



Elson S. Floyd College of Medicine

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

Advisory Guideline Title: Guidelines for the Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

Applies to: Tenure and tenure track faculty

Date: 02/19/2021

1.0 Guidelines for the Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty are expected to make significant contributions to the research, scholarship, teaching, and service/outreach missions of the WSU Elson S. Floyd College of Medicine. This document outlines the WSU College of Medicine guidelines for progress-toward-tenure review, intensive (third year) review, tenure review, and promotion to Associate Professor, Professor, and Regents Professor ranks. Each candidate for promotion is evaluated in terms of the workload of research, scholarship, teaching, and service outlined in the offer letter or re-negotiated agreement with the Chair. Candidates for promotion shall be evaluated in accordance with the guidelines outlined in the Faculty Manual of Washington State University (WSU), the College of Medicine Guidelines for Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty (this document), and specific expectations and criteria as outlined in departmental tenure and promotion guidelines.

2.0 Definitions

For all types of reviews: If the Department Chair or Associate Chair does not hold tenure, the review is completed by a tenured Department Chair, Associate Dean or a Vice Dean at the College of Medicine, assigned by the Office of Faculty Affairs in collaboration with the Office of the Provost.

Abridged Review: Abridged reviews are only available to tenured faculty and occur the year after a faculty member received a rating of Satisfactory or above on Comprehensive or Intensive review. Abridged reviews require that the faculty submit a curriculum vitae and a short description of his or her accomplishments since the last annual review. This review is performed by the Department Chair (or Associate Chair at Clinical Campuses). A written report is sent by the Department Chair or the Associate Chair to the Dean and the faculty member. The report will include a rating of either 1) Satisfactory or Better or 2) Less than Satisfactory. The report must include an invitation to the faculty member to meet with the Department Chair/Associate Chair. A rating of Less than Satisfactory will result in an explanation of the decision and all subsequent reviews will be comprehensive until a rating of Satisfactory or better is achieved.

Comprehensive Review: Intended to evaluate the performance of the faculty member and to provide feedback relative to university and department expectations. Each comprehensive review will consider the faculty member's accomplishments and

Guidelines for the Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

contributions since the last comprehensive or intensive review in the context of his or her cumulative performance. All faculty will undergo comprehensive reviews either annually or biennially. Only tenured faculty have the option of undergoing comprehensive reviews biennially. By the due date set by the Department Chair, each faculty member is expected to provide their curriculum vitae that includes information concerning education, instructional performance, research activities and publications, awards, professional experience, service activities, and affiliations, as well as a summary of his or her activities since the last comprehensive or intensive review. The comprehensive review is performed by the Department Chair/Associate Chair in consultation with appropriate faculty supervisors. Each comprehensive review will result in a written report from the Department Chair to the Dean and the faculty member who was reviewed. The report sent to the faculty member should include an invitation to meet face-to-face with the Department Chair if the faculty member so desires. Reports will contain the faculty member's percentage appointment and primary responsibilities; whether the review is based on an annual or biennial time frame; a summary and written evaluation of the faculty member's performance in each of his or her areas of responsibility since the last comprehensive or intensive review, viewed in the context of his or her cumulative performance; an assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure or promotion, when applicable; and an annual review rating assigned to the faculty member's performance according to one of the following categories. These categories include:

- Especially Meritorious Performance
- Strong Performance Beyond Satisfactory
- Satisfactory
- Some Improvement Needed
- Substantial Improvement Needed.

If an annual review rating of "Some Improvement Needed" or "Substantial Improvement Needed" is assigned, then the report will include a list of goals and expectations intended to help the faculty member achieve a "Satisfactory" or above annual review rating at the next review, which must be comprehensive or intensive. The list should clearly identify areas in which performance is deemed deficient and specific recommendations to correct the deficit. Optionally, the report may also contain: an evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward previously set goals and expectations, as approved by the Department Chair, a list of goals and expectations to be evaluated at the next comprehensive review, and additional comments from the faculty member's immediate supervisor, if the immediate supervisor is someone other than the Chair.

For untenured faculty, a rating of "Substantial Improvement Needed" may lead to non-reappointment as described in section III.C.3 of the Faculty Manual. In this event, the faculty member may, within 30 calendar days after notification of non-reappointment, petition the Faculty Status Committee to review the decision upon grounds of inadequate consideration, violation of academic freedom, or substantial procedural irregularity.

Intensive Review: The intensive review is a two-part review that includes a comprehensive review and a career progress review. The comprehensive review is the same as that described above. The career progress review evaluates the progress of the candidate towards tenure and/or promotion, provides feedback relative to university and

Guidelines for the Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

department expectations, identifies relevant deficiencies, and offers recommendations that may assist the candidate in determining future work. Untenured faculty are normally required to undergo one intensive review. Assistant Professors will undergo an intensive review after the third year of their employment at the Assistant Professor rank, and tenured faculty who are eligible for promotion are strongly encouraged to request an intensive review every four to six years. The intensive review contains two parts, each with its own rating. The comprehensive portion of the intensive review is performed by the Chair in consultation with appropriate faculty supervisors and matches the procedure for the comprehensive review outlined above.

The career progress portion of the intensive review is coordinated by the Chair and normally requires participation from all faculty and administrators eligible to perform tenure or promotion evaluations for the candidate. For untenured faculty, the career progress portion of the intensive review procedures will match those for final tenure consideration, except that external professional evaluations are not required. For tenured faculty, the career progress portion of the review can be limited to the department level.

By the due date set by the Department Chair, each candidate is expected to provide a curriculum vitae that includes information concerning education, instructional performance, research activities and publications, awards, professional experience, service activities, and affiliations, as well as copies of select publications, a research statement (limited to two pages), and a teaching portfolio. Faculty may submit, in addition, a context statement, and descriptions of their external and institutional service activities. A summary of their activities since the last comprehensive or intensive review should also be provided.

Each intensive review will result in two reports: a comprehensive review report and a career progress report. The Chair will meet face-to-face with the candidate to discuss both reports. The comprehensive review report is sent by the Chair to the Dean and to the faculty member who is being reviewed. The rating given in the comprehensive review report will serve as the annual review rating anywhere an annual review rating is used. The career progress report is prepared by the Chair and should reflect the views of the faculty eligible to vote on the candidate's tenure and/or promotion. The report should highlight the candidate's strengths and weaknesses and include recommendations for improvement and the likelihood for tenure and/promotion. In the case of untenured faculty, the candidate should be advised according to the following categories:

- Well Prepared- the candidate is encouraged to seek tenure and/or promotion at the next opportunity;
- Satisfactory- the candidate appears to be building an appropriate profile, but has not yet achieved the standards expected for tenure and/or promotion;
- Improvement Needed- the candidate should review the criteria for tenure and/or promotion and the career progress report carefully, and seek advice from other faculty in the university and his or her discipline;
- Unsatisfactory- the candidate is not on track for tenure and/or promotion.

The Chair should provide the candidate with a copy of the career progress report prior to the face-to-face meeting. For untenured faculty, the career progress report will be sent via the Chair to the Dean and follow the same procedures as that for the final tenure review,

Guidelines for the Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

except that external professional evaluations are not required. A determination that the progress toward tenure is unsatisfactory can lead to non-reappointment as described in section III.G.1 of the *Faculty Manual*. In this event, the faculty member may, within 30 calendar days after notification of non-reappointment, petition the Faculty Status Committee to review the decision upon grounds of inadequate consideration, violation of academic freedom, or substantial procedural irregularity.

Faculty Responses to Annual Review Evaluations: After receiving the annual review report, the Chair/Associate Chair shall provide the faculty member a minimum of ten business days to sign the report, indicating that they have had the opportunity to read the report and to discuss it with the Department Chair/Associate 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 business days that the statement has been reviewed by the Department Chair's immediate supervisor (the Dean). At the same time that a response is sent to the faculty member, the Department Chair's supervisor (the Dean) will forward to the Provost the annual review, the faculty member's response to that review, and the Department Chair's/Associate Chair's response to the faculty member. After receiving this information, the Provost has an additional fifteen business days to provide a written acknowledgement to the faculty member and Chair's supervisor (normally the Dean) that he or she has reviewed all of the statements. For faculty located on urban or clinical campuses, a faculty member's dissent will first be routed through the chancellor (or their designee) and the Regional Associate Dean for review before forwarding to the Dean.

Promotion to Associate Professor/Tenure Review: Promotion and granting of tenure represents a significant commitment by the University to the faculty. Therefore, only candidates who demonstrate potential for long-term excellence and contributions to the University will be promoted to Associate Professor and receive tenure.

Each spring, the Provost will notify the Dean which faculty in the college are eligible for tenure. Faculty are notified that they will be reviewed for tenure in the spring of the fifth year of their initial appointment (Assistant Professors) or the spring of their second year of their appointment (Associate Professors- without tenure). Faculty may request a one-year extension due to extenuating circumstances, such as childbirth, adoption, or serious medical illness. Faculty who are seeking an extension should notify their Department Chair as soon as possible. In rare cases, Assistant Professors can petition for early tenure review (e.g., when review outcome is "Well Prepared"). Faculty who wish to go up for early promotion should closely consult with their Department Chair, as well as the department and college FRPT committees. Faculty who will be considered for tenure and promotion will be notified in the spring by their Chair or the Dean that they should begin preparing their tenure materials. The candidate and their Chair will have approximately 7-8 weeks to prepare this information so that the materials can be provided to the external professional reviewers in a timely fashion. The candidate should work with the Chair to assure that all necessary materials are included in the tenure and promotion packet. The tenure and promotion packet (including the external professional letters) is then reviewed by all tenured faculty members in the department, who must complete a ballot/recommendation to grant or not grant tenure and promotion. The results of these

Guidelines for the Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

evaluations are summarized by the Chair in his or her evaluation. Faculty ballots and the Chair's evaluation are forwarded via the Chair to the Dean along with the entire packet reviewed by the tenured faculty and the Chair. College of Medicine FRPT committee members will then review the tenure and promotion packet, excluding the faculty ballots, and make a recommendation to Dean. The Dean will then provide a written summary of her or his evaluation of the candidate. The entire tenure and promotion packet will be provided to the Office of the Provost (typically during the last week of October) for review and a final decision on the granting of tenure and promotion.

Candidates are typically notified of this decision in the subsequent spring. All promotions and tenure are effective July 1 (for faculty on annual appointments) and August 16 (for faculty on academic appointments) of the year after the promotion packet was submitted. Candidates who are not granted tenure will be given a one-year terminal appointment.

Promotion to Professor: Generally, promotion to Professor is based upon active and longstanding excellence in research and scholarship, teaching, and service, with the expectation of continued excellence. The candidate's research and scholarship should be nationally and internationally recognized. Service should include College of Medicine and University service, as well as service to state and national professional organizations.

Candidates for Professor should also demonstrate continued excellence in teaching. Consideration for promotion is based on the quality of the candidate's cumulative record. Time in rank is not sufficient basis for promotion to Professor; however, it is expected that candidate for promotion will serve as Associate Professors for at least five years before seeking promotion to Professor in their sixth year. Faculty seeking promotion to Professor should confer with their Chair one year prior to seeking promotion. Requests for consideration of early promotion must be based on extraordinary merit. The Dean must obtain approval for early promotion consideration from the Provost prior to the preparation of promotion materials. Candidates should follow the procedures outlined above for tenure review when submitting their application for promotion. The Chair is responsible for providing all comprehensive and intensive reviews conducted since the candidate's last promotion. Only those tenured faculty holding the rank of Professor will vote and make recommendations regarding promotion to Professor. Failure to attain promotion to Professor will not result in a terminal appointment. Instead the applicant will be given feedback on areas of improvement needed to attain promotion.

Promotion to Regents Professor: The Regents Professor rank was developed to recognize the exceptional and cumulative contributions of a small number of extraordinary faculty. Eligible individuals are tenured full Professors or equivalent who have been employed by the University for at least 7 years, achieved the highest level of distinction in the discipline and raised the standards of the university through activities in teaching, and/or research/scholarship, and/or public service. These achievements must be nationally and internationally recognized. There can only be 30 active Regents Professors at any one time. Each college can only nominate two candidates each year. A maximum of five individuals will be promoted to Regents Professor each year. The promotion process and procedures correspond to those for promotion to professor but with appropriate modifications to accommodate the university-wide nature and limitations on number (e.g., tenured faculty recommendations/ballots are not required). Nominees who are not

Guidelines for the Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

selected may remain in consideration for up to three years. Candidates who meet eligibility criteria and are interested in promotion to Regents Professor should contact their Chair who will confer with the Dean regarding the college's nominations for Regents Professor.

3.0 Responsibilities

FRPT Committee: Abridged reviews, comprehensive reviews and intensive reviews will not be sent to the college FRPT for review.

College of Medicine Dean's Office: To collect review forms for each department and forward to the Provost's Office.

Provost's Office: The original administrative forms for abridged, comprehensive, and intensive reviews are retained at the college level and a copy is sent to Human Resource Services. A spreadsheet containing the college roster of all faculty required to undergo an annual review, their review type, and their assigned rating is forwarded to the Provost's Office.

4.0 Procedures

The candidate is responsible for preparing and maintaining a personnel file that provides material bearing on the criteria identified below which should include:

- Research Statement
- Resume/CV
- Teaching Portfolio
- Names of at least two suggested external reviewers

One goal of the College of Medicine is to promote a culture of collaboration, collegiality, and diversity. Therefore, promotion materials should describe how the candidate has partnered with other college and University faculty, as well as faculty at other universities and community partners, if appropriate, through their scholarship, teaching and service.

The Department Chair is responsible for providing comprehensive past annual reviews and third year (intensive) reviews (if appropriate), external letters, department faculty recommendations/ballots, and a copy of the department's and College of Medicine's criteria for promotion and tenure. The Department Chair is responsible for providing the evaluation of the candidate's performance and a recommendation (i.e. tenure and/or promotion).

Each candidate should work with their Department Chair, as well as consult the Provost's yearly annual memo that describes requirements for the tenure and promotion packets, which is typically released in the late spring or early summer.

External Letters: Four external letters are required for promotion and tenure. External letters should be sought from distinguished faculty at peer or better institutions who hold a rank at or above the rank being sought by the applicant. External professional reviewers should not have a relationship with the candidate that goes beyond that of a typical colleague (e.g., not be a former mentor, collaborator, or co-author). Two reviewers may be suggested by the faculty member. The Department Chair will obtain letters from two of these individuals. The Department Chair will obtain an additional two letters from reviewers not nominated by the candidate. The Department Chair will

Guidelines for the Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

provide a brief one paragraph description of each external reviewer's credentials to be included in the promotion packet. The Department Chair will provide the reviewers with copies of the candidate's CV and additional materials noted above documenting the candidate's accomplishments. The external reviewers will be asked to provide an evaluation of the quality and significance of the candidate's work and the candidate's suitability for promotion and/or tenure.

Voting: All eligible departmental faculty must evaluate and provide recommendations or ballots. Only those with personal conflicts of interest (e.g., spouses, family members), are allowed to abstain. Individuals, such as Department Chairs/Associate Chairs or members of the college FRPT committee, can 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 FRPT Committee. All eligible department faculty must be provided with the full tenure/promotion packet, as well as time to review and comment on the candidate's suitability for promotion and/or tenure. If a department has fewer than five eligible faculty who can vote, then the Department Chair/Associate Chair will work with the Dean and Provost's office to identify additional eligible faculty throughout the college or University who will submit recommendations/ballots.

Areas of Evaluation

Research/Scholarship: In the College of Medicine, scholarship and research can take many forms, given the diversity in the types of research conducted by our faculty. Success in scholarship and research will be evaluated by the metrics below, taking into account the type of research conducted by each faculty member. Each candidate should prepare a Research/Scholarship Statement that succinctly summarizes the candidate's research accomplishments within the context of a systematic program of research. This document is limited to two pages. The following is a non-prioritized, illustrative list of evidence of effectiveness in research or scholarly productivity.

Authoring peer reviewed research publications.

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

Guidelines for the Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

- J. Invited research publications.
- K. Invited lectures at WSU, other institutions, professional and scientific conferences, or medical centers.
- L. Authorship of policy or clinical reports or guidelines at a city, county, state, national or international level.
- M. Authorship as inventor or co-inventor of provisional patent applications filed by WSU.
- N. Other activities related to commercializing reviewable scientific discoveries as part of the candidate's duties at WSU.
- O. Demonstrated integration of scholarship (research findings) into teaching and clinical work.
- P. Awards for excellence in research or scholarship.
- Q. Authoring publications on the scholarship of teaching.
- R. The design, implementation, and dissemination of results of teaching scholarship.
- S. The design, implementation, and dissemination of quality improvement projects, or projects that study or improve health disparities, social determinates of health or population health.
- T. When appropriate, examples of partnership with colleagues on research scholarship.
- U. Reviewing other faculty's grant application, manuscripts, or professional presentations prior to submission.
- V. Demonstration of the impact of the candidate's scholarship.

Teaching: In the College of Medicine, teaching may take a variety of forms including but not limited to classroom instruction, clinical supervision, student mentorship and advising, and serving on masters or doctoral thesis and dissertation committees. It is incumbent on the applicant for tenure and promotion to document excellence in teaching. This is done primarily through a Teaching Portfolio (as described in the College of Medicine Teaching Portfolio) that typically is up to five pages long and presents information under the appropriate headings listed below (and perhaps others). This document is prepared by the candidate and must be signed and dated by the candidate. It does not need to include all information (e.g., all student evaluations), but instead evidence that supports teaching excellence. See the College of Medicine Teaching Portfolio for additional elaboration.

- A. Teaching Goals/Philosophy: A compact but thoughtful statement about the candidate's teaching aspirations, strategies used for improvement, obstacles overcome and goals for teaching in the near future.
- B. 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/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.

Guidelines for the Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

- 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.
- C. 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 can 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.
- D. 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 can claim 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.

Service: Service is essential to the success of the College of Medicine and University. It is important that the applicant document their service in a level of detail that allows for accurate evaluation. Candidates should describe how they partnered with others in their service.

Guidelines for the Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

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.
For promotion to Full Professor, mentorship of junior faculty.
- J. Representing the Department, college or University to external bodies.

5.0 Related Policies

[BPPM 60.55](#)

[WSU EP#29](#)

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

6.0 Revision/ Review History

Original Approval	Guideline Number	Date Revision Approved
11/04/2016	G.FR.03.03.161104	7/21/2017
		02/19/2020