

DEPARTMENT OF PLANT PATHOLOGY  
TENURE & PROMOTION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

Adopted for use 7/1/85  
Revised 1/1/89; 8/25/99; 5/1/03; 1/11/05; 1/29/08

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Establishing a Career Guidance Committee

Procedure for Annual Review

Procedure for Annual Review of Progress toward Tenure

Form "Summary of Annual Review of Progress toward Tenure"

Third-year Review

Tenure and Promotion

Procedure for Review of Progress toward Promotion to Rank of Professor

Form "Summary of Review of Progress toward Promotion"

Categories and Areas to be considered in the Tenure and/or Promotion Process

## INTRODUCTION

The Department of Plant Pathology is a complex department with faculty in Pullman and the outlying campuses at Mount Vernon, Prosser, Puyallup, Seattle, and Wenatchee. The Department has missions in teaching, research and extension, and most faculty members have formal appointments involving more than one of these activities. The chair of the department is ultimately responsible for the evaluation and reward of faculty members statewide. In the case of faculty members at outlying campuses, the relevant director provides input on the annual evaluation. The chair formally reviews every faculty member each year, usually at the home location of the faculty member.

One of the problems of a faculty located among widely separated campuses is the potential lack of communication among faculty members. A statewide faculty meeting is held every other year for the purpose of discussing common goals and problems and to become better acquainted with colleagues. Frequent visiting and communication among faculty at all locations is encouraged.

This document is intended to communicate the general departmental procedures and guidelines for establishing a career guidance committee, annual review, annual review of progress toward tenure, third-year review, tenure and promotion, and promotion to the rank of full professor or equivalent. The policies and procedures described herein are expected to be consistent with the current *Faculty Manual* ([http://www.wsu.edu/Faculty\\_Senate/facmanual.html](http://www.wsu.edu/Faculty_Senate/facmanual.html)) and used in conjunction with it. In addition, CAHNRS has recently established a set of Assessment Matrices for research, teaching, and extension activities that are useful in describing general performance expectations.

## ESTABLISHING A CAREER GUIDANCE COMMITTEE

With consensus between the chair and each new faculty member, a career guidance committee (mentoring committee) is formed during the first 6 months of employment to mentor the non-tenured faculty member through the tenure process. This committee consists of at least three tenured faculty members. Representatives from allied fields are eligible to serve on the committee, although the chair of the committee will be a member of the department. The career guidance committee meets at least once each year, usually prior to December 31, with the non-tenured faculty member to discuss progress toward achieving the goals of the faculty member's teaching, research, and/or extension program(s). The chair of this committee then submits a written report to the chair of the department regarding the progress of the faculty member toward tenure. This report will be used by the chair when he/she conducts the Annual Review of Progress toward Tenure as described. Ultimately the chair discusses the results, implications, and reviews progress toward tenure in light of departmental criteria with the non-tenured faculty member.

## PROCEDURE FOR ANNUAL REVIEW

Each year every faculty member will be reviewed in accordance with university and college guidelines (<http://cahnrs.wsu.edu/fs/pro-dev.html>). A summary of the faculty member's **WSU Online Review and Query System** (WORQS) report on teaching, research, extension, and service activities will be furnished to the chair in January of each year with a Faculty Accomplishment Report in a format specified by the chair, and a current copy of the faculty member's curriculum vitae. The chair will seek input from the R & E Center Directors according to college guidelines. The chair then reviews this material, prepares a written evaluation and assigns a numerical rating. The faculty member and the chair arrange a meeting to review and discuss the written evaluation. If appropriate, a dissenting document may be attached. In the case of off-campus faculty, the chair may travel to the R & E Center or arrange a videoconference to discuss each faculty member's review with the faculty member and with the station director. The report is then signed by the chair and director (for off-campus faculty) and forwarded to the college administration for further action. The college administrators discuss the evaluation, assign a final numerical rating, sign the report, send a copy back to the department and forward the evaluation to the provost. The current *Faculty Manual* ([http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty\\_manual/index.html](http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual/index.html)) should be read and understood. In addition, CAHNRS has recently established a set of Assessment Matrices for research, teaching, and extension activities that are useful in describing general performance expectations.

## PROCEDURE FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE

According to the faculty manual, each non-tenured faculty member is to be reviewed for their progress toward tenure by all tenured faculty members in the tenure unit every year. This review is supplemented by the mentoring committee, which meets with the non-tenured faculty member at least once per year to discuss progress toward tenure and provides a written report to the department chair.

The procedure for conducting this review is outlined below. In recent years these materials have been due in late March so reviews can be conducted in April.

1. Each non-tenured faculty member will make a brief (20 to 30 minutes) presentation to the tenured faculty each spring, except in years when the 3<sup>rd</sup> Year review is conducted and when the tenure package is submitted. For those faculty located off-campus, the presentation may be made via WECN. The intent of this presentation is to address the individual's progress toward tenure and must therefore address all aspects of his or her position. ***This is not a research seminar.***

The following elements of the individual's program are to be discussed in the following order:

- Responsibilities of the position
- Your goals and vision for the position
- Approximate amount of time that is spent on each of the major responsibilities
- Types of activities involved in meeting these responsibilities (e.g. teaching classes, extension presentations, research, and service)
- Accomplishments in the framework of the position

The last point will be very important in terms of evaluating progress toward tenure and should include a description of courses taught, graduate students directed, grants written and received, manuscripts published, extension bulletins written, presentations made, service to the institution and profession, and other measures of productivity.

In preparation for this presentation, tenured faculty members will receive copies of the non-tenured faculty member's current CV, a copy of his or her WORQS report, and any other materials submitted as part of the Annual Review process.

Each presentation, including that of the chair of the mentoring committee, will be recorded electronically in the event a tenured faculty member is unable to attend the meeting.

2. Following each presentation, the chair of the non-tenured faculty member's mentoring committee will make a brief presentation describing the committee's

evaluation and conclusion regarding the faculty member's progress toward tenure. This presentation should be 10 to 15 minutes long.

3. Each tenured faculty member will provide written comments through the specified medium regarding their evaluation of the non-tenured faculty member's progress toward tenure. This evaluation should address the strengths and weaknesses of the individual's accomplishments along with specific recommendations for improvement, if needed.

Specific expectations for tenure and promotion are described below and in the *Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for Promotion/Tenure in the College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences* documents.

4. The department chair will collect written comments from all tenured faculty members and prepare a written summary after the presentation omitting the source of specific comments. The draft written summary will be distributed to all tenured faculty members for review and revision. The chair will then revise the written summary accordingly.

5. The chair will provide the non-tenured faculty member with the written summary of faculty comments and then discuss them and their implications in terms of progress toward tenure with the faculty member. The purpose of this discussion is to aid the faculty member in understanding how the tenured faculty views his or her performance relative to their position and departmental expectations.

6. The chair will prepare a written summary of the discussion on the form in this document for signature by the chair and the non-tenured faculty member. The non-tenured faculty member has the right to respond in writing to the summary and to have it permanently attached to the summary.

7. The written summary of faculty comments and of the faculty-chair discussion will become part of the non-tenured faculty member's tenure file. These documents will be available to any tenured faculty member in the department upon request. These evaluations will be sent forward with the third-year review file to the provost's office.

DEPARTMENT OF PLANT PATHOLOGY  
SUMMARY OF ANNUAL REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE

---

Faculty Member

---

Date

The following is a summary of the comments of tenured faculty concerning your performance and progress toward tenure.

---

Faculty Member

---

Date

---

Chair

---

Date

## THIRD-YEAR REVIEW

As required in the current *Faculty Manual*, a formal tenure progress review will occur in the spring of the third year of employment (3 years prior to tenure) for those faculty newly hired with no credit toward tenure. The tenure progress review will be conducted by the faculty eligible to perform final tenure evaluations and follow similar procedures as the final tenure consideration, except for external professional evaluations. Specific guidelines for the Third-year review are distributed each year by the provost and dean of the college and are available at <http://cahnrs.wsu.edu/fs/pro-dev.html> .

Completed documents for Third-year review must be submitted to the department chair no later than February 1. It is the responsibility of the faculty member being reviewed to prepare all documents according to the guidelines and submit them to the chair by the deadline.

Each tenured faculty member in the department will submit a written review through the specified medium with comments that specifically address the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member under review and his/her progress toward tenure. The department chair will prepare an evaluative analysis of the candidate's progress toward tenure and make a recommendation for final action (Progress Satisfactory, Improvement Required, or Progress Unsatisfactory) and submit it to the dean.



## TENURE AND PROMOTION

A person shall be considered for tenure during the sixth year of service, unless specified to otherwise in their letter of hire or extended by the Provost after hire. A candidate should read and understand the criteria for promotion/tenure for CAHNRS, the tenure procedures in the current *Faculty Manual*, university and college guidelines (<http://cahnrs.wsu.edu/fs/pro-dev.html>) and departmental criteria. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is almost always concurrent with the awarding of tenure.

In discussions with the non-tenured faculty member and in all written material, the department chair is to convey only information relating to performance in teaching, research, extension, and/or service. The chair is to strongly convey the message that job performance in total or in part is unsatisfactory or requires improvement, when such is the case. Where possible, the chair will advise on ways and means to alleviate and correct such deficiencies. The department chair is likewise to convey the message that job performance in total or in part is satisfactory, when such is the case. The chair is not, however, to promise tenure or imply that it will be granted entirely on the basis of satisfactory performance.

The non-tenured faculty member must also be informed that tenured faculty members have the right to vote for persons with whom they wish to work and, conversely, to vote against those with whom they choose not to work. One does not necessarily earn tenure with satisfactory work performance alone. The decision process involves faculty review of documentation provided by the chair and individual and private vote by tenured faculty; a recommendation by the chair; review and discussion with the dean and directors; and a recommendation by the dean to the provost and president. The president makes the ultimate decision on granting or denial of tenure. The Board of Regents must approve granting of tenure.

In recent years, the completed tenure package has been submitted to the department chair no later than the end of May to provide time for solicitation of external letters and review by the tenured faculty. It is strongly recommended that the assistant professor under consideration complete preparation of the tenure package far enough in advance of the deadline to allow the mentoring committee and then department chair time to review it.

It is mandatory that at least five letters from outside the institution be obtained in support of the faculty member under consideration. These letters may be obtained from evaluators chosen by the chair from a list composed partially from recommendations of the candidate. These letters should be from highly regarded professionals who are familiar with the accomplishments of the individual and who can evaluate the individual in a comparative way.

PROCEDURE FOR REVIEW OF PROGRESS  
TOWARD  
PROMOTION TO RANK OF PROFESSOR

The professorial rank is the highest attainable in academia. The Professor (or equivalent rank) is expected to represent the university with distinction. Thus, the rank is to be earned and not merely conferred after some specified length of service, although promotion is usually not considered until after at least six years in the Associate Professor rank or equivalent. A sustained, high-quality record of accomplishment showing substantial progress and attainment of professional goals is an essential first step for promotion to the rank of Full Professor or equivalent rank.

The process whereby a faculty member is considered for promotion begins with the department chair, who distributes a letter early in the calendar year requesting the Associate rank faculty to submit their pre-promotion packet for review by the Full Professors for possible submission to the college. Each associate professor member will be reviewed at least every third year following their promotion, or since the last review, to evaluate their progress toward promotion to full professor.

The process for review of progress toward promotion is outlined below. It will be the responsibility of the associate professor being reviewed to prepare the review materials and submit them in a timely manner specified by the department chair.

1. The associate professor being reviewed will submit a current CV, prepared according to college promotion guidelines, and a statement of accomplishments since promotion in each of the areas corresponding to their appointment that is no longer than 3 pages total to the department chair, who will distribute the materials to the full professors. In recent years these materials have been due in late March so reviews can be conducted in April.
2. The associate professor will make a brief (20 to 30 minutes) oral presentation to the full professors. For those faculty located off-campus, the presentation may be made via WECN. The intent of this presentation is to address the individual's progress toward promotion and should therefore address all aspects of his or her position. ***This is not a research seminar.***

The following elements of the individual's program are to be discussed in the following order:

- Responsibilities of the position
- Your goals and vision for the position
- Approximate amount of time that is spent on each of the major responsibilities
- Types of activities involved in meeting these responsibilities (e.g. teaching classes, extension presentations, research, and service)

- Evidence of national and international reputation
- Overall accomplishments in the framework of the position

The last point will be very important in terms of evaluating progress toward promotion and should include a description of courses taught, graduate students directed, grants written and received, manuscripts published, extension bulletins written, presentations made, service to the institution and profession, and other measures of productivity.

Each presentation will be recorded electronically in the event a full professor is unable to attend the meeting.

2. Following each presentation, the full professors may ask questions of the associate professor. Afterwards, the full professors will discuss the associate professor's progress in closed session.
3. Each full professor will provide written comments through the specified medium regarding each area of the associate professor's appointment and their progress toward promotion. This evaluation should address the strengths and weaknesses of the individual's accomplishments along with specific recommendations for improvement, if needed.

Specific expectations for promotion are described below and in the *Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for Promotion/Tenure in the College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences* document (<http://cahnrs.wsu.edu/fs/pro-dev.html>).

4. The department chair will collect written comments from all full professors and prepare a written summary after the presentation omitting the source of specific comments. The draft written summary will be distributed to all full professors for review and revision. The chair will then revise the written summary accordingly.
5. The chair will provide the associate professor with a written summary of full professors' comments and then discuss them and their implications in terms of progress toward promotion with the faculty member. The purpose of this discussion is to aid the associate professor in understanding how the full professors view his or her performance relative to their position and departmental expectations.
6. The chair will prepare a written summary of the discussion on the form in this document for signature by the chair and the associate professor. The associate professor has the right to respond in writing to the summary and to have it permanently attached to the summary.
7. The written summary of full professors and of the associate professor-chair discussion will become part of the associate professor's promotion file. These

documents will be available to any full professor in the department upon request. At this time there is no requirement for such a letter in promotion packages by the College or University and therefore, they will not be included therein unless the faculty member under consideration requests that it be included.

If a substantial majority of full professors agree that the associate professor should be considered for promotion to full professor, the department chair shall encourage the associate professor to develop and submit a full promotion packet for submission and consideration according to University and College procedures. Opinion and advice from the full professors shall be considered as advisory to the department chair, and, ultimately, to college and university administration.

In recent years, the completed promotion package has been submitted to the department chair no later than the end of May to provide time for solicitation of external letters and review by the tenured faculty. It is strongly recommended that the associate professor under consideration complete preparation of the tenure package far enough in advance of the deadline to allow the department chair time to review it.

It is mandatory that at least five letters from outside the institution be obtained in support of the associate professor under consideration. These letters may be obtained from evaluators chosen by the chair from a list composed partially from recommendations of the candidate. These letters should be from highly regarded professionals who are familiar with the accomplishments of the individual and who can evaluate the individual in a comparative way.

DEPARTMENT OF PLANT PATHOLOGY  
SUMMARY OF REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARD PROMOTION

---

Faculty Member

---

Date

The following is a summary of the comments of full professors concerning your performance and progress toward promotion to full professor.

---

Associate Professor

---

Date

---

Chair

---

Date

CATEGORIES AND AREAS TO BE CONSIDERED  
IN THE  
TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION PROCESS

The following categories and areas will be considered with regard to faculty of the Department of Plant Pathology, Washington State University, for tenure and promotion purposes. Additional details are presented in the *Faculty Manual* and the CAHNRS Assessment Matrices. These criteria are intended to be sufficiently specific to guide all concerned, and at the same time, permit a degree of value judgment.

The criteria are specific for different functions (teaching, extension and research). They should be realistically applied to the percentage of employment (50% teaching/40% research for individual A, 100% research for individual B, etc.).

To prevent confusion and misunderstanding among directors, chair of the department, and faculty, position descriptions should be well conceived, described and administered. For example, a faculty member on a 50% teaching/50% research appointment shall have duties that closely approximate the apportionment. The chair shall see that assigned duties are as consistent as possible with appointment. Faculty members on 100% research appointments at R & E Centers, for example, should be evaluated for tenure and promotion on the basis of full-time research. If such faculty members are engaged in extension activities, the appointments should be changed or the duties limited to research. This is particularly important to the morale, well being and advancement of non-tenured and junior faculty. Regardless of apportionment, public service to the university, the state, or on the national level, shall likewise be considered in the evaluation process.

Teaching

1. Knowledge of subject.
2. Inclusion of important, representative materials in the course and presentation of significant theories, concepts, ideas and principles.
3. Effective organization of the course and of individual lectures and laboratories.
4. Effective delivery of course materials.
5. Effective testing of students' performance.
6. Effective guidance of graduate students.

Extension

1. Establishment of programs aimed at specific problems.

2. Evidence of leadership rather than reaction to problems after the fact.
3. Assistance to, and training of, county agents and key persons in agribusiness.
4. Effective use of newspapers, radio, television and internet, and preparation of current publications on specific subjects.
5. Ability to organize and participate in short courses, commodity meetings, field days, twilight tours, etc.
6. Activity as liaison between growers and research workers, reporting changes in diseases to the growers and researchers.

### Research

1. Competent research, whether applied or basic or both. The “mix” of basic and applied research should be consistent with the description of the position and the current Agricultural Research Center CRIS Project description.
2. The capacity to conceive and complete well-designed experiments, applied or basic, and publish the results promptly. Evaluation should recognize that some kinds of studies (for example, some field studies) entail several years, and the number of publications from such studies cannot equal the numbers generated by other studies, which may generate publishable results more rapidly.
3. Published results should generally be judged of greater value than oral presentations.
4. Papers published in refereed journals should be judged primarily on quality and secondarily on number and length. Full-length papers shall be judged of much greater value than abstracts.
5. Solution of a practical problem should be as worthy of potential reward as solution of a basic problem.
6. Development and release of breeding lines and/or cultivars should be recognized as significant research contributions.
7. Researchers should have sufficient flexibility to respond to changing conditions in their particular areas of responsibility, but they should not jump from one problem to another precipitously without thorough assessment of the situation.

Non-tenured faculty should concentrate primarily on teaching, extension and research (i.e., in approximate proportion to their appointments).

The following criteria apply most heavily to tenured faculty:

### Service

1. Service to various segments of Washington agriculture (commodity groups, agribusiness) and to science should become more easily recognized with the passing of time and should be rewarded.
2. Service to state, regional and national agriculture, and scientific societies should be rewarded.
3. Service to the department, experiment stations, College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences, and university should be rewarded.

Researchers, in general, should guard against undue expenditure of time in extension activities that dilute their effectiveness as researchers. However, some extension-type work by researchers (up to 10% of their time) is expected by CAHNRS Administration and beneficial to the effectiveness of the institution and to the scientist by maintaining open communication with stakeholders. Extension-type activities, which are not included in the job assignment, must not become counterproductive.

### Professional Development

Faculty members tend to become narrow and highly specialized with time. The department chair and station directors should support measures to counter this attrition of interest, knowledge, and skills as much as possible. This can be done by fostering appropriate seminars and encouraging participation in short courses and scientific meetings. In addition, the university provides for professional leaves (<http://cahnrs.wsu.edu/fs/pro-dev.html>), and these should be used carefully for personal growth.

### Interpersonal Relationships

All employees should strive to minimize friction among faculty, staff and students. This is not to imply popularity contests, but to stress the need for collegial working relationships.

### Exposure to Young Faculty

Given the widely distributed nature of the Department of Plant Pathology, the chair should encourage interaction of faculty at different locations through all departmental activities to provide exposure of Pullman-based faculty to those at the R & E Centers, and vice-versa.