

3 August 2021

Dear Colleagues,

This document contains resources to support you in preparing materials for annual review, promotion, and tenure. The resources may be especially helpful in documenting the importance and impact of activities that are historically harder to evaluate, such as community-engaged scholarship and service. This documentation is especially important now that new faculty manual guidelines for reviewing faculty emphasize all aspects of our land-grant mission (see Section VI).

The resources included here are not exhaustive, and there are many additional activities for which information could be added. Please feel free to send suggestions for future iterations of this document. In the meantime, many of the principles and examples included here can be applied to other domains, such as innovation and entrepreneurship, service learning, clinical service, and leadership or governance activities.

Contents of the packet:

- I. Document Your Impact (page 2)
- II. Document Your Individual Contributions to Grants and Papers on Your CV (page 5)
- III. The Teaching Portfolio (page 7)
- IV. Sample Format for Documenting Impact (page 10)
- V. Checklist for Candidates: Promotion, Tenure, and Third-Year Review Procedure and Statements (page 11)
- VI. Washington State University's Core Missions And Guiding Principles For Faculty Review (page 13)

## I. DOCUMENT YOUR IMPACT

### A. Community-Engaged Scholarship

All three references below place community-engaged scholarship in the context of Boyer's model of engaged scholarship, which uses "broader definitions of scholarship, encompassing a continuum of faculty work ranging from discover to the integration of discovery with ... the application of faculty expertise" (Calleson, Kauper-Brown, & Seifer, 2005). Community-engaged scholarship encompasses teaching, research, and service.

The first two references also provide suggestions and examples for defining and describing impact in your CV, annual review materials, and statement for promotion and tenure documents.

Throughout these documents there are examples of **how to document the quality and impact of your work**.

*\*\* Please note that in these first two documents and other references online, there is reference to a site that appears to be used now as a personal blog: <http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info> \*\**

1. Calleson D, Kauper-Brown J, Seifer SD. (2005) *Community-Engaged Scholarship Toolkit*. Seattle: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Retrieved from <https://compact.org/resources/the-community-engaged-scholarship-toolkit>

This toolkit includes a definition of community-engaged scholarship and sections on the following topics:

- Planning for promotion and tenure
- Creating a strong portfolio
- Portfolio examples
- References and resources

2. Jordan, C., Editor (2007). *Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion & Tenure Package*. Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. PDF retrieved from [https://communityengagement.uncg.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/CCPH\\_CES\\_Review\\_Promotion\\_Tenure\\_Package.pdf](https://communityengagement.uncg.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/CCPH_CES_Review_Promotion_Tenure_Package.pdf)

Comprehensive document also includes definition of community-engaged scholarship (CES), indicators of quality CES, a fictitious dossier, and links to additional resources.

The collaborative's eight indicators of high-quality engaged scholarship are:

- Clear academic and community change goals
- Adequate preparation in content area and grounding in community
- Appropriate methods: rigor and community engagement
- Significant results: Impact on the field and the community
- Effective presentation/dissemination to academic and community audiences
- Reflective critique: Lessons learned to improve the scholarship and community engagement
- Leadership and personal contribution
- Consistently ethical behavior: Socially responsible conduct of research and teaching

3. Ellison, J & Eatman, T.K. (2008). *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University: A Resource on Promotion and Tenure in the Arts, Humanities, and Design*. Syracuse, NY: Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life Tenure Team Initiative on Public Scholarship. PDF retrieved from <https://imaginingamerica.org/scholarship-in-public-knowledge-creation-and-tenure-policy-in-the-engaged-university-a-resource-on-promotion-and-tenure-in-the-arts-humanities-and-design/>

This resource is a whitepaper produced to encourage public scholarship and campus-community partnerships. Although much of the document is a roadmap for universities looking to change the culture in higher education, there are also some good examples of reporting impact in the arts, humanities, and design fields.

## B. Service

1. *Defining, Documenting, and Evaluating Service: A Guide for Regional Campus Faculty*. PDF retrieved from <https://www.miamioh.edu/academic-affairs/admin-affairs/regional-faculty-service-guide/index.html#types>

Miami University in Ohio has a webpage defining service and describing types of service. It provides clear, concise suggestions for creating a service portfolio, and how to document the quality and impact of service for annual review, promotion and tenure.

2. *Service and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession* (2018). PDF retrieved from <https://altoona.psu.edu/offices-divisions/academic-affairs/promotion-tenure/education-human-development-social-sciences/service-and-scholarship-service-university-society-and-profession>

Penn State Altoona has a guide for how to document service for annual review, tenure or promotion document. It includes suggestions tips on how to select and report service to the university and profession and best practices for documenting them.

3. Although [this webpage](#) discusses how to write an effective impact statement for research, its principles and tips can be easily translated to service. A summary of their recommendations for writing an effective impact statement:

- A clear description of the problem you are addressing
- An effective action statement highlighting steps you have take to resolve the problem
- An explanation of the impact (socio-economic, environmental, health-related, etc.), preferably both quantifiably and descriptively
- A list of collaborators and their contributions

Their description of how to explain impact: “You need to describe clearly who benefits from your work and in what ways. You can focus on multiple different levels of benefit—individual, organizational, community, or social benefits.”

<https://www.enago.com/academy/writing-an-impact-statement-four-things-you-need-to-know/>

## C. Research

Wolfson College (2021). *Wolfson College Academic Skills: Measuring the Impact of Your Research*. Cambridge University Libraries. <https://libguides.cam.ac.uk/wolfsoncollege/impact>

Many scholars use impact factors and h-index or i-index to report on the impact of their research. However, those metrics are notoriously flawed, and they may not capture impact for many types of research. Wolfson College at Cambridge has an excellent page on different types of metrics (including altmetrics, which track online engagement with your work) and their limitations, as well as strategies to increase citation metrics.

Additional suggestions for documenting your individual contributions and accomplishments in grants and scholarship are included in the next section of this document (p5).

## D. Teaching

The standard WSU teaching portfolio requirements are outlined in Section III of this document (note that the Colleges of Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Medicine, and Veterinary Medicine have separate, college-specific guidelines for the teaching portfolio).

However, there are numerous online resources that are relevant to documenting impact in teaching that may be helpful. The Teaching Academy Website from the Consortium of West Region CVM (of which WSU is a member) includes [a wealth of suggestions and examples](#). Among them is a template for [writing a teaching portfolio \(Educators Reflective Document\)](#), which may stimulate ideas for how to formulate your presentation of impact in teaching.

[https://teachingacademy.westregioncvm.org/initiative-eprt\\_domainexamples/](https://teachingacademy.westregioncvm.org/initiative-eprt_domainexamples/)

[https://s3.wp.wsu.edu/uploads/sites/1358/2017/05/2-Writing-a-Teaching-Portfolio\\_Reflective-Documents-05-28-2017.pdf](https://s3.wp.wsu.edu/uploads/sites/1358/2017/05/2-Writing-a-Teaching-Portfolio_Reflective-Documents-05-28-2017.pdf)

## II. DOCUMENT YOUR INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO GRANTS AND PAPERS ON YOUR CV

### A. Grants

#### 1. Summarize your record of grant funding:

Sample table for top of Grants section in your CV:

	Post tenure*		Pre tenure		Career Totals
	<i>External</i>	<i>Internal</i>	<i>External</i>	<i>Internal</i>	
<b>Submitted</b>	4	1	2 <sup>a</sup>	1	8
<b>Awarded</b>	3 <sup>b</sup>	1	1	1	6
<b>Amount</b>	\$312,158	\$22,300	\$555,920	\$38,250	\$1.07m

\*All grants post-tenure have been as PI or Co-PI

<sup>a</sup>One recommended for funding and in final budget negotiation when program was cut from NSF budget

<sup>b</sup>One grant as senior personnel, the other as PI

#### 2. Identify your roles on grants:

Either use the numbering system below, or a narrative system, or some combination (e.g. narrative for current grants, numbering system for older grants).

##### 1. Numbering system:

- 1) Provided the initial idea
- 2) Developed research design and hypotheses
- 3) Authorship of grant application
- 4) Developed and/or managed budget
- 5) Managed personnel and project activities

Funding Agency (Grant number), “Grant Title”, Name. (PI), Co-PIs: Name, Name, Name.

\$223,950. 01/01/01 – 02/31/12. [2,3,4]

##### 2. Narrative system:

1. Funding Agency (Grant number), “Grant Title”, Name. (PI), Co-PIs: Name, Name, Name.

\$223,950. 01/01/01 – 02/31/12.

**Aims:** X is a 5-year effort that builds upon the success of a prior X grant. The aims of the project are: (1) Increase midcareer STEM women faculty engagement in career advancement and leadership policy and practice decision-making at doctorate-granting and community colleges/PUIs, and (2) Support policy/practice transformation promoting advancement of midcareer women faculty in STEM at the institutional level for all higher education partners, enhancing equity messaging.

**Role:** As (PI)(PI on subcontract)(Co-PI)(Investigator), I (description of role). In Year 1, my responsibilities are .... In Years 2-5, I will... Years 3-5, I will contribute to ....

3. *Funding applied to your program:*

In some disciplines, a specific amount of grant money is assigned to each investigator on the project. In those disciplines, that amount partially indicates the level of your contribution, but not the content or quality, so it would be good to use either the narrative system or the numbering system in conjunction with the grant amount assigned to your program.

## B. Papers

As with grants, the candidate's role in papers can be indicated with a numbering/lettering system, or with a narrative, or a combination.

- Special attributes of the paper should be included (e.g. "Top 10 downloaded articles of 2021").
- Some departments/colleges require h-index or i-index, despite their known limitations as indicators of influence. Other departments require journal rejection rates, also flawed. See the Wolfson College reference listed above in Section I.C for additional suggestions.
- In some disciplines, the senior or corresponding author is listed last; in others, first. If you don't use the narrative system to describe your role in each article, it is good to include information about the significance of first/last authorship at the top of the section.
- Please include the hyperlinked doi for each article in your CV rather than providing copies of manuscripts in the dossier.

### PROFESSIONAL ARTICLES, MANUSCRIPTS PUBLISHED AND IN PRESS, REFEREED (\*Student author   <sup>c</sup>ommunity partner   #Senior author)

\*Author 1, \*Author 2, **Candidate** (2020). Article title. *Journal of Research Excellence*.  
doi.org/x.1x/xxx1   **[a,b,c,d,e,f]**

*Role: I was senior author on the paper, written with an undergraduate and a graduate student. The paper was selected by the journal as 2020's Outstanding Contribution by a Student Author.*

Author 1, \*Author 2, Author 3, 'Author 4, 'Author 5, #**Candidate**. (2018). Article title. *Journal Name*.  
doi.org/aaaa7/bb-bb-01151-1   **[e,f]**

*Role: This paper was published in a specialty journal read primarily by practitioners. The journal does not have a high impact factor, but the best practices we recommended have been adopted by the Society for Practice of XYZ, which has 15,000 members. I had primary responsibility for writing the recommendations section.*

- |  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| a) Developed the initial idea                    | d) Analyzed data         |
| b) Obtained or provided funds or other resources | e) Wrote/created product |
| c) Collected data                                | f) Edited product        |

### III. The Teaching Portfolio (from the [2021-2022 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#))

A "teaching portfolio" is a compilation of information about a faculty member's teaching, made by that faculty member, and is used in consideration for tenure or promotion. It is not, in itself, an instrument for teaching evaluation, but a vehicle for presenting information which may include results of evaluations and which may itself contribute to evaluation. The goal of the teaching portfolio is to present an overview of contributions to teaching and learning.

The format and uses of the portfolio will naturally vary from one part of the university or discipline to another. The outline that follows is meant to be an adaptable template, which can be modified for individual units or even individual faculty members. Nevertheless, there should be a degree of uniformity. The original impetus for proposing the portfolio at WSU was the fact that personnel documents from different units described teaching activities in such varied ways that often it was difficult, if not impossible, to use them fairly or to obtain useful aggregate results. Some guidance seemed in order.

#### General Format

The teaching portfolio narrative shall be **firmly limited to five pages, with the exception of Health Sciences portfolios** (Colleges of Nursing, Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Medicine, and Veterinary Medicine), which are limited to **twenty-five pages**. Faculty in health sciences colleges should refer to their college's Teaching Portfolio formats.

The portfolio should present information under headings selected appropriately from those listed below (and perhaps others) and organized in much the same way. Some faculty members may attach complementary information in the form of appendices or exhibits, but these are not always essential and should be used in moderation. The outline that follows can therefore be regarded as a menu from which faculty members (or departments, or colleges) can select items to include in teaching portfolios to fit their particular circumstances.

#### A. Goals

A compact but thoughtful statement about the faculty member's intentions and aspirations in teaching, especially for the near future. Examples: preferred principles for good teaching; plans for actions for improvement, curricular projects, publications, presentations, etc. Obstacles the faculty member has encountered, such as inadequate facilities, inadequate library resources, excessive class size, etc. Platitudes and vacuous generalities should be avoided.

#### B. Responsibilities

(The topics listed below reflect a broad concept of teaching. Others might be added.)

1. Percentage of appointment devoted to teaching, if stipulated.
2. Courses recently and currently taught, with credit hours and enrollments. When instructional duties for a course are shared, those of the faculty member should be described or at least represented by a percentage. Attachment of typical syllabi as exhibits may be appropriate.
3. Work with individual students  
Examples: Guidance of independent study or undergraduate or graduate research; direction of theses; supervision of postdocs.

4. Advising  
Examples: Advising for the Center for Advising and Career Development (CACD), advising of majors, advising students competing for prestigious scholarships or for admission to graduate or professional programs. Approximate numbers of students advised, etc. Advising students in one's own classes specifically about those classes does not belong here.
5. Instructional innovations  
Innovation and major efforts to improve teaching should receive appropriate consideration when evaluating teaching accomplishments. Examples: Novel use of instructional technology; development of collaborative arrangements outside the unit and/or university; adoption of such methods as collaborative learning, use of case studies, etc.
6. Extraordinary efforts with special groups of students  
Examples: Exceptionally able students; members of underrepresented groups or groups facing special challenges (e.g., women in mathematics, men in nursing, returning students, physically impaired students).
7. Use of research in teaching  
Examples: Modification of syllabi, laboratory experiments, reading lists, etc., connection to one's own research and use in the classroom; involvement of students in research; special activities for helping students to develop creative and critical thinking skills for use in their research.
8. Out-of-class evaluation activities  
Examples: Participation in assessment of educational outcomes, such as end-of-program assessment; participation in conducting examinations for advanced degrees; screening students for scholarships and other distinctions.
9. Service on WSU or other committees concerned mainly with instruction  
Examples: Service on the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee, Teaching Academy, and college and department committees of the same general kind.
10. Learning more about teaching  
Examples: Programs of systematic reading in the literature on teaching; attending short courses and professional conferences concerned with teaching; leading or participating in faculty seminars concerned with teaching issues. Of particular value in this area are demonstrable connections between faculty learning and changes in pedagogy, course design, and the like.
11. Projects and potential projects requiring non-state funding  
Teaching-centered grants received and grant proposals under consideration. When other faculty members are involved, the role of the faculty member who is reporting should be clear.

### **C. Evaluations**

The "Evaluation" section in a portfolio should consist chiefly of summaries of data from whatever methods for evaluating teaching are used--not only evaluation by students. The data themselves may be attached in exhibits or offered as available on request. Some faculty members may wish to include explanations or rejoinders for evaluations which they believe to be potentially misleading.

1. Student evaluations



Results of student questionnaires; interviews of students; the one-minute essay and other forms of "classroom research." Teaching evaluations should be provided whenever possible.

2. Measures of student learning  
Direct evidence of the extent and quality of learning by the faculty member's students (e.g. performance on appropriate standardized tests).
3. Peer evaluation  
Reports from respected colleagues who have visited classes, examined instructional materials, talked with the faculty member, etc. (these are particularly helpful). Letters from colleagues may also be useful.
4. Letters from students, alumni, and employers of alumni  
Solicited letters (e.g. from former students) do not carry the credibility of unsolicited statements.
5. Teaching awards  
Something should be said about the character of the awards if the names are not self-explanatory.
6. Other evaluations

#### **D. Results**

1. Student successes  
Noteworthy achievements of students (in awards, admissions to graduate school, employment, other accomplishments), for which the faculty member claims a significant part of the credit.
2. Instructional materials developed  
Textbooks, workbooks, manuals, visual aids, software, etc.
3. Contributions to the scholarship of teaching  
"The scholarship of teaching" treats teaching itself (especially in one's discipline) as a subject of scholarly discourse and pursuit. Research related to teaching may include oral presentations and papers in appropriate journals related to teaching topics.  
In items 2 and 3, data about publications should be presented in some standard style.
4. Other results, Appendix, or exhibits  
These may include detailed information (syllabi, student evaluation forms, reports of peer evaluations, grade distributions, etc.) about specific courses and other teaching activities; copies of materials listed under D.2; preprints or offprints of items listed under D.3; etc.

#### IV. SAMPLE FORMAT FOR DOCUMENTING IMPACT

Below is one format for documenting impact, which provides a systematic approach to working through some of the suggestions provided by resources in Section I for documenting engagement and service activities. Even if you don't use a form like this, the items provide good ideas for structuring a statement.

<b>DOMAIN and/or ACTIVITY =</b>	
<b>Name:</b> Name (Click to enter text)	<b>Affiliation:</b> College & Department
<b>1. Name the activity or accomplishment you have chosen to highlight.</b>	
Name your activity(ies)	
<b>2. Your role(s):</b> Describe your role(s) and specifically what you contribute(d).	
Role(s)	
<b>3. Group(s) served and amount of contact:</b>	
<b>4. Rationale:</b> What was the need or issue addressed?	
<b>5. Overall goals and specific objectives:</b> If these are extensive, provide just a few illustrative examples.	
Methods	
<b>6. Description:</b> What did you do?	
Rationale \ Background	
<b>7. Outcome(s):</b> Results and impact.	
Results and impact	
<b>8. Reflective critique:</b> Describe your reflections, what went well and plans for improvement.	
Reflective critique	
<b>9. Dissemination:</b> If applicable, describe how your efforts have been recognized by others externally through peer review, dissemination (publication or presentation), use by others, awards, etc.	
Dissemination	



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

## V. CHECKLIST FOR CANDIDATES: PROMOTION, TENURE, AND THIRD-YEAR REVIEW PROCEDURE AND STATEMENTS

### 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
    - Journal articles (published, in press, under review, all separated)
    - Abstracts
    - Proceedings
    - Books and book chapters
    - Patents
    - Original scores
    - Exhibits
    - Performances
    - Works of art
  - Non-refereed
    - 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. Context Statements (not required; 2pp maximum)

- Research/scholarship statement
- Service statement
- Other 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

## VI. 13 (*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.

### *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. Therefore, 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.