

**STATEMENT OF TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

Originally adopted 2013.
Revised and adopted April 2020.
Revised and adopted April 2024.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW.....	3
CAS POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR ALL FACULTY	3
CAS STATEMENTS	5
Statement on Workload	5
Statements on Excellence.....	5
General Statement on Excellence in Teaching	5
General Statement on Excellence in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities	6
General Statement on Excellence in Service	6
Statement on Interdisciplinary Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity	6
Statement on Public and Community-Engaged Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity.....	7
Statement on Commercialization Activity.....	8
Statement on Tribal Relations and Sovereignty	8
TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY	9
TENURE	9
Criteria	9
Procedures.....	9
Annual Evaluation of Progress Toward Tenure	9
Third Year Intensive Review	10
Tenure Review	10
PROMOTION.....	12
Criteria	12
Procedures.....	12
PROMOTION GUIDELINES FOR CAREER TRACK FACULTY	15
WORKING TITLES	15
CRITERIA.....	15
Teaching Sub-Track.....	15
Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor.....	15
Promotion to Teaching Professor	16
Scholarly Sub-Track.....	16
General Statement on Secondary Areas.....	16
Promotion to Scholarly Associate Professor	17
Promotion to Scholarly Professor.....	17
Research Sub-Track	18
Promotion to Research Associate Professor	18
Promotion to Research Professor.....	19
Clinical Sub-Track.....	19
General Statement on Excellence in Clinical Practice and Clinical Instruction	19
General Statement on Secondary Areas.....	20

Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor.....	20
Promotion to Clinical Professor.....	21
PROCEDURES	21
<i>APPENDIX 1</i>	24
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES TEACHING PORTFOLIO POLICY	24

OVERVIEW

CAS POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR ALL FACULTY

The Faculty Manual of Washington State University (WSU) states the official criteria and procedures for advancement to tenure and/or promotion in rank for tenure and career track faculty. 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. “Track” refers to the type of faculty position whether tenure or career track. “Subtrack” is used to delineate between the differing types of career track positions. For more information about how tracks and subtracks are defined, see the WSU Faculty Manual.

Each Department in 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, and in the Provost’s office. 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, tenure (if applicable), and promotion.

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain the materials (such as annual reviews, updated curriculum vitae, statements, etc.) that provide bearing on the criteria identified for their particular track (and subtrack, if appropriate) and rank. It is the joint responsibility of the faculty member and the Chair to assure that the dossier presents the case fully, clearly, and accurately. The College expects Departments to form and implement effective mentoring committees for all promotable faculty. Their function is to advise on various local and discipline-specific aspects regarding the faculty member’s workload and progress towards tenure and/or promotion.

An additional level of oversight is required for faculty not located on the same campus as the Dean (WSU Everett, Global, Spokane, Tri-Cities, and Vancouver). In general, their annual reviews, tenure reviews, and consideration for promotion require input from both Pullman and the home campus, and the signature of the home campus vice chancellor.

Cases for early promotion and/or tenure must be justified by extraordinary merit (“*extraordinary*” in that the criteria for promotion and/or tenure were met in shorter timeframe than established in the original employment offer) and permission to bring the case forward must be obtained from the Provost before the case is prepared. The faculty member needs to initiate the request via a memo to their Chair. After which, the Chair sends a memo to the Provost, via the Dean and Vice Chancellor (if appropriate), 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.

Similarly, the standards for tenure and promotion remain the same for faculty who have been granted a tenure clock extension and/or a pre-tenure intensive review deferral. Even though a faculty member may be given a longer period of time in which to meet these standards, the

faculty member should be held to the same performance standards as a faculty member who has not received an extension.

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. This requirement holds for other promotion types, regardless of track, in addition to tenure reviews.

The Dean presents promotion and tenure cases to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. The committee usually consists of 9 members, a mix of career track and tenure track (with tenure) Professors or Associate Professors selected by the Dean with recommendations from the Chairs. The Associate Professors and Professors will recommend on tenure and/or 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 form forwarded to the Dean. All proceedings of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee are confidential. The members’ recommendation forms are advisory to the Dean and not shared with other parties.

It is College policy that all documents not prepared by the faculty member themselves (e.g., faculty recommendations, letters of recommendation, Chair/Dean statements) 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.

At completion of a tenure and/or promotion review, 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 when these letters are to be distributed to the faculty. The Provost’s office notifies the Dean’s office of the notification period and when the letters are ready. The Dean’s office distributes the letters to the Chairs and they distribute them to the faculty members, all on the same day. For faculty not located on the same campus as the respective Dean, the Dean’s office express mails the letters to them and a copy to the home campus CAS Director to ensure 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 Faculty Manual. Promotion review shall result in either the granting of promotion, to become effective at the beginning of the next academic year following the year in which the promotion review is conducted, or the deferral of promotion. The policy for appeal of promotion deferral follows the procedures stated in the Faculty Manual.

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 Faculty Manual is found at http://www.wsu.edu/Faculty_Senate.

CAS STATEMENTS

Statement on Workload

Following the WSU Faculty Manual, all faculty should be reviewed according to the workload expectations of their positions. As such, those workloads should be shared as part of all reviews whether it be annual reviews, progress towards tenure reviews, third year intensive reviews, and reviews for promotion and/or tenure. The workloads should be shared with the reviewing faculty within the university as well as with external evaluators (or internal evaluators for career track faculty) with instructions that the specific workload should be the lens used for the review. When faculty members take on administrative leadership roles, their workload assignments should be modified to account for that administrative service, which may include reductions in their other expectations including research, teaching, and/or service. Those faculty with modified workloads that account for administrative leadership should be reviewed according to those adjusted workloads. Some components of a faculty member's efforts may extend across multiple aspects of their workload. For example, graduate student mentorship and advising could be considered both “teaching” and “research” depending on the nature of the graduate student project. Similarly, teaching activities may generate publications or extramural funding, which are markers of “research”. Faculty should identify a primary area of attribution for any reported activity (in alignment with disciplinary norms, where possible), but that activity can be co-listed under other areas.

Statements on Excellence

The statements below detail the college's definition of excellence in the three most common workload categories for CAS faculty. Scholarly career track faculty with secondary areas outside of the below categories should follow the criteria in the [scholarly career track specific guidelines](#). Other faculty with workload categories outside of the areas below should be reviewed for excellence using the framework of growth, coherence, and impact as described in the [Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities general statement](#).

General Statement on Excellence in Teaching

The College values a demonstrated teaching record of achievement and growth, one that demonstrates evolution and innovation in a faculty member's teaching over time. The College also recognizes that teaching occurs in a variety of modes and environments outside of the formal classroom, individual or group lessons, studio, or lab settings. Work such as independent studies, mentoring and informal advising, and advancing student professional development, especially when it is accompanied by evidence of effectiveness, can also be an element of teaching excellence.

Excellence in teaching should be presented and assessed through multiple measures and with attention to the teaching that has occurred throughout a candidate's time in rank. While high student evaluation scores are perhaps the most immediately accessible means of demonstrating excellence in teaching, scores by themselves will not be determinative for promotion, nor will individual instances of lower teaching evaluations automatically prevent promotion. Additional measures of teaching excellence may include peer evaluations, participation or leadership in program assessment, development of teaching material (both proprietary and open education resources), effective engagement with larger unit and discipline efforts to advance pedagogy and curricula, internal and external awards, and presentation or publication of material regarding teaching in appropriate professional outlets. Departments will conduct peer evaluation of

teaching according to policies developed in the departments and grounded in best pedagogical practices. At minimum, there will be two peer evaluations by department faculty in the third year for all assistant professors (career and tenure track), and the year before consideration for tenure and/or promotion for all faculty regardless of rank and track. Departments are strongly encouraged to provide opportunities for annual peer review of teaching. If a Department does provide annual peer reviews, then faculty may instead choose which set of peer reviews to include in their promotion materials (either a total of four for assistant professors or a total of two for associate professors).

General Statement on Excellence in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities

As a multi-disciplinary and forward-facing unit, the College of Arts and Sciences recognizes that a faculty member's work in research/scholarship/creative activity will likely take many forms over the course of a career as well as across the College. The College thus maintains an expansive view of scholarship that recognizes the value of multiple modalities and reaching multiple audiences, including scholarship that involves collaborations that cross disciplinary boundaries, engages community partners, and includes commercialization activities. Excellence in research/scholarship/creative activities at the College level is defined by the concepts of growth, coherence, and impact.

- **Growth:** increasing levels of accomplishment, responsibility, engagement, and/or leadership
- **Coherence:** developing particular expertise and recognizable professional profile
- **Impact:** contributing to the advancement of a disciplinary field and community engagement (if applicable)

Faculty who are seeking tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor should demonstrate a sustained record of emerging scholarly leadership whereas faculty who are seeking promotion to Professor should demonstrate a sustained record of established scholarly leadership, as proportional to their workload assignment and track. Within that framework, the College expects each Department to develop a more detailed definition of excellence that is appropriate to their own disciplines. In addition, each faculty track within the College, [tenure](#) and [career](#) (and subtracks within), has their own set of specific research/scholarship/creative activities criteria and expectations.

General Statement on Excellence in Service

Service allows for academic units, campuses, institutions, and professions to operate as a collective. As such, the College values effective service wherein the faculty member takes an active and collaborative role in departmental, college, university, community, and professional activities. Chairs and mentoring committees should advise faculty members on the appropriate balance between departmental, college, university, professional, and community service commitments in alignment with Department and discipline expectations. Faculty members seeking promotion to Professor (regardless of track) should also demonstrate leadership in their service commitments, particularly within the Department, College and/or University. Regardless of whether a faculty member has a service allocation to their workload or the relative proportion of service, all faculty are expected to contribute to a positive community and culture. All faculty should contribute in positive ways as colleagues, 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.

Statement on Interdisciplinary Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Many of the most compelling and challenging questions faculty pursue necessarily involve theories, techniques, and evidence that cross institutionalized and/or disciplinary boundaries. Pursuing such interdisciplinary questions in a program of research, scholarship, and creativity may mean that a faculty member may develop a profile that differs from those concentrated in a single discipline. For example, the faculty member may pursue more collaborative ventures (formal or informal), learn and employ multiple methodologies, and present or publish in a variety of outlets.

Given this potential diversity, candidates for tenure and/or promotion are encouraged where appropriate to explain within their promotional statements the significance and/or value of their cross-disciplinary work, as well as how that work contributes to their larger professional profile within their Department and scholarly field(s). Candidates who have pursued sustained work in these areas may also wish to identify among their suggested external reviewers at least one evaluator experienced in one or more of the associated fields outside the core-discipline connected with the interdisciplinary work. For its part, to the extent that the candidate's work meets the foundational expectations of coherence, significance, and peer review, the College values interdisciplinary research, scholarship, and creative activity at the same level as it values these activities within the candidate's core discipline.

Statement on Public and Community-Engaged Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

In keeping with WSU's land-grant mission, the College of Arts and Sciences values research, scholarship, and creative activity that actively seeks to communicate to, and engage with, audiences outside of the academy. The College recognizes that such activity may require significant work in relationship building and/or career exploration. Such activity also may often result in products that are multi-disciplinary, appear in non-traditional or specialized venues, share authorship with non-academic or community partners, and combine work in categories (such as teaching and service) more often reviewed separately.

As such, the evaluation of public and community-engaged scholarship may entail considerations different than those applied to disciplinary-based work. In assessing such work, the College values clarity of goals; intellectual rigor and creativity in content, methodology, or design; opportunities for ongoing and/or future collaboration and engagement; effective communication with appropriate audiences; and impact. Impact may be assessed by indices such as financial support offered by granting agencies and external partners, presentations at recognized scholarly and public meetings, measurements of engagement (such as citations, number of online views or downloads, and other quantitative scales), adoption of work products by academic or non-academic institutions, policy influence, and resonance with identifiable communities. Letters of support detailing this activity and its impact can be included among a candidate's supporting materials.

The College recognizes that public and community-engaged work may introduce considerations unfamiliar to internal and external reviewers not trained in similar work. Where appropriate, candidates for tenure and/or promotion are thus encouraged to articulate their understanding of such considerations in the research statement and/or CV. Candidates who have pursued sustained work in these areas may also suggest among their possible external reviewers from similar communities of practice. These evaluators should not be from the communities of practice that the candidate has active collaborations as that may pose a conflict of interest (letters of support can be included in supporting materials). Evaluators from the communities of practice (academic

or non-academic) should possess a significant depth of experience that is often, but not always, demonstrated by a leadership position. It is the policy of the College to treat such evaluations equally with those drawn from more traditional academic sources.

Statement on Commercialization Activity

The College recognizes that, where appropriate, entrepreneurial success and commercialization efforts can strengthen a faculty member's research and scholarship portfolio. Entrepreneurial or commercialization activities, including the development of new technologies, patents, copyrights, licensing agreements, industrial collaborations, and start-up companies are valued. Where appropriate, candidates for tenure and/or promotion are encouraged to articulate their accomplishments in these areas in the research statement and/or CV.

Statement on Tribal Relations and Sovereignty

As a Morrill Act institution, WSU bears a particular responsibility to develop, sustain, and enhance its relationships with Native Tribes and other indigenous peoples. Most important among these are the Tribal governments and communities with which WSU maintains formal connections via MOUs and programs administered at WSU by the Office of Tribal Relations.

Recognizing that these Tribes and similar First Nation peoples in Canada are sovereign nations, the College of Arts & Sciences maintains that any scholarly, teaching, and service work with these governments and communities should be valued as highly as international recognition and engagement and contribute similarly to tenure and promotion criteria. Such efforts are still subject to assessments of growth, coherence, and impact as specified previously. In addition, faculty members engaged in this work must demonstrate a commitment to securing tribal engagement, consultation, and consent in a respectful and reciprocal manner, operating within the guidelines set by the respective Tribes and WSU's Executive Policy 41.

TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

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 (where applicable) and advising and mentoring of undergraduate students, (e) participation in professional activity, (f) participation in departmental and university service. For more information about how excellence in these areas is defined, see [Statements on Excellence](#). Except in instances in which written agreement specifies otherwise, in the College of Arts and Sciences tenure will not be recommended unless excellence in **both** instruction and research/scholarship/creativity activity can be satisfactorily demonstrated. In view of the responsibilities of the faculty in university governance, judicious and effective participation in departmental and extra-departmental assignments is also expected. Normally, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should be considered simultaneously.

Procedures

Annual Evaluation of Progress Toward Tenure

Evaluations of the progress of untenured faculty members are to be conducted at the departmental level once a year as part of the annual review process. 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 annual reviews, and they should usually lead logically to the final tenure decision. Similar to the annual review, the home campus administrator should be consulted when reviewing the progress of faculty members who are not located on the same campus as the Dean.

The progress towards tenure review portion of the annual review is based on cumulative performance and requires the participation of all tenured faculty in the department. The Chair should call a meeting of all tenured faculty in the department to discuss the untenured faculty member's progress toward tenure. The Chair will then summarize and incorporate that feedback within the progress towards tenure review portion of the annual review. If the candidate resides on a campus other than Pullman, the Chair will seek and include information from the relevant home campus administrators.

The Chair must also meet with and 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 their performance in light of the departmental/college criteria and expectations. 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 home campus CAS Academic Director and administrator.

The process can lead to a recommendation that employment be terminated before the end of the pre-tenure period. The procedure is outlined in the section titled "Non-reappointment" in the Faculty Manual.

Third Year Intensive 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 their third academic year at WSU. The purpose of this review is to identify relevant strengths and areas for improvement with regard to progress towards tenure. The review shall be conducted following the procedures which apply to the tenure review, except that external review 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 intensive review is optional for faculty appointments with a pre-tenure period less than three years. For faculty not located on the same campus as the Dean and/or their Department Chair/School Director, information must be obtained from the home campus by the department Chair.

After consultation with the tenured faculty, the department Chair will make a recommendation that the candidate is well prepared for tenure and/or promotion, or that the candidate's progress is satisfactory, needs improvement, or is unsatisfactory. The recommendation is to be forwarded to the Dean and, if applicable, to the home 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, prepares a separate recommendation. The Dean and, if applicable, the Vice Chancellor, will then reach an agreement with the Provost on retention or non-reappointment.

The purpose of this review is to identify relevant areas for improvement 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 (and/or Vice Chancellor in the case of faculty who are not located on the same campus as the Dean). Where the results are judged unsatisfactory, the third year tenure progress review can lead to non-reappointment as described in the Faculty Manual.

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 in addition to any other materials required by the Provost's Office and any optional supporting materials:

- (a) curriculum vitae;
- (b) a teaching portfolio (no more than 5 pages of narrative) in the format adopted by the university and College of Arts and Sciences (see [Appendix](#));
- (c) a research statement of no more than two pages;
- (d) a service statement of no more than two pages;
- (e) confidential letters from at least four 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;

- (f) a total of up to 10 relevant research publications, other scholarly and creative contributions and manuscripts in press that together make a compelling case for tenure; and
- (g) the required appendices that are part of the teaching portfolio (see [Appendix](#)).

A statement of context may be included but is not required. If a Context Statement is included it should be limited to two pages.

Submitted 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 clearly indicate their role in those publications/contributions on their curriculum vitae.

External Reviewers: External evaluations play an important role in the tenure and promotion process by providing disciplinary expertise and an external perspective. They ideally serve as an additional source of information about the broader impact and value of a candidate's scholarship to the discipline from an objective standpoint. The College and University require a minimum of four external reviewers. 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, or former/current students. At least half of letters should not be from the reviewers on the list provided by the candidate. The reviewers should be tenured and at, or higher, than the rank that the faculty member is seeking for promotion. If a reviewer is not from academia (for example, for the review of a faculty member who conducted community-engaged scholarship), then that reviewer should be in a leadership role (at a level equivalent to or higher than the academic promotion level the faculty is seeking) in that community of practice. 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. Every review letter that is solicited (by the Chair) and received should be included.

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.

The Chair shall collate the results and all files are uploaded to an online shared website 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.

The Dean reviews the cumulative record, obtains input from the home campus vice chancellor, if applicable, and forwards a recommendation and the documentation to the Provost.

PROMOTION

Criteria

The basic criteria are those outlined above for [evaluating tenure](#). Consideration for promotion is based on the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the candidate's cumulative record. Time in rank is not sufficient by itself. 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 if applicable; and, undergraduate and graduate (where applicable) instruction. Effective participation in departmental and extra-departmental service is also expected. For more information about how excellence in these areas is defined, then see [Statements on Excellence](#). Normally, promotion to Associate Professor and tenure is 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 impact, and an expanded 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, if instruction is part of their assignment, individuals who cannot present a record of continuing excellence in instruction will not be considered favorably for promotion to the rank of Professor. 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 extramural funding. For promotion to professor, an individual must also exhibit leadership qualities that are essential for the progress of the Department, College, and University. For more information about how excellence in these areas is defined, then see [Statements on Excellence](#).

Procedures

The procedures of documentation and review for promotion in rank are similar to those outlined for tenure review and are also outlined in the annual distribution of information regarding tenure and promotion from the Provost's office. For reviews for promotion to associate professor that are coupled with a tenure review, then the procedures outlined in the [tenure review section](#) should be followed. The below details the procedures for all other promotion review cases for tenure track faculty.

Faculty members within the Tenure Track may be considered for promotion to Professor after five years as an Associate Professor. However, exceptional circumstances may alter this time period. Any early consideration must first be approved by the Dean and the Provost in the spring semester prior to the proposed review. Within the Tenure Track, there is no limit on the number of times promotion to Professor may be sought. It should be noted that time in rank is not sufficient by itself to be considered for any promotion. As such, faculty members considering promotion review should work with their mentoring committee and chairs to receive regular feedback on progress towards promotion and should also consider requesting an intensive review a couple of years in advance of their requested promotion timeframe.

Faculty who would like to be considered for promotion (and have met the time in rank threshold) should notify their Chair in the spring semester before they wish to be reviewed. 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 in addition to any other materials required by the Provost's Office and any optional supporting materials:

- (a) curriculum vitae;
- (b) a teaching portfolio (no more than 5 pages of narrative) in the format adopted by the university and College of Arts and Sciences (see [Appendix](#));
- (c) a research statement of no more than two pages;
- (d) a service statement of no more than two pages;
- (e) confidential letters from at least four 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;
- (f) a total of up to 10 relevant research publications, other scholarly and creative contributions and manuscripts in press that together make a compelling case for promotion; and
- (g) the required appendices that are part of the teaching portfolio (see [Appendix](#)).

External Reviewers: External evaluations play an important role in the promotion process by providing disciplinary expertise and an external perspective. They ideally serve as an additional source of information about the broader impact and value of a candidate's scholarship to the discipline from an objective standpoint. The College and University require a minimum of four external reviewers. 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, or former/current students. At least half of letters should not be from the reviewers on the list provided by the candidate. The reviewers should be tenured and at, or higher, than the rank that the faculty member is seeking for promotion. If a reviewer is not from academia (for example, for the review of a faculty member who conducted community-engaged scholarship), then that reviewer should possess a significant depth of experience that is often, but not always, demonstrated by a leadership position. 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. Every review letter that is solicited (by the Chair) and received should be included.

Documentation, including the letters of evaluation from at least four 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. The Chair presides at the deliberations of the departmental faculty and determines whether to forward a recommendation for promotion and the accompanying documentation. A faculty member may request that the file

be forwarded to the Dean, even if the Chair's recommendation is negative. 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 from the home 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 CAREER TRACK FACULTY

WORKING TITLES

College faculty in the Career Track will be assigned internally to one of four sub-tracks (research, clinical, scholarly, and teaching). This assignment and the accompanying individual workload allocation will guide annual and promotion reviews.

The WSU Faculty Manual also permits individual colleges to identify college-wide working titles for career track faculty. Following the Faculty Manual, it is the policy of the College of Arts and Sciences that the working title for faculty assigned to the research or clinical sub-tracks will be a title composed of the sub-track followed by the appropriate rank (e.g., Research Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor). The working title for faculty assigned to the scholarly or teaching sub-tracks will be a title composed of the individual rank followed by “Career Track” (e.g. “Assistant Professor, Career Track; Associate Professor, Career Track; Professor, Career Track). Individual or departmental substitutions and/or abbreviations of these working titles are not authorized by the Faculty Manual and thus should not be used. Working titles are to be used on any official form of communication such as, but not limited to, individual email signatures and departmental web pages and directories.

CRITERIA

Teaching Sub-Track

Faculty in the teaching sub-track have appointments that are primarily oriented toward teaching, often with expectations in service and limited or no expectations in research, scholarship, or creative activity. As such, promotion within this sub-track is determined largely by a continuing excellence in teaching (see [General Statement on Excellence in Teaching](#)).

Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor

Candidates for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor are expected in the first instance to demonstrate that their teaching effectively supports course and unit learning outcomes, and that it reflects the current state of knowledge and pedagogy in the discipline. Assignments in service or research, scholarship, and creative activity will be evaluated as outlined in the [Statements of Excellence](#) with particular expectations conditioned by the faculty member’s contractual workload.

Regarding teaching, candidates for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor should demonstrate the capacity to effectively communicate course content to students, and their course and assignment designs should be accessible to all students. These designs should also support student success and, where appropriate, active learning. Where appropriate, candidates are expected to help develop these qualities in teaching assistants assigned to their supervision. For promotion to Teaching Associate, the College also particularly values the capacity and commitment for further development as a teacher, especially when these qualities build upon the pedagogical growth a faculty member has already pursued as a Teaching Assistant Professor. Versatility in the classroom, as shown either by teaching a range of classes or by pursuing new methods of teaching within regularly reoccurring set of courses, can also demonstrate that a

faculty member continues to develop as a teacher. Such qualities help ensure the continuing level of excellence appropriate to a more senior position in this sub-track.

Promotion to Teaching Professor

Candidates for promotion to Teaching Professor are expected to demonstrate continuing effectiveness in the classroom, as well as elements of pedagogical growth and leadership beyond that which would characterize promotion to Teaching Associate Professor. Assignments in service or research, scholarship, and creative activity will be evaluated by the standards outlined in the [Statements of Excellence](#) with expectations conditioned by the faculty member's contractual workload expectations.

Candidates for promotion to Teaching Professor should demonstrate not only sustained excellence in classroom teaching but also innovation and further growth in their pedagogy, course and assignment design, and efforts toward student success. The College recognizes that such efforts may expose the faculty member to lower student evaluation scores or unsuccessful moments of teaching. In assessing such instances, and growth in teaching more generally, the College will seek a pattern of iterative growth, one in which a faculty member extends their pedagogy, assesses the results of that change, and makes further adjustments based on those assessments.

Especially for promotion to Teaching Professor, the College also particularly values efforts and initiative toward supporting the growth of colleagues and graduate students (both within and outside the unit) as teachers, and work to enhance a unit's curricula. Candidates seeking promotion to Teaching Professor are expected to take on active leadership roles in such activities within and/or outside their home unit. Such qualities reflect a concern with the larger dimensions of teaching appropriate to the highest teaching-centered rank within the College.

Scholarly Sub-Track

CAS Faculty in the scholarly sub-track generally have appointments that include both a primary allocation toward teaching and a significant allocation dedicated to one or more of the following areas: student advising, research or scholarship, creative activity, outreach, practice, educational leadership, administration, or academic service.

Given the resulting diversity of such appointments, and in particular the potential range of secondary duties, all promotion reviews for faculty in the scholarly sub-track should be informed in the first instance by the specific workload expectations detailed in the candidate's contract. The College recognizes that the needs of a unit or the candidate's professional development may result in changes in these assignments, especially in a candidate's secondary area(s). Shifts in these areas will thus not necessarily be considered an impediment to a candidate's promotion. In some cases, successful faculty members who have changes in secondary areas may need more time in their current rank in order to achieve the credentials necessary for promotion to the next rank. The secondary area, and the history of any changes to it, should be shared with all of the reviewers (both within the Department and those external to the Department). CAS Faculty in the scholarly sub-track should prepare context statements that clearly explain the secondary area as well as their accomplishments in that secondary area.

General Statement on Excellence in Secondary Areas

Given the potential range of secondary areas available to scholarly faculty, the College recognizes that the profiles and accomplishments of candidates for promotion in this sub-track

may vary widely. Especially given this diversity, expectations for the type of work and its manner of production and dissemination will also likely vary by discipline and should be defined in part by the expectations of a candidate's home department. For its part, the College holds that the quantity of work in any given area, while potentially significant, is by itself an insufficient criterion for promotion. Rather, the College expects that the following characteristics will inform the evaluation of candidate performance in any of the secondary areas identified above:

- **Growth:** within their secondary area(s) candidates should demonstrate increasing levels of accomplishment, responsibility, engagement, and/or leadership.
- **Coherence:** activities within secondary area(s) should contribute to candidates developing a particular expertise and a recognizable professional profile.
- **Impact:** activities within secondary area(s) should contribute to the advancement of a scholarly field; curricula, programs, or departments; colleges, campuses, or the university as a whole; individual students or student groups; initiatives in research, scholarship, or creative activity; opportunities for public engagement and policy influence; or other defined areas of work beyond individual professional development. Activity that has not secured specific outputs or results, such as scholarship "in progress" or new programs still in development, will be recognized but thus accorded lesser significance.

Promotion to Scholarly Associate Professor

While contractual expectations will inform any individual case for promotion to Scholarly Associate Professor, initial promotion within this career sub-track is most frequently determined by a continuing excellence in teaching and an emerging record of sustained accomplishment in the secondary area(s) relevant to the candidate's appointment (see [Statements on Excellence](#) and [General Statement on Excellence in Secondary Areas](#)).

The teaching of candidates for promotion to Scholarly Associate Professor will be evaluated in adherence with the criteria established for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor ([above](#) and see [General Statement on Excellence in Teaching](#)), with particular attention being paid to the demonstration of effective communication, accessibility of the course and assignments, support for student success, and the capacity for further development as a teacher. Proportionate to contractual expectations, performance in the secondary area(s) is to be assessed using the criteria detailed above, with particular attention being paid to the qualities of coherence and growth. In terms of impact, candidates emphasizing work internal to WSU, such as advising or program development, should demonstrate an emerging reputation for individual excellence and engagement. Candidates emphasizing externally facing work, such as research/scholarship/creative activity or public engagement and policy efforts, should demonstrate an emerging regional or national reputation in these areas. Letters of support detailing this activity and its impact can be included among a candidate's materials.

Promotion to Scholarly Professor

While contractual expectations will inform any individual case for promotion to Scholarly Professor, promotion to this rank is most frequently determined by a continuing excellence in teaching and a sustained record of accomplishment and leadership in the secondary area(s) relevant to the candidate's appointment (see [Statements on Excellence](#) and [General Statement on Excellence in Secondary Areas](#)).

The teaching of candidates for promotion to Scholarly Professor will be evaluated in adherence with the criteria established for promotion to Teaching Professor ([above](#) and see [General Statement on Excellence in Teaching](#)). Candidates for promotion to Scholarly Professor who

have teaching expectations are expected to demonstrate continuing effectiveness in the classroom, as well as elements of pedagogical growth and active leadership beyond that which would characterize an initial promotion. In particular, candidates should demonstrate qualities of exploration, innovation, and classroom or curricular versatility.

Proportionate to contractual expectations, performance in the secondary area(s) is to be assessed using the criteria detailed above, with particular attention at this level being paid not only to continuing potential for growth but also impactful leadership. Candidates emphasizing work internal to WSU, such as advising or program development, should demonstrate a capacity to translate their individual efforts into work with broader positive impacts among colleagues, curricula, departments and programs, or the university as a whole. Candidates emphasizing externally impactful work, such as research/scholarship/creative activity or public engagement and policy efforts, should demonstrate an established regional, national, or international reputation in these areas. Together such qualities reflect a concern with the larger dimensions of accomplishment appropriate to this rank. Letters of support detailing this activity and its impact can be included among a candidate's materials.

Research Sub-Track

CAS Faculty in the research sub-track generally have appointments that are predominantly or exclusively focused on research, scholarship, or creative activity. They may also serve as principal or co-principal investigators on grants or contracts administered by the university. Particular terms of these appointments, including salary, requirements for extramural funding, space, and start-up funds, will vary, and may include the expectation that faculty members to provide all or significant portions of their own salary through extramural funding.

As such, promotion reviews for faculty in the research sub-track should be informed in the first instance by the specific workload expectations detailed in the candidate's contract. In general, however, the high level of research/scholarship/creative activity workload for faculty in this sub-track will be reflected in commensurately high expectations for productivity and impact in this area. Similarly, these faculty will have no significant teaching or service expectations unless those responsibilities are negotiated and commensurate funding support is provided. Where core research obligations involve the individual supervision and/or mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students, however, this work should also be evaluated in any promotion review.

Promotion to Research Associate Professor

While contractual expectations will inform any individual case for promotion to Research Associate Professor, initial promotion within this sub-track is most frequently determined by a candidate's record of accomplishment and growth in the area of research, scholarship, and creative activity. Candidates who work collaboratively in labs, multi-person initiatives, or research or performance groups are also expected to contribute positively to the effectiveness of such groups.

The particular markers of such accomplishment will vary by discipline but will frequently include considerations of productivity in publication, creative performances, and exhibitions; significance of venues for such work; effectiveness in securing extramural funding; and the successful application of research to partnerships with industry, governmental agencies, and other public or private entities. In all cases, however, the candidate will be expected to demonstrate in such areas an emerging national or international reputation, as well as the capacity and likelihood for continued excellence (see [General Statement on Excellence in](#)

[Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities](#)). Where student supervision and mentoring are included in workload expectations, the candidate is expected to have demonstrated effective communication, support for student professional development, and adherence to departmental or unit expectations.

Promotion to Research Professor

While contractual expectations will inform any individual case for promotion to Research Associate Professor, promotion to this rank is most frequently determined by a record of sustained accomplishment in the area of research, scholarship, and creative activity. In addition, candidates who work collaboratively in labs, multi-person initiatives, or research or performance groups are also expected not only to contribute positively to such groups but also take on informal or formal leadership roles that amplify the effectiveness of these groups.

The particular markers of such accomplishment will vary by discipline but will frequently include considerations of productivity in publication, creative performances, and exhibitions; significance of venues for such work; effectiveness in securing extramural funding; and the successful application of research to partnerships with industry, governmental agencies, and other public or private entities. In all cases, however, the candidate will be expected to demonstrate in such areas an established national or international reputation, as well as the capacity and likelihood for continued excellence (see [General Statement on Excellence in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities](#)). Where student supervision and mentoring are included in workload expectations, the candidate is expected to have demonstrated effective communication, support for student professional development, and adherence to departmental or unit expectations.

Clinical Sub-Track

CAS Faculty in the clinical sub-track generally have appointments in which the primary responsibility rests with clinical practice and/or the supervision and clinic-based instruction of professional students, interns, residents, and/or fellows. They may have secondary expectations in one or more of the following areas: research, scholarship, or creative activity; teaching (when distinct from clinic-based instruction); outreach; educational leadership; administration; or academic service.

Given the resulting diversity of such appointments, and in particular the potential range of secondary duties, all promotion reviews for faculty in the clinical sub-track should be informed in the first instance by the specific workload expectations detailed in the candidate's contract. The College recognizes that the needs of a unit or the candidate's professional development may result in changes in these assignments, especially in a candidate's secondary area(s). Shifts in these areas will thus not necessarily be considered an impediment to a candidate's promotion. In some cases, successful faculty members who have changes in secondary areas may need more time in their current rank in order to achieve the credentials necessary for promotion to the next rank.

General Statement on Excellence in Clinical Practice and Clinical Instruction

In considering the clinical practice, supervision, and instruction presented for promotion in this track, the College values most highly a demonstrated record of achievement and growth, one that demonstrates over time the evolution, innovation, and the expansion and extension of a faculty member's knowledge and clinical practice. Of particular value is the extent to which a faculty member's individual clinical practice and instruction contributes to the larger mission of the

clinic, department, or unit. While the specific nature of this work will vary among clinics and appointments, the College emphasizes in each instance the importance of providing services and instruction that are ethical, evidence-based, and consistent with the best professional expectations of the discipline. The College also recognizes that clinical instruction can occur in a variety of environments outside of the formal classroom or clinic. Work such as independent studies, mentoring and informal advising, and advancing student professional development, especially when it is accompanied by evidence of effectiveness, can thus also be an element of a promotion case in this sub-track. Similarly, when appropriate, scholarship in this sub-track may also be focused on applied professional practice or teaching as well basic disciplinary research. Excellence in clinical practice and instruction should be presented and assessed through multiple measures and with an attention to the work that has occurred throughout a candidate's time in rank.

General Statement on Excellence in Secondary Areas

Given the potential range of secondary areas available to clinical faculty, the College recognizes that the profiles and accomplishments of candidates for promotion in this sub-track may vary widely. Especially given this diversity, expectations for the type of work and the forms of its expression will also likely vary by discipline and should be defined in part by the expectations of a candidate's home department. For its part, the College holds that the quantity of work in any given area, while potentially significant, is by itself an insufficient criterion for promotion. Rather, the College expects that the following characteristics will inform the evaluation of candidate performance in any of the secondary areas identified above:

- **Growth:** within their secondary area(s) candidates should demonstrate increasing levels of accomplishment, responsibility, engagement, and/or leadership.
- **Coherence:** activities within secondary area(s) should contribute to candidates developing a particular expertise and a recognizable professional profile.
- **Impact:** activities within secondary area(s) should contribute to the advancement of a scholarly field; curricula, programs, or departments; colleges, campuses, or the university as a whole; individual students or student groups; initiatives in research, scholarship, or creative activity; opportunities for public engagement and policy influence; or other defined areas of work beyond individual professional development. Activity that has not secured specific outputs or results, such as scholarship "in progress" or new programs still in development, will be recognized but thus accorded lesser significance.

Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

While contractual expectations will inform any individual case for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, initial promotion within this sub-track is most frequently determined by a continuing excellence in clinical practice and/or instruction and an emerging record of sustained accomplishment in the secondary area(s) relevant to the candidate's appointment.

The clinical practice and instruction of candidates for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor will be evaluated in adherence with the criteria detailed above. In their clinical practice candidates are expected in the first instance to have provided consistently high-quality, evidence-based, and empathetic care to patients and/or clients. Particular attention will also be paid to the candidate's ability to communicate clearly and effectively; the quality of participation in clinic programs and/or student instruction; and the capacity for further development as a clinician. When that work entails formal classroom-based instruction, it will be evaluated in accordance with the [General Statement on Excellence in Teaching](#) detailed elsewhere in this document. Proportionate to contractual expectations, performance in the secondary area(s) is to be assessed

using the criteria detailed above, with particular attention being paid to the qualities of coherence and growth. In terms of impact, candidates emphasizing work internal to WSU, such as advising or support of services provided to the campus community, should demonstrate an emerging reputation for individual excellence and engagement. Candidates emphasizing externally facing work, such as research/scholarship/creative activity or the provision of external services or professional and educational outreach in clinically relevant areas, should demonstrate an emerging regional or national reputation in these areas. Letters of support detailing this activity and its impact can be included among a candidate's materials.

Promotion to Clinical Professor

While contractual expectations will inform any individual case for promotion to Clinical Professor, promotion to this rank is most frequently determined by a continuing excellence in clinical practice and/or instruction that is accompanied by a sustained record of accomplishment and leadership in the secondary area(s) relevant to the candidate's appointment.

The clinical practice and instruction of candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor will be evaluated in adherence with the criteria detailed above. In particular candidates are expected to have extended their individual excellence in clinical practice and instruction to broader positive impacts on students, communities, the clinic(s) they serve. Where appropriate and available, candidates will also be expected to have pursued leadership roles in education, clinical program assessment and development, and/or community service programs that serve the mission of the clinic, the department and the university. In their primary role of clinical practice and instruction, candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor who have teaching expectations are expected to demonstrate continuing effectiveness, as well as elements of pedagogical growth and active leadership beyond that which would characterize an initial promotion. In particular, candidates should demonstrate qualities of exploration, innovation, and classroom or curricular versatility. When that work entails formal classroom-based instruction, it will be evaluated in accordance with the [General Statement on Excellence in Teaching](#) detailed elsewhere in this document.

Proportionate to contractual expectations, performance in the secondary area(s) is to be assessed using the criteria detailed above, with particular attention at this level being paid not only to continuing potential for growth but also impactful leadership. Candidates emphasizing work internal to WSU, such as advising or program development, should demonstrate a capacity to translate their individual efforts into work with broader positive impacts among colleagues, curricula, departments and programs, or the university as a whole. Candidates emphasizing externally impactful work, such as research/scholarship/creative activity or public engagement and policy efforts, should demonstrate an established regional, national, or international reputation in these areas. Together such qualities reflect a concern with the larger dimensions of accomplishment appropriate to this rank. Letters of support detailing this activity and its impact can be included among a candidate's materials.

PROCEDURES

Faculty members within the Career Track may be considered for promotion to Associate Professor within the appropriate sub-track after five years as an Assistant Professor within the Career Track. However, exceptional circumstances may alter this time period. Any early consideration must first be approved by the Dean and the Provost in the spring semester. If promotion to Associate Professor within the Career Track is not pursued or is not granted, faculty may remain at the rank of Assistant Professor within the appropriate sub-track provided

satisfactory performance continues. Within the Career Track there is no limit on the number of times promotion to Associate Professor may be sought.

Faculty members within the Career Track may be considered for promotion to Professor within the appropriate sub-track after five years as an Associate Professor. However, exceptional circumstances may alter this time period. Any early consideration must first be approved by the Dean and the Provost in the spring semester. If promotion to Professor within the Career Track is not pursued or is not granted, faculty may remain at the rank of Associate Professor within the appropriate sub-track provided satisfactory performance continues. Within the Career Track there is no limit on the number of times promotion to Professor may be sought. It should be noted that time in rank is not sufficient by itself to be considered for any promotion within the Career Track.

Faculty who would like to be considered for promotion (and have met the time in rank threshold) should notify their Chair in the spring semester before they wish to be reviewed. The candidate and the Chair shall jointly assure that the case materials as specified by the Provost's office are complete. For promotions within the Career Track the department conducts a comprehensive, tenure-style review. All files are uploaded to an online shared website as specified by the Office of the Provost. The online shared website contains the same information as the promotional file for a tenure track or tenured faculty member. In particular, the following shall be included in the confidential file in addition to any other materials required by the Provost's Office and any optional supporting materials:

- (a) curriculum vitae;
- (b) a teaching portfolio (no more than 5 pages of narrative) in the format adopted by the university and College of Arts and Sciences (see [Appendix](#));
- (c) a secondary area statement of no more than two pages, where applicable;
- (d) a service statement of no more than two pages;
- (e) confidential letters from at least four well qualified reviewers evaluating the quality of the components of the faculty member's workload;
- (f) the required appendices that are part of the teaching portfolio (see [Appendix](#)).

Reviewers: Reviewers provide an additional perspective on the career track faculty member's overall trajectory and quality and impact of their work. For career track faculty, this assessment should be grounded within that faculty member's specific workload and sub-track. As such, that information must be provided to the reviewer as well as material that helps them evaluate that performance within that workload and the Department's expectations. The College and University require a minimum of four external reviewers. The reviewers shall be selected by the Chair, and may include ones suggested by the candidate, but should not include people who have a conflict of interest, such as a personal relationship with the faculty member that goes beyond that of colleague (e.g., mentor, present or former collaborators of the candidate, or former/current students). These reviewers may be internal or external to WSU but must be external to the department. Although reviewers external to WSU are optional, including one or more is highly recommended. At least half of letters should not be from the reviewers on the list provided by the candidate. The reviewers should be at, or higher, than the rank that the faculty member is seeking for promotion. If a reviewer is not from academia (for example, for the review of a faculty member who conducted community-engaged scholarship), then that reviewer should possess a significant depth of experience that is often, but not always, demonstrated by a leadership position. Under no circumstances will a reviewer be paid or compensated in any way for reviewing the candidate's file or writing a letter. Every review letter that is solicited (by the Chair) and received should be included.

Documentation, including the letters of evaluation from at least four internal or external reviewers, will be assembled by the Chair and presented for consideration to the departmental faculty members holding academic rank higher than that of the candidate. The Chair presides at the deliberations of the departmental faculty and determines whether to forward a recommendation for promotion and the accompanying documentation. A faculty member may request that the file be forwarded to the Dean, even if the Chair's recommendation is negative. 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.

On cases in the Career Track that seek promotion to Associate Professor, all career track faculty at the Associate or Professor ranks submit recommendations, regardless of the sub-track of the recommender or candidate. Tenure track Associate Professors and Professors also submit recommendations, again regardless of the sub-track of the candidate. On cases in the Career Track that seek promotion to Professor, all career track faculty at the Professor rank submit recommendations, regardless of the sub-track of the recommender or candidate. Tenure track Professors also submit recommendations, again regardless of the sub-track of the candidate.

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 home 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.

APPENDIX 1

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES TEACHING PORTFOLIO POLICY

(Effective March 2013; Revised and effective April 2024)

In order to have uniformity, the teaching portfolio should be prepared according to the following guidelines. The body of the portfolio should not exceed five pages, but any additional materials within the appendices may be longer. All appendices should be filed within the “Supplementary Materials” folder on the online shared website.

All teaching portfolios should have the following sections: (A) Goals, (B) Responsibilities, (C) Evaluations, and (D) Results/Impacts. Please see the annual College and Provost’s office instructions for more detailed information for each section.

In addition, the following required appendices should also be included:

Student Evaluations: For pre-tenure and assistant professor, career track 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 summary questions. For faculty members being considered for promotion to professor, summaries are only required for courses taught in the past four years. All faculty should provide complete sets of student comments for two (*and only two*) courses.

Course Materials: 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.

Peer Teaching Evaluations: Departments will conduct peer evaluation of teaching according to policies developed in the departments. At minimum, there will be two peer evaluations visits by department faculty in the third year, for all assistant professors (career and tenure track), and the year before consideration for tenure and/or promotion for all faculty regardless of rank and track. Departments are strongly encouraged to provide opportunities for annual peer review of teaching. If a Department does provide annual peer reviews, then faculty may instead choose which set of peer reviews to include in their promotion materials (either a total of four for assistant professors or a total of two for associate professors). A short description of the evaluations will be provided to the Chair, given to the faculty member evaluated, and included in the materials presented for review. The College strongly suggests that the faculty member’s mentoring committee review instruction during the first year of appointment to assist in rapid progress in instructional proficiency. Ideally, peer teaching evaluations are to be conducted by faculty who are at or above the rank within the same track for which promotion review the evaluatee is seeking. In addition, ideally, one of the evaluations is on the same home campus as the evaluatee. Note, there may be circumstances that may require exceptions to the guidance for peer evaluators, including seeking evaluators outside the department and/or college at lower ranks or on different tracks.

At the time of the third year review or tenure and/or promotion review, in the Chair’s summary, the Chair will provide an analysis of the student evaluation “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.