

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

CARSON COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

# Tenure and Promotion Handbook

Revised

May 12, 2020



## Tenure and Promotion Handbook

### 1 OVERVIEW

---

The Carson College of Business at Washington State University seeks to “create insight and opportunity through the study of business and the power of our community, for Washington state and the world” by being a “globally engaged community, creating an amazing educational experience, developing outstanding business leaders and scholars, and producing impactful research.” These statements of our mission and our shared vision reflect the values of our college. Our success in achieving them depends on the collective effort of the faculty and the continuing commitment of each member of the college to pursue the highest level of performance in research, teaching and service.

This document elaborates the criteria that are used in assessing faculty performance in each of these areas for decisions relating to tenure and promotion, and outlines the processes we use in making these decisions. It should be read in conjunction with the Faculty Manual, the Provost’s Instructions for Tenure and Promotion, and the Guide to Washington State University’s Policies and Procedures for Evaluating Tenure-track Faculty Members: Tips for Faculty Members, Mentors, Department Chairs, and Deans (all available at <http://provost.wsu.edu/> ). It is incumbent upon each faculty member to be familiar with the promotion and tenure guidelines outlined in these documents.

Note that this document includes references to the 2018-2019 version of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual (Faculty Manual)*. The *Faculty Manual* is subject to change, however, and is the prevailing document if this document becomes in any way, inconsistent with the *Faculty Manual*. In addition, some of the processes described in this document are at the discretion of the provost. Therefore, they too are subject to change. Please refer to the provost’s annual memoranda regarding faculty promotion and/or tenure and faculty annual reviews for the current versions of these processes. Finally, some of the processes described in this document are at the discretion of the dean. Any changes in these processes will be communicated to the faculty in writing.

This document outlines the college requirements. Each unit within the college may elect to maintain its own criteria for third year review, and the granting of tenure and promotion, appropriate to its area, in a published document that meets, or exceeds, the requirements set out in this document on each relevant dimension. Proposed new or revised departmental and unit criteria and review processes shall be submitted to the college’s senior associate dean of faculty affairs and research for submission to the dean and the provost.

### 2 CRITERIA

---

Every promotion decision is made on the basis of a faculty member’s performance in the categories of research, teaching and/or service, as relevant to the individual’s position, and their

adherence to high ethical and professional standards of conduct. This section outlines the broad performance expectations in each category and the types of evidence sought to demonstrate achievement. Each subsection below begins with a table outlining the broad criteria used in assessing performance and the types of evidence that are typically used in assessing performance against the criteria. After the table, the expectations for performance for each level of review are explained. It is important to recognize that the assessment of a candidate's record requires the exercise of judgment. Each candidate's record is unique and must be assessed in a holistic fashion taking into account strengths and weaknesses with regard to all areas of performance and forming an overall judgment of performance. Each criterion is important to the assessment, yet no single criterion outweighs the others. Similarly, each area of research, teaching and service is important to the assessment of faculty performance. It is incumbent upon the candidate to present sufficient details of their record for the various committees to assess the record against the criteria and on the evaluators in the department and the college promotion and tenure committee to explain how the evidence was weighed.

## 2.1 RESEARCH

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion whose workload includes research must exhibit excellence in their scholarship and an authentic commitment to research. This is demonstrated by a sustained pattern of rigorous, relevant, and high quality research, leading to the development of a national or international reputation. Consistent with the definitions of AACSB, our research activities include discipline-based scholarship, practice-oriented scholarship and teaching and learning-related scholarship. The strategy of the Carson College of Business, as a school within a research one university, emphasizes discipline-based scholarship, especially for our tenured and tenure-track faculty members, but recognizes the value of all types of scholarship as part of a portfolio of activity.

Table 1 identifies the specific elements of research that are assessed for tenure and promotion decisions. This is followed by an explanation of the expectations for faculty at different stages of their career (pre-tenure review, final tenure review, promotion to full professor, promotion to scholarly associate professor or promotion to scholarly full professor).

In assessing the criteria in Table 1, it is important to note that many faculty join Washington State University after multiple years of service at other institutions. The consideration of such candidates should reflect the entire record of the candidate, as well as their work since joining WSU. It is expected that candidates whose record includes significant work at other institutions demonstrate continued performance during their time at Washington State University. Nonetheless, the entire body of research forms the national or international reputation of the individual.

<b>CRITERION</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION &amp; EVIDENCE</b>
<i>Consistency of Publication</i>	An established program of research with the promise of future intellectual contribution is expected of any candidate. A candidate should have a publication record of sufficient quantity and a pipeline of working papers that evidence sustained and serious research effort.
<i>High Quality Publications</i>	Research of the highest quality is required for promotion. Publications should appear in journals read and cited by faculty in the candidate's discipline and in which peers doing similar research would publish. These journals include, but are not limited to, the highest quality journals in a candidate's discipline.
<i>Research Impact</i>	Research impact may include impact on the discipline, as evidenced by the quality of the journal publications and citations to the work, and impact on practice or policy. Assessment of practical impact may be made through publication of articles in highly regarded practitioner outlets or through demonstration of applied outcomes. Disciplinary impact is of particular importance to scholars in tenure-track and tenured positions.
<i>Research Independence / Intellectual Leadership</i>	Candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to demonstrate increasing intellectual leadership over their career, eventually establishing a national or even international reputation for their scholarship. Demonstrating intellectual leadership requires providing evidence of the ability to lead and execute quality research independently and to contribute in a significant way to the intellectual development of research. Research independence and intellectual leadership are assessed through authorship order and number of authors (though expectations on this vary from discipline to discipline), as well as awards for research excellence, and outside letters reflecting the candidate's contributions to scholarship.
<i>Research Coherence</i>	Research coherence is demonstrated by publications and working papers generally focused on a particular area or areas of a candidate's expertise.
<i>External Funding</i>	External funding is generally not an expectation of faculty in the Carson College of Business. However, securing extramural funding from prestigious sources that advance the research mission of the Carson College of Business contributes to the strategy and mission of WSU and is therefore valued.

Table 1. Evaluative Criteria for Research

Candidates undergoing a **pre-tenure intensive review** (normally in the third year) are expected to demonstrate progress on each of the criteria in Table 1, with an emphasis on the first two. Candidates are expected have research that has been accepted for publication in high quality journal(s) and a set of research projects in process that include papers in advanced stages of the research process, journal revision requests, and working projects. The body of work should demonstrate potential for publication in the target journals of the discipline and the college.

Candidates being considered for **tenure and promotion to associate professor** are expected to demonstrate their ability to publish regularly and to publish in the highest quality outlets in their discipline. At a minimum, candidates must demonstrate the ability to publish in the highest

quality journals in their respective discipline. Naturally, higher quality journals are weighted more heavily. Candidates with research appearing largely in lower level journals could be judged as not exhibiting the desired quality of research. A coherent research program should be evident, reflecting independence and having the potential for impact. In reviewing a candidate's research record, his/her general research area(s) should be readily identifiable by peers in the discipline. A research record spanning broadly disparate and unrelated topics with few published papers in any one area may be viewed as lacking coherence. Candidates with a consistent pattern of subordinate roles in their research could be judged as unable or unwilling to lead and execute research independently. (It is recognized, however, that in some disciplines, authors are listed alphabetically; as such, order of authorship is irrelevant in those cases.) Likewise, candidates with a pattern of co-authoring exclusively with their dissertation mentor or other specific senior scholars could be judged as unable or unwilling to independently lead and execute research. To demonstrate progress towards impact, a candidate should demonstrate a pattern of research publications in an identifiable research stream. Recognizing that measurable impact takes time to develop (e.g., normally a 3-6 year lag in citations), candidates should document the impact of their research. Documented impact will be considered in evaluation of a case.

Candidates for promotion to **full professor** are expected to have established a strong national or international reputation as a scholar. Research of the highest quality is required for promotion, and candidates are expected to maintain a level of consistency and quality of publications that would merit awarding of tenure since promotion to associate professor. Their work will demonstrate impact on the field (e.g., recognized by the recommendations of external reviewers who are leaders in the field, citations, influence on doctoral dissertations from peer and aspirant peer institutions, use of research in doctoral seminars) and will reflect their intellectual leadership.

For promotion to **scholarly associate professor**, for those faculty whose workload includes research, candidates are expected to present a publication record of sufficient quantity to demonstrate sustained commitment to research. In the assessment of quality, the expectations should reflect the nature of the appointment. Greater weight may be given to practice-oriented and teaching-oriented scholarship. For practice-oriented scholarship, documented impact measures such as publication circulation and media mentions will also be considered.

For promotion to **scholarly professor**, for those faculty whose workload includes research, candidates are expected to maintain a level of consistency and quality of publications at a level sufficient to achieve promotion to scholarly associate professor and ideally to demonstrate improvement in at least one of these dimensions. Demonstration of impact (academic or practical) is of critical importance at this promotion level.

## 2.2 TEACHING

A candidate must exhibit excellence in teaching and demonstrate a sustained contribution to the Carson College of Business teaching mission. Teaching excellence involves the effective dissemination of knowledge to students and working with students to build important skills

(e.g., critical thinking, quantitative) identified in university, college, and departmental (if any) learning goals.

Table 2 identifies the specific elements of teaching that are assessed for tenure and promotion decisions. This is followed by an explanation of the expectations for faculty at different stages of their career (pre-tenure review, final tenure review, promotion to full professor, promotion to scholarly or teaching associate professor or promotion to scholarly or teaching full professor).

<b>CRITERION</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION &amp; EVIDENCE</b>
<i>Effectiveness of instruction</i>	Course delivery (either classroom instruction in face to face classes or online instruction in our undergraduate and masters programs) represents the most visible component of our teaching activities. Effective instruction requires that candidates have command of content that is up to date and relevant to the specific course. Course content and activities should be sufficiently effective to advance students' knowledge and skills. A candidate should demonstrate the use of effective instructional methods including active learning techniques, and an ability to deliver instruction in different forms (delivery models) or at different levels (lower division, upper division, master's, PhD) as appropriate to the department and campus. Teaching innovation, aligned with the college mission, is also valued. Course syllabi should evidence clear organization, communication of expectations (e.g., learning goals), assignments, and applicable policies (e.g., grading, cheating, accommodations for students with disabilities). Syllabi should also evidence the availability and quality of supplemental materials relevant to content, assignment instruction, and expectations. Student evaluations of teaching (including both numerical scores and student comments) form part of the assessment of instructional effectiveness, but they are only one metric. Candidates are also encouraged to seek periodic evaluations of teaching from mentors and to have these evaluations documented to provide an additional source of evidence regarding teaching effectiveness.
<i>Course development</i>	In addition to effective instruction, faculty need to be actively engaged in ongoing course development. Such activities may include ongoing maintenance of existing classes, the development of new classes to meet student needs and participation in the development of programs as needed by their departments and the college. Such efforts can be demonstrated through the submission of syllabi showing course developments, proposals for new courses submitted for university approval, and through student and other stakeholder comments explaining the value of the improvements made.
<i>Effectiveness of doctoral program engagement</i>	Candidates are expected to participate in doctoral level education as needed by their individual areas and respective campuses. As dictated by a candidate's program, campus location, the college, and the University, this involvement consists of, but is not limited to, chairing or co-chairing dissertations, serving as dissertation committee members, participating in comprehensive examinations, teaching PhD seminars, and serving as a guest instructor for various seminar sessions. Co-

	authorship with doctoral students is also a valued part of participation in doctoral education.
<i>Development of instructional materials</i>	Developing new instructional materials such as text books, software, and cases in certain instances and from certain perspectives (creating program visibility), may be considered valuable. Such activities are not a substitute for research publications or the teaching criteria outlined above and are generally not encouraged prior to tenure and promotion.

Table 2. Evaluative Criteria for Teaching

Candidates at their **pre-tenure intensive review** should be developing their teaching activities, with an emphasis on the effectiveness of instruction. Student and peer evaluations should show progress towards the development of a strong teaching record. Course development and the development of teaching materials are likely to be limited at this time. Involvement in graduate instruction, if appropriate, should demonstrate a commitment to working with graduate students.

For **tenure and promotion to associate professor**, candidates should show progressive development of teaching and the ability to effectively deliver classes in our programs. Delivery of multiple courses is not essential but is desirable. Evidence of course development, in the form of continuous improvement of existing courses, should also be provided. For departments with a doctoral program, candidates should demonstrate effective engagement with the program through doctoral seminars or project supervision.

A candidate for **full professor** should demonstrate effective teaching across all dimensions, with an increased weight on continuous improvement and new course development. Graduate instruction, for those candidates whose departments have a doctoral program, should demonstrate sustained and effective engagement with the program in the form of seminars, project supervision and thesis supervision.

**Career track faculty** are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching at the same level as tenure-track and tenured faculty for promotion to associate and full professor respectively. The only difference is that career track faculty are not expected to be involved in doctoral education.

## 2.3 SERVICE

Service involves activities beyond those normally associated with research and teaching that support the mission of a candidate's department, college, and university and the profession. Candidates must contribute to the effective functioning of their unit (i.e., department and campus), the Carson College of Business, the university and the profession. Effective service contributions reflect the individual's genuine commitment to the mission of the college and university, and to the collegial process. All faculty are also expected to maintain high ethical and professional standards. While service is expected of all candidates and a valued activity, high performance in service cannot compensate for a lack of performance in either teaching or research.

<b>CRITERION</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION &amp; EVIDENCE</b>
<i>Service to the department and campus</i>	All faculty are expected to play a role in activities supporting the department. Activities include but are not limited to committee (e.g., recruiting) or task force membership (e.g., strategic planning), curriculum development, leading student groups or clubs, overseeing facilities (e.g., laboratories), outreach to external constituents (e.g., businesses, alumni), faculty governance representation (e.g., Faculty Senate), and execution of program initiatives (e.g., visiting scholar arrangements).
<i>Service to the college</i>	Faculty are also required to participate, when asked, in college-level service activities. Such activities include but are not limited to committee (e.g., graduate-level or undergraduate-level program policy committees) or task force membership (e.g., strategic planning), curriculum development, outreach to external constituents (e.g., businesses or community), and development/execution of college initiatives (e.g., online programs).
<i>Service to the university</i>	Some faculty may contribute by participation in university-level service, participating on or leading university committees. Service to the university is not an expectation for every candidate, but it is a valued activity that contributes to the overall mission of the institution and the contribution of the Carson College of Business to the institution.
<i>Service to the profession</i>	Candidates are expected to have some level of professional service as a means of contributing to the discipline or to the practitioner community. For tenured/tenure-track faculty, professional service also provides exposure of the candidate to the field and substantially contributes to the development of a candidate's national or international reputation. Activities include, but are not limited to, reviewing for reputable journals and academic conferences in the candidate's field, serving on journal editorial review boards of reputable journals in the candidate's field, conference participation and support activities, and activities supporting a candidate's professional association. Increasing levels of professional service, including leadership roles, are expected as a candidate progresses in their career.

Table 3. Evaluative Criteria for Service

At the **pre-tenure intensive review**, candidates are expected to have completed limited but effective service, mostly at the unit level. Some level of professional service in the form of reviewing for high quality journals or involvement in major conferences is expected. Candidates may also have some service at the college or university level, though such activities are rare. Over-involvement in certain forms of professional service (e.g., leadership roles in professional associations) is normally not advisable.

For consideration for **tenure and promotion to associate professor**, candidates should show consistently effective service to the unit, the college and the profession, at a level consistent with the assigned service workload. Service to the university is typically not expected at this stage, though is valued if present.



For promotion to **full professor**, candidates are expected to show consistently effective service to the unit, the college, the university and the profession including evidence of leadership in at least some roles. A candidate is required to have considerable professional service for promotion to full professor as it contributes to the establishment of the candidate’s national or international reputation. Serving as editor or associate editor and on editorial review boards of well-respected journals and/or involvement, participation, and leadership roles in national conferences are important. Service to national or international professional organizations may also be an important component of service that demonstrates leadership for the candidate.

**Career track faculty** are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in service to the unit, college and university at the same level as tenure-track and tenured faculty for promotion to associate and full professor respectively. Service to the profession for career track faculty is not as highly expected and may include service to practice-oriented as well as academically-oriented communities.

### 3 PROCESS

---

#### 3.1 OVERVIEW AND ACTIVITIES

The promotion and tenure process is administered by the senior associate dean for faculty affairs and research in the Carson College of Business, whose task it is to see that relevant deadlines are publicized, adhered to, and that the promotion packets are secure. All candidates for promotion will be given full and fair consideration based on the guidelines outlined in the *Faculty Manual* and this document.

General procedures for promotion and tenure are explained in the faculty manual and are not repeated here. In addition, each year the provost’s office provides detailed instructions on the process and the relevant dates by which materials are due. These two sources provide the framework within which our college process operates.

Tenure and promotion reviews are conducted by two separate bodies within the college. The first level of review is conducted by the department. The table below indicates who within the department participates in the evaluation for each type of promotion.

<b>TYPE OF EVALUATION</b>	<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>
For tenure and promotion to associate professor	Associate and full professors
For promotion to full professor	Full professors
For promotion from teaching assistant to teaching associate professor	Associate and full professors; Scholarly associate and full professors; Teaching associate and full professors
For promotion from teaching associate to teaching full professor	Full professors; Scholarly full professors; Teaching full professors
For promotion from scholarly assistant to scholarly associate professor	Associate and full professors; Scholarly associate and full professors

For promotion from scholarly associate to scholarly full professor	Full professors; Scholarly full professors
--	--

*Table 4. Participants in Evaluation*

The second level of review is conducted by the college promotion and tenure committee. This committee is appointed by the dean to provide a college-level perspective on all candidates for promotion and tenure.

Faculty from within a candidate's department will not vote in the college level committee, as they will have already participated in the departmental review.

The general process for promotion and tenure consideration is as follows:

1. Copies of college documents on tenure and promotion procedures and criteria are shared with untenured faculty during hiring process.
2. For pre-tenure faculty:
  - a. Yearly ratings and comments on un-tenured faculty member's progress toward tenure provided by all departmental tenured faculty.
  - b. Where relevant, the campus academic director prepares a written evaluation, incorporating feedback based on activities at the local campus. This report is sent to the department chair for inclusion in his or her report, and is copied to the campus vice chancellor for academic affairs and the CCB senior associate dean for faculty affairs and research.
  - c. Yearly written evaluations provided by the department chair based on the individual faculty evaluations, discussion at the meeting of tenured faculty, and the chair's own evaluation.
  - d. Intensive review in the third year conducted in accordance with instructions provided by provost's office.
3. For post-tenure faculty and ccareer track faculty:
  - a. Yearly written evaluations provided by the department chair through annual review process. This evaluation should also reflect the evaluations of the academic director if applicable.
  - b. Optional intensive review recommended to provide insight into promotion prospects and career progress.
4. For all faculty, at time of tenure and/or promotion consideration, submission of materials in accordance with the faculty manual, instructions from the provost's office and this document. It is particularly important for the candidate to supply materials from his/her private files that would otherwise be unavailable to reviewers.
5. Final tenure and promotion review within the college, which includes the following steps:
  - a. Candidate's tenure/promotion review materials available for tenured faculty review (including external letters for assistant and associate professors).
  - b. Solicitation of external letters as outlined in section 3.3.
  - c. Departmental faculty members holding promotional rank or higher submits official tenure/promotion recommendations.

- d. Department chair review and recommendation. This recommendation is forwarded to the college promotion and tenure committee and the senior associate dean for faculty affairs and research.
- e. Where relevant, the campus academic director also prepares a written evaluation, incorporating feedback based on activities at the local campus. This report is sent to the department chair, the senior associate dean for faculty affairs and research, and the college promotion and tenure committee. It is also sent to the campus vice chancellor for academic affairs.
- f. College-level review and recommendation. Materials reviewed by the committee include department chair and other unit administrator’s recommendations and tenured faculty recommendation tally. The committee prepares a written report summarizing the input from committee members. This report is forwarded to the senior associate dean for faculty affairs and research and the dean.
- g. Dean’s review and recommendation. The associate dean for faculty affairs and research in consultation with the dean prepares an evaluation of the candidate and forwards this assessment along with the candidate’s complete tenure packet and evaluations from their unit and the Promotion and Tenure Committee to the provost’s office. The dean’s recommendation is forwarded along with the packet and evaluations on or before the published deadline.

The key responsibilities for action at each stage are further summarized in Table 5.

<b>ACTIVITY</b>	<b>REQUIRED ACTION AND RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</b>
<i>Outside Reviewers</i>	List of potential outside reviewers prepared by the unit head in consultation with candidate.
<i>Solicitation of Outside Letters of Recommendation</i>	In consultation with senior associate dean for faculty affairs and research, unit head selects outside reviewers from the lists and solicits evaluations, in writing, from each designated outside reviewer.
<i>Responsibility for Packet Preparation</i>	Unit head assists candidate in tenure and/or promotion packet preparation.
<i>Packet Evaluation (Unit level)</i>	(1) Appropriate faculty within unit (all tenured faculty for assistant to Associate decision; all full professors for associate to full decision) prepare faculty recommendations evaluating candidate; (2) unit head prepares summary ballot evaluating candidate.
<i>Packet Evaluation (College level)</i>	(1) Promotion & Tenure Committee prepares written evaluation of candidate; (2) dean and associate dean for faculty affairs and research and campus vice-chancellors of academic affairs, where appropriate, prepare written evaluation of candidate. Unit head or associate dean to notify the candidate of the nature of the Promotion & Tenure Committee’s evaluation and the dean’s recommendation. The Promotion and Tenure Committee’s evaluation, the dean’s recommendation, and unit ballots are forwarded to the provost’s office.
<i>Packet Evaluation (University level)</i>	Provost’s Office evaluates packet and makes final determination.

Table 5. Activities and Responsibilities

## 3.2 NORMAL TIMING OF PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISIONS

The timing for tenure and promotion decisions is provided in Table 5.

<b>PROMOTION TYPE</b>	<b>NORMAL TIMING</b>
Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	Normally in the 6 <sup>th</sup> year of appointment as an assistant professor. An alternative date may be specified in the hiring documents for faculty who join us with prior appointments as an assistant professor. The WSU faculty manual also specifies conditions under which faculty may seek an extension of their tenure clock.
Promotion to Scholarly Associate Professor or Teaching Associate Professor	Normally no earlier than the 6 <sup>th</sup> year of appointment as a scholarly assistant professor or teaching assistant professor
Promotion to Full Professor / Scholarly Full Professor	Normally no earlier than the 6 <sup>th</sup> year of appointment as an associate professor, scholarly associate professor or teaching associate professor

Table 6. Normal Timing for P&T Decisions

## 3.3 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

For promotion and/or tenure decisions involving assistant and associate professors, outside reviewers are a key component of the review process. For scholarly or teaching assistant professors and scholarly or teaching associate professors, outside letters are not required but may be sought.

Prior to June 1 of a year in which a unit has candidates to be considered for promotion to associate professor or professor, the unit's head is to submit to the associate dean for faculty affairs and research the names and qualifications of at least six individuals outside of Washington State University who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the candidate's packet. In preparing this list, the unit head will invite the candidate to submit names that he/she would like to have included.

### 3.3.1 Criteria for Selecting Outside Reviewers

#### 3.3.1.1 Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Criteria for the selection of outside reviewers include their scholarly reputation, academic rank, their institution (i.e., peer or better), relationships with the candidate, and rationale for seeking their input. Individuals in the following categories would be considered qualified (in approximate rank order) for selection as an outside reviewer if they have expertise in the appropriate field of study:

1. Editors of high quality journals (especially premier journals),
2. Endowed or named professors in respected programs at peer or better AACSB accredited institutions,
3. Department chairs at peer or better AACSB accredited institutions,

4. Full professors at peer or better AACSB accredited institutions (for assistant professors seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor, outstanding associate professors may also be considered).

#### *3.3.1.2 Non-Tenure Track Faculty*

External reviewers are not required (but may be sought) for promotion to the rank of Scholarly Associate Professor or Scholarly Full Professor. Because of the wide variety of contributions of non-tenure track faculty, external assessors will be selected based on the recommendations of department chairs. Chairs should provide a short description of the qualifications of each person writing an external letter and their ability to assess one or more of the criteria.

#### **3.3.2 Limitations on the Eligibility of Outside Reviewers**

The credibility of an outside reviewer is determined by their ability to make an objective and detached evaluation of the candidate's qualifications. Accordingly, persons who served on a candidate's doctoral committee, or those from the institution granting their Ph.D., other contemporaries from that institution, or co-authors are normally inappropriate choices as outside reviewers. In cases where one of these individuals meets the other qualifications listed above, she or he may be included as an outside reviewer. In no case, however, will more than one (1) outside reviewer with such ties to the candidate be allowed.

#### **3.3.3 Solicitation of Outside Reviewers**

Outside letters are requested by the unit head with the prior consent from the office of the associate dean for faculty affairs and research. Approximately half the names of those requested to evaluate a candidate's promotion packet should be recommended by the candidate with the remaining evaluators chosen by the unit head in consultation with the associate dean.

To insure that the return rate is high, unit heads should contact potential reviewers well in advance of any deadlines and secure agreements from them that they will write an evaluation and submit it in a timely manner.

#### **3.3.4 Criteria for Evaluation**

##### *3.3.4.1 Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty*

Letters sent to the external reviewers will ask the reviewers to evaluate a candidate's research in terms of the quality of the scholarly journals in which the research appears, and to rank the journals in which a candidate has published according to their prominence. To comment on the importance of the candidate's basic research, the extent to which the candidate's publications are cited and read, the extent of the candidate's professional reputation and disciplinary impact, the noteworthiness of any research acknowledgements the candidate may have been awarded, and the importance of any extramural funding that the candidate may have received. Additionally, reviewers should be asked to comment on the candidate's likely future research productivity.

#### *3.3.4.2 Non-Tenure Track Faculty*

External letters for non-tenure track faculty will be more varied than those for tenured/tenure-track faculty. For those faculty whose responsibilities include research, evaluators may be asked to comment on research, using similar criteria as for tenure/tenure-track faculty, but recognizing the lower research workload. For other faculty, external assessments that speak to the candidate's performance in teaching or service may be sought. The candidate will work with the department chair and the senior associate dean for faculty affairs and research to determine the likely value of external assessments and the focus that those assessments should take.