APPENDIX A: Chair's Outline for Tenure, Promotion and Intensive Career Progress ("Third-year") Review Statements

A good chair's statement analyzes the quantity, quality, and impact of the candidate's productivity in each of the areas of job responsibility (usually teaching, scholarship and service) in the light of the appropriate department, college and university standards. It is not just a recitation of the facts of the case, but rather an interpretation of those facts for those outside of the field and an analysis of critiques by colleagues and peers, as well as the chair's own assessment. What follows is a comprehensive list of points that might appear in a good chair's statement. Many of these items can be omitted in individual cases if they are not relevant. This description is followed by a list of common problems in chair's statements and a checklist for use in preparing statements. Problematic cases usually require longer statements than clear cases; most statements will be about 2 pages.

The Chair's recommendation will not ignore the views of the faculty but need not be in agreement with the majority of faculty recommendation forms. Faculty who have appointments that might provide more than one occasion to participate in evaluations (joint appointments, department chair, dean, etc.) must do so only once.

In commenting on the promotion of assistant to associate professor, the chair's analysis should show that the candidate has a potential for national and international prominence, as well as for excellence in teaching, based on the candidate's performance to this point. Chairs should also assess a candidate's potential for continued positive contribution to the University. **In the event the evaluation differs markedly from those given at the time of the intensive third-year review and/or annually with respect to cumulative progress towards tenure, every effort should be made to explain these evaluative differences.**

In commenting on the promotion of associate professor to professor, the chair's analysis should stress persistence of quality in teaching, scholarly, and creative activities with particular focus on performance since promotion to associate professor, as well as increasing service to the institution, professional organizations, and society. In all areas of work—scholarship, teaching, and service—the **quality and quantity of accomplishments of the full professor are expected to be at a significantly higher level than that of the associate professor.** Attainment of the rank of professor is an indication that, in the opinion of colleagues, the individual has made and continues to make outstanding contributions to the areas of their work assignment. The outstanding contributions that merit promotion to professor should be clearly specified. Promotions to professor cannot be justified on the basis of time in rank alone or generally adequate work.

Contents of the Chair's Statement

1. **Procedural**
   A. **Process used during unit review**
      o Did the meeting take place in person, via Zoom, AMS, other?
      o Was the committee composed of departmental members, or was there a need for supplementary members to reach the required number of five balloting faculty
         ▪ If the latter, please describe who the additional faculty were
   B. **Describe the candidate's position**
      o What is the distribution of responsibilities?

C. Describe candidate's tenure clock, if needed (e.g., extensions, or time granted for work previous to employment at WSU)
- If the timing of tenure and/or promotion is unusual (i.e. earlier or later than usual), please explain why
    - Is there anything about prior jobs that might influence the case?
    - Was candidate granted years (or work completed) to be counted toward tenure upon hire or appointment to the tenure track?
    - Did the candidate have tenure-clock extension? If so, please note that the increase in years before applying for tenure does not mean that reviewers should expect increased productivity.

Please note that the standards for tenure and/or promotion are absolute standards. Candidates should be held to the same standard regardless of whether the tenure clock was extended.

2. Evaluate candidate's contributions to all areas of responsibility relative to the appropriate guidelines

A. Evaluate the overall quantity, quality, and impact of TEACHING
- What is the candidate's formal teaching load?
    - What is the distribution between graduate and undergraduate courses?
    - Is the load typical for the department? If not, why not?
    - Did the candidate have an unusual number of new preparations?
    - Are the courses unusually challenging (e.g., mix of majors and non-majors, varying levels of student preparation, foundational to student success)?
    - If courses are co-taught, what was the role of the candidate?
- How much out-of-classroom teaching has the candidate done?
    - Advising?
    - Invisible labor -- e.g. informal advising, advising of student groups, undergraduate research mentoring?
- Supervision of honors theses or other undergraduate scholarship?
- Assess the quality of the candidate's teaching.
    - Compare student evaluations to the departmental mean.
    - Trajectory of measures of teaching quality? (Is teaching improving, and if so, how has this trend been tangibly demonstrated?)
    - Comments from peer reviewers?
    - Teaching awards and other recognitions?
    - Professional development activities related to teaching improvement (e.g., workshops, seminars)?
    - Familiarity with and use of new teaching techniques and technology?
- Graduate student mentorship.
    - Mentorship of graduate students.
        - Number of students mentored and completed.
        - Scholarly outputs or other professional recognition for students mentored.
    - Service on graduate student committees.

B. Evaluate the quantity, quality, and impact of SCHOLARSHIP relative to the appropriate guidelines

- Refereed Scholarship/Juried Exhibitions or Creative Products
  - Quantity and impact on discipline or professional society of refereed scholarship.
    - Please count only published, in-press, or accepted articles, books, book chapters, performances, artistic creations etc.
      - Submitted articles are useful only to establish continuing productivity.
      - If "in press" articles are counted, proof of acceptance must be provided (e.g., an email from the editor).
    - Please separate journal articles from book chapters and textbooks and edited books from monographs, etc.
  - Describe the quality of the journals, presses, venues for artistic presentations, etc.
    - Are the venues for artistic presentations international, national, regional, state?
    - Is there an average impact factor for the journals? A measure of rejection rates? The website http://scimagojr.com provides a comprehensive list of journals with quartile rankings by subdiscipline.
  - Is the rate of publication or artistic creation steady or was there a productivity burst?
  - Are the publications or artistic works cited often by peers?
  - Do the publications form a coherent body of work or are they scattered?
  - How often is the faculty member the senior or corresponding author? Note that how this status is identified (e.g. first author, last author) may vary between publications and disciplines. Chairs reviewing work published in multiple disciplines or by faculty with joint appointments should educate themselves regarding any relevant distinctions.
  - Are the publications independent of the candidate's mentors and other prominent senior faculty?
  - If there are co-authors:
    - Who are they (e.g., graduate students, comparable faculty members, senior faculty members)?
    - What is the candidate's contribution to the work?
- Grant funding if appropriate
  - How much money has the person obtained relative to how much is needed for their research?
    - How much as PI? How much as co-PI?
    - What is the candidate's contribution to multi-authored or co-authored grants?
  - What is the source of the funding (federal, regional, state, commodity group)? How competitive is it? Is the money competitive or pass through funding?
  - Is funding likely to continue? (Predictions are difficult to make. Please discuss this only if the prediction is clear.)

o Are there signs that the candidate has been recognized for their scholarship?
- Membership on editorial boards of journals or presses?
- Editorships or associate editorships of journals, book series, etc.?
- Curator of exhibits?
- Invited addresses, performances or exhibits at respected universities or in national or international venues?
- Indices of recognition of work such as the h index?
o Presentations at professional meetings
- How many?
- Were presentations competitively reviewed?
- Was the venue international, national, regional, state, local?
- Were the presentations invited, talks, posters?

C. Evaluate the quantity, quality, and impact of SERVICE or LEADERSHIP relative to the appropriate guidelines
o Evaluate the quantity of service to:
- The department
- The college
- The campus (for urban campus faculty members)
- The university
- The profession
- The community – Please note that community service counts only if it is related to the candidate's area of expertise.
o Please evaluate the quality and impact of service. This may be difficult, but several characteristics are worth examining. Consider not only the form of service but the level of leadership displayed by the candidate, as well as the extent to which the candidate's service made others in the organization more effective. Document instances where that service had a demonstrable impact on institutional or professional practices. Consider whether the position was invitational and/or competitively achieved, and the size and nature of the audience engaged. ***(For Extension faculty, please refer to CAHNRS instructions for evaluation of Extension outreach programs and impact.)***

D. Evaluate the quantity, quality, and impact of other important aspects of the candidate's work relative to the appropriate guidelines, including:

- Community outreach/engagement
- Extension programming
- Clinical work
- Innovation and entrepreneurship
- Other

Additional information
o Contributions to a positive working environment (i.e., collegiality)
- Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to contribute to a positive working environment, including activities such as guest lecturing in courses, reviewing colleagues' manuscripts or grant applications, contributions to committee work, and so on. Please mention these contributions only if the candidate has made unusually positive or negative contributions.

- - **Please note that collegiality is not the same as congeniality.** The candidate's behavior should be discussed only if it affects the functioning of the unit (e.g., loss of graduate students because of inadequate mentoring, inability to collaborate, persistent avoidance of service activities), not if it's merely annoying.
  - Has the candidate encountered anything unusual that should be considered (e.g., failure of mentoring or required reviews, frequent changes in administration, unusually heavy teaching load, lack of lab space, COVID-related barriers to productivity)?
  - Please summarize the faculty recommendations.
    - Please mention it if some recommendations provide a text statement that contradicts the "vote" that was cast.
    - If possible, provide an explanation for conflicting information across faculty recommendations.
    - Provide a summary of, and explanation for, negative information if possible. Are these concerns fatal to the case?
  - Do any of the reviewers have a conflict of interest?
    - What do they recommend and is their recommendation qualified or unqualified?
    - Please do not quote extensively from the external letters. They're included in the file. Short quotations that make an important point may be included.

Summary

- If the case is for tenure and/or promotion, please recommend for or against. There is no other option.
- If the case is for third-year review, please recommend:
  - Progress satisfactory
  - Some improvement required
  - Substantial improvement required
  - Unsatisfactory (may lead to termination).
- Justify your recommendation by referring to earlier sections of your statement that compare the candidate's performance to the standards of the department, college and university.
- In the case of a third-year review, please recommend any actions required for correcting deficiencies in performance.

Please avoid the following problems:

- Failure to reach a clear conclusion.
- Failure to address one or more aspects of the job description, most commonly a failure to talk about teaching or service, especially graduate teaching and mentoring.
- Reaching a conclusion that is inconsistent with the appropriate guidelines without a convincing explanation for the difference.
- Reaching a conclusion that is not consistent with past progress-towards-tenure or annual reviews without a recent change in the candidate's performance to justify the inconsistency.
- "Voting" for or against tenure and/or promotion when the text of your statement supports the opposite conclusion.
- 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 accepted or "in press" is counted only if appropriate documentation is provided.
- Failure to account for the candidate's workload distribution, particularly applying the same standards for scholarship and/or teaching to candidates who have very different percentage assignments to these activities.
- Failure to evaluate the quality of the work for those outside of the field.
- Failure to clarify the candidate's role in multi-authored publications and grants or team-taught courses. The identity of coauthors matters (e.g., graduate students vs. chair of candidate's dissertation committee).