

**STATEMENT OF TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY**  
**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES**  
**WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY**  
2013 (6/5/18 Update)

The Faculty Manual of Washington State University (WSU) states the official criteria and procedures for advancement to tenure and promotion in rank. The following text supplements these guidelines and explains their application in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The criteria reflect the goals of the College of Arts and Sciences; the procedures provide a framework for evaluation and ensure due process for the candidate. Professional evaluation is based on informed judgment, which must be sound, adequately sampled, carefully reviewed, and subject to appeal. In this document "department" is used for any academic unit (department or school) with tenure and promotion responsibilities; "Chair" is used for the Chair, typically either a Chair or a Director. Departments augment this document with criteria and procedures specific to those departments. The College expects Departments to form and implement effective mentoring committees for untenured, tenure-track faculty. Their function is to advise on various local and discipline-specific aspects regarding teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, service, and progress towards tenure and promotion.

Nothing in this or departmental documents should be construed to be in conflict with the broader statements of the university or the Faculty Manual pertaining to tenure and promotion. In case of apparent conflict, university and Faculty Manual rules take precedence. In the document below, we refer to the Faculty Manual several times. The current Faculty Manual is found on the web at [http://www.wsu.edu/Faculty\\_Senate](http://www.wsu.edu/Faculty_Senate).

An additional level of oversight is required for faculty at the urban campuses (WSU Spokane, Tri-Cities, and Vancouver). In general their annual reviews, tenure reviews, and consideration for promotion require input from both Pullman and the urban campus, and the signature of the urban campus vice chancellor. These issues are addressed below.

Cases for early promotion and/or tenure must be justified by extraordinary merit and permission to bring the case forward must be obtained from the Provost before the case is prepared. With the agreement of the faculty member the Chair sends a memo to the Provost, via the Dean (for signature), making the case for early promotion and/or tenure. Although extraordinary merit is necessary for early consideration, the College criteria for receiving the promotion and/or tenure remain the same.

**NOTE TO FACULTY:** Faculty not yet tenured and who were hired in the former **College of Liberal Arts** (CLA) prior to Fall 2013 have the option of following either: 1) the former CLA tenure and promotion guidelines; or, 2) the College of Arts and Sciences tenure and promotion guidelines. Faculty not yet tenured and who were hired in the former **College of Sciences** (COS) prior to Fall 2013 have the option of following either: 1) the former COS tenure and promotion guidelines; or, 2) the College of Arts and Sciences tenure and promotion guidelines.

## **TENURE**

### **Criteria**

The areas of evaluation in considering eligibility for tenure are: (a) research, scholarship or creative activity, (b) classroom and individual instruction, (c) external funding at a level appropriate to the candidate's discipline, (d) interactions with colleagues and students, as well as the supervision of graduate students and advising and mentoring of undergraduate students, (e) participation in professional activity, (f) participation in departmental and university service. In the College of Arts and Sciences, criterion (a) is of primary importance, but criterion (b) is significant and the others are important. In view of the responsibilities of the faculty in university governance, judicious participation in extra-departmental assignments is expected. Except in instances in which written agreement specifies otherwise, tenure will not be recommended unless excellence in both research/scholarship/creativity activity and instruction can be satisfactorily demonstrated. The university and college have adopted the teaching portfolio (College policy and format appended, Appendices 1 and 2) as the means of documenting excellence in instruction. Normally, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should be considered simultaneously.

Each academic department of the College of Arts and Sciences must develop a statement of departmental criteria and procedures supplementing those outlined here. The statement is to be on file in the department, college office, faculty senate office, and in the Provost's office.

### **Procedures**

Copies of the department and college criteria for tenure and promotion will be provided to new faculty hires, no later than at the time when the offer is made, normally the criteria are sent with the letter of offer. For joint appointments, the letter of offer will specify which department will be the lead for annual evaluation and tenure and promotion.

It is the responsibility of each untenured faculty member to maintain an academic biography that provides material bearing on the criteria identified above. It is the joint responsibility of the faculty member and the Chair to assure that the dossier presents the case fully, clearly and accurately.

### ***Annual Evaluation of Progress Toward Tenure***

This review is separate from the annual review for performance and salary adjustment. Evaluations of the progress of untenured faculty members are to be conducted at the departmental level once a year. The purpose is to advise and direct progress towards tenure or, to recommend termination of employment. This review should assess the faculty member's cumulative progress towards tenure. Progress Towards Tenure Reviews should be done at the same time of year as the annual review and they should usually lead logically to the final tenure decision. Similar to the annual review, the urban campus administrator should be consulted when reviewing the progress of faculty members at urban campuses.

Unlike the annual review, the progress towards tenure review is based on cumulative performance and requires the participation of all tenured faculty in the department. The Chair

must also discuss the outcome of the review with the untenured faculty member. The purpose of the discussion is to aid the faculty member in understanding how tenured members view his or her performance in light of the departmental/college criteria and expectations.

If the candidate resides on a campus other than Pullman, the Chair will seek information from relevant individuals at that site. These must include faculty tenured in the department and the appropriate urban campus administrators.

A dated written summary of the discussion of these results and of the implications shall be signed both by the department Chair and the untenured faculty member. The faculty member shall have the right to append a statement concerning this summary; the statement will become a permanent part of the record. A copy of the signed summary is to be provided to the faculty member, the Dean, and, if applicable, to the urban campus CAS Director. The policy for this progress towards tenure review can be found in the Faculty Manual, *Section III.3.d*.

The process can lead to a recommendation that employment be terminated before the end of the pre-tenure period. The procedure is outlined in *Section III.F.1*. "Nonreappointment" [http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty\\_manual/](http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual/).

### ***Third Year Review***

Every tenure-track faculty member with a pre-tenure period of six years undergoes a formal "third year" tenure-progress review in the spring of his or her third academic year at WSU. The purpose of this review is to identify relevant strengths and deficiencies with regard to progress towards tenure. The review shall be conducted following the procedures which apply to the tenure review, except that outside letters are not required. The timing for the formal third year review should be negotiated at the time of appointment for faculty appointments with a pre-tenure appointment less than six years. The third year review is optional for faculty appointments with a pre-tenure period less than three years. The complete policy can be found in *Section III.D.2.e* of the Faculty Manual [http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty\\_manual/](http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual/). For urban campus faculty, information must be obtained from the location by the department Chair.

After consultation with the tenured faculty, the department Chair will make a recommendation that progress is satisfactory, some improvement required, substantial improvement required or unsatisfactory. The recommendation is to be forwarded to the Dean and, if applicable, to the urban campus vice chancellor. The Dean will prepare and forward a recommendation to the Provost, along with the case materials and Chair's recommendation. The vice chancellor, if applicable, writes a separate recommendation. The Dean and, if applicable, the vice chancellor, will then reach an agreement with the Provost on retention or nonreappointment.

The purpose of this review is to identify relevant deficiencies with regard to progress towards tenure. The faculty member, Chair and Dean will receive a letter from the Provost stating the outcome of the Third Year Review. After the candidate receives the Provost's letter, the Chair must meet with the candidate and discuss the review. In the event the Chair is unavailable, the meeting and discussion should be held with the Dean (or vice chancellor in the case of faculty at the urban campuses). Where the results are judged unsatisfactory, the third-year tenure progress review can lead to nonreappointment as described in section III.F.1.

### ***Tenure Review***

At the time of faculty tenure consideration as specified in their letter of offer (or at hire, for faculty being hired with tenure at senior ranks), the candidate and the Chair shall jointly assure that the case materials as specified by the Provost's office are complete. In particular the following shall be included in the confidential file: (a) curriculum vitae; (b) A total of up to 10 relevant research publications, other scholarly and creative contributions and manuscripts in press that makes a compelling case for tenure. These publications and contributions should have been generated while the candidate held a faculty position at Washington State University unless the faculty member has been granted time off of the tenure clock for work done elsewhere. If the selected materials have co-authors or co-investigators, it is the responsibility of the candidate to indicate clearly his/her role in those publications/contributions; (c) confidential letters from at least five well qualified external reviewers evaluating the quality of the candidate's published research or other evidence of scholarly activity, the contribution to the candidate's profession and discipline, and the candidate's professional reputation. Every review letter that is solicited (by the Chair) and received should be included. The reviewers shall be selected by the Chair, and may include ones suggested by the candidate, but should not include present or former collaborators of the candidate, coauthors or thesis/post-doctoral advisors. The majority of letters should not be from the reviewers on the list provided by the candidate. Letters from other WSU faculty are not acceptable. Under no circumstances will a reviewer be paid or compensated in any way for reviewing the candidate's file or writing a letter. (d) a teaching portfolio (no more than 5 pages of narrative) in the format adopted by the College of Arts and Sciences (see Appendices 1 & 2). A statement of context may be included but is not required. If a Context Statement is included it should be limited to two pages.

Following the review of the file and discussion of the record among themselves, the tenured faculty members shall provide recommendations by way of confidential, signed faculty recommendations, a sample of which is supplied in the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines distributed by the Provost's office. The Chair shall assure that every tenured member (including those on leave, if practical) has an opportunity to review the record and to complete a faculty tenure recommendation form. The Chair must also convey to the faculty the responsibility to participate in the evaluation process and to provide a rationale for their recommendation, whether it is positive or negative. Faculty who have appointments that might provide more than one occasion to participate in evaluations must do so only once. If the candidate resides on a campus other than Pullman, the Chair will seek information from relevant individuals at that site. Note the following requirement specified in the Faculty Manual: "At least five persons who are thoroughly familiar with the attainments of the eligible faculty member must complete this tenure form. When there are not five tenured faculty members in the department, the tenured members shall recommend additional such persons through the Dean to the Provost, who shall determine which of these persons will complete the tenure form." The Chair's recommendation does not count as one of the five.

The Chair shall collate the results and all files are uploaded to a SharePoint site as specified by the Office of the Provost. It is college policy that faculty tenure recommendations and letters of recommendation are privileged information and are to be handled as such. They are not to be shared with the candidate without an official Public Records Request.

All personnel involved with tenure and promotion should realize that state and federal public disclosure laws may limit confidentiality of the file (including faculty recommendation forms and

outside letters). The Provost's office recommends qualifying statements to be used on all requests for letters of recommendation.

The Dean presents all tenure cases to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. The committee usually consists of 11 members, all tenured Professors or Associate Professors selected by the Dean with recommendations from the Chairs. The Associate Professors and Professors will recommend on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Only Professors will recommend on promotion to Professor. The members review and discuss the record of each candidate, the summary of the departmental evaluation, and the Chair's recommendation. The Chair normally appears before the committee to discuss the candidate's case. Each member records a recommendation on a confidential ballot forwarded to the Dean. All proceedings of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee are confidential. The members' recommendation forms are advisory to the Dean.

The Dean reviews the cumulative record, obtains written input from the urban campus vice chancellor, if applicable, and forwards a recommendation and the documentation to the Provost. The Provost's office generates letters to the faculty members with copies to the Chairs and the Dean. As determined by the Provost's office, there is a period of three days when these letters are to be distributed to the faculty. The Provost's office notifies the Dean's office of the three day notification period and when the letters are ready. The Dean's office distributes the letters to the department Chairs and they distribute them to the faculty members, all on the same day. For faculty at an urban campus, the Dean's office express mails the letters to them and a copy to the urban campus CAS Director to insure that all faculty receive their letters on the same day. Tenure review shall result in either the granting of tenure, to become effective at the beginning of the next academic year following the year in which the tenure review is conducted, or denial of tenure together with the offering of a one-year terminal appointment. The policy for appeal of denial of tenure follows procedures stated in the most recent update of the Web Faculty Manual, *Section III.F.1.*

## **PROMOTION**

### **Criteria**

The basic criteria are those outlined above for evaluating tenure. Time in rank is not sufficient by itself. Consideration for promotion is based on the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the candidate's cumulative record. Additional criteria for the ranks are listed below.

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will depend upon adequate demonstration of the candidate's sustained excellence in the following: scholarly and/or creative contributions; effort and success in obtaining external funding at a level appropriate to the candidate's discipline, if such is required for support of the candidate's research/professional program; supervision of graduate students; and, undergraduate and graduate instruction. Normally, promotion to Associate Professor and tenure should be considered simultaneously.

For promotion to the rank of Professor, in addition to the cumulative qualifications already summarized, a candidate must present evidence of national recognition, reputation for sustained scholarly competence, and an increased level of professional activity. This evidence may include but is not limited to a substantial body of publications, scholarly or creative contributions, a well-established research program with a substantial record of external funding at a level appropriate

to the candidate's discipline, effective use of professional leave and other opportunities for self-improvement, service as an editorial referee or editor of learned journal(s), consulting, and invitations to speak to professional societies. The progress made since the faculty member achieved tenure should be clearly indicated. Candidates for promotion to professor must have made substantial progress beyond the work submitted for promotion to associate professor. For example, research publications, scholarly/creative contributions or grants responsible for a favorable tenure decision will not be considered to justify promotion to Professor. *Documented evidence that the quality and quantity of the accomplishments of the candidate are at a significantly higher level than that expected of an Associate Professor is required.* It should be emphasized that individuals who cannot present a record of continuing excellence in instruction will not be considered favorably for promotion to the rank of Professor, if instruction is part of their assignment. For promotion to professor, an individual must exhibit mature leadership qualities that are essential for the progress of the department. A teaching portfolio (no more than 5 pages for the narrative) must be included with the promotion materials. On occasion, the rank of Professor will be recommended for individuals who excel in instruction and show clear and convincing evidence of a statewide or national reputation in teaching. Evidence may include publications in refereed pedagogical journals, recognition by organizations external to WSU, and funding for creative activities in instruction.

The rank of Professor is a faculty rank. As a result, administrative service usually will not justify promotion to Professor, no matter how excellent the work. Administrators can be rewarded for their contributions in other ways (e.g., through salary increases). Faculty members accepting heavy administrative burdens before achieving the rank of Professor may jeopardize their opportunity to meet the standards of teaching and scholarship necessary for promotion.

Only under exceptional circumstances will a faculty member be considered for promotion to Professor prior to serving as an Associate Professor for fewer than five years. In such instances, prior approval for consideration for promotion to Professor must be obtained from the Provost, via the Dean.

### **Procedures**

The procedures of documentation and review for promotion in rank are similar to those outlined for tenure review.

Nominations for promotion normally originate with the Chair. Documentation, including letters of evaluation from at least five external reviewers, will be assembled by the Chair and presented for consideration to the tenured departmental faculty members holding academic rank higher than that of the candidate. Under no circumstances will a reviewer be paid or compensated in any way for reviewing the candidate's file or writing a letter. If the candidate resides on a campus other than Pullman, the Chair will seek information from relevant individuals at that site.

The individual faculty member may initiate his/her promotion to full professor. In such cases, that faculty member may request that the file be forwarded to the Dean, even if the Chair's recommendation is negative. The documentation, including letters of evaluation from external reviewers, will be assembled by the Chair and presented for consideration by relevant tenured department faculty members in accordance with departmental procedures.

The Chair presides at the deliberations of the departmental faculty and determines whether to forward a recommendation for promotion and the accompanying documentation. Recommendation procedures are outlined in the annual distribution of information regarding tenure and promotion from the Provost's office. It is college policy that faculty recommendations for promotion and letters of recommendation are privileged information and are to be handled as such. They are not to be shared with the candidate without an official Public Records Request. The Chair shall collate the results and forward them together with the faculty recommendation forms, documentation, and a confidential recommendation to the Dean in the format specified in the guidelines from the Provost's office. The Dean presents promotion cases to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The Dean considers the cumulative record, obtains input in writing from the urban campus vice chancellor, if applicable, and determines whether or not to forward to the Provost a positive recommendation and the documentation. If the decision is to not forward the documentation the faculty member will be given a written justification. In addition, the faculty member will be given a minimum of five working days to exercise the right to have the documentation forwarded to the Provost regardless of the Dean's decision. Recommendations are reviewed by the Provost.

## **Promotion Guidelines for Senior Instructor, Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor**

### **Appointments**

Instructor:

The title Instructor is used for short-term teaching contracts where no indication of rank is intended. The title Instructor implies the appointment is non-permanent and non-tenure track in nature. An instructor's primary responsibility is teaching undergraduate or laboratory courses as defined by the Chair. These appointments can be renewed indefinitely upon satisfactory annual performance reviews. Instructor appointments may be from one to three years.

Clinical Assistant Professor:

Faculty at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor are on fixed term appointments of up to three years contingent upon College/Department needs and may be reappointed upon satisfactory evaluation as measured by annual performance review.

There is a distinction in terms of responsibilities between faculty in Clinical ranks and instructors. The main responsibility of faculty in Clinical ranks is teaching, mostly at the undergraduate level and at times at the graduate level. In addition, a Clinical faculty member's responsibility will include a secondary component relating to research, scholarship, creative work, outreach or training activities. The secondary area of responsibility could be pedagogical or discipline specific.

An Instructor may be promoted to Senior Instructor. A Clinical Assistant Professor may be promoted to Clinical Associate Professor and then to Clinical Professor. To warrant promotion the candidate must have performed in an exceptional way that can be documented in the promotional file. The exact nature of this exceptional performance will vary according to the candidate's position description.

Promotion to Senior Instructor, Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor is initiated by the Chair. All individuals to be considered for promotion are required to develop and maintain a teaching portfolio in the same way as tenure-track or tenured faculty. This review will take place on the same time line as the tenure-track faculty tenure and promotion review.

### **Criteria**

An Instructor who has successfully completed at least five years of continuous service as an Instructor in an academic department may be considered for promotion to Senior Instructor in that academic department. An early consideration must be approved by the Dean and the Provost in the spring semester. However, time in rank is not sufficient by itself to be considered for promotion. Since the primary responsibility of an Instructor is undergraduate teaching, the

leading criterion of promotion evaluation is exceptional performance in teaching. Signs of exceptional performance may include student evaluations, peer evaluations, internal and external teaching awards, publication in journals about teaching, invitations to present at professional meetings about teaching, etc. Internal WSU signs (college/WSU awards and recognition of distinction) are acceptable for promotion to Senior Instructor. Also, any service component and the ability to interact effectively with colleagues, students and staff will be given significant consideration. Faculty members promoted to the rank of Senior Instructor will be granted a fixed term appointment of up to five years.

### ***Clinical Associate/Clinical Professor***

Typically, a candidate will be considered for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor after completing five years at the level of Clinical Assistant Professor. However, under exceptional circumstances this promotion may be made before the completion of five years at the Assistant rank. An early consideration must be approved by the Dean and the Provost. If promotion to Clinical Associate Professor is not pursued or is not granted, faculty may remain at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor provided satisfactory performance continues. There is no limit on the number of times promotion to Clinical Associate Professor may be sought. Faculty members promoted to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor will be granted a fixed term appointment of up to three years.

Faculty members may be considered for promotion to Clinical Professor after five years as a Clinical Associate Professor. However exceptional circumstances may alter this time period. As stated above, the early promotion must be approved by the Dean and Provost. If promotion to Clinical Professor is not pursued or is not granted, faculty may remain at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor provided satisfactory performance continues. There is no limit on the number of times promotion to Clinical Professor may be sought. Faculty members promoted to the rank of Clinical Professor will be granted a fixed term appointment of up to three years.

It should be noted that time in rank is not sufficient by itself to be considered for promotion to either the Clinical Associate Professor rank or the Clinical Professor rank.

**For Clinical Faculty:** The primary areas of evaluation in considering eligibility for promotion are excellence in the areas of teaching and service along with excellence in at least one of the secondary areas such as research, scholarship, creative work, outreach or training activities. While all of these areas may impact a particular promotion decision, candidates will be evaluated for their balance of accomplishments in both the primary and secondary areas. The ability to interact effectively with colleagues, students, and staff will be a tertiary, but significant consideration. As noted previously, signs of excellence in teaching may include student evaluations, peer evaluations, internal and external teaching awards, publication in journals about teaching, invitations to present at professional meetings about teaching, etc. for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor. However, some external recognitions of distinction is necessary for promotion to Clinical Professor.

### **Procedure**

The department conducts a comprehensive tenure-style review. All files are uploaded to a SharePoint site as specified by the Office of the Provost. A notebook is submitted according to the normal promotional processes as outlined in the guidelines released by the Office of the

Provost. The SharePoint site and the notebook contain the same information as the promotional file for a tenure-track or tenured faculty member. Candidates will be asked to provide a current vita; a signed teaching portfolio (5 pages maximum); teaching evaluations; and, supplemental material related to scholarship or creative activity to support the case.

All other elements of a promotion file should be presented, including: At least five supporting letters solicited by the Chair. Under no circumstances will a reviewer be paid or compensated in any way for reviewing the candidate's file or writing a letter. These may be internal or external to WSU, but external to the department. A few of the letters could include former students. Although letters external to WSU are optional, it is highly recommended. Also included are the Chair's summary, Dean's summary, vice chancellor's summary when appropriate; faculty recommendation forms; and, the candidate's past annual reviews.

The following members of the faculty submit recommendations on promotion to Senior Instructor: Senior Instructors, Clinical Associate Professors, Clinical Professors, Associate Professors and Professors. The following faculty submit recommendations on promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor: Clinical Associate Professors, Clinical Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors. The following faculty submit recommendations on promotion to Clinical Professor: Clinical Professors and Tenured or Tenure Track Professors.<sup>1</sup>

It is college policy that faculty recommendation forms for promotion and letters of recommendation are privileged information and are to be handled as such. They are not to be shared with the candidate without an official Public Records Request. The Chair shall collate the results and forward them together with the faculty recommendation forms, documentation, and a confidential recommendation to the Dean in the format specified in the guidelines from the Provost's office. The Dean presents promotion cases to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The Dean considers the cumulative record, obtains input in writing from the urban campus vice chancellor, if applicable, and determines whether or not to forward to the Provost a positive recommendation and the documentation. If the decision is to not forward the documentation the faculty member will be given a written justification. In addition, the faculty member will be given a minimum of five working days to exercise the right to have the documentation forwarded to the Provost regardless of the Dean's decision. Recommendations are reviewed by the Provost.

Clinical faculty and Instructors in rank for 5 years or more may be considered for promotion. Anyone appointed in the former College of Liberal Arts (CLA) as a Clinical faculty or Instructor prior to Fall 2013 and who were in rank for five years or more in Spring 2015 have the option of following either: 1) the former CLA tenure and promotion guidelines; or, 2) the College of Arts and Sciences tenure and promotion guidelines. Anyone appointed in the former College of Sciences (COS) as a Clinical faculty or Instructor prior to Fall 2013 and who were in rank for five years or more in Spring 2015 have the option of following either: 1) the former COS tenure and promotion guidelines; or, 2) the College of Arts and Sciences tenure and promotion guidelines.

---

<sup>1</sup> This sentence has been updated as of June 2018 to be in alignment with the *WSU Faculty Manual* which states: "At the time the faculty member elects to seek promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor, the College/Department will conduct a comprehensive tenure style review that involves all clinical, tenure-track, and tenured faculty in the College/Department holding the Full Professor Rank."

## **Nonreappointment and Termination of Appointment**

Please see the WSU Faculty Manual, Section V.F.

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES TEACHING PORTFOLIO POLICY** (Effective March 2013)

In order to have uniformity, the teaching portfolio should be prepared according to the following guidelines.

For pre-tenure, instructor and Clinical rank faculty, a summary of student evaluations of teaching should be included in the appendix to the teaching portfolio for all courses. The synopsis should include the average “score” on the uniform college questions. Complete sets of student comments should be provided for two courses. For faculty members being considered for promotion to professor, summaries are only required for courses taught in the past four years.

At the time of 3<sup>rd</sup> year review or tenure and promotion, in the Chair’s summary, the Chair will provide an analysis of the “scores,” putting them in the context of the level of class taught, typical scores at that level, and any other explanatory notes that would aid others in their interpretation.

Syllabi from two courses must be submitted. Lecture notes or volumes of course materials should not be submitted. If both graduate and undergraduate courses have been taught, a syllabus from each level should be included. The syllabus should be appended to the tenure and promotion “Teaching Portfolio” tab on the SharePoint site. The body of the portfolio should not exceed five pages but the syllabi may be longer. Additional materials can be appended.

Departments will conduct peer evaluation of teaching according to policies developed in the departments. There will be at least two classroom visits by department faculty in the year of the third year review and the year before consideration for tenure and promotion. Departments may opt for annual peer review of teaching. A short description of the observations will be provided to the Chair, given to the faculty member observed, and included in the materials presented for review. The College strongly suggests that the faculty member’s mentoring committee observe instruction during the first year of appointment, so as to assist in rapid progress in instructional proficiency.

**APPENDIX 2****COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES TEACHING PORTFOLIO SAMPLE #1****TEACHING PORTFOLIO FOR \_\_\_\_\_**

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

**A. GOALS**

In large part due to the way in which I was taught, my emphasis in teaching is on important concepts and principles. It is these that are at the forefront when I develop a syllabus, and the examples I draw upon are selected to ‘hammer the concepts home’. Bare facts are of little significance without a framework in which they can be embedded.

In addition, I seek to encourage a way of thinking that is problem-based. I make frequent use of phrases such as “imagine that . . .” and “what if . . .” My goal is to make people *think*, to consider alternative solutions to particular problems. I stress the value of scientific research in testing alternatives, and provide access to actual research data where appropriate. I believe that fostering such abilities not only aids in understanding the specific material at-hand, but also facilitates a lifetime of learning.

The courses I teach are aimed at a variety of audiences, and it is sometimes difficult to maintain distinctions. For my UCORE course, I believe it’s appropriate to sacrifice depth for synthetic/integrative breadth. At the 400-level, I do just the opposite. Straddling the divides between (my discipline) majors and non-majors, and between undergraduates and graduate students, is a hard challenge. As my teaching evaluations show, I never please everyone!

My goal as a research advisor is to help my students develop the various skills needed to be competent and independent researchers. I am something of a ‘hands-off’ advisor, but always ready to provide advice, direction and encouragement. I prefer my students to conduct work that, although within my sphere of interest, can stand outside of my personal research program. I am far more concerned that my students ask ‘good’ questions than work on any particular narrow concept. This general philosophy applies to both graduate students and undergraduates working under my supervision (the latter requiring more attention, of course).

## **B. RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **1. COURSES RECENTLY & CURRENTLY TAUGHT**

My typical teaching load is (xx) courses per semester, although I occasionally add a graduate seminar. The following is a list of all courses I have taught at WSU:

Spring 2010:            Course name and number, number of students

Fall 2010:             Course name and number, number of students

Spring 2011:         Course name and number, number of students

Etc.

### **2. WORK WITH INDIVIDUAL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS**

Number and name of students and projects working on or completed under your supervision.

### **3. WORK WITH INDIVIDUAL GRADUATE STUDENTS**

Number and name of students or committees with which you worked.

### **4. SERVICE ON GRADUATE COMMITTEES**

Number, type and capacity served on: i.e.: Master's committees, Ph.D. committees, preliminary exams, etc.

### **5. UNDERGRADUATE ADVISING**

Number and type of advising. i.e. certified or non-certified majors.

### **6. USE OF DISCIPLINARY RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP OR CREATIVE WORK IN TEACHING**

I think it is crucial to present students with actual research data whenever possible, and do not hesitate to present work I have conducted for scrutiny. More specifically, I attempt to include novel experiments or ideas drawn from within my own research program.

## 7. SERVICE ON INSTRUCTION-RELATED COMMITTEES

I served as a member of the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ Subcommittee. List charge to the committee and the eventual outcome.

### C. EVALUATIONS

#### 1. STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Selected but representative quotes from student evaluation of all courses I have taught at WSU are included as Appendices \_\_\_\_\_. I have tried to be evenhanded in selecting this material, including both negative and positive evaluations.

#### 2. SELF-EVALUATIONS

##### I. PRINCIPLES OF CONSERVATION (DEPT XXX)

As a UCORE course, Dept xxx is designed for non-biology majors. Nevertheless, the number of students majoring in biology/environmental science has grown steadily (about 50% in spring 1996). That these people find Dept xxx rather superficial or lacking in depth (as revealed in the evaluations) is no surprise. However, I am reluctant to change this course, as I feel an emphasis on synthetic breadth is appropriate.

Moves are afoot to revise Dept xxx's syllabus, which will provide a greater opportunity for additional reading and discussion. This may increase the palatability of the course to biology majors, while retaining its appeal to non-majors.

##### ii. BIOLOGY OF AMPHIBIANS & REPTILES (DEPT YYY): taught once

Dobzhansky once said that “nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution”. With this comment to the forefront when I received my own training, it is inevitable that it affects my teaching. I make no apologies for being unabashedly evolutionary and phylogenetic in my treatment of herp biology. I consider this to be the contemporary way in which the ‘-ologies’ should be taught.

I chose to focus on how herps have solved important biological problems, rather than on their systematics, and I think most people appreciated this focus (perhaps due to the very varied backgrounds of people who took Dept yyy). My most severe critic was a zoology grad student for whom systematics is THE big thing in evolutionary biology! I agree that I may have overly de-emphasized systematics and will provide greater balance in the future.

Many people criticized the lab associated with this course. In my attempt to move away from the traditional lab of gazing at pickled specimens and dissecting animals, I failed to devise a sufficient number of good alternative exercises. I intend to provide better labs when Dept yyy is taught again in fall 2012.

iii BEHAVIORAL ECOLOGY (DEPT ZZZ): taught once

Dobzhansky's comment holds true for behavioral ecology also. For this reason, I make no apologies for stressing evolutionary concepts, both general and specific. That I placed greater emphasis on 'behavior' than 'ecology' reflects my own expertise as well as the state of the field.

Comments that I had little understanding of the literature beyond the text are unfair. It is true that I could not provide detailed background information for every empirical example we discussed, but our taxonomic scope was very broad. One reason for the paper required in this course was to encourage people to explore areas that they found especially interesting and/or which I considered in lesser detail. Everyone wrote excellent papers.

Why did I emphasize the behavioral ecology of reproduction at the expense of other areas? To have covered more conceptual material would have been to sacrifice depth for breadth in a way that would not have been acceptable at the 400-level.

About 25% of students were undergraduates, and thus it was difficult to assume equivalent knowledge of basic behavioral, ecological and evolutionary principles. Without doubt, the undergraduates found this a difficult course, but they may have gained the most from it.

#### **D. RESULTS: INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS**

In the summer of 2012 I was awarded an instructional minigrant to develop a discussion-based supplement to my course *Principles of Conservation*. Considering current conservation issues from both *pro* and *con* perspectives, I wrote an accompanying text of over 30 pages in length (copies available on request). I intend to incorporate this into my course in the future.

## COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES TEACHING PORTFOLIO SAMPLE #2

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Department of \_\_\_\_\_, WSU

### TEACHING PORTFOLIO

Date

#### A. Goals

In a world where our graduates will likely take on many different careers over the course of their lives, where science and technology play an ever more sophisticated role, and where human impacts on the Earth are significant, I believe it is of vital importance that we prepare our students with basic scientific knowledge, either to function as scientists, or to critically evaluate scientific evidence presented in daily life. Students need to understand the scientific method. Therefore, in both my undergraduate and graduate courses, I strive to create an environment within which:

students discover key scientific concepts and gain confidence in solving scientific problems;

students develop clear conceptual models for hypothesis testing and integrate interdisciplinary information collected into a holistic system picture;

students are comfortable using appropriate technology.

These goals can be achieved by implementing problem-based labs, using research project assignments and bringing recent research into the classroom. Because education research shows that students learn by participating, students should be *doing* all aspects of science, including hypothesis development, hypothesis testing, data analysis and interpretation, and summarizing work in both oral presentations and written reports.

#### B. Responsibilities

*Courses recently and currently taught* (list course name and number and number of students)

A summary of courses developed and taught.

**Table 1. Courses taught**

<i>Year/Semester</i>	<i>Course #:</i>	<i>Course Title</i>	<i>Credit Hours*</i>
<b>Undergraduate courses and special projects:</b>			
1993/Fall	Course #	name of course	1.5 (3 total)
1994/Spring	Course #	name of course	3
1994/Fall	Course #	name of course	1.5 (3 total)

\*number of credits that I was or am responsible for is shown outside the parenthesis.

### *Instructional innovation and use of disciplinary research in teaching*

**Undergraduate courses.** Research has shown that students learn by their own experiences. My philosophy in developing the new courses and in recreating the courses has been to create *active* labs in which the students learn by conducting and interpreting their own experiments, rather than by exclusively reading about and working with measurements that have previously been made by others.

With the agreement of my co-instructors, I have converted one credit of lecture to a lab credit. Thus far, I have taken the lead on lab development for the course.

At the present time, there are no lab manuals commercially available that present a program of active labs, such as are needed for effective education. In fact, there is only one commercially available lab manual. It has a number of limitations: different cases are used to illustrate each concept so that learning is fragmented; students are looking for the one correct text-book solution in a verification format rather than using a more valuable “discovery” approach; “hands-on” components are minimal; and perhaps most importantly, there is little room for the students to ask their own questions or create their own experiments. Therefore, we have begun to create our own field-focused problem-based program.

An instructional mini-grant has funded the initial instrumentation of the demonstration site. The \_\_\_\_\_ provides a location for developing and testing key concepts, and making observations of a natural system. Through the labs, students conduct a study of the system at the field site in stages over the course of the semester. Students collaborate to produce a significant summary report which integrates their knowledge. Thus, the students conduct a complete scientific study: they construct hypotheses about the system, make observations concerning the physics and chemistry of the system over the course of the semester, critically analyze and interpret the data that they

collect, and work together with other class members to determine conclusions and create a formal scientific report. The report constitutes a significant (~20%) proportion of the course grade. An example student report is provided in the Appendix.

Consistent with current pedagogy, the goal is to create labs that use a “discovery” approach and emphasize critical thinking. Additionally, the labs are designed to develop communication and team work skills. Technological tools, including computing and analytical equipment, are used where appropriate and available.

**Graduate Course.** I feel that graduate courses should emphasize the recent literature as the primary source of information. Both interpretation and critical evaluation of the literature is encouraged through problem-solving assignments and guided class discussions. I also make a point of bringing current issues in the field to class. For example, the Washington Department of Ecology is currently considering changing the methodology by which soil clean-up criteria are established within the state. After the students had spent a few weeks developing a model of the mechanisms controlling the interactions between organic contaminants and soil/sediments, we discussed the advantages and limitations of employing our model in the regulatory framework. Discussions like these allow the students to work through practical applications of current scientific literature, and require critical evaluation of the literature in a supported environment. My service on the Washington Department of Ecology Science Advisory Board, for example, provides a connection for the class to the very real issues of groundwater and soil contamination.

#### *Educational proposal pending*

A proposal, to fund development of groundwater labs using technology currently unavailable to WSU students and to create multimedia labs, has been submitted to the National Science Foundation, Instrumentation and Laboratory Development, Leadership in Laboratory Development program (ILI-LLD).

#### *Work with individual students and advising*

I have been the major advisor for one Master’s student who has successfully completed his degree. Currently, I am the major advisor for two graduate students who are both making good progress on their research projects and are supported on RAs this semester. It is a high priority to gain research support for the students during part of their graduate career so that they can focus attention on their research.

I serve on the committees of a number of other graduate students from the Departments of \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_. I provided advice on course selection for all of the graduate students in (dept) during a professor’s sabbatical leave.

Together with interested students, I have been creating an ad hoc group that meets approximately monthly. The group members include myself, 2 faculty, our graduate students and a few interested others.

I have involved several undergraduate students in my research through independent study projects (Table 1) and through paid research positions. Students are included on portions of

projects that I or one of the graduate students are working on directly.

I always make a point of sharing the overall goals of the research and keep the students apprised of the progress so that the students understand the whole picture. These students are always encouraged to join the research group and to come on field trips with the graduate students. A few of the students have taken advantage of these opportunities.

For these students, I have provided advice about graduate school options. A student that is currently working in the lab for me and I have discussed what makes a “good” graduate experience - I try to provide the broader academic context based on my experiences at other institutions and to empower students with information about how the academic department functions.

#### **D. Results**

*Instructional materials completed and in preparation*

In collaboration with my colleagues at WSU, I have created the draft lab manual (Appendix). After next year’s offering of the course, we should be able to provide a well-organized manual for the students at the beginning of the course.

Additionally, my colleague, and I will be collaborating to create a publishable lab manual for wide distribution, as described in a letter of support provided for the NSF proposal (Appendix).

*Student successes*

Name of student was awarded a scholarship for his M.S. research from the urban chapter of the \_\_\_\_\_ . A manuscript for publication from his M.S. research is nearly completed, and he contributed to a second manuscript which is currently in the review process.

#### **E. Appendix**

1. Course syllabus and lecture notes from name of course.
2. Course syllabus for name of course.
3. Syllabus for proposed course, name of course.
4. Selected sections of the lab manual under development for name of course.
5. Examples of the final team project produced for name of course.
6. Letters of evaluation from:  
  
\_\_\_\_\_