FACULTY GUIDE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

Overview of the Process

WSU has a multi-level review process for promotion and tenure (P&T) decisions and 3rd year reviews. The processes vary slightly for Tenure Track (TT) and Career Track (CT) positions, but the general principles are the same for the two appointment tracks. Recommendations for P&T and for 3rd year reviews are made in the department/school/program unit according to unit, college and university bylaws, policies, and procedures. Procedures and requirements may vary slightly between departments, but all adhere to the college and university policies. Recommendations that involve the award of tenure are reviewed successively by the dean, the provost, and the president, who makes the final recommendation to the Board of Regents for action. Recommendations that do not involve the award of tenure are reviewed successively by the dean, the provost, and the president, who makes the final decision.

Criteria and Standards

Decisions to promote and/or to grant tenure to faculty members are the most important ones made by the university, for they will determine WSU’s reputation and prominence for many years to come. They are also important decisions as they impact the careers of individual faculty members. A recommendation for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor (typically) includes the award of tenure (in TT positions) and should be based on several years of sustained, outstanding achievements in scholarship, teaching, and service across the mission, consistent with performance levels expected for promotion to associate professor at peer universities. A reasonably long period in rank before promotion is usually necessary to provide a basis in actual performance for predicting capacity to become an expert of national and/or international stature and long-term, high-quality professional achievement and University service.

Faculty are reviewed in accordance with their defined responsibilities/official job description – i.e., according to their designated contributions to our land grant university’s missions (below). No single mission of the university shall have inordinate weight in the review of a faculty member unless that mission is the primary focus for that faculty member. Rather, the expectation of the faculty member’s appointment directs the weight of the various missions in their appointment. It should be noted that faculty appointments and expectations can be modified, permanently to temporarily, upon agreement with their chair or director in consultation with the associate deans and dean.

Washington State University’s core missions:

- Teaching & Learning, including mentoring and advising
  - Scholarship of pedagogy
  - Scholarship of application
- Research, as broadly defined by Boyer
  - Scholarship of discovery
  - Scholarship of integration

*adapted from https://hr.msu.edu/ua/promotion/faculty-academic-staff/guide.html*
The institution values the capacity of faculty to integrate their work across the land grant missions. Those faculty members who are engaged in two or more missions of the land grant university can integrate their work across their teaching, extension, research, and service roles. Faculty who successfully demonstrate this integration embody the ideals of the land grant university, and their efforts should be recognized and rewarded accordingly, regardless of track.

All faculty are expected to contribute to a positive community and culture. Recognizing that academic units, campuses, institutions, and professions operate as a collective, all faculty should contribute in positive ways as mentors, advisors, contributors, and leaders. Faculty should value the professional and personal well-being of their colleagues, including fellow faculty, staff, administrators, and students and work toward an equitable distribution of formal and informal service and leadership.

Contributions in scholarship should be documented in promotion materials by describing research/creative activities and providing evidence of scholarship, such as peer-reviewed publications, success in obtaining competitive funding, and student development. Programmatic impacts of projects or specific outputs should be explained so that a faculty outside the discipline can understand the purpose of the work and the significance of the results, whether addressing a fundamental scientific question or an applied solution to specific social, agricultural, or environmental issues. If possible, the overall focus of a program should be described along with specific milestone accomplishments to show progress, ideally measurable impact, in an identifiable way towards a long-term goal. A faculty’s specific role in publications and grants should be documented as described in Faculty Resources for Documenting Impact. Other evidence of scholarly contributions come from various types of peer evaluation and interaction. There are many manifestations of peer evaluation other than grants and journal/book publication, including but not limited to: Publication in peer-evaluated media; commentaries and citations; invitations to present papers, performances and master classes, chair conference sessions, participate in symposia, referee papers, review grant applications, or participate on review panels; editorships of journals; and membership on boards of societies.

Service is interpreted generally as activities that benefit and contribute to the profession, university, or communities. Shared governance, the basic operating principle of the University, is impossible without faculty service, so evidence of service is expected in tenure and promotion documents for all types of faculty appointments. Expectations for service generally increase as a faculty member advances through their career; typically, less for promotion to associate professor than professor. The basic elements comprising service include outreach as well as university, college, department, professional discipline, and public service. Various types of service are described in the faculty manual, in the section Review of Faculty.
WSU’s expectations for full ranked professors, irrespective of track, is similar to those of other land grant universities. For example, from Michigan State University (https://hr.msu.edu/ua/promotion/faculty-academic-staff/guide.html) - In as much as the University invests in an individual at the time of promotion to associate, the measure of promotion to “full” (for a tenure track faculty member) is the investment the individual has made in the University. As such, a recommendation for promotion from associate professor to professor in the tenure system should be based on several years of sustained, outstanding achievements in scholarship and education across the mission. Moreover, it is an expectation that individuals should provide leadership within the department, mentorship to junior faculty and graduate students, teaching of undergraduates, service on committees, and contribute to a flourishing intellectual life for those in the broader discipline, unit, college, and Institution. A reasonably long period in rank before promotion is usually necessary to provide a basis in actual performance to permit endorsement of the individual as an expert of national and international stature and to predict continuous, long-term, high-quality professional achievement and University service. As a tenured faculty member, a professor must not only demonstrate disciplinary excellence, but also demonstrate commitment and effectiveness in larger institutional missions such as improving culture, inclusiveness, and equity both in the academy but also more broadly in society. Innovation brought to teaching and interdisciplinary team building that enables broader groups of people from the widest possible disciplinary or college perspective are also part of a move from individual work to being a university professor. Such a responsibility is even greater for those who earn promotion to full professor.

Expectations & examples of scholarship, scholarly activity, impact, and creative activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Planning</td>
<td>• Research/Extension or other creative activity is focused and moving in an identifiable way (trajectory) towards measurable outcomes &lt;br&gt; • Main focus should be in line with subject matter of appointment &lt;br&gt; • Communicates with stakeholders in industry and commissions to identify needs &lt;br&gt; • Programs reach diverse audiences with culturally appropriate materials &lt;br&gt; • Teaches courses at the level expected by appointment with guidance from the chair &lt;br&gt; • Course content is in line with needs based on curriculum and student learning needs &lt;br&gt; • Contributes to the success of the curriculum by integrating course contents and learning goals</td>
<td>• Faculty member is gaining recognition regionally and nationally for work in focus area &lt;br&gt; Planning includes synergy from collaborations with complementary programs &lt;br&gt; Scales up program planning to a higher level such as statewide or nationally &lt;br&gt; Involved in curriculum revisions and development</td>
<td>• Faculty member is recognized nationally &amp; internationally for impact in focus area &lt;br&gt; Scales up program planning to a higher level such as statewide or nationally &lt;br&gt; Leads team or center program planning processes resulting in measurable outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Scholarship</td>
<td>• Conducts innovative research/creative activity that advances their discipline &lt;br&gt; • Regularly publishes in appropriate or high-impact peer reviewed journals or other media, (juried events, educational material) including some as primary author &lt;br&gt; • Publishes applied research results in appropriate media to impact industry and public stakeholders</td>
<td>• Programs and methodologies are highly innovative, and receive regional or national recognition for quality, professionalism, and impact</td>
<td>• Faculty member shows leadership in collaborative interdisciplinary programs that include research, Extension and education &lt;br&gt; Leads disciplinary efforts with colleagues to form programs with alliances to stakeholders and agencies &lt;br&gt; Provides leadership in curriculum, student success, recruitment and retention issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*adapted from https://hr.msu.edu/ua/promotion/faculty-academic-staff/guide.html*
**Approximate TimeLine and Annual Timetable for Promotion and Tenure Actions**

For tenure track faculty hired as assistant professors, the tenure review process will occur after the fifth year unless there is an approved extension. Accelerated timelines may be appropriate for faculty hired with significant experience as an assistant or associate professor at another university; this will generally be included in the tenure track faculty member’s offer letter. Promotion to professor, or any promotions for non-tenure track faculty are typically after they have been in rank for five years but are done at the discretion of the faculty member in consultation with their chair/director and mentor/career guidance committee. For career track faculty hired as assistant professors, the same timeline across the years is typically followed for extension appointments. Deviations from the timeline require approval from the chair/program director, and not the dean and the provost.

*adapted from https://hr.msu.edu/ua/promotion/faculty-academic-staff/guide.html*
The annual timetable for submission of promotion and tenure process is approximately (exact dates vary each year, and by units):

May  Distribution of instruction and newest forms on promotion and tenure.
Late May/Early June  Requests for consideration of early promotion or tenure must be submitted to the dean’s office.
Late June  Chairs send lists of which faculty are going up for promotion and tenure to the dean’s office, including those who would be scheduled to apply but are delaying a year for Covid interruptions or other reasons. Chair sends requests to external/internal letter writers.
June -August  Department chairs/directors inform faculty when final tenure & promotion materials are due at the department level and the chair schedules meetings with other faculty to discuss & evaluate the packages.
Late Aug  Department chair/director sends a recommendation and (T&P) document summarizing the departmental recommendation for promotion and/or tenure materials to the dean’s office.
Sept./Early Oct.  College T&P committee evaluates packages, along with materials forwarded from the departments and makes recommendations to the dean.
Late October  Complete dossiers are due in the provost’s office.
December  Discussion by the provost’s T&P advisory committee
January  Discussions with relevant deans/vice provosts begin and recommendations are sent to the Board of Regents.
March  Letters sent to faculty

Promotion Materials Content

The provost’s office provides a useful checklist for promotion, tenure and third year review materials. Your department/unit may require additional items that it considers important when reviewing your package. CAHNRS requests a statement document (Updated CAHNRS TP Policies Procedures and Criteria - May 2013) which is optional in the provost’s requirements. The statement document provides additional context for the different areas of the faculty member’s appointment that are not apparent in the other materials. For example, it may include expectations of a faculty member for their work at research stations or regional campuses, the requirement of joint appointments or other special circumstances such as leadership roles or commitments to industry, service centers or student groups. The statement can be used to clarify the themes of the faculty’s scholarship and/or service activities.

Intensive annual reviews (aka, third-year review) are conducted during the third year of an appointment unless the faculty member had an approved tenure-clock extension. The third-year review is done as part of the annual review process during the relevant year but includes both a comprehensive annual review plus a career progress review; the latter covers overall progress toward promotion, not just your past year’s performance. This is also referred to as an Intensive Review. The faculty member is responsible for the usual annual review materials - a current curriculum vitae and an updated Activity Insight report – plus a statement document and a teaching portfolio (if relevant to the appointment;

*adapted from https://hr.msu.edu/ua/promotion/faculty-academic-staff/guide.html
limited to five pages). Supporting material may be included if desired (e.g., examples of scholarly material). External review letters are not part of the third-year review.

Unit Faculty that are at a higher promotion rank are expected to provide input on a faculty member’s career progress, in addition to that provided by the mentor/career guidance committee. The chair/director will discuss both the annual review and career progress portions of the review with you. For pre-tenured TT faculty, the career progress portion of the review is sent to the dean’s office along with the annual review. Overall, for pre-tenure TT faculty, the overall process of the third-year review is similar to a promotion process except that external reference letters are not included.

*adapted from https://hr.msu.edu/ua/promotion/faculty-academic-staff/guide.html*