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# INTRODUCTION

# This College of Education Handbook is designed to address promotion processes for both tenure track and career track faculty and should be read in conjunction with the *Faculty Manual,* the *Provost’s Instructions for Tenure and Promotion*, and the *Provost’s Instructions for Annual Review* (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. The intent of this handbookis not to be prescriptive but to provide guidelines regarding minimum standards and expectations that demystify and clarify a process that is often perceived as ambiguous. The first section of this handbook addresses procedures for tenure and promotion, and minimum criteria for success, for tenure track faculty. The second section addresses procedures for promotion of career track faculty and criteria for success. It is not a standard process in the COE for faculty to transfer between the two tracks and would only be considered if it was initiated by the dean, with support from the provost, for specific strategic reasons.

# SECTION I: PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION/TENURE REVIEW

In alignment with the College of Education document, Tenured Faculty Workload Expectations, the typical distribution of workload expectations for tenured COE faculty is 40% scholarship, 40% teaching, and 20% service. The typical course load for a tenured faculty member with this 40-40-20 distribution is two-3-credit courses per semester, or 12 credit hours per academic year (2 + 2 teaching load).

# Timing of Evaluations

Department chairs are to perform annual evaluations of all faculty members and convey the results of these evaluations to the faculty member and the dean. Faculty will receive either an Abridged Review, a Comprehensive Review, or an Intensive Review (see *Provost’s Instructions for Faculty and Staff Annual Reviews*). For pre-tenure faculty, a comprehensive review is performed and should include a review of annual accomplishments as well as a cumulative review of progress toward tenure. A formal intensive review (“third-year” review) of progress toward tenure shall also be completed at the departmental level and forwarded to the dean, normally during the third year of appointment for faculty being considered for tenure after a six year probationary period. Pre-tenure faculty with probationary periods of four or five years shall receive this formal review during their second and third years, respectively. None of the guidelines or timelines contained in this document preclude issuance of a non-renewal notice at any time during the tenure probationary period if it is apparent that the faculty member is failing to meet standards of professional conduct and ethics.

Effective January 1, 2018, a simplified review process that combines annual reviews, progress toward tenure and third year reviews was instituted. Faculty are required to use the faculty reporting system, Activity Insight, in submitting these reviews.

The schedule for tenure review is specified in the original appointment document. Generally, faculty members holding appointment at the rank of assistant professor will seek promotion and tenure simultaneously, though in special cases one might seek promotion to associate professor in advance of tenure consideration. For faculty hired at WSU as a new assistant professor, tenure review shall normally take place during the sixth year of service at Washington State University with tenure, if granted, to be effective at the beginning of the seventh year. Under usual circumstances one shall not be considered for tenure while remaining at the rank of assistant professor.

# General Considerations

The department chair must convey to tenured faculty the responsibility to participate in the evaluation process and to provide a rationale for their recommendations, whether positive or negative. Faculty who have appointments that might provide more than one occasion to participate (i.e., make a recommendation) in evaluations (joint appointments, department chair, dean, etc.) must do so only once. Evaluators at all levels must judge cases on their merit and in relation to department, college, and university expectations and not in comparison with others in the department with tenure already or being considered at the same time. All evaluations should be joint evaluations and include faculty and academic directors/supervisors at all campuses. In the case of joint appointments (including ones in which the appointment is evenly split between two units), initial letters of appointment must indicate which department is to function as the lead for purposes of faculty evaluation; faculty shall receive only one evaluation, which includes the agreed-upon assessment of the multiple units.

# Mentor Committee

During the pre-tenure period, important roles are played by the non-tenured faculty member’s mentor committee. This committee is appointed by the department chair in consultation with the non-tenured faculty member and shall typically consist of two or three tenured faculty members, at least one of whom is in the non-tenured faculty member’s program or specialty area. In departments with multiple program areas, there may be advantages to including representation from more than one area. Normally, the mentor committee shall remain the same during the entire pre-tenure period, but changes in membership may be requested by the non-tenured faculty member in consultation with the department chair. The mentor committee shall meet with the non-tenured faculty member to review tenure and promotion criteria early in the non-tenured faculty member’s first semester in the college and at least once each academic year throughout the rest of the pre-tenure period. The mentor committee may serve a number of roles, including the following:

1. Consultation on the tenure and promotion process, including the preparation of materials
2. Clarification of tenure and promotion criteria
3. Oral reports to the tenured faculty on tenure progress (see below)
4. Advisement on professional development
5. Classroom observations

See the document entitled Guidelines for Mentoring Committees of Non-tenured Faculty Members in the WSU College of Education for additional details regarding mentoring committees.

# Pre-Tenure Reviews

# Comprehensive Annual reviews for Pre-tenure Faculty

The goal of the annual comprehensive progress toward tenure review is to ready pre-tenure faculty for the intensive third year and promotion and tenure reviews. Accordingly, materials submitted should start to include all documents required by the Provost’s office in anticipation of these reviews.

All pre-tenure faculty should consult the Provost’s website for any updates about materials to submit so they will be in alignment with the Provost’s guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews. These materials are uploaded to the department SharePoint site.

The materials to be submitted include:

* An updated Activity Insight report;
* An updated curriculum vita;
* Statements (e.g., context, scholarship, and service) are written by the faculty member (limited to two pages each). The context statement may include expectations placed on a faculty member by circumstances extant at research stations or regional campuses, the requirement of joint appointments or other special circumstances such as commitments to student groups. Scholarship and service are often adequately represented in the vitae. However, if the faculty member would like to clarify the themes of his or her scholarship and/or service activities, he or she may provide short descriptions;
* Signed and dated teaching portfolio with summary of course evaluations (template provided – five page limit)
* Supporting Materials Available Electronically – Bibliography of work submitted as a cover sheet
* Books, papers (no more than 10), slides, tapes and other evidence (e.g., photographs, videotapes) of the candidate’s teaching, research, scholarly, creative, and service activities.
* Include a Scholarly Activity Form for each article. NOTE: For materials available electronically, a functional web link may be submitted along with an APA style reference for each body of work.
* Supporting Documents – e.g. syllabi, course evaluations (only previous 2 years requested).

The comprehensive review is performed by the department chair/school director in consultation with appropriate Academic Directors at other campuses, as appropriate. Each comprehensive review will result in a written report from the chair to the dean and vice chancellor for academic affairs (dependent on college and WSU campus). The report sent to the faculty member should include an invitation to meet face-to-face with the chair, if the faculty member so desires.

# Intensive Review (Comprehensive review plus revised third-year review and progress toward promotion)

The intensive third year review is designed to provide a cumulative and comprehensive review of the faculty member at the third year as a way to monitor prospects for success with the tenure process.

The intensive review is a two-part review that includes a comprehensive review and a career progress review. The comprehensive review is the same as that described above. The career progress review evaluates the progress of the candidate toward tenure and/or promotion, provides feedback relative to university and department expectations, identifies area of improvement, and offers recommendations that may assist the candidate in determining future work. Pre-tenured faculty typically undergo one intensive review (at the third year).

The materials to be submitted should be prefaced by a table of contents. The table of contents does not need to be numbered by page. Materials for the career progress review should be assembled in the order indicated below:

* Current curriculum vitae;
* Updated Digital Measures report;
* Comprehensive Reviews/ Past Progress Toward Tenure;
* Statements (e.g., context, scholarship, service) are written by the faculty member (limited to two pages each). The context statement may include expectations placed on a faculty member by circumstances extant at research stations or regional campuses, the requirement of joint appointments or other special circumstances such as commitments to student groups. Scholarship and service are often adequately represented in the vitae. However, if the faculty member would like to clarify the themes of his or her scholarship and/or service activities, he or she may provide short descriptions;
* Teaching portfolio (includes goals, responsibilities, evaluations, results and appendix, or exhibits). The narrative is limited to five pages. The teaching portfolio should be presented in the approved format. Refer to the Faculty Manual, Section Ill: https://facsen.wsu.edu/.
* Faculty recommendations; and
* Supporting materials (e.g., a statement on the faculty member's progress toward tenure from his or her formal mentor(s), articles).

The career progress portion of the intensive review is coordinated by the chair and normally requires participation from all faculty and administrators eligible to perform tenure or promotion evaluations for the candidate. For pre-tenured faculty, the intensive review procedures will match those for final tenure consideration, except that external professional evaluations are not required.

# Review Processes

In both the comprehensive and intensive third-year reviews, the non-tenured faculty member’s mentor committee shall review the submitted materials and discuss the candidate’s progress with the candidate.

Subsequently, the mentor committee may make an oral report on tenure progress in terms of the college criteria at a meeting of the tenured faculty in the department, which includes an in- depth analysis of the candidate’s scholarly works, focusing on their originality, importance, intellectual rigor and impact. Based on the discussion at this meeting and tenured faculty members’ individual reviews of the candidate’s materials, tenured faculty submit to the department chair their evaluation of the candidate’s tenure progress. For the annual comprehensive reviews, evaluation by individual tenured faculty members is provided using a recommendation comment form which addresses college criteria for promotion and tenure provided by the department chair for this purpose. For the intensive third-year review, official Intensive Review Faculty Evaluation forms are used.

In each case, the department chair prepares a written summary evaluating tenure progress based on the individual faculty evaluations, the discussion at the meeting of tenured faculty, and their own evaluation For annual comprehensive tenure progress reviews other than the formal intensive third-year review (which is reported by the college to the Provost) the department chair meets individually with the non-tenured faculty member to discuss the results and implications of the pre-tenure review and invites the non-tenured faculty member to react to the written evaluation. A final version of the written evaluation is dated and signed by the non-tenured faculty member and the department chair. The non-tenured faculty member has the right to add a written statement concerning the final document and have it permanently attached to the document. A copy of the written evaluation is provided to the non-tenured faculty member. The mentor committee may, at their discretion or at the request of the non-tenured faculty member, meet with the non-tenured faculty member after the yearly pre-tenure review to provide feedback or discuss perceived strengths and weaknesses identified during the review. Each non-tenured faculty member also has the right to meet with the tenured faculty as a group to discuss his/her pre-tenure review.

It is the responsibility of the unit administrator (usually the chair) to ensure that all faculty eligible to submit recommendations during annual comprehensive, intensive third year, and tenure, and promotion reviews have available at the time of their deliberations all relevant documents (department criteria, complete file, conditions of appointment when appropriate) including those from other related units (institutes, research stations, other campuses, etc.).

Files are considered complete at the time of the deadline for submission of materials. Additional material may not be added to the file after the deadlines except for the following:

1. A pre-tenured 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. This is a "cosmetic" change and requires no further action.
2. A pre-tenured faculty member who is being evaluated during intensive third-year review or considered for tenure has listed a publication as "submitted" and, after the file leaves the department, the faculty member receives word that the manuscript has been accepted. The pre-tenured faculty member may request reconsideration at the department level if the Provost has not yet rendered a final decision. The pre-tenured faculty member must provide documentation to the department chair, who shall request reconsideration by the recommending faculty. Both the original and subsequent recommendations shall become part of the file sent to the college for reconsideration and then to the Provost. Reconsideration is appropriate to ensure that the best possible case is made for pre- tenured faculty members, who are at a critical juncture in their career.
3. The mentor committee or department chair requests additional materials prior to submission of recommendations by departmental faculty.

Faculty use various terms to describe the status of publications: in progress, in revision, under contract, submitted, accepted, in press, etc. *Any publication which is not accompanied by documentation such as a letter of acceptance, signed contract, or other proof of eventual publication shall not be considered as part of the file.*

# Tenure and Promotion Review

Tenure and promotion candidates should submit a complete set of materials in accordance with instructions received each year from the Provost’s office. As with the intensive third- year review, these shall include a teaching portfolio of five (5) pages maximum (not including appendix and supporting materials) and an optional statement of context.

In addition, copies of at least four external letters from individuals of national stature in the candidate’s area of expertise who are not employees of Washington State University evaluating the candidate’s qualifications for promotion and/or tenure must be available for review by tenured faculty. In cases where a faculty member has a joint appointment or more than one specialization, the department chair may decide, in consultation with the faculty member, to request an additional letter. These letters should be solicited by the department chair, after consultation with the faculty member’s mentor committee and program committee, and should be from individuals who hold professorial rank at or above that to which the candidate aspires. In no case should letters be sought from individuals who served as faculty advisors, teachers or mentors during a candidate’s program of graduate or undergraduate study. While candidates may be asked for names of professional colleagues who might serve as evaluators, candidates should not contact potential reviewers directly and should not reveal to the potential reviewers that they have been recommended to the department chair. The department chair is free to contact persons recommended by the candidate, but at least two of the letters in the final promotion portfolio must be from individuals not supplied by the faculty member. In the best interest of the candidate, and with transparency, the chair will contact the faculty member (the candidate) and give them one week to provide names of additional external reviewers should the candidate’s initial choices not be available.

The department chair’s requests for letters should be couched in neutral terms, asking for “evaluation” rather than “support” and stating that the candidate is being “reviewed” not “recommended” for promotion and/or tenure. The department chair should assure that the language in the letter to external reviewers encourages an impartial, unbiased review of the candidate’s professional work and stature in the discipline. The materials submitted to the dean should contain a brief explanation of the credentials of each outside evaluator, as well as a copy of the letter sent by the department chair seeking the evaluation.

As during the annual and intensive third-year pre-tenure reviews, the mentor committee meets with the candidate to discuss their tenure and promotion materials. Subsequently, the mentor committee may make an oral report on tenure progress in terms of the college criteria at a meeting of the tenured faculty in the department. The report should provide an overview of the context of the faculty member’s work; progress on research, teaching, and service; candidate concerns; and recommendations, if needed, for supporting the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and/or tenure. Based on the discussion at this meeting and individual tenured faculty members’ own reviews of the candidate’s materials, individual faculty submit to the department chair their official tenure and promotion recommendation on each candidate.

Recommendations submitted by tenured faculty members in the department must include comments and rationale. Tenure recommendations must be completed with due consideration of the importance of the tenure decision and the need for documentation of support or lack of support for the candidate. A mere recommendation or a general comment without supporting rationale on the tenure recommendation does not suffice. Tenure recommendations should be completed with the same care and detail as if one were writing an external review letter for a tenure candidate at another institution of higher education. Inadequate or incomplete tenure recommendations carry the possibility of being substantially discounted during the review process.

When promotion/tenure materials are received by the dean with the faculty recommendations and recommendation of the department chair, a college review process is initiated. Specifically, the dean seeks the recommendation of the College of Education Faculty Affairs Committee (CEFAC) on each individual who is considered for promotion and/or tenure. CEFAC members from the candidate’s department must recuse themselves from discussions regarding those candidates. All other CEFAC members, whether associate or full professors, participate in the evaluation process of candidates for associate professor. Only full professors who are not from the candidate’s department participate in the evaluation of candidates for full professor. If there are fewer than three full professors who are not from the candidate’s department serving on CEFAC, an ad hoc committee will be appointed by the CEFAC chair, in consultation with the dean, so that at least three full professors review the candidate’s materials. Department chairs (who have their own opportunity to comment) should not be a part of CEFAC deliberations. In addition to the materials provided to individual recommending faculty, CEFAC members are provided with the evaluations prepared by the department chair and other unit level administrators as well as the faculty recommendation counts for and against tenure or promotion. The CEFAC assists the dean in evaluating candidates’ qualifications for promotion and/or tenure and provides a written recommendation to the dean, but does not state formal votes. After discussion by the CEFAC and consultation with the appropriate department chair, and campus vice chancellor/administrator, the dean makes a recommendation on each candidate to the provost. The recommendation of CEFAC is reported as part of the dean's analysis and recommendation to the provost.

All necessary materials for individuals to be considered for promotion and/or tenure must be submitted by the department to the dean’s office no later than the third week in October in order to allow ample time for review prior to the deadline for submission to the Provost’s office.

# Synopsis of Tenure and Promotion Steps

1. Copies of college documents on tenure and promotion procedures and criteria shared with untenured faculty during hiring process.
2. Appointment of tenure and promotion Mentor Committee by department chair in consultation with non-tenured faculty member.
3. Meetings of Mentor Committee with non-tenured faculty member at least once each academic year throughout pre-tenure period, providing consultation on tenure and promotion procedures, clarification of criteria, advocacy, feedback, and professional advisement.
4. Yearly oral reports by Mentor Committee to the departmental tenured faculty summarizing non-tenured faculty member’s progress toward tenure in terms of college tenure and promotion criteria may be presented.
5. Yearly ratings and comments on non-tenured faculty member’s progress toward tenure by all departmental tenured faculty.
6. Yearly written evaluations by the department chair based on the individual faculty evaluations, discussion at the meeting of tenured faculty, and the chair’s own evaluation.
7. Intensive third-year reviews in accordance with instructions provided by Provost’s office.
8. At time of final tenure and promotion consideration, submission of tenure and promotion materials in accordance with instructions from Provost’s office and college procedures document; timing of tenure decision specified at time of hiring (normally the sixth year for those hired as new assistant professors).
9. Final tenure and promotion review within the college, which includes the following steps:
	* 1. Mentor committee meets with candidate to discuss tenure/promotion materials.
		2. Candidate’s tenure/promotion review materials available for tenured faculty review (including external letters).
		3. Mentor committee may present an oral summary of tenure and promotion progress at meeting of departmental tenured faculty.
		4. Tenured faculty member submits official tenure/promotion recommendations.
		5. Department chair review and recommendation.
		6. College-level review and recommendation by CEFAC; materials reviewed by CEFAC include department chair and other unit administrator’s recommendations and tenured faculty recommendation tally.
		7. Dean’s review and recommendation.

# Criteria for Awarding Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

There is no more serious activity for a university faculty than the consideration of colleagues for promotion in rank or granting of indefinite tenure. Both promotion and tenure decisions must be based on demonstrated excellence in scholarly activity, teaching, and service.

While all three of these aspects are considered in tenure and promotion decisions, as members of a research institution, faculty must provide evidence of a focused research agenda in addition to demonstrating effectiveness in teaching and research. The purpose of the criteria presented below is to delineate expectations for teaching, scholarly activity, and service. Each of these plays an important role in a faculty member’s candidacy for tenure and promotion, but the greatest emphasis is typically placed on scholarly activity. Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor is based on consistent, sustained, and significant achievement in scholarly activity, effective teaching, and sufficient service activities to support the mission of the department, college, and university.

# Scholarly Activity

As a research university, WSU’s expectations regarding the scholarly record of faculty are high. In general, faculty candidates for promotion are expected to document an extensive body of peer-reviewed published work in reputable journals and/or academic presses. Quality of publications is more important than quantity, although there must be sufficient quantity to provide evidence of a significant level of productivity and national recognition.

# Primary Scholarly Activity

Scholarly activity is underscored by several expectations that contribute to the assessment of a scholarly record: (a) continuity, (b) consistency, and (c) quality. The following guidelines provide a general way to consider these criteria.

1. Continuity: One expectation of scholarly activity includes continuity, as represented by a clearly-identifiable program of research, publication, or creative works. Overall, the focus of the research should be identifiable and convey an integrated and coherent line of inquiry.
2. Consistency: A second expectation involves an ongoing record of scholarly activity in process and outcomes with the goal of satisfying the achievement criteria stated below. For example, having several contiguous years with no accepted publications or equivalent scholarship would not meet this expectation. Having one publication in one year and three in another would evidence consistency.
3. Quality: Judgments about quality depend upon the scholarly activity. In each instance, the scholarly venue contributes to this decision. For journals, this includes refereed outlets of importance to the candidate’s professional field that are national or international in scope and target an appropriate audience. This also holds for books and book chapters, which may also be evaluated in part on the status of the publisher in the faculty member’s academic area (i.e., higher quality would be intimated from national professional organizations and recognized academic publishers than from author-paid publishers), distribution, the professional status of the book’s editor and other scholarship criteria. The responsibility for contextualizing the quality of scholarly venues lies with the candidate. This can be addressed on a Scholarly Activity Description Form. For non-text outlets, the candidate holds a higher degree of responsibility to explain the appropriateness of the outlet and its significance. This includes originality, creativity, and rigor of scholarly efforts. Since peer-evaluation and interaction are an integral aspect of research, scholarly and creative activity, evidence of peer responses and review is expected

The primary indicator of scholarly productivity is refereed scholarly publications with a target average of two per year. Journal publications must address the previously explained quality guidelines. While co-authorship is encouraged, particularly with students and cross- disciplinary colleagues, sole or first authorship is valued more highly by the university for tenure and promotion. The reason is that sole or first authorship provides the strongest evidence that a faculty member can stand on their own as an independent scholar. This determination is more difficult when a faculty member is a secondary author on a multi- authored paper. Faculty are advised to make certain that some publications be sole or first authored.

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member should be a nationally recognized scholar evidenced by a minimum of ten published or verified as in-press publications and an additional two verified as under review. The number of publications is one indicator of scholarly productivity. In exceptional cases, the quality and significance of the candidate’s overall scholarship record may compensate for a lesser number of publications. The majority of publications should be refereed journal articles; however, equivalent refereed works can provide evidence of scholarly achievement. In general, the following accomplishments might be considered as equivalent to one or more journal publication(s), taking into account quality considerations and disciplinary norms. The candidate should make clear in his/her documentation how these various types of accomplishments are weighted within his/her specific field:

* 1. Single or co-authored book
	2. Book chapter
	3. Edited book
	4. A principal investigator (or co- PI) for a funded peer-reviewed competitive grant or contract, at the regional or national level

Refereed presentations do not replace the target number per year of refereed publications; however, they do serve to enhance the overall record of scholarly activity. A general guideline for refereed presentations would be, on average, one national or international presentation per year. A candidate’s record of refereed presentations should be characterized by the scholarly guidelines listed above: (a) continuity, (b) consistency, and (c) quality.

Candidates should note that, while scholarly work takes many forms and is published in many venues, a balance of venues and formats is expected in any candidate’s portfolio.

# Secondary Scholarly Activity

With the expectation that emphasis is on refereed journals with a national or international audience, publications that appear in regional refereed journals may count toward the achievement expectation, as may publication in peer-evaluated non-print media, performances and other creative works. Faculty members may be recognized for seeking and receiving funding through fellowships, grants, contracts, commissions and awards as appropriate. Expectations on funding should be consistent with the costs associated with doing research in a given area and the availability of funding. However, a limited amount of secondary activity will be counted toward the achievement expectation. Secondary scholarly work must still demonstrate the expectations noted in the previous section. In addition, candidates are responsible for explaining the work’s impact, competitiveness of venue, and contribution to the department/college/field.

The candidate, with accompanying contextual explanation, may also propose other scholarly works that fit his or her research agenda and coincide with the standards of his or her professional community.

The following types of publications can help establish a candidate’s national reputation; however, they do not contribute directly to publication achievement because they do not meet the conditions stated above:

* + 1. Non-refereed conference proceedings
		2. Technical reports
		3. Refereed proceedings
		4. Publications in non-refereed journals
		5. Newspaper (op-ed or other) publications
		6. Non-refereed book reviews
		7. A principal investigator (or co-PI) for an unfunded, peer-reviewed, competitive grant or contract

The guidelines in this section apply directly to annual review and yearly progress toward tenure reviews and offer direction for a successful tenure dossier. However, the tenure dossier remains a composite of scholarly activities throughout the probationary period and as such also includes teaching and service.

# Teaching

According to the Provost’s guidelines, teaching activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. **Instruction**, which can be quite varied, including large enrollment lower-division courses, upper-division courses, graduate courses, honors college courses, seminars, and classroom and distance education courses.
2. **Mentoring** of individuals, including face-to-face guidance of undergraduate students, graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, and others in such areas as special projects, senior projects, thesis and dissertation research, performances, exhibitions, career goals, and life choices. Guiding professional and student clubs may also involve mentoring.
3. **Academic advising**, including guidance of individual students in setting up appropriate programs of instruction while observing academic requirements. It also includes guiding groups of students such as departmental majors.
4. **Educational outreach** in areas in which a faculty member is expert, including Extension, external instructional activities in K-12 schools, other colleges and universities, presentation of public lectures, and lecturing at significant workshops or professional schools.

Especially for academic faculty, evaluation of teaching is a major consideration in annual review and in the tenure and promotion processes. Both quality and quantity of instructional activities are evaluated. Quantity of instruction will include, but not be limited to, consideration of class sizes, numbers of courses, course levels, whether courses require unusual levels of preparation, and development of new courses. For tenure and promotion, evaluation of the quality of instruction must be based on multiple forms of assessment, such as peer review and student end- of-course evaluations, rather than on a single form. Multiple forms of assessment are also desirable in annual reviews. Evaluation of teaching will take into account special situations, such as a faculty member undertaking more instructional activity than is normally expected or a faculty member supervising or training teaching assistants in laboratory and clinical settings. Evaluation of teaching will also take into account the levels of desirable and actual assistance provided in support of instruction, such as in the form of teaching assistants.

Recognition will be given for creativity in the art of teaching, including submitting grant applications in support of instruction, receiving grant awards or other funds in support of instruction, publishing pedagogical articles, and incorporating instructional innovations in courses. Similarly, learning more about teaching at conferences and workshops, developing significant new courses, applying methods supported by the current pedagogical literature, assessing the quality of instruction, and disseminating instructional innovations and assessments at conferences will be recognized.

In general, effective teaching can be evidenced by one’s:

1. Ability to make quality contributions in graduate and/or undergraduate education commensurate with instructional assignment.
2. Competence to teach in area(s) of importance to the department and college.
3. Excellence in instruction documented through multiple sources of data.
4. Availability to students for instructional purposes.
5. Contribution to mentoring and advising of undergraduate and/or graduate students.

Unless otherwise stated in the faculty member’s contract, general guidelines that support the university teaching criteria for promotion and tenure include:

1. Four-course teaching load. Consideration is also given to playing a significant role in practica and internships.
2. Positive student teaching reviews (all courses 3.0 on average or greater on 5.0 scale) and peer observations. For the third-year review, the candidate’s materials must include all student evaluations, at least one peer observation, and at least one additional document that provides information about teaching quality. For the promotion and tenure review, the candidate’s materials must include all student evaluations, one or more peer observations under the purview of the mentoring committee, and at least two additional documents that provide information about teaching quality. These items should be considered in tandem, not in isolation. See below for ways to document teaching quality.
3. Course or program development or revision. Consideration is given to the number and significance of development/revision efforts.

Specific documentation for teaching quality may include:

1. Graduate student completion rates (if applicable).
2. Letters from current and former students explaining the positive impact of your teaching on their professional practice.
3. Teaching artifacts (e.g., syllabi, sample assignments, etc.).
4. Teaching and/or mentor awards and nominations.
5. Professional development activities (documentation of participation in opportunities presented through Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology or other teaching related activities).
6. Mentoring and advising loads (evidence that the candidate contributes to an equitable distribution of undergraduate and/or graduate advising, responds to students’ inquiries in a timely manner, and makes oneself available for advising appointments).
7. Philosophy about grading.

#

# Service

Service is interpreted generally as activities aligned with teaching and research that benefit and contribute to the professional, university, or external communities. In addition to teaching and research, faculty duties include a substantive service component that, along with teaching and research, is considered in annual evaluations for salary increases, tenure, and promotion decisions Shared governance, the basic operating principle of the university, is impossible without faculty service.

# Guidelines for Involvement in Service

Involvement in service evolves over time and newly hired assistant professors are not expected to take on major service roles in the interest of meeting demands for excellence in research and teaching. The role of an assistant professor is to develop understanding of one’s field, department, college, university, and larger communities. Service can play a key role in developing understanding, but it is incumbent on the individual and his or her mentor committee to carefully balance service contributions in light of the emphasis placed on scholarly activity and teaching assignments. While faculty participation in service will be assessed on the basis of quality and quantity, it is in no way expected that junior faculty will have service as a focus of their work at this rank. For junior faculty service at the department, college, university, and community level is expected to be a means to familiarize faculty with the workings of these areas and involvement in service at this time would be in a limited capacity. Service to the discipline at this rank is an important means to help junior faculty establish a reputation at the national level. Activities such as reviewing proposals for annual meetings and service as session chairs are ways to become established and appropriate levels of involvement.

# Quality of Service Contributions

Service responsibilities need to be taken seriously. Candidates are evaluated on the basis of level of contribution and quality of participation, not on quantity of committees. Faculty should indicate on their vita (1) the committee or service activity, (2) their role, and (3) major tasks completed. Sample vita/ Digital Measures entries include:

2007 *Journal of General Education*, manuscript reviewer, reviewed three manuscripts. 2008 College of Education Scholarship Committee, member, helped rewrite scholarship guidelines and reviewed applications.

# Description of Service Venues

The basic elements comprising service include outreach and university, college, department, professional discipline, and public service.

1. **Outreach and public service**, which are defined broadly to involve activities that benefit communities external to the university, include for example, but are not limited to, activities such as contributions to the welfare of a city, school, or public service group; technology transfer to further economic development, or educational outreach to the general public in area of faculty member’s expertise.
2. **Professional discipline service** includes for example, but is not limited to, activities such as journal and grant reviewing, leadership roles in national or regional professional associations, leadership and contribution to regional and national conferences.
3. **University service** includes for example, but is not limited to, activities such as serving as member or chair of university and/or level committees and task forces involved in tenure and promotion policies, diversity and equity policies, graduate and undergraduate program policies, and university level recruitment (e.g., deans, provosts, president, etc.), organization, production, and support of University events, facilitation of visiting scholars and artists, and involvement with and support of Faculty Senate.
4. **College service** includes for example, but is not limited to, activities such as membership or chairing of committees involved with tenure and promotion, curriculum, undergraduate and graduate programs, and college level recruitment.
5. **Departmental service** includes for example, but is not limited to, participation or leadership in activities such as recruitment, advising student organizations, development of tenure and promotion practices and policies, graduate and undergraduate program policy development, and curriculum development and policies.

While service is expected and required of all faculty members, its form and composition varies significantly across colleges, disciplines, departments, and faculty ranks. Broad guidelines for number of service assignments that support university criteria for promotion and tenure include the following:

1. Department service. Tenure track: 2-3. Tenured: 3-4
2. College service. Tenure track: 0-1. Tenured: 1-3
3. University service. Tenure track: 0-1. Tenured: 1-3
4. Professional service (outside the university). Tenure track: 0-1; Tenured: 1-3
5. Outreach and Public Service. Tenure track: 0-1; Tenured: 1-3

# Implications for Initial Tenure Decisions

It is important that non-tenured faculty monitor their profile of duties and contributions during the pre-tenure period so that they are able to establish a productive and programmatic line of research/scholarship. Mentor committees and department chairs should assist the non-tenured faculty in doing so. Thus, it is important that pre-tenure faculty demonstrate that they will be able to sustain a productive and ongoing program of research as a tenured faculty member, leading eventually, in combination with their other contributions as an associate professor, to promotion to full professor.

# General Guidelines and Principles Regarding Promotion to Full Professor

Decisions on promotion to professor in the College of Education should take into account the following general principles. These guidelines or principles are meant to supplement, not replace, the College of Education Criteria for Promotion and Tenure.

1. **National or International Reputation** – Individuals promoted to professor should generally have a national or international reputation in their area of expertise. Typically, this will have been attained, at least in part, through publications in national/international journals and presentations at relevant national/international conferences in appropriate areas of expertise.
2. **Diversity of Contribution Profiles** – The college recognizes that individual faculty will differ in the relative balance of effort and responsibility in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service, including external outreach/partnerships and related activities. Satisfaction of minimum criteria noted in other sections of this document is not sufficient to ensure promotion to professor.
3. **Diversity of Programmatic Roles** – Decisions about promotion to professor should take into account the faculty member’s role(s) in his/her primary program(s) and the demands and needs of those programs. For example, faculty whose primary roles are in graduate degree programs with significant thesis/dissertation advising loads should have active programs of research/scholarship, facilitating guidance of students in conducting state-of- the-art research in relevant fields. Similarly, faculty whose departmental roles and responsibilities have required significant program development and coordination duties or outreach/partnership activities should have a valued record in these activities and may, by necessity, have focused somewhat less on research/scholarship.
4. **Significant/Long-term Administrative Roles** – In some cases, long-term (e.g., two or three terms) primary contributions as an important and valued administrator within the college or university (e.g., department chair, associate dean) may represent a special case. For example, multiple terms as an administrator may coincide with limited teaching responsibilities and significantly reduced time available to maintain an on-going research program. These factors can be taken into consideration in decisions about promotion to professor. However, administrative work alone would not qualify a faculty member for promotion in the absence of ongoing contributions as indicated in point 5 (next).
5. **Ongoing Contributions in Teaching, Service, and Research/Scholarship** – Individual faculty may differ in their profile of contributions. Persistent high levels of attainment in each of the traditional areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service are expected and should be considered in decisions about promotion to professor. These accomplishments should clearly distinguish the candidate from the expectations noted for an associate professor. For example, the above principles are not intended to enable faculty to largely discontinue contributions in service or satisfactory teaching. Although the candidate for professor may make contributions to the department, college and university in many and varied forms, candidates for promotion to professor should have maintained an ongoing program of research/scholarship and a record of publication and conference presentations sufficient to attain a prominent level of national or international exposure and recognition. The candidate holds the responsibility to define prominent for his or her accomplishments. It is also expected that candidates for professor will have made positive leadership and mentoring contributions within their units.
6. **Time in Rank** –It is assumed that faculty will spend a minimum of five full years in rank as an associate professor prior to applying for promotion. As stated in the Faculty Manual, only under extraordinary circumstances will a person be recommended for promotion to professor when he or she has served as associate professor for fewer than 6 years. Tenured faculty who are eligible for promotion are strongly encouraged to request an intensive review every four (4) to six (6) years. The career progress portion of the review can be limited to the department or college level.

# SECTION II: PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION OF CAREER TRACK FACULTY

**Introduction – Career Track Faculty**

The objective of this document is to provide additional and specific guidance for Career Track faculty appointments (Scholar, Teaching, or Research) in the College of Education (COE). COE and Washington State University (WSU) value the contributions of career track faculty. The title Career Track implies the appointment is non-permanent and non-tenure track. These essential fixed-term faculty appointees may be hired for up to five years on renewable contracts, and, are not intended to be temporary positions, but rather designed as extended career options. A description of specific duties for the Teaching, Scholar, or Research track will be outlined in an individual fixed-term renewable contract designed according to the needs of each department and the expertise of each faculty member by percentage load. Such contracts will clearly detail responsibilities for these faculty members. Career track appointments may be renewed based upon satisfactory review of prior performance and departmental needs. These guidelines are supplementary to procedures and policies specified in the WSU Faculty Manual for all career track faculty. In all matters pertaining to questions of procedure, the WSU Faculty Manual takes precedence.

Candidates for career track appointment must hold an appropriate terminal degree related to the program area in which they are to provide supervision and/or instruction. When deemed appropriate, chairs and career track faculty will work together to identify and assign a mentor committee to assist the career track faculty in meeting their performance criteria. The mentor committee shall consist of three members, including at least one Associate Career Track faculty from within the COE, and one faculty member from the Assistant Professor’s program. Faculty may remain in their current rank and be reappointed to subsequent terms at that rank even after their sixth year of service provided satisfactory performance continues. If the faculty member elects to seek promotion, college/department will conduct an intensive promotion style review that involves all career-track, tenure track, and tenured faculty in the college/department at or above the rank applied for. Usually promotion would be granted in the sixth (6th) year of employment. In extraordinary circumstances, early promotion may be considered only after consultation with the department chair and dean. An individual college/department, at its discretion, may require external reviews as part of the promotion process.

Time served in clinical positions by individuals being reassigned to career track positions starting in the 2020-2021 academic year, will be counted toward eligibility for promotion, assuming the candidate fulfills other requirements for promotion.

At least four review letters are also required for career-track promotions and may be from either internal or external reviewers. These letters may come from WSU faculty outside the candidate’s home department or from others familiar with the candidate’s role (e.g., professional associations or external agencies). The same process for soliciting reviewers will be applied as for tenure track faculty (see page 7, under *Tenure and Promotion Review*.)

Criteria for each of the tracks are described below in detail; however, effective and innovative teaching are overarching expectations in both the Teaching and Scholar subtracks, whereas research is the primary expectation in the Research subtrack. Additionally, some service will be expected for all career track faculty, but may vary depending on the terms of their contract and the needs of the program/department/college at the time of their appointment. Service may be interpreted generally as activities that contribute to the department, college, university, professional or external communities. Shared governance, the basic operating principle of the university, is impossible without faculty service.

# TEACHING TRACK

Teaching track faculty have significant teaching responsibilities. They will have little to no additional expectations in research/scholarship and/or creative activity or leadership. Some service may be required depending on their contract. Teaching may include traditional classroom instruction, online course delivery, hybrid delivery, graduate and/or undergraduate student advising, practicum and/or intern and/or field supervision.

G**eneral statement on excellence in teaching**

The COE recognizes that teaching occurs in a variety of environments outside the formal classroom. Work such as independent studies, individual or group lessons, mentoring, serving on masters or Ph.D. candidates’ committees, and informal advising, especially when it is accompanied by evidence of effectiveness, can also be an element of a promotion case in this track. Excellence in teaching should be presented and assessed through multiple measures and with attention to the teaching that has occurred throughout a candidate’s time in rank. While high student evaluation scores are perhaps the most immediately accessible means of demonstrating excellence in teaching, such scores by themselves will not be determinative for promotion, nor will instances of lower teaching evaluations necessarily prevent promotion. Additional measures of teaching excellence may include peer evaluations, participation or leadership in pedagogical development opportunities, effective engagement with larger unit and discipline efforts to advance pedagogy and curricula, internal and external awards, and presentation or publication of material regarding teaching in appropriate professional outlets.

**Expectations for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor**

Contractual expectations will inform any individual case for appointment or promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. Promotion within this career track will be determined by a record of continued excellence in teaching that provides evidence of teaching effectiveness and innovation and demonstrates growth and advancement in teaching quality over time.

The teaching of candidates for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor will be evaluated in adherence with the qualities associated with the development and/or delivery of materials pertinent to achieving curriculum and course learning outcomes, contributions to improving the milieu of students’ practical experience (where appropriate), and the contribution to the integration of experiences and academic programs.

The following criteria will be considered for evaluating Teaching Track faculty. Faculty will be expected to meet some, but not all, of these criteria:

* Demonstrated knowledge of content area (including teaching and/or areas of intern-field supervision) based on assessment of peers as well as certifications or participation in professional development opportunities.
* Demonstrated effectiveness of teaching based on the assessment by peers. Two peer evaluations of recent teaching (within the prior three years of an application) must be included in the candidate’s promotion materials; completed by faculty within either the Teaching Track or Tenure Track, with a rank of associate or professor.
* Demonstrated effectiveness of teaching based on the assessment by students as evidenced by scores from Blue Course evaluations in the areas of teaching effectiveness and quality of course content.
* Demonstrated production of effective learning support materials (e.g., course development, improved teaching techniques, state-of-the-art delivery systems, curricula development, teaching scholarship, workbooks, guides or textbooks, and/or other products learning approaches relevant to the needs of the discipline).
* Demonstrated pursuit of excellence in the improvement and development of teaching competence.
* Demonstrated use of teaching materials incorporating current relevant research.
* Demonstrated leadership and support in teaching, advising, and developing and reviewing curriculum.
* A record of advisement of students, and student organizations appropriate to one's department, position, and standing.
* Development of materials pertinent to practice (e.g., supervisory evaluation tools, in-service materials, teaching modules, handbooks).
* Presentation or publication of material regarding teaching in appropriate outlets.
* Internal and/or external awards.
* Submission of a teaching portfolio.

Faculty will be expected to submit a teaching portfolio that follows the Provost guidelines for promotion.

A teaching portfolio is a compilation of information about a faculty member's teaching and is intended to present an overview of contributions to teaching and learning. The following outline should serve as a template that may be modified, as necessary, for individual faculty members.

General Format- The teaching portfolio narrative shall be firmly limited to five pages and should present information under headings selected appropriately from those listed below. Some faculty members may attach complementary information in the form of appendices or exhibits, but these are not essential and should be used in moderation. Each teaching portfolio should be dated and signed by the faculty member.

* 1. Goals - A compact but thoughtful statement about the faculty member's intentions and aspirations in teaching, especially for the near future.
	2. Responsibilities - Responsibilities may include percentage of appointment devoted to teaching, if stipulated, courses recently and currently taught, with credit hours and enrollments, work with individual students, advising, instructional innovations, extraordinary efforts with special groups of students, use of research in teaching, out-of-class evaluation activities, service on WSU or other committees concerned mainly with instruction, or learning more about teaching, projects and potential projects requiring non-state funding
	3. Evaluations - Evaluations should consist chiefly of summaries of data from whatever methods for evaluating teaching are used--not only evaluation by students.
	4. Results – Results should include evidence of student successes

 **Expectations for promotion to Teaching Professor**

Teaching Professors are expected to demonstrate continued effectiveness in the classroom, as well as elements of pedagogical growth and leadership beyond that at the associate level, particularly demonstrating qualities of innovation and classroom or curricular versatility.

# SCHOLAR TRACK

Scholar track faculty in the COE will have significant responsibilities in teaching and in at least one of the following secondary areas: a) student advising, b) research, c) creative activity, d) outreach, e) practice, f) educational leadership, g) administration, h) service depending on the needs of their unit and their particular qualifications. Some service may be required depending on their contract. It is also expected that scholar track faculty will contribute to scholarship/creative activities broadly defined and as described in their contract with an approximate workload expectation of five percent of their total workload. The scholar track is the most complex of the three tracks because of the greater options in workload responsibilities.

**General Statement on Overall Performance Evaluation**

Given the potential range of activity areas available to scholarly faculty, the COE recognizes that the profiles and accomplishments of candidates for promotion in this track may vary widely. Especially given this diversity, expectations for the type of work and its manner of production and dissemination will also likely vary by discipline and should be defined in part by the expectations of a candidate’s contract. For its part, the COE holds that the quantity of work in any given area, while potentially significant, is by itself an insufficient criterion for promotion. Rather, the COE expects that the following characteristics will inform the evaluation of candidate performance in any of the activity areas identified above:

* **Growth**: within their appointed areas, candidates should demonstrate increasing levels of accomplishment, responsibility, and/or leadership.
* **Connection**: activities should possess a level of coherence that contributes to candidates developing an area of expertise and a recognizable professional profile.
* **Impact**: activities should lead to results or outputs that contribute to the advancement of a scholarly field; curricula, programs, or departments; individual students or student groups; initiatives in research, scholarship, or creative activity; or opportunities for public engagement and policy influence. Activity that has not resulted in output or results, such as scholarship “in progress” or new programs still in development, will be recognized but thus accorded lesser significance.

**General statement on excellence in teaching.**

Teaching is to be a common emphasis area for COE Scholar Track faculty. In evaluating the teaching of candidates within the Scholar Track, the COE values most highly a demonstrated record of achievement and growth--one that demonstrates growth and innovation in a faculty member’s teaching over time. Refer to the Teaching Track section for further descriptions for teaching excellence.

**General statement on excellence in secondary areas.**

Scholar track faculty members will devote their time to the inseparable activities of teaching and one or more secondary areas. Scholar track faculty are expected to participate actively in advancing education, practice, or the basic, or applied sciences in their field and to demonstrate a scholarly approach to improve growth and effectiveness, regardless of which secondary area(s) they choose. In order to be appointed or promoted to the Associate Scholarly Professor or Scholarly Professorrank, an assistant scholar track faculty member shall have contributed to knowledge and/or practice in their field. Their creative work may be broadly defined and be disseminated, for example, in a body of publications, in teaching materials or methods, or in improvements or innovations in professional practice in their area. Evidence of achievement in this area may include training manuals, academic publications, new courses, or training of other professionals in the field. Textbooks and similar publications, or contributions by candidates to the professional literature and the advancement of professional practice or of professional education should be judged as creative work. The quantitative productivity level achieved by a scholar track faculty member should be assessed in accordance with contracted percentages of load.

**Expectations for promotion to Associate Scholarly Professor**

While contractual expectations will inform any individual case for appointment or promotion to Scholarly Associate Professor, promotion within this career track is most frequently determined by a continuing excellence in teaching and an emerging record of sustained accomplishment in the secondary area(s) relevant to the candidate’s appointment.

The teaching of candidates for promotion to Scholarly Associate Professor will be evaluated in adherence with the qualities detailed in the criteria established for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor in this document, with particular attention being paid to the demonstration of effective communication, support for student success, contribution to the scholarship of teaching (e.g., published articles and/or development of new curricula or methods), and the capacity for further development as a teacher.

Proportionate to contractual expectations, performance in the secondary area(s) is (are) to be assessed using the criteria detailed above, with particular attention being paid to the qualities of connection and potential for growth. In terms of impact, candidates emphasizing work internal to WSU, such as advising or program development, should demonstrate an established reputation for individual excellence at the university. Candidates emphasizing externally facing work, such as research/scholarship/creative activity or public engagement and policy efforts, should demonstrate an emerging regional or national reputation in these areas.

To be considered for promotion to associate scholarly professor, faculty should demonstrate effectiveness in teaching that might include areas such as:

* Effective teaching based on assessment of students and peers
* Development and/or application of effective learning techniques and innovative delivery systems
* Pursuit of excellence in the improvement and development of teaching competence

To be considered for promotion to associate scholarly professor, faculty should demonstrate effectiveness in secondary areas that might include activities such as:

* Capacity for organizing, presenting, and implementing high quality educational outreach programs, such as school district professional development, or support materials for outreach programs
* Production of published works, including articles, books, films, public presentations or other appropriate delivery channels for scholarly work
* State or regional recognition as a leader in the profession
* Involvement and/or leadership roles with professional societies
* Demonstrating how they have engaged in advising or contributed to the advising field, as a faculty member.

**Expectations for promotion to Scholarly Professor**

While contractual expectations will inform any individual case for appointment to or promotion to Scholarly Professor, initial promotion within this career track is most frequently determined by a continuing excellence in teaching and an established record of sustained accomplishment in the secondary area(s) relevant to the candidate’s appointment.

The teaching of candidates for promotion to Scholarly Professor will be evaluated in adherence with the expectations detailed in the criteria established for promotion to Teaching Professor criteria in the COE. Candidates for promotion to Scholarly Professor who have teaching expectations are expected to demonstrate continuing effectiveness in the classroom, as well as elements of pedagogical growth and leadership beyond that which would characterize an initial appointment. In particular, candidates should demonstrate qualities of innovation, smart risk-taking, and classroom or curricular versatility. Contribution to the scholarship of teaching should have impact beyond the candidate’s classroom and program, demonstrating established regional or national reputation in these areas.

Proportionate to contractual expectations, performance in the secondary area(s) is to be assessed using the criteria detailed below, with particular attention at this level being paid not only to continuing potential for growth but also impact. Candidates emphasizing work internal to WSU, such as advising or program development, should demonstrate a capacity to translate their individual efforts into work with broader positive impacts among colleagues, curricula, departments and programs, or the university. Candidates emphasizing externally facing work, such as research/scholarship/creative activity or public engagement and policy efforts, should demonstrate an established regional or national reputation in these areas. Together such qualities reflect a concern with the larger dimensions of accomplishment appropriate to this rank. To be considered for promotion to scholarly professor, faculty should demonstrate effectiveness in teaching and a secondary area at an advanced level of effectiveness for the areas noted above that document a higher level of growth, connection and impact as that expected at the associate level.

Documentation of advanced levels of teaching might include:

* Sustained recognition by and students and peers as a stimulating, inspiring, and effective teacher
* Sustained advisement of students appropriate to one’s department
* Application of innovative approached to educational experiences

Documentation of advanced levels of activities in secondary areas might include:

* Sustained effectiveness of outreach programs
* Leadership roles in cooperative projects with colleagues that contribute to the solutions of community or institutional problems
* Sustained production of published works

Note: Refer to Appendix 1 for additional criteria for assessing teaching and secondary areas.

# RESEARCH TRACK

Research faculty predominantly conduct research/scholarship activity and may serve as principal or co-principal investigators on grants or contracts administered by the university. In general, research faculty will have no significant teaching or service expectations unless those responsibilities are negotiated and reflected in the percentage workload assignment. Promotion in this sub-track is based on fulfillment of contractual obligations which may include support provided to ongoing grants, projects and efforts for dissemination of research. Measures of research and scholarship should include, where appropriate, number of grants and projects supported, publications, extramural funding, outreach, and projects taking research to practice at the local, state, or national levels

.

**General Statement on Excellence in research**

Research track faculty will be expected to work on college and/or university sponsored projects and grant funded projects with time negotiated as needed for each/p individual appointment. Their role will be to assist, or take a lead role depending on their rank in this track, in funded projects, conference submissions, grants/proposals and journal article publications, consultation with graduate students, and service at the department level.

**Expectations for promotion to Associate Research Professor**

Associate research professors will be expected to work on college and/or university sponsored projects and grant funded projects negotiated as needed for each individual appointment. At the associate level they should have demonstrated satisfactory or better performance in job duties and be consistently supported on grants and projects to the extent agreed on with the College in their original contract. They should also demonstrate an ability to lead original research that can be maintained as an associate research professor. Examples of this might include documented leadership roles on research work for grants, dissemination of articles, conference presentations; training of graduate students, documented dissemination of new knowledge and insights through a variety of media, and seeking and receiving funding through fellowships, grants, contracts, and awards as appropriate.

**Expectations for promotion to Research Professor**

Research Professors will be expected to work on college and/or university sponsored projects and grant funded projects negotiated as needed for each individual appointment. In addition to duties similar to Associate Research Professor, a Research Professor will have the responsibility of leading their own line of original research and expanding their efforts to gain a national and/or international presence in their field. Evidence might be demonstrated by taking leadership roles on research work for grants, grant proposals, projects, and research dissemination (e.g. articles, conferences), serving as PI or Co-PI’s on grants and proposals and lead authors on journal articles and conference presentations, consultation with graduate students primarily for help with theses and dissertation work, and serving on key department and college committees.

**Appendix 1 – Additional criteria for scholar subtrack**

The scholar subtrack is the most complex of the three subtracks because of the greater options in responsibilities and how these are assessed. The following describes criteria to be considered for teaching and additional secondary areas.

Teaching:

* Demonstrated effectiveness of teaching based on the assessment of students and peers.
* Demonstrated production of effective learning support materials in the form of course development, improved teaching techniques, state-of-the-art delivery systems, curricula development, teaching scholarship, workbooks, guides or textbooks, and/or other products.
* Demonstrated creativity in the form of the development or application of new teaching techniques, delivery systems and learning approaches to current subject matter.
* Demonstrated pursuit of excellence in the improvement and development of teaching competence.
* Demonstrated use of teaching materials incorporating current and appropriate research.
* A record of advisement of students, and student organizations appropriate to one's department, position, and standing.
* Demonstrated creativity in the form of the development or application of new teaching techniques, delivery systems, learning approaches, and programs relevant to the needs of the discipline.

Secondary area(s):

* Demonstrated capacity for organizing, presenting and implementing high quality outreach educational programs.
* Demonstrated effectiveness of outreach programs based on the assessment of participants and evaluators.
* Demonstrated production of effective outreach support materials in the form of material development, improved instructional techniques, state-of-the-art delivery systems, workbooks and guides, applied research demonstrations, reports and publications on applied research/demonstrations, or other products.
* Demonstrated cooperation with colleagues as they initiate and complete their work
* Evidence of excellence in research and promise of continued growth.
* Demonstrated ability to produce published works, including articles and books, films, audio/video recordings, computer programs, public presentations, or other appropriate delivery channels for scholarly work.
* Demonstrated ability to secure extramural funding or other resources to support research or other work as assigned.
* Evidence of contribution to the research of colleagues
* Evidence of state and regional recognition as a leader in the profession.
* Evidence of creative and significant contributions to the profession.
* Evidence of collaborative and cooperative relations with professional colleagues.
* Involvement with professional societies.

Examples of documentation to consider:

* Letters from peers, organizational supervisors/ administrators, etc., evaluating the quality of professional activities assigned to the candidate.
* Adoption by other institutions of programs developed/maintained by the candidate.
* Documentation of consultation in the candidate’s field.
* Participation on professional committees.
* Contribution to professional newsletters.
* Grants/contracts received to provide services to organizations.
* Invited presentations or lectureships.
* Identification as an expert consultant by agencies outside of the University.
* Presentation of service activities at state, regional and national professional meetings.
* Invited lectures to professional groups.
* Participation in local, state, regional, national and international professional organizations (elected officials, committee membership, etc.)
* Reviewer or editor for professional journals, reviewer of abstracts for professional meetings.
* Presentation of continuing education programs.
* Participation in or presentations to community organizations as a practicing educator.
* Documentation of contribution to the mission and goals of the faculty.
* Demonstration of professional advancement or leadership through administrative duties within a professional organization.
* Demonstration of professional advancement or leadership through managerial duties within a professional organization.
* Appropriate licensure or credentialing.
* Invited lectureships to present creative activities.
* Presentation of results of creative activities at state, national & international professional meetings.
* Publication of results of creative activities in journals appropriate for the discipline.
* Invited lectureships to present research findings at other institutions or organizations
* Presentation of research results at state, national and international professional meetings
* Publication of results of research projects in journals appropriate for the discipline.
* Published research papers related to teaching.
* Election to offices, committee activities, and other important service to professional associations and learned societies including editorial work and peer reviewing as related to teaching.
* Contribution to newsletters.
* Development of instructional materials.
* Published textbooks and book chapters adopted by other programs.
* Receipt of grants to support research efforts, including funding for fellowships and other personnel.
* Published position papers.
* Published case reports.
* Published professional review articles.
* Published book reviews.
* Published practice guidelines and policy statements.
* Honors and awards for professional achievements.
* Honors and awards for research efforts.
* Departmental and institutional governance and academic policy and procedure development as related to teaching, research and clinical activities.
* Editorial/reviewer work for professional journals in which research results are published.
* Reviewer for abstracts for state, regional and national professional meetings in which research results are presented.
* Reviewer of research proposals for funding by University or national organizations.
* Reviewer for textbooks and book chapters.
* Citations of research scholarship in other publications.
* Recognition as a consultant in the candidate’s field of research.
* Contribution to College or University standing committees, including ad hoc advisory groups.
* Advising students.
* Faculty advisor to student organizations.
* Mentoring of junior faculty.
* Service to the public as it relates to the candidate’s professional expertise.
* Performance of administrative responsibilities.
* Serving on boards.
* Initiation and implementation in public policy.
* Developing assessment processes for community programs.