigned to the areas noted above. As a result, the areas of evaluation (as described below) should be consistent with the candidate's negotiated scope of work.

1.0 Guidelines for the Appointment and Promotion of Career Scholar Sub-Track Faculty

Scholar sub-track faculty contribute to an array of responsibilities consistent with the Faculty Manual delineation of this sub-track and their negotiated workload at the time of initial appointment (and any subsequent, documented changes negotiated between the faculty and Department Chair). Responsibilities typically include at least two of the following:

research/scholarship and creative activity, teaching innovation and excellence, and clinical practice and/or supervision and clinic-based instruction, with many also contributing to didactic teaching, outreach, educational leadership, administration, or academic service missions of their department and/or the Elson S. Floyd College of Medicine. Depending on their role in the college, their contributions will differ. Each department within the college that employs scholar faculty should have its own more detailed policies and expectations regarding promotion of scholar track faculty. Requests for appointments or promotion of scholar sub-track faculty are made to the Dean and the Faculty Rank, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (FRPT) through Department Chairs or Associate Chairs (e.g., at outlying campuses). Appointments at the rank of scholar assistant professor do not require review by the FRPT. Candidates for promotion shall be evaluated in accordance with the guidelines outlined in the Faculty Manual of Washington State University.

The college may make scholar track faculty appointments to best serve programmatic needs by appointing persons whose expertise would benefit its mission. Scholar faculty are expected to contribute in at least two areas delineated above (e.g., research/scholarship, teaching), as stated in the letter of offer and/or negotiated and documented thereafter as department/college needs evolve. However, they are encouraged to contribute in other areas delineated in this sub-track.. Contributions should not be so broadly distributed as to diminish the faculty's ability to focus their scope of work. Where core scholar obligations involve the individual supervision and/or mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students, however, this work should also be evaluated in any promotion review. One goal of the college is to promote a culture of collaboration, collegiality, and diversity. Therefore, promotion materials should describe how the candidate has contributed toward this goal as appropriate to their assigned scope of work (e.g., partnering with other WSU departments/colleges and community partners, team teaching, guest lecturing, etc. Evidence of involvement in college activities, such as attending college sponsored education activities, grand rounds, and other department or college-wide activities may also demonstrate collegiality.

The promotion procedures for scholar faculty are similar to those established for tenure-track appointments, except that the required four letters may be all external, all internal, or a combination of the two. Letters may be obtained from no more than two individuals recommended by the candidate. At least two should be from faculty who are tenured or scholar track faculty who hold the rank to which the faculty member aspires and are not members of the faculty balloting committee. Other letters may come from internal individuals who will not ballot on the candidate's promotion or external individuals who are uniquely qualified to speak to the specific accomplishments of the candidate to which other faculty might not be qualified to speak. For example, a scholar track faculty member may have made a significant national contribution that would be part of a promotion case. Letters should not be solicited from the candidate's former professors, mentors, or colleagues. The reviewers will be provided with copies of the candidate's curriculum vitae and additional materials noted above documenting the candidate's accomplishments. Each candidate should work with their Department Chair (or Associate Chair at outlying campuses) to determine which materials are needed for the promotion dossier. At minimum, the candidate under consideration for promotion is responsible for preparing and maintaining a personnel file that provides material bearing on the criteria specified in these guidelines, including at a minimum: a curriculum vitae/resume; scholarship activity statement (maximum two pages); evidence of excellence in the primary areas of the candidate's scope of work (e.g., key peer-reviewed publications, teaching evaluations, clinical

leadership activities, and editorial appointments, etc.). The consultant reviewers will be provided with the file prepared by the candidate and asked to provide an evaluation of the excellence and impact of the candidate's work and professional contribution.

Criteria for promotion of scholar sub-track faculty are described under Procedures (4.0) below. Time in rank is not a criterion for promotion; however, only under extraordinary circumstances will faculty be considered for promotion prior to the beginning of the sixth year of service in their current rank. All eligible departmental faculty must evaluate and ballot on the candidate. If a department has fewer than five eligible faculty who are eligible to vote, then the Chair will work with the Dean and Provost's office to identify additional eligible faculty throughout the college or University who will submit recommendations. Committees including faculty outside the candidate's department are considered to be "augmented" committees. Only eligible departmental faculty with personal conflicts of interest (e.g., spouses, family members) are allowed to abstain. All department scholar associate professors, scholar professors, associate professors, professors and other members of the augmented committee are eligible to vote on candidates seeking promotion to scholar associate professor. All department scholar professors and professors and other members of the augmented committee are eligible to vote on candidates seeking promotion to scholar professor. Individuals, such as chairs or members of the FRPT committee, may only provide one written recommendation (i.e., they cannot vote twice). These individuals can, however, participate in discussions of the candidate if, for instance, they serve on the College FRPT. All eligible department faculty and other members of the augmented committee must be provided with the full promotion packet, as well as time to review and comment on the candidate's suitability for promotion.

2.0 Definitions

Annual Review: Scholar sub-track faculty performance is reviewed annually by the Chair/Associate Chair for all faculty who have served at WSU for a full year and who are expected to be on appointment in the subsequent year (i.e., have not officially resigned, retired, or been given a terminal appointment). Principal Investigators who provide funding to or supervise a scholar sub-track faculty member will provide input. Reviews are also required for all scholar sub-track faculty on grant funding who may be eligible for salary increases if salary dollars are available and they are reappointed. Full-time scholar sub-track faculty (0.50 FTE or greater) are required to update the designated WSU-wide faculty electronic system (i.e., Activity Insight). The period of each annual review is from January 1 to December 31. Full-time scholar sub-track faculty receive annual reviews that alternate every other year between abridged reviews and comprehensive reviews, as long as the faculty member is making satisfactory progress. If the annual review rating is "less than satisfactory," the written report must include an explanation for the decision, clearly identify areas in which performance is deemed deficient and specific recommendations to correct the deficit to help the faculty member achieve a "satisfactory" or above annual review rating at the next review. All subsequent annual reviews will be comprehensive or intensive until a rating of "satisfactory" or better is achieved. Scholar sub-track faculty will receive an intensive review if they seek promotion. Part-time scholar sub-track faculty receive abridged reviews annually.

Results are submitted to the Office of the Provost by May 1 of the following year (e.g., May 1, 2020 for the 2019 annual review). The annual review provides feedback relative to the department expectations and guides critical personnel decisions. Faculty are to be evaluated in terms of their performance during the specified annual review period, in relevant areas as specified for the faculty member's sub-track, as described in this policy and by the faculty member's department guidelines

and policy. Scholar sub-track faculty should highlight contributions to research, teaching, and/or clinical activity and participation as principal or co-principal investigators on grants or contracts, and other areas in their negotiated scope of work.

Upon annual review completion, the faculty review is forwarded to the Dean and Vice President (VP) for Health Sciences. After receiving the annual review report, the chair shall provide the faculty member a minimum of ten (10) business days to sign the report, indicating that he or she has had the opportunity to read the report and to discuss it with the chair and/or appropriate faculty supervisors. A faculty member's dissent regarding contents of the report may be appended to the signed report. When a dissent is appended, the faculty member must receive written acknowledgement within fifteen (15) business days that the statement has been reviewed by the chair's immediate supervisor (normally the Dean) and VP of Health Sciences or designee (e.g., Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs). At the same time that a response is sent to the faculty member, the chair's supervisor will forward to the Provost the annual review, the faculty member's response to that review, and the supervisor's response to the faculty member. After receiving these materials, the Provost has an additional fifteen (15) business days to provide a written acknowledgement to the faculty member and chair's supervisor that he or she has reviewed all of the statements.

3.0 Responsibilities

FRPT Committee: FRPT does not participate in annual reviews (i.e., abridged reviews, comprehensive reviews and intensive reviews). The FRPT reviews and advises the Dean regarding promotion packets for all tenure and career sub-tracks.

Dean's Office: The Dean reviews all cases for promotion, forwards to the Vice President for Health Sciences, and then to the Provost for determination.

4.0 Procedures

Candidates for promotion shall be evaluated in accordance with the guidelines outlined in the Faculty Manual of Washington State University. Specific criteria and procedures for promotion of specific career track faculty are elaborated below. Faculty's negotiated scope of work may place greater emphasis on certain activities and less in others. For scholar-sub-track faculty, this will vary from faculty to faculty depending on what portions of their FTE are allocated to each (i.e., teaching, service, clinical and research) responsibility. Below is a description of each responsibility area along with examples of relevant evidence. Each candidate should work with their Chair (or Associate Chair at outlying campuses) to determine all materials needed for the promotion dossier.

Promotion to Scholar Associate Professor: Consistent with the Faculty Manual, scholar assistant professors typically are not considered for promotion to scholar associate professor prior to the sixth year of service at the rank of scholar assistant professor with the promotion, if granted, awarded at the end of the sixth year. Exceptional candidates may be offered the opportunity to advance in rank prior to the sixth year of service. If promotion to scholar associate professor is not pursued or is not granted, faculty may remain at the rank of scholar assistant professor and be reappointed to subsequent terms at that rank after their sixth year of service, contingent upon funding, satisfactory performance and department and college need. Individuals who are not promoted may request promotion consideration at a later date once they and their Chair believe they have successfully addressed the issues that led to an unsuccessful initial application.

Initial promotion within this career track is most frequently determined by a candidate's record of

accomplishment and growth in their areas of focus (e.g., research, scholarship, teaching, clinical activity, and/or entrepreneurial and commercialization activity). Candidates who work collaboratively in laboratories, institutes, centers, or multi-person initiatives are also expected to contribute positively to the effectiveness of such groups. Evidence of such accomplishment will include considerations of productivity in publications, grants, and patents, and the successful application of research to partnerships with industry, governmental agencies, and other public or private entities. The candidate will be expected to demonstrate in such areas an emerging national and international reputation, as well as the capacity and likelihood for continued excellence. Where student/fellow/trainee supervision and mentoring are included in workload expectations, the candidate is expected to have demonstrated effective communication and support of the student/fellow/trainee's professional development. Promotion to scholar associate professor requires demonstration and evidence of excellence in at least two of the following areas: teaching, clinical activity, scholarship, research, creative activity, service (i.e., at a minimum "strong performance beyond satisfactory"). Faculty promoted to the rank of scholar associate professor may be appointed to a term of up to five years (with or without a rolling horizon) based on department and college need.

Promotion to Scholar Professor: Consistent with the Faculty Manual, scholar associate professors typically are not considered for promotion to scholar professor prior to the beginning of the sixth year of service at the rank of scholar associate professor. Exceptional candidates may be offered the opportunity to advance in rank prior to the sixth year of service. If promotion to scholar professor is not pursued or is not granted, faculty may remain at the rank of scholar associate professor and be reappointed to subsequent terms at that rank after their sixth year of service, contingent upon funding, satisfactory performance, and department and college need. Individuals who are not promoted may request promotion consideration at a later date once they and their chair believe they have successfully addressed the issues that led to an unsuccessful initial application.

Promotion to this rank is most frequently determined by a record of sustained accomplishment in the faculty member's negotiated scope of work (e.g., teaching, research, scholarship, clinical activity and/or creative activity [e.g., entrepreneurial/commercialization activity]). Candidates who work collaboratively in labs, institutes, centers, or multi-person initiatives are also expected not only to contribute positively to such groups but also take on informal or formal leadership roles that amplify the effectiveness of these groups. Evidence of such accomplishment will include considerations of productivity in publication, grants, and patents, and the successful application of scholar to partnerships with industry, governmental agencies, and other public or private entities. The candidate will be expected to demonstrate in such areas an established national or international reputation, as well as the capacity and likelihood for continued excellence. Where student/fellow/trainee supervision and mentoring are included in workload expectations, the candidate is expected to have demonstrated effective communication and support for the student/fellow/trainee's professional development. The candidate's teaching, research, scholarship, clinical activity and/or creative activity should be nationally and internationally recognized. Faculty seeking promotion to scholar professor should confer with their chair one year prior to seeking promotion. Promotion to scholar professor requires demonstration and evidence of scholarly excellence (i.e., at a minimum "strong performance beyond satisfactory"). Faculty promoted to the rank of scholar professor may be appointed to terms of up to five years (with or without a rolling horizon) based on department and college need.

Areas of Evaluation

The areas of evaluation must align with the candidate's negotiated scope of work/focus areas.

Teaching: In the college, teaching may take a variety of forms including, but not limited to, classroom instruction, clinical supervision, and mentorship, advising, and serving on master's or doctoral thesis committees if designated as a member of their department's Graduate Faculty. It is incumbent on the applicant for promotion to document excellence in teaching. This is done primarily through the College Teaching Portfolio. This document is prepared by the candidate and must be signed and dated by the candidate. This document is available online to all faculty within the college. It does not need to include all information (e.g., all student evaluations), but instead evidence that illustrates and supports the individual's teaching excellence. The length and content of the teaching portfolio may vary, consistent with the candidate's involvement in teaching. Typically, the teaching portfolio is no more than five pages (plus exhibits as appropriate). The information delineated below should be included as appropriate to one's teaching assignment. See the College Teaching Portfolio for additional elaboration.

Teaching Responsibilities: This should include a clear description of the candidate's percent effort dedicated to teaching, the specific courses, components, sessions taught, work with individual students/fellows/trainees, settings in which supervision occurred, students advised or other advising activities, and graduate committee service. Descriptions should be as specific as possible and include information that allows for evaluation of the quantity and intensity of teaching. The topics listed below reflect a board concept of teaching. Others might be added.

- a. Instructional innovations.
 - b. Development of instructional and/or assessment materials.
 - c. Assessment of student learning outcomes.
 - d. Extraordinary efforts with special groups of students.
 - e. Using research in teaching: including using hands on research in the classroom or integrating scientific findings or methods into clinical supervision.
 - f. Out of class evaluation activities: involvement in development or evaluation of new curriculum.
 - g. Mentoring students, post-docs, trainees.
 - h. Service on committees focused on instruction.
 - i. Learning about teaching-efforts to improve teaching.
 - j. Funded projects and projects under review for funding to improve teaching or improve clinical programs.
 - k. Teaching continuing education courses.
- A. Evaluations: This section should consist of summaries of data from whatever methods for evaluating teaching are used, including but not limited to evaluations by students. The candidate may include explanations of evaluations which they believe may be potentially misleading. Teaching evaluations may include:
- a. Student evaluations: includes results of student questionnaires, interviews of students.
 - b. Measures of student learning (e.g., performance of students on standardized tests).

- c. Peer evaluations: includes ratings by peers regarding observation of teaching, review of instructional materials. Letters from colleagues might also be useful.
 - d. Unsolicited correspondence from students, alumni, and employers of alumni.
 - e. Teaching awards.
 - f. Other evaluations.
- B. Results: The results of teaching should be documented, and these include:
- a. Student/trainee successes: awards, admission to graduate or post-graduate programs, employment and other accomplishments for which the candidate may deserve some credit.
 - b. Instructional materials developed: textbooks written, teaching manuals, software.
 - c. Contributions to the scholarship of teaching: including research about instruction, publication and presentation of these findings to university and nation-wide audiences.
 - d. Educational leadership: evidence of impact beyond one's own students.
 - e. Other results, appendix, or exhibits may include syllabi, student evaluation forms, grade distributions.

Clinical Practice/Clinical Instruction: In the college, clinical practice and clinical instruction may take many forms given the diversity of the types of work conducted by our faculty. Success in these areas will be evaluated by the metrics below, taking into account the scope of work conducted by each faculty member. Each candidate active in clinical practice should prepare a clinical practice/clinical instruction activity statement that succinctly summarizes their accomplishments. This document is limited to two pages. The following is a non-prioritized, illustrative list of evidence of effectiveness in clinical practice/clinical supervision/instruction.

- A. Patient satisfaction survey results or other documentation of patient feedback (e.g., letters or emails from patients)
- B. Documentation of improved patient outcomes
- C. Awards and recognition for clinical care
- D. Board certification
- E. Clinical leadership such as serving as a supervising clinician, managing a clinical service, unit or practice
- F. Evidence of expertise in a field or specialty. Documented evidence that the applicant has established local, national, or international expertise in a field as documented by letters from peers, publications in professional journals, presentations at conferences, or continuing education talks or trainings
- G. Evidence of mentoring exceeding most peers in quantity and effectiveness as measured by mentees' accomplishments
- H. Local, regional and national leadership activities in educational, professional, scientific or healthcare related community organizations
- I. Participation in local, regional and national level interdisciplinary health care-related work groups or committees with evidence of outstanding impact/improved outcomes
- J. Local, regional and national recognition/awards for clinical expertise from professional and public groups
- K. Invitations to present locally, regionally, nationally or internationally on novel synthesis of knowledge or new techniques and/or procedures

- L. Innovative clinical programs that are disseminated and serve as models for other institutions
- M. Securing external funding for practice innovations, new clinical initiatives or innovative or complex shared scientific resources
- N. Involvement in quality improvement initiatives. Participate, lead, or design quality improvement projects within the applicant's scope of practice
- O. Development and use of innovative and/or evidence-based practices in clinical care
- P. Clinical growth, such as development of a new specialty or expertise through board certification, independent study, or continuing education
- Q. Documentation of clinical excellence from peers, supervisors, and students
- R. Evidence of clinical collaboration (e.g., participation in multidisciplinary teams, case conferences, collaborative care)
- S. Development of new clinical tools, programs and/or treatments
- T. Fellowship, Masters status in national professional organizations (e.g., FACP, MAGA)
- U. Provision of charity care to underserved populations, locally, nationally, or internationally
- V. Supervision and clinic-based instruction of professional students, interns, residents, and/or fellows.

Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity: In the college, scholarship, research, and creative activity that are a product of work performed at WSU can take many forms given the diversity of the types of research conducted by our faculty. Success in these areas will be evaluated by the metrics below, taking into account the type of work conducted by each faculty member. Each candidate should prepare a research/scholarship/creative activity statement that succinctly summarizes their accomplishments within the context of a thematic, cohesive, and systematic program. This document is limited to two pages (plus exhibits as appropriate). The following is a non-prioritized, illustrative list of evidence of effectiveness in research, scholarly, and/or creative productivity:

- A. Authoring peer reviewed research publications
- B. Serving as a Principal Investigator on externally funded research grants or contracts, including Federal, State, Foundation, and Corporate sponsors
- C. Serving as a Co-Investigator on externally funded research grants or contracts, including Federal, State, Foundation, and Corporate sponsors
- D. Serving as a Principal Investigator on peer-reviewed internally funded grants
- E. Serving as a Co-Investigator receiving subcontracted support from the grant on externally funded grants or contracts, including Federal, State, Foundation, and Corporate sponsors
- F. Serving as an Inventor, Principal Investigator, or Co-Investigator on research leading to intellectual property licensed by WSU
- G. Authoring peer reviewed abstracts, should be denoted as peer reviewed on curriculum vitae
- H. Peer-reviewed presentations at international, national, state or local conferences
- I. Authorship of book chapters, textbooks, monographs, web resources, computer programs, or other written scholarship
- J. Editor of a journal or book
- K. Service on editorial boards of scholarly publications

- L. Invited presentations at WSU, other institutions, professional and scientific conferences, or medical centers
- M. Authorship of policy or clinical reports or guidelines at a city, county, state, national or international level
- N. Authorship as inventor or co-inventor of provisional patent applications filed by WSU
- O. Other activities related to commercializing reviewable scientific discoveries as part of the candidate's duties at WSU

Service: Service is essential to the success of the college and the University. Scholar faculty are encouraged to contribute in areas other than their primary foci as negotiated within their scope of work. If the candidate has engaged in service, they should describe the service they have conducted, including service at or on behalf of WSU and outside WSU (e.g., professional associations). It is important that the applicant document their service in a level of detail that allows for accurate evaluation. Candidates should describe how they collaborated with others in their service. Service might include the following:

- A. Departmental, College or University committee service
- B. Service in university administration
- C. Involvement in relevant professional organization, including serving in a leadership or committee position
- D. Involvement in local, state, national or international communities in a manner that improves the health and wellbeing of these communities
- E. Serving on local, state, national or international advisory committees
- F. Serving as a journal or grant reviewer
- G. Efforts to promote diversity
- H. Sponsorship or advising of student organizations
- I. Supporting/mentoring other faculty in teaching, scholarship, or service or promotion to scholar professor, mentorship of junior faculty

5.0 Related Policies and Guidelines

[BPPM 60.55](#)

[WSU EP #29](#)

[Faculty Manual Section III.C.3](#)

ESFCOM Guidelines for the promotion of tenure track faculty

6.0 Revision History

| Original Approval | Guideline Number | Date Revision Approved |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| 00/00/2020 | G.FR.03.02.170721 | N/A |