MEMORANDUM

TO: Vice Provosts, Chancellors, VCAAs, Deans, and Legal Counsel

FROM: Elizabeth S. Chilton, Provost and Executive Vice President

SUBJECT: Recommendations for Faculty Promotion and/or Tenure and Regents Professor Nominations

DATE: May 11, 2023

Enclosed are the instructions for the 2023-24 promotion and/or tenure recommendations and the Regents Professor nominations. Please ask department chairs and school directors to provide copies of these instructions to all promotion and/or tenure candidates. Updated forms, which can be signed electronically, are posted on the [Provost's Office website](#).

For faculty not located on the same campus as their respective dean and department chair, please adhere strictly to the revised [Executive Policy 29, "Policies, Responsibilities, and Authorities for the Operation of Multi-Campus Academic Programs."](#)

Please note that recommendations and a summary sheet for faculty promotions and/or tenure actions **must be received by the Office of the Provost no later than October 27, 2023.** You are welcome to contact Kristina Peterson-Wilson (Vice Provost for Academic Administration & Chief of Staff) in the Provost's Office at (509) 335-8915 if you have questions or require assistance.

The granting of tenure is one of the most important personnel decisions made at our university. Your recommendation and documentation should be guided by the current *Faculty Manual*. Generally, recommendations for tenure will be made concurrently with the promotion to associate professor.

Thoughtful and clear recommendations are requisite to an appropriate university decision. While it is unfortunately and, hopefully, rare, if there is serious doubt about the wisdom of granting tenure, tenure denial is the proper recommendation.

I realize that promotion and tenure cases are time consuming and require hard work. I greatly appreciate your care and attention to such important personnel matters in support of excellence at Washington State University.

<h1 style="text-align:center">Tenure and Promotion Guidelines 2023-2024</h1>

I. TENURE AND PROMOTION SCHEDULE 2023-2024

<u>Schedule</u>

May 2023	Distribution of Instructions and Forms on Promotion and Tenure
Summer 2023	Distribution of Lists of Names for Tenure
October 27, 2023	**Complete dossiers are due in the Provost's Office**
December 2023	Discussion by the Provost's Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee
January 2024	Discussions with relevant Deans/Vice Provosts begin
March 2024	Letters sent to faculty

II. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS 2023-2024

The forms will be similar to those used last year, but paper forms will no longer be required. All materials are to be submitted electronically. **Please fill all forms out completely.** Forms are available on our website at http://provost.wsu.edu. As a gentle reminder, faculty recommendations are required for all promotion cases, including promotion in the career tracks.

A. Upload to Teams Site

We will have a Teams site for each college available and ask that you upload as many documents as possible to that site.

The following materials should be numbered and organized on the Teams site in the order indicated below. The folders for most candidates would be as follows:

1. Administrative Recommendation Form(s) (Chair's, Dean's, and Vice Chancellor's if Dean and Chancellor disagree)
2. Current Curriculum Vitae
3. Teaching Portfolio (25-page limit for health sciences; 5 pp for all others)
4. Statements (2-page limit for individual statements) (e.g., research, service, split appointments, COVID, DEI work, other context) **or a single unified statement, limit 6 pp. This is a change from previous years; please make faculty aware that this is an option.**
5. Past annual progress toward tenure, and intensive third-year reviews (in cases of promotion to full professor, only those reviews conducted since the last promotion need be included)
6. External/Internal Review Letters
7. Supporting Materials
   Wherever possible, we ask that you submit supporting materials in electronic format to the Teams site rather than in another format.

   DOIs can be supplied on the CV for manuscripts that are available electronically.

   If electronic versions or pictures are not available, supporting material may include books, slides, tapes and other evidence (e.g., photographs, videotapes) of the candidate's teaching, research, scholarly, creative, and service activities. The material should be assembled in an archive box and labeled with the candidate's name, department, and college.

   Any materials that are submitted as part of a candidate's supporting documentation may become part of WSU's permanent record and may not be returned to the candidates. We strongly urge candidates to submit copies rather than originals.

8. Copy of Departmental <u>and</u> College Criteria for Promotion and Tenure
9. Faculty Advisory Recommendation Forms (to be uploaded to the Teams channel reserved for faculty recommendations only)

The folders may make more precise divisions if needed, but in no case should any of the above sections be combined.

III. WSU'S CORE MISSIONS AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR FACULTY REVIEW (*Faculty Manual* III.C.4)

Starting in August 2021, the *Faculty Manual* has a description of WSU's core missions and how they apply to faculty review (passed by the Faculty Senate on April 8, 2021). Below we provide the text added to the *Faculty Manual* and all material in this section is part of the *Faculty Manual*. These guidelines place the promotion and tenure process in the context of our land-grant mission and reflect best practices in faculty review. Since these guidelines have been added recently, they should not be interpreted in any way that would harm current promotion and tenure cases.

Please consider this text carefully and, especially since it is a new addition, make your faculty aware of these changes and their importance to the review process.

Faculty Manual III.C.4:

A. Washington State University's core missions:
- Teaching & Learning, including mentoring and advising
- Scholarship, as broadly defined by Boyer
    i. Scholarship of discovery
    ii. Scholarship of integration
    iii. Scholarship of application
    iv. Scholarship of teaching
       Boyer, E. L. (1990), Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
- Outreach & Engagement, including extension, clinical service, etc.
- Service, a balance of internal and external
    i. Academic Service, Governance, and Leadership (internally directed service)
    ii. Professional Service (externally directed service that supports professional organizations, advisory boards, peer review processes, etc.).

B. Guiding Principles for Faculty Review

CORE PRINCIPLE/VALUE: The university values and seeks excellence in all the traditional missions of our land grant university and recognizes that true excellence is only achieved through the collective contributions of our faculty.

1. WSU is committed to diversity, equity, and inclusion through every aspect of its statewide system. With this commitment comes the recognition that traditional promotion guidelines, processes, practices, and institutional culture do not reward or serve all equitably. For example, service, teaching, working with underserved populations, and leadership responsibilities (i.e., activities which have traditionally received little to no weight during promotion and tenure reviews) often fall disproportionately on underrepresented and underserved groups, including faculty of color and women faculty. We are committed to creating and sustaining policies that promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.
2. Faculty must be reviewed in accordance with their defined responsibilities/official job description – i.e., according to their designated contributions to our land grant university's missions. No single mission of the university shall have inordinate weight in the review of a faculty member unless that mission is the primary focus for that faculty member.
3. Faculty must be reviewed in true peer review fashion – i.e., internal reviewers must include peers who understand and contribute to the same mission(s) in similar ways. In cases in which a unit or review team does not include true peers, it is essential that the unit solicit additional review from outside the unit, college, and/or university.
4. Measures of scholarship and research productivity should be selected carefully to minimize bias and provide a complete assessment of productivity, quality and impact. The traditional measures of scholarship and research are often poor and/or biased measures of productivity, quality, and impact for other missions of the university. Over-reliance on these traditional metrics perpetuates bias and incomplete assessment.

5. Reporting and assessment methods should expand beyond traditional scholarship. In addition to the essential work of discovery and creative endeavors (i.e. traditional scholarship), much of the university's work is translational. It represents the scholarship of application, integration, and/or community engagement. Basic science, theory, and current evidence-based best practices are often put into practice and tested in teaching, mentoring and advising, outreach and engagement, academic service/leadership, etc. As a result, students, the public, and the university itself benefit. <u>Therefore</u>, faculty members whose designated contributions to our university's missions do not include or go beyond research/discovery must be provided with clear, viable means by which they can report and showcase their achievements. These methods should effectively communicate to reviewers quantity, quality, role, scholarly basis, and impact.

6. The institution values the capacity of faculty to integrate their work across the land grant missions. Those faculty members who are engaged in two or more missions of the land grant university have the opportunity to integrate their work across their teaching, outreach, research and service roles. Faculty who successfully demonstrate this integration embody the ideals of the land grant university, and their efforts should be recognized and rewarded accordingly.

7. Each faculty member's respective contributions to their assigned roles in our collective missions are valued and rewarded – regardless of track. Because of the resource commitment it represents, tenure is one of the most important decisions made by the university and thus merits special consideration. Nonetheless, the university should otherwise strive to minimize differences between tenure and career tracks that create hierarchy.
    *   Both tracks should have clear expectations and processes for promotion, including the expectation for continuing growth and achievement for any faculty member being considered for promotion to Professor. As stated elsewhere for both tenure and career tracks, attainment of the rank of professor is an indication that, in the opinion of colleagues, an individual has made, and continues to make, progressive contributions to a major area of the individual's work assignment. By way of example, innovation and leadership is expected from all full professors (regardless of track) and from any faculty member applying for or aspiring to promotion to full professor.

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

C. Operational Principles for Faculty Review
1. All faculty should have descriptions of their position responsibilities. As appointment dictates evaluation, all current faculty (regardless of track and/or sub-track) must have clear position descriptions/role statements that include the faculty member's assignment and responsibilities relative to each college mission. Similarly, it is essential that all WSU faculty job offers include a clear position description and/or role statement.

2. All faculty should be provided clear expectations for promotion and tenure. All units must have clear criteria for promotion and tenure and provide them to candidates, colleagues, and all internal and external reviewers. Criteria should be comprehensive but not prescriptive.

3. A faculty member may report an activity and outcome under more than one mission area. Because missions often overlap, faculty should identify a primary area of attribution for any reported activity (usually in accordance with their primary assigned responsibilities). However, that activity might be co-listed under another mission.

- For example, research and creative work often involve significant mentoring and advising.
- Outreach and engagement often involve teaching – through formal WSU course offerings and/or other diverse settings.
- Teaching and learning may generate publications and lead to extramural funding.

4. Service to a faculty member's professional organization(s) is valued and recognized. These externally facing service activities and collaborations raise the reputation of the university and/or unit. They also serve the faculty member's work by building collaborative networks, providing successful models, enhancing professional skills, and increasing personal reputation.

5. Communication to external reviewers should reflect all of WSU's missions. External evaluations play an important role in the P&T process by providing disciplinary expertise and an external perspective. Our communication with external reviewers should center WSU's core values and missions as well as provide context, including the faculty member's defined responsibilities/official job description. When appropriate, WSU should make it clear to the external reviewers the value the university, college and unit places in university missions and/or activities that reviewers may not be accustomed to seeing within a promotion or tenure package (e.g. community-engaged scholarship, administrative service & leadership, etc.)

IV. PROCEDURAL REMINDERS FOR CHAIRS AND DEANS

1. All pre-tenured faculty should have an intensive review the spring before their year of tenure consideration. Feedback from the intensive review should include feedback on all statements and on the CV. There should be a departmental discussion of career progress for all pre-tenured candidates, and in the case of third-year intensive reviews, all faculty should provide their recommendations and comments on candidates' progress toward tenure. Discussions should be held by Zoom if the unit has faculty members on more than one campus.

2. All tenure cases must be forwarded to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President.

3. The dean, in consultation with the chancellor or VCAA, and/or chancellor may decide not to forward cases for promotion to associate professor (career-track) or professor (both career- and tenure-track). The dean is now required to notify candidates in writing about whether their case for promotion will be forwarded to the Office of the Provost. Notification must occur within 10 working days of the decision. If the decision is to not forward the packet, the faculty member will be given a written justification. In addition, the faculty member will be given a minimum of five (5) working days to exercise the right to have the packet forwarded to the provost, regardless of the dean's decision. Be certain to provide clear and complete documentation to support all recommendations.

4. Chair's and dean's statements should include the sections outlined in the documentation provided on the Provost's Office website "Chair's Outline for Tenure, Promotion, and Intensive Third-Year Review Statements" and "Dean's Outline for Tenure and Promotion, and Intensive Third-Year Review Statements". (Intensive third-year review statements from the deans are optional except in the case of an "Unsatisfactory" rating on progress toward tenure.) See also the Checklist for Chairs and Directors.

5. Evaluators at all levels must judge cases on their merit and based on their job descriptions. Faculty review should not include comparison with others in the department with tenure already or being considered at the same time. Cases should also be evaluated in the context of WSU's core missions, using the guiding principles for faculty review, and in relation to department, college, and university expectations.

6. Please be sure that your recommendations, and the procedures that you follow, are consistent with your college and departmental guidelines. Each college should now have updated guidelines for promotion of career-track faculty; please be sure to refer to those, and to updated unit guidelines, and make sure they are provided to all chairs, the college-level tenure and promotion committees, and internal and external reviewers.

7. The same general procedures and timeline should be followed in recommending promotion of career-track faculty and tenure-track faculty.
8. Make sure that all of the relevant chancellors, vice chancellors, deans, academic directors, and department chairs who are involved in a case provide input about the case (see p13). In addition, all faculty members who are eligible to assess a case should do so. All recommendations (e.g., faculty, department tenure and promotion committee, college tenure and promotion committee) should be reported in the summaries prepared by the chair and dean. There must be at least five faculty recommendations, not including the chair, for promotion and/or tenure.
9. No one with a conflict of interest should assess or prepare a case for a candidate. For example, no one with a personal relationship with the candidate that goes beyond that inherent in the role of colleague should contribute to a case. External and internal letters should not be solicited from mentors, collaborators, former graduate students, post-doctoral associates, etc.
10. Approval for cases for early promotion and/or tenure must be obtained from the Provost <u>before</u> the case is prepared. Please submit requests by June 15, 2023.
11. It is required that the faculty discussion of all candidates' cases for tenure and/or promotion be held over Zoom or Academic Media Services (AMS) in schools and departments that have any participating members at the Everett, Spokane, Tri-Cities, and Vancouver campuses or other off- campus sites. This meeting must be available to all faculty eligible to ballot on the particular case at all appropriate sites (see p13). This meeting will allow all faculty members, regardless of location, to provide and to hear information about any candidate's progress and will allow questions about this progress to be asked and answered. I urge you to schedule these meetings early with Zoom/AMS.
12. Tenure and/or promotion should be granted when the candidate has reached the level of performance specified in the departmental and college tenure and promotion guidelines. Those who have been granted extension(s) of the tenure clock should be held to the same standards as those given a normal clock. They should not be held to a higher standard because of the extension.
13. COVID-19 affected many candidates' ability to complete scholarly work and also required extra work in teaching during the spring semester of 2019-2020 and academic years 2021-2022 and 2022-23, and this may be reflected in the work products presented for review. All evaluators should consider to what extent this may be true for any given individual evaluated and modify judgment accordingly. In addition, because course evaluations may have suffered from the rapid switch to online teaching, faculty may choose not to report Spring 2020 semester's course evaluations in their teaching portfolio.
14. Files are considered complete at the time of the deadline for submission of materials. Faculty may not add material to the file after the deadlines except for the following:
    - A faculty member has listed a publication as "in press" and the article or book is published. If the faculty member wishes the material to be included, it may be substituted for the manuscript in the file. The CV may be updated. This is a "cosmetic" change and requires no further action.
    - A faculty member who is being considered for tenure and/or promotion has listed a publication or grant proposal as "submitted" and, after the file leaves the department, the faculty member receives word that it has been accepted. The faculty member can request that the documentation be added to their file for incorporation into subsequent stages of the evaluation process.

V. DETAILED INSTRUCTIONS FOR CHAIRS AND DEANS

1. **Administrative Recommendation Forms**

    <u>To be completed by the department chair(s):</u>
    Tenure/Promotion Recommendation Form: Please see the "Chair's Outline for Tenure, Promotion and Third-year Review Statements" on the Provost's Office website for a description of statement requirements and a detailed list of statement content. Evaluation by the chair should be detailed and interpretive, containing analysis of critiques by colleagues and peers as well as the campus academic director and, if applicable, the chair of department in which faculty member has a secondary appointment. Include forms from both department chairs in the case of a joint appointment.

    The recommendation on tenure and promotion should follow logically from, and be consistent with, the feedback the candidate has been given in past annual and intensive reviews whenever possible. **Thoughtful and lucid recommendations are prerequisites to a proper decision. If there is serious doubt about the wisdom of granting tenure, tenure denial is the proper recommendation.**

    <u>To be completed by the dean, in consultation with VCAA:</u>
    Promotion/Tenure Recommendation Form: Please see the attached "Dean's Outline for Tenure, Promotion and Third-year Review Statements" on the Provost's Office website for a description of statement requirements and a detailed description of statement content.

    For faculty not located on the same campus as their respective dean, the dean is responsible for ensuring that all relevant campus input and recommendations have been appropriately obtained, and for reconciling and seeking an agreed-upon recommendation between the dean and vice chancellor for academic affairs (VCAA) on all campus tenure and/or promotion cases on the VCAA's campus prior to submission to the Provost. In the rare event that such agreement cannot be reached, the VCAA has the prerogative to submit a dissenting recommendation that will be included explicitly in the tenure packet forwarded to the Provost.

2. **Copies of past annual progress towards tenure, and intensive third-year reviews.** In cases of promotion to full professor or Regents professor, only those reviews conducted since the last promotion need be included. The recommendation on tenure and promotion should follow logically from, and be consistent with, the feedback the candidate has been given in the past whenever possible.

3. **External and Internal Review Letters.** This section of the dossier should include:

    - A short (one-page maximum) reviewer bio -- please do not send full CVs
    - A list of reviewers contacted, with the names supplied by the candidate marked with an asterisk.
    - A copy of the letter sent to reviewers requesting their comments. All letters to reviewers should include the following statements:

        "Washington State University will treat your evaluation as a sensitive document, and it will not be made generally available. However, because Washington State University is a public institution and because our state has a very broad public records law, we are unable to guarantee confidentiality. If requested, evaluations will be made available to the candidate."

and

"Beginning in March 2020 the COVID-19 pandemic significantly disrupted operations, including instructional delivery, at Washington State University and the rest of the U.S. As a result, our campus underwent a rapid transition to remote learning before the end of the spring semester. All classes continued online from spring 2020 through summer 2021 sessions. Research facilities, including labs and libraries, were closed for several months, and field research and conferences were also suspended. In conjunction with the disruptions experienced on-campus, many faculty were working out of their homes while simultaneously providing childcare due to the closures of childcare facilities and K-12 schools, and/or elder care. Many publication submissions went through unusually prolonged review processes. These research disruptions, significant shifts in teaching modalities, and challenges with dependent care have greatly affected productivity for many faculty and will have ripple effects for several years to come. We ask that you take these unprecedented events into consideration when evaluating work performed by the candidate."

Please note that the minimum number of review letters is four; however, all letters received by the department by the time the case is forwarded to the dean's office must be included in the file. Two reviewers should come from a list supplied by the candidate.

Letters should not be solicited from people who have a conflict of interest, such as a personal relationship with the candidate that goes beyond that of colleague (e.g., mentor, collaborators, partners, faculty who have conflict with candidate). For tenure-track faculty, letters from WSU faculty are not considered "external" letters and should not be solicited. If they are received, they should be included in an appendix to the file. Letters from WSU faculty can be used as internal reviewers for career-track faculty, but again, letters should not be solicited from people who have a conflict of interest.

Unsolicited letters from students, colleagues, and citizens, or other evidence of research, creative or performance activities, teaching, extension, or service excellence, may be submitted but should be included only when unique perspectives are offered on the faculty member's service to the institution and society. Such letters should be included in the Supplementary Materials.

All review letters should be available to faculty and administrators involved in the review process.

a. External Review Letters (required for tenure track, optional for career track)

At least four external letters are required for **tenure and for tenure-track promotion** considerations and, in view of the time constraints, we urge you to begin to solicit external letters as soon as possible.

Communication to external reviewers should reflect all of WSU's missions. External evaluations play an important role in the P&T process by providing disciplinary expertise and an external perspective. Our communication with external reviewers should center WSU's core values and missions as well as provide context, including the faculty member's defined responsibilities/official job description. When appropriate, WSU should make it clear to the external reviewers the value the university, college, and unit place on university missions and/or activities that reviewers may not be accustomed to seeing within a promotion or tenure package

(e.g., community-engaged scholarship, administrative service and leadership, innovation and entrepreneurship, etc.).

External review letters should be solicited from noted senior faculty, scholars, researchers, clinicians, artists, and performers at comparable or better institutions, research centers, or government or private-sector organizations. Candidates who have pursued sustained work in communities, state, and national agencies may also suggest among their possible external reviewers one or more evaluators (academic or non-academic) possessing significant experience in communities of practice relevant to the candidate's scholarship. Careful thought should be given to the qualifications, stature and overall appropriateness of those from whom letters are solicited. Letters may be obtained from evaluators chosen by the chair from a list composed partially from recommendations of the candidate. Academic standing of external reviewers is particularly important. Where appropriate, letter writers should hold a rank at least equal to the rank to which the candidate aspires.

b. Internal or External Review Letters (Required for career-track faculty)

At least four review letters are also required for **career-track promotions** and may be from either internal or external reviewers.

Some colleges require letters from WSU faculty outside the candidate's home department or from students; please check college guidelines for career-track promotion. In some cases, letters from students, professional associations, or external agencies may be appropriate.

4. **Faculty Advisory Recommendations**

It is the responsibility of the chair or director to ensure that all faculty eligible to offer an opinion about a candidate have available at the time of their evaluations all relevant documents, including those from other related units (institutes, research stations, campuses, etc.). To facilitate the dissemination of appropriate information, the faculty discussion of all candidates' cases for tenure and/or promotion will be held over Zoom or Academic Media Services in schools and departments that have any participating members at other campuses or other off-campus locations. This meeting must be available to faculty at all appropriate locations.

The administrator must also convey to faculty the responsibility to participate in the evaluation process and to provide a written recommendation. Each eligible department member is to complete one copy of the appropriate recommendation form for each member of the department eligible for consideration. **Department members should indicate "yes" or "no" and provide an explanation for their recommendations.** Abstentions are not usually permitted. However, faculty with a conflict of interest should not vote, and chairs should make a note of this in their administrative recommendation. **Faculty members should take particular care to ensure that the contents of their recommendation conform to, and support, their recommendation of yes or no.**

For faculty not located on the same campus as their respective dean and department chair, the chair will also consult with the appropriate academic director. Academic directors will provide input on annual progress toward tenure reviews, intensive third-year reviews, and tenure and/or promotion reviews to department chairs/school directors. The input will be acknowledged and incorporated explicitly into the tenure and/or promotion review narratives by the department chair/school director.

Academic directors will provide input to the department chair/school director at least two weeks before the Administrative Recommendation Form is to be submitted to the dean. Colleges will publish a schedule of evaluation needs that facilitates this input and circulate it to academic directors, and their VCAAs.

Faculty in each department must submit recommendations for faculty with joint appointments, and each chair must also submit an administrative form.

The granting of tenure is an important decision. Tenured members of the faculty tend to remain on the faculty for many years. Faculty members are in a good position to evaluate both the performance and promise of their potential long-term colleagues. Therefore, faculty members bear particular responsibility for upholding standards of excellence and should write their recommendations with those standards in mind and with particular care.

Who submits recommendations

There must be at least five faculty recommendations, not including the chair, for promotion and/or tenure. If there are fewer than five tenured faculty members in the unit, the tenured members shall recommend additional such persons via the department chair/school director and dean to the Provost. The Provost shall determine which of these persons will review the candidate's materials and complete a recommendation form.

- All tenured faculty should complete recommendations on the granting of tenure and/or promotion to **tenure-track associate professor.** Colleges may also decide to include associate or full-rank career-track professors in completing recommendations.

- All tenured full-rank professors should complete recommendations on the appointment or promotion to **tenure-track professor.** Colleges may also decide to include full-rank career-track professors in completing recommendations.

- All career- and tenure-track associate professors and professors submit recommendations on promotion to **career-track associate professor.**

- All career- and tenure-track professors submit recommendations on promotion to **career-track professor.**

5. **Regents Professor Nominations**

The Regents Professor faculty rank has been created to recognize the exceptional levels of cumulative performance achieved by a small fraction of faculty. It reflects university-wide recognition for such faculty by designation as "Regents Professor."

Characteristics
To be considered for promotion to Regents Professor a faculty member must:

be a tenured full professor or equivalent; and must have served Washington State University for at least the immediately preceding seven years; achieved the highest level of distinction in a discipline and raised the standards of the University through activities in teaching and/or scholarship and/or public service; and sustained a level of accomplishment, which has received national and international recognition.

It is university policy that there will be no more than 30 active Regents Professors at any one time. Should one or more vacancies exists, each college may nominate no more than 2 candidates for this rank. The number of promotions to Regents Professor is limited to **five (5)** annually for the institution.

Procedures
The promotion process and procedures correspond to those for promotion to professor but with appropriate modifications to accommodate the university-wide nature and limitations on numbers. Faculty advisory recommendations are not necessary for this nomination.

The Administrative Recommendation Form for Regents Professors is similar to that used for tenure and promotion. It calls for specific information. **Please fill out the form completely.**

Be certain to provide clear and complete documentation to support all nominations. Outside letters are required. External letters should not be solicited from people who have a conflict of interest such as a personal relationship with the candidate (e.g., mentor, collaborator).

If the candidate has within the last year received a Faculty Excellence Award or the Eminent Faculty Award, the four letters may be from that group of previously solicited letters. External letters may be reused one time or new letters may be solicited, as desired. After the letters have been reused one time, new letters must be included in the packet.

The process for submitting these nominations is described below. Candidates who are not chosen in one year may remain in the pool for up to 3 years (but may also be withdrawn), but materials should be updated. The college may also choose to re-nominate previous candidates after their initial 3 years of eligibility expires. To re-nominate a candidate, you must submit a promotion notebook with a current curriculum vitae. External letters may be reused one time or new letters may be solicited, as desired. Each college is allowed to nominate 2 candidates per year.

All college-level recommendations for promotion to Regents Professor are submitted to the Provost's Office. They are then provided to a university-wide committee, which makes recommendations to the Provost. Final decisions and notifications are made at the same time as other tenure and promotion decisions.

Conditions
A ten percent salary increase will accompany promotion to Regents Professor. Newly promoted Regents Professors will also be honored at the Celebration of Excellence Dinner at Showcase. Once granted, the rank is held for the remainder of the recipient's active service at Washington State University. The title "Regents Professor Emeritus" is conferred upon retirement upon submittal to HRS of an appropriately completed personnel action form.

VI. CHECKLISTS

<p align="center" style="color:#a00000">Checklist for Candidates
Promotion and Tenure Review Procedure and Statements</p>

1. Curriculum Vitae
- ☐ Education and professional positions
- ☐ Brief summary of research/scholarship interests
- ☐ List of graduate courses taught (with semesters), study abroad courses, graduate/postdoctoral fellow supervised, graduate committees served on
- ☐ Summary of grant and contract support
  - ☐ Identify funding agency, grant periods, total amount funded
  - ☐ Clearly identify your role, and the amount of funding to your program, if relevant
  - ☐ Separate in-progress from completed or pending grants/contracts
- ☐ Awards and honors
- ☐ Complete list of scholarship products, separated by category:
  - Refereed
    - o Journal articles (published, in press, under review, all separated)
    - o Abstracts
    - o Proceedings
    - o Books and book chapters
    - o Patents
    - o Original scores
    - o Exhibits
    - o Performances
    - o Works of art
  - Non-refereed
    - o Technical reports
  - Invited presentations at national/international conferences (refereed)
  - Posters and presentations (refereed)
  - Invited presentations (non-refereed)
  - Posters and presentations (non-refereed)
  - Other scholarship products not listed here (workshops, extension publications, etc.)
- ☐ Documentation of acceptance for in-press or accepted publications
- ☐ Consultancies, professional leaves, international collaborations
- ☐ Professional memberships
- ☐ Service
  - External service (professional service, grant review panels, editorial boards, service to state or community as relevant to scholarship)
  - University service
  - Campus service
  - College service
  - Departmental service
  - Clinical service
  - Community service
- ☐ Professional development activities
- ☐ Other elements relevant to specific disciplines

2. **Statements** (research statements may be required by college; other statements are optional)
☐ Research/scholarship statement
☐ Service statement
☐ Context statements as relevant (joint appointment, leadership role, community-engaged scholarship, clinical work, innovation & entrepreneurship, other)

3. **Teaching Portfolio**
☐ Goals
☐ Responsibilities
  - Percent appointment for teaching
  - Courses, credit hours, enrollments
  - Work with individual students
  - Advising
  - Instructional innovations
  - Extraordinary efforts with special groups of students
  - Use of research in teaching
  - Out-of-class evaluation/assessment activities
  - Instruction-related service
  - Learning about teaching
  - Project requiring non-state funding
☐ Evaluations
  - Student evaluations
  - Measures of student learning
  - Peer evaluation
  - Comments from unsolicited student letters
  - Teaching awards
  - Other
☐ Results/Impacts
  - Student success
  - Instructional materials produced
  - Contributions to scholarship of teaching
  - Other results, appendix, exhibits

Checklist for Dean's Assistants
Promotion and Tenure Review Procedure and Statements

1. **Administrative Recommendation Forms**
☐ All forms are current forms from the Provost's Office website.
   (All other forms will be returned.)
☐ All fields are completed
☐ Chair/director, dean and chancellor or VCAA*
   Where applicable have all signed and dated
☐ In cases where dean and VCAA disagree, include a separate administrative form from VCAA
☐ In case of secondary appointment, chair/director of second unit has been consulted
☐ In cases of joint appointment, both chairs/directors have completed separate forms
☐ Include numbers of faculty ballots for each category of recommendation
☐ Include chair, dean, and VCAA recommendation
☐ FOR PROMOTION ONLY: Dean has notified candidate in writing, within 10 working days of decision, about whether the case for promotion will be forwarded to Provost.

Chancellor may designate someone to conduct the review. Using VCAA from here on out to refer to either chancellor or VCAA

2. **Candidate's Curriculum Vitae**
☐ CV included

3. **Teaching Portfolio**
☐ All teaching portfolios for <u>health sciences colleges</u> may use special approved format and be up to 25 pages.
☐ All other teaching portfolios should be 5 pp maximum.

4. **Context Statements (e.g. research, service, joint appointments, COVID, other)**
☐ Each statement is limited to two pages (or a single unified statement with a limit of 6 pages)
☐ If separate context statements are utilized, they must be saved as separate documents

5. **Copies of Past Annual Progress Toward Tenure And Intensive Third-Year Reviews**
☐ FOR TENURE and/or PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: All comprehensive/abridged/intensive reviews from employment start date, including third-year review
☐ FOR PROMOTION TO FULL RANK OR REGENTS PROFESSOR: All annual reviews since last promotion

6. **External/Internal Review Letters**
☐ At least 4 letters are included
☐ List of reviewers, their titles, and universities
☐ Candidate's name suggestions are denoted with an asterisk
☐ Copy of the letter that is sent to respective reviewers

7. **Supporting Materials**

8. **Faculty Recommendations (ballots)**
☐ All ballots are signed
☐ All ballots include written rationale for recommendation
☐ Ballots are uploaded into separate Teams channel for faculty recommendations

9. **College and Departmental/School Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

<h1 style="text-align:center">Checklist for Chairs and Directors:
Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Statements</h1>

1. Procedural

☐ Describe process used during unit review
☐ Describe candidate's position (percentage or distribution of duties)
☐ Describe candidate's tenure clock, if needed
☐ Make sure all faculty ballots are signed, have checked a recommendation, and provide written rationale for recommendation

2. For all categories that are relevant, evaluate candidate's contributions to:

☐ Teaching
☐ Refereed scholarship/juried exhibitions or creative products
☐ Service and leadership roles
☐ Community outreach/engagement
☐ Extension programming
☐ Clinical work
☐ Innovation and entrepreneurship activities
☐ Positive working environment
☐ Other

3. Internal recommendations and external reviews

☐ Summarize faculty recommendations
☐ Summarize external review letters
☐ Describe/explain discrepancies between positive and negative recommendations/reviews

4. Chair or director summary

☐ Recommendation
☐ Justification of recommendation
☐ Included recommendation and comments of campus chancellor

5. Review your statement for common mistakes

☐ Failure to reach a clear conclusion.
☐ Failure to address one or more aspects of the job description.
☐ Reaching a conclusion inconsistent with guidelines without explanation of the difference.
☐ Reaching a conclusion inconsistent with past progress-towards-tenure or annual reviews without a recent change in the candidate's performance to justify the inconsistency.
☐ Recommendation vs. the text of your statement support opposite conclusions.
☐ Failure to address problems in the case. The problems will be noticed. Please address them and provide an explanation for why the problems are or are not critical to the case.
☐ Excessive repetition or quotations from other documents that are in the file.
☐ Inaccurate counts of activities. Scholarship that is "in progress" does not count and scholarship that is "in press" is counted only if appropriate documentation is provided.
☐ Failure to account for the job description, particularly by applying the same standards for scholarship and/or teaching to candidates who have very different percentage assignments to these activities

V. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE PROVOST'S OFFICE WEBSITE
https://provost.wsu.edu/guidelines-and-forms/

Candidates
- Guidelines for Documenting Impact

Chairs/Directors
- Chair's Outline for Promotion, Tenure, and Third-year Review Statements

Dean's Office
- Dean's Outline for Promotion, Tenure, Third-year Review Statements