WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

School of
Design and Construction
VOILAND COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURE

2.3 SDC Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

This document contains guidelines for tenure and promotion within the School of Design and Construction (SDC) at Washington State University (WSU).[1] These guidelines are supplementary to procedures, policies, and criteria specified in the Provost's Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure, the WSU *Faculty Manual*, and the Voiland College of Engineering and Architecture (VCEA). In cases where conflicts arise because the various documents are not precisely in concert with one another, the *Faculty Manual* and/or those documents recommended by the Office of the Provost shall take precedence.

The SDC Tenure and Promotion Guidelines are intended to provide specific directives for faculty seeking tenure and promotion within the School of Design and Construction. They are also intended to provide guidance for SDC tenure and promotion committees, the SDC director, and the SDC administrative manager as they navigate the complexities of the tenure and promotion process. All SDC faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion must be evaluated under these guidelines.

The SDC supports the university's land-grant mission in recognizing value and excellence in both traditional modes of scholarship and teaching, as well as ways that extend beyond traditionally recognized activities such as community-engaged and translational research and practice. The school is committed to diversity, equity, and inclusion in its tenure and promotion practices.

SDC administration should review this document annually to ensure relevancy and compliance with university and/or college policies and to update the following links:

[Faculty Manual (Presidential Approved for 2021-21)](#)

[Provost and Executive Vice President's Recommendations for Faculty Promotion and/or Tenure and Regents Professor Nomination (June 2, 2021)](#)

[Voiland College of Engineering and Architecture Tenure and Promotion](#)

If revisions to the criteria of the SDC Tenure and Promotion Guidelines are warranted, the SDC director should appoint a representative faculty committee to propose changes to the document and follow faculty manual procedures for adoption. The adoption process shall be approved by a majority vote of all tenured and tenure-track candidates by anonymous ballot (see *Faculty Manual,* pp. 81-82).

Prior to any evaluation, the SDC director should consult the candidate's initial letter of appointment. If inconsistencies between the appointment letter and the current responsibilities of the faculty member have shifted, such shifts must be accounted for in the evaluation. Furthermore, faculty will be evaluated for tenure and promotion according to the tenure and promotion guidelines that were adopted at the time of their initial appointment to their respective track. The expectations for advancement will not change during the candidate's progression toward the next level of advancement.

II. Procedures and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (tenure-track)

The standard length for the *granting* of tenure and promotion from assistant to associate professor at WSU is six years, although candidates are *considered* for advancement in rank after five years. Thus, nearly all material for the tenure and promotion dossier must be complete by the conclusion of the fifth academic year. Under most circumstances, faculty appointed at the assistant professor rank will be considered for promotion to associate professor at the time of tenure consideration. The same criteria and procedures will apply to both promotion and the granting of tenure.

Candidates seeking early consideration for tenure and promotion must receive the written support of the SDC director, dean(s), and provost or the advanced standing will be outlined in the candidate's contract. For accelerated tenure and promotion cases (particularly for those tenure-track faculty who may be joining WSU from another unit or institution), accomplishments and contributions in research, scholarship, and/or creative activities; teaching; and service since joining the SDC shall be more heavily weighted.

The following faculty members make recommendations on tenure and promotion from assistant professor to associate professor: tenured associate professors and tenured professors. The following faculty recommend promotion to professor: tenured professors.

A. Tenure and promotion mentoring committee

1. Committee composition: Within three months of initial appointment, the director will provide a tenure and promotion mentoring committee for tenure-track faculty members. The director will appoint this committee after consulting with the candidate and appropriate faculty about its membership. The director is urged to consider carefully the composition of this committee, ensuring the most appropriate committee members for the candidate.

Each committee must consist of at least three tenured faculty members, ideally appropriate to the candidates' research trajectory and interests. Two of these tenured faculty should be from the SDC, and one of these two SDC representatives should be the chair. The director will appoint a chair under the advisement of the candidate and/or selected faculty members.

2. Committee role: The mentoring committee must keep abreast of the candidate's research trajectory, teaching accomplishments, and service contributions. The committee should act in an advisory role as candidates prepare materials and content for any (optional) presentations to faculty and staff; the intensive (third-year) review; and final the tenure and promotion dossier and colloquium. The committee also should attempt to position candidates for success in tenure and promotion by providing advice for the organization of materials in presentations and dossiers, however, this advisement should not be confused with advocacy. Peer review of candidates' teaching effectiveness is also coordinated by the chair of the committee. If possible, the chair should solicit evaluations from faculty who can provide an unbiased report (thus, ideally, faculty who have not co-taught; collaborated on grants or research; or are otherwise invested in a positive outcome). The chair of the committee also must ensure that at least one meeting with the candidate per year is held, but it is ultimately the

responsibility of the candidates—through accomplishments in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; teaching; and service—to ensure that they have put themselves in the best position for success.

3. Committee meetings and report: The mentoring committee must have a formal meeting with the candidate at least once an academic year to review and discuss the candidate's progress towards tenure and, if necessary, to highlight areas where improvement is needed. A report—to be shared with the candidate, members of the committee, and the director—will be drafted and must include a list of members present, an assessment of the candidate's accomplishments and progress, and clear directions for improvement. This formal, annual meeting should occur in the second half of the fall semester and the report should filed with the administrative manager by the first day of the spring semester so the report can assist the director with the annual review. Candidates may request to meet with their mentoring committees more than once a year (or mentoring committees may request more than one meeting per year); however, only one report must be filed annually. Of course, candidates may wish to seek advice or counsel from any tenured faculty member at any time but are urged to make their mentoring committee aware if such consultation is extensive.

4. Changes to the committee: The mentoring committee should be maintained for the duration of the candidate's time to tenure, after which point the committee should be dissolved. If a change in committee composition is necessary, the director should work with the candidate (and the committee) to identify an appropriate replacement. Candidates may also request that the committee makeup be changed at any time.

B. Intensive review (third-year)

1. Peer review of teaching: Once during the first three years of service (prior to the intensive/third-year review), the chair of the mentoring committee shall initiate an evaluation of teaching for the candidate. The chair may ask any faculty member of higher rank (including any member of the mentoring committee) to attend an instructional session provided by the candidate and evaluate the candidate's teaching. Ideally, the chair will choose a faculty evaluator with at least a working understanding of the candidate's subject or methods. Once selected, the candidate and evaluator may work out the best day/time for the evaluation.

Following the session, the evaluator shall fill out the "Peer Review Teaching Evaluation Form" (SDC Policy 2.4) to the best of their ability. This evaluation form will be submitted to the director and administrative manager, placed in the candidate's file, and included in the candidate's dossier.

2. Intensive (third-year) dossier preparation: During the third academic year of the candidate's appointment (or in the year specified in the candidate's letter of appointment), a review shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures specified in the *Faculty Manual*. The candidate, under the guidance of the mentoring committee, shall prepare a dossier to include past annual reviews; curriculum vitae; teaching portfolio (no more than five pages); articles and/or creative work either published or in process; and relevant supplementary material (e.g., conference presentations; posters;

grant applications; evidence of exhibitions; professional or consulting activity; awards; letters of support; and unsolicited commendation from colleagues, students, or alumni).

Candidates are encouraged to include narrative statements that describe the direction and efforts of their research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; teaching; and service (see Office of the Provost guidelines, p. 9). Each of these statements should be no more than two single-spaced pages. An optional context statement, describing special circumstances placed upon a faculty member, also may be included. This context statement is typically distinct from the research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; teaching; and service statement(s). The development of the dossier should be in accordance with the policies set forth by VCEA, the *Faculty Manual*, and the Office of the Provost.

3. Intensive (third-year) dossier dissemination: Candidates shall make their dossier available to all tenured faculty in the school, and must submit that material to the administrative manager by a date specified by the director—typically in January of the spring semester of the third year. The tenured faculty of the SDC should have at least a week to review the candidate's third-year dossier prior to the candidate's presentation.

4. Intensive (third-year) review presentation: Candidates shall have the opportunity to present their accomplishments in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; teaching; and service to the entire SDC faculty and staff—typically in February of the year of intensive review. Following this presentation, which should be limited to no more than twenty (20) minutes, a question-and-answer period will take place. Following this, only tenured faculty shall remain to discuss the candidate's progress, and recommendations will be distributed to tenured faculty per the guidelines in the *Faculty Manual*. The presentation at the third-year is intended to provide context and clarify any questions from the tenured faculty; however, the presentation is not a replacement for the dossier. The dossier is the package that is to be considered when evaluating candidates for tenure and promotion.

5. The intensive (third-year) review form: Tenured faculty shall have two weeks to complete a recommendation form to the school's administrative manager, who shall collect them for the director. In completing recommendations, tenured faculty should be sure to account for the entirety of the candidate's accomplishments up to that point. The recommendations, available annually from the provost's office, will ask tenured faculty to choose from the following criteria:

- Well prepared
- Satisfactory
- Improvement needed
- Unsatisfactory

5. Intensive review (third-year) administrative form: Per the provost's guidelines, the director must collect recommendations from tenured faculty and write a draft letter of evaluation on the intensive review administrative form. That letter must attempt to summarize faculty recommendations (and, if helpful, verbal discussion at the presentation) and the director must provide an overall evaluation.

The director must provide all tenured faculty at least two weeks to review the draft report and provide additional feedback to the director, if necessary. After this point, the director should arrange to meet with the candidate for discussion and signature(s). The candidate has the opportunity to provide an addendum to that form if desired.

The form is then forwarded to the dean, who makes an additional recommendation and forwards the candidate's materials to the provost. The evaluations from the provost, dean, and director become a permanent part of the candidate's file. The director is responsible for meeting with the candidate to discuss the review following the provost's decision. More information about this process can be found in the *Faculty Manual*.

C. Final tenure and promotion review

1. Final tenure and promotion dossier preparation: By the conclusion of the fifth academic year of the candidate's appointment (usually in May), the candidate, under the guidance of the mentoring committee and the director, per guidelines released by the Office of the Provost (which may be updated annually), shall prepare an updated and more extensive dossier than that which was prepared for the intensive (third-year) review. Similar to the intensive review, however, the dossier should include:

- past annual reviews (these may be included for faculty perusal, but may not be distributed to external reviewers);
- peer reviews of teaching
- optional statements, in narrative form, that describe:
    - research, scholarship, and/or creative activity
    - teaching
    - service, and
    - if necessary, an appointment context statement that explains any particular circumstances that may have affected the time-to-tenure.
    - (Each of these statements should not exceed two single-spaced pages.)
- curriculum vitae
- teaching portfolio (no more than five pages, and organized as closely as possible to the categories as specified in the guidelines that can be downloaded from the Office of the Provost website)
- summary of teaching evaluation scores organized by year
- articles and/or creative work either published or in process
- relevant supplementary material (e.g., conference presentations; posters; grant applications; evidence of exhibitions; professional or consulting activity; awards; letters of support; or unsolicited commendation from colleagues, students, or alumni)

Candidates should be careful to include only relevant material, and also should coordinate with VCEA's recommendations for organization and content. It is expected that all files viewed and assessed by SDC faculty and selected external reviewers as part of the tenure and promotion process should be done electronically. To upload and view files, a "Sharepoint," "OneDrive," or other related site exclusive to tenured SDC faculty and selected external reviewers shall be created by the SDC director.

2. Additional peer review of teaching: Candidates must obtain at least one additional peer review of teaching following the intensive (third-year) review. As with the pre-

intensive peer review, the chair of the mentoring committee should initiate the evaluation process and select a faculty member of higher rank to attend an instructional session given by the candidate. Ideally, this faculty member should be different than the faculty member who completed the initial review, though exceptions could be granted with consultation between the candidate, the chair of the mentoring committee, and the director. The evaluator shall fill out the Peer Review Teaching Evaluation Form (SDC Policy 2.4). This assessment form will be submitted to the director and administrative manager, placed in the candidate's file, and included in the dossier.

3. Final tenure and promotion dossier dissemination for external letters: The candidate shall work with the mentoring committee and the director in May to identify outside evaluators for external letters. A minimum of four (4) letters must be attained from higher-ranking faculty at peer or higher-ranking institutions. No more than half of those external letters shall come from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

Once external reviewers agree to evaluate the candidate, the director must work with the administrative manager to ensure that all dossiers are mailed to external reviewers in the manner of their choice (either hard copy or electronic). It is highly advisable that all dossiers are sent out no later than early June in order to ensure that external reviewers have enough time to evaluate and compose their letter; it is also advisable so that the requisite number of letters (four) is obtained by the time of faculty evaluation. Tenured faculty evaluations are based on the dossier and external letters. Directors may choose to solicit *more* than the requisite number of letters to ensure that enough are available; however, should more than the minimum eventually come in, the director is obligated to include all of them with the candidate's dossier materials for review.

4. Final tenure and promotion colloquium: Similar to the intensive (third-year) review, candidates shall be encouraged to present their accomplishments in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; teaching; and service to the entire SDC faculty and staff in a final tenure and promotion colloquium, typically during late August or September of the sixth year. At least one week prior to the colloquium, the candidate's dossier should be made available to the tenured faculty of the unit. The final tenure and promotion colloquium should provide a comprehensive summation of the candidate's work as well as their plans for the future. This colloquium presentation should be limited to twenty (20) minutes, after which a question-and-answer period will take place. Following this, only tenured faculty shall remain to discuss the candidate's progress, and final tenure recommendation forms will be distributed to tenured faculty per the guidelines in the *Faculty Manual*. The colloquium presentation at final tenure and promotion is intended to provide context and clarify any questions from the tenured faculty; however, the presentation is not a replacement for the dossier. The dossier is the package that is to be considered when evaluating candidates for tenure and promotion.

5. Final tenure and promotion recommendations: Tenured faculty shall have at least two weeks following the colloquium to submit completed recommendation forms to the school's administrative manager, who shall collect them for the director. These recommendations by tenured faculty in the school are to be based on the reading of the dossier and external letters. All eligible faculty members must fill out a recommendation

form, check one of two boxes (to recommend tenure and promotion or to recommend denial) and defend their selection. Recommendations with more thoughtful and objective analyses of the candidate's case will be taken more seriously than those with little rationale and little effort.

6. Director's assessment: Per the provost's guidelines, the director must collect recommendations from tenured faculty and write a letter of assessment, which is typically due in the dean's office in September. That letter should summarize faculty recommendations (as well as any discussion), but it should be a more comprehensive letter than an annual review or the letter written for the intensive (third-year) review. This letter must evaluate the candidate's research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; teaching; and service in light of their profession, peers, and school mission. The director also must provide an overall evaluation. It is not expected that the director reveal the content of that letter (or the decision) to the candidate or other school faculty. It is also not expected that the director meet with the candidate to discuss the progress of the case as it moves forward.

7. Deans' area and provost review: The candidate's dossier, replete with the director's assessment, faculty recommendations, external letters, annual reviews, and intensive (third-year) review are to proceed to the dean's area for internal review. A tenure and promotion committee at the college level, comprised of representatives from all units in the college, will review the package and provide a recommendation and written assessment to the dean. The dean then advances their recommendation (to grant or deny tenure and promotion), along with the dossier, to the Office of the Provost.

D. Criteria for advancement of rank to Associate Professor

Candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the SDC must demonstrate:

- outstanding accomplishments in research, scholarship, and/or creative activities;
- effective teaching; and
- adequacy in both professional service and university service.

Within those three areas of criteria, all candidates must also demonstrate effective, respectful, and professional interaction with faculty, staff, and students. That interaction should allow basic academic freedoms such as dissent or differences in opinion but should not detract from the progress or advancement of others. Furthermore, the potential for candidates to meet the requirements for future promotion to the rank of Professor must be apparent.

Tenure-track faculty in the SDC are evaluated based upon their workload defined in their contract. It is, however, understood that it is difficult for faculty to break down their time commitments in ways precisely mirroring this percentage breakdown, and that workload responsibilities may have shifted since the original contract was signed. Furthermore, tenure-track faculty may excel more in one category than the other(s), and the WSU Faculty Manual recognizes the overlap "among scholarship, teaching and service activities" (*Faculty Manual,* p. 68). The SDC defines research, scholarship and

creative work according to Ernest Boyer's interrelated dimensions of scholarship: discovery, integration, application, teaching, and engagement.[2]

Along these lines, given the important, intensive, and frequently time-consuming responsibilities for SDC tenure-track faculty in areas of community, professional, and/or industry and commercial engagement, several accomplishments potentially considered as teaching or service may be more accurately credited as research, scholarship, and/or creative activity. Faculty engaged in such responsibilities often address applied research and engagement, generating outcomes of public and intellectual value. These activities, addressed in various ways in the tiers, below, may help and/or promote the school, college, and/or university by creating, clarifying, codifying, and communicating knowledge in ways that are different, but no less effective, than more traditional forms of research, scholarship, and/or creative activity. To the extent that it is possible, such work should be disseminated and peer reviewed. All reviewers should carefully consider the dossiers of faculty members whose body of work falls substantially into these areas of engagement. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain the intellectual contribution, significance, and impact of such work in the narrative of the dossier.[3]

Regardless, for tenure and promotion to the level of Associate Professor, there will be no substitute for one of category or percentage appointment nearly completely at the expense of another (for example, no tenure-track faculty members can dedicate nearly all of their time to teaching and expect to receive tenure), and tenure and/or promotion will not ordinarily be granted to faculty members who satisfy only minimal standards of any of these categories. Tenure-track candidates also should be mindful to balance their loads during their time-to-tenure, and the SDC director and tenure mentoring committees should be vigilant that this is enforced.

To assist tenure-track and tenured candidates seeking promotion to higher ranks, the SDC has established "tiers" of performance both for research, scholarly, and/or creative activity and for teaching. The tiers are intended less as prescriptive guidelines than as suggestions as to where candidates might focus their energies. It is understood that many candidates will need to establish more than a few accomplishments in tiers three or two prior to achieving a tier one product; evaluators must consider candidates' trajectory and progress when evaluating their dossiers.

Candidates for tenure and promotion should strive for at least five (5) Tier One products in each of the categories of research, scholarship, and creative activity; and teaching. However, it is understood that the number of Tier One products may vary. Where research, scholarship, and creative activity are concerned, for example, they may vary depending upon the size or quality of the publication or venue. For example, a single-authored book published by a reputable press (which typically takes several years to reach publication) may carry more weight than several published articles; a published article in a prestigious journal may carry more weight than two or three articles published in less prestigious journals; a nationally awarded or recognized project in design or construction may carry more weight than two or three projects awarded or recognized in local competitions.

Candidates should not, however, focus upon stacking accomplishments in Tier Two and Tier Three and expect to achieve tenure and/or promotion, for many Tier Two and Tier Three products are intended as building blocks for achieving Tier One products (in other words, it should not appear that candidates are *intentionally* stacking accomplishments in Tier Two or Tier Three to avoid Tier One). Candidates whose contributions fall entirely outside of Tier One or who find it challenging to achieve Tier One products are urged to communicate regularly with their mentoring committee and the director to clarify their contributions towards tenure and promotion.

Tenure and promotion will be evaluated based upon 1) Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activity; 2) Teaching; and 3) Service:

1. **Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activity**
   The dissemination of outstanding research, scholarship, and/or creative activities is fundamental to all tenure-track candidates seeking advancement to associate professor in the SDC. Candidates are expected to develop and maintain an independent, focused, and sustained program of high-quality disseminated research, scholarship, and/or creative activity that can be distinguished from that of others. Multi-authored, collaborative, and/or interdisciplinary disseminated peer-reviewed projects are also encouraged, but candidates' specific contributions to such projects must be clear and should not be pursued to such an extent that they blend too heavily with the work of others. The work, whether independent or collaborative, should be peer reviewed.[4]

   Research, scholarship, and/or creative activity initiated prior to arrival at WSU (and published after one's arrival) may be counted towards tenure and promotion, but there must be clear evidence of a scholarly body of work from research initiated at WSU. If extramural support (i.e. grants) is vital for candidates to establish or sustain their research program, then peer-reviewed, disseminated outputs should accompany that support. While often prestigious, extramural support alone does not constitute the dissemination of scholarly and creative work.

   A candidate's research, scholarship, and/or creative activity should a) advance the theoretical, practical, and/or creative knowledge base of architecture, construction engineering, construction management, interior design, landscape architecture, and/or related disciplines in design and construction; b) demonstrate a comprehensive and up-to-date engagement with the existing body of knowledge that constitutes the basis of the candidate's area of research; and c) be published or displayed in peer-reviewed regional, national, or international journals or venues sponsored by relevant professional organizations. Candidates also should demonstrate that their research, scholarship, and/or creative activity contributes to the core mission, vision, and values of the SDC.

   Gray areas often exist depending upon the program, discipline, profession, and industry and/or the shifting reputations of journals, publishers, conferences, exhibition venues, fellowships, scholarships, and grants. Thus, it is recommended that candidates work consistently with their mentoring committee and the director to determine the value of their research, scholarship, and/or creative activity for

tenure and promotion. If candidates have been receiving a consistent message about the direction and success of their research, scholarship, and/or creative activity (as reflected in annual reviews, annual mentoring committee reports, and the intensive third-year review), there should be no surprises regarding the relative value of the venues in which work is being disseminated by the time of tenure and promotion consideration.

The products as distributed in the tiers below provide *suggestions* for advancement, though candidates should strive to achieve at least five (5) products in Tier One, and several products in tiers Two and Three. It is understood, however, that because of the differences between programs and ever-shifting opinions about what constitutes "value" in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity, the bullet points below may constitute higher (or lower) tier products at any given time. It is the responsibility of candidates and mentoring committees to make a case for the value of certain items included in their dossier. No matter the numbers of accomplishments in each of the tiers, candidates and evaluators are reminded that for the ultimate evaluation of research, scholarship and creative activity, "the quality of the work, not the sheer quantity, is the primary criterion." (*Faculty Manual,* p. 69).

It is the responsibility of the candidate to explicitly outline in the dossier CV, statement(s), and supporting materials the significance of the research, scholarship, or creative activity to their field, discipline, and/or across disciplines. Furthermore, the candidate should explain how the various scholarly activities collectively establish them as a prominent scholar in their field, discipline, and/or across disciplines.

Research, scholarship, and/or creative activity in the SDC will be assessed based upon the following criteria:

Tier One
- Published, peer-reviewed book(s) representing original work with the candidate as principal or co-author, issued by a reputable academic publisher (e.g. a university press). A single book should be granted significant weight for tenure and promotion consideration.
- Book manuscripts, with the candidate as principal author, accepted by a reputable academic publisher (following peer-review and with evidence of acceptance).
- Peer-reviewed articles, with the candidate as principal or co-author, published in recognized regional, national, or international journals or edited books.
- Peer-reviewed articles, with the candidate as principal author or co-author, accepted—but not yet published—by recognized regional, national, or international journals or edited books. Such articles must either be in press or pending only minor revisions with no additional peer review. Evidence of acceptance must be included in the dossier as well as a brief statement about what is required for completion.
- Editor or co-editor of a published, peer-reviewed book, issued by a reputable academic publisher (e.g. a university press), with evidence of scholarly production in association with the book (e.g., introduction, contributed article, conclusion/epilogue, chapter prologues).

- Book chapter in an edited, peer reviewed book with the candidate as principal author (accepted by a reputable academic publisher).
- Publication of peer-reviewed papers in conference proceedings of recognized regional, national, or international organizations (provided a case can be made that publication in conference proceedings is on par with a published, peer-reviewed journal sponsored by that organization and/or in the specific discipline).
- Completed projects in architecture, construction engineering, construction management, interior design, or landscape architecture (or related fields) recognized through awards or meritorious citations by professional design or construction organizations or juries.
- Publication of creative work or construction projects, with the designer or construction manager as lead author, in recognized and peer-reviewed regional, national, or international design or construction journals.
- Exhibitions of creative work at museums, galleries, or exhibitions of regional, national, or international significance, selected through peer review.
- Competition entries with a demonstrated, disseminated, and peer-reviewed scholarly component.
- Lead-PI on a successful research-oriented grant of national or international significance (peer-reviewed, disseminated work should emerge from this grant).
- Awarded fellowships and/or scholarships of regional, national, or international repute, adjudicated by peer-review panels.
- National or international award for research.
- Completed multimedia works such as product design, graphic design, artwork, film, digital media, or other related activities that have a demonstrated scholarly component and a relationship to the fields of architecture, construction engineering, construction management, interior design, or landscape architecture. This work should be recognized through awards or meritorious citations by professional organizations or juries or through publication in recognized regional, national, or international journals.
- Public presentations, workshops, reports, publications, designs, site plans, built work, or related activity, with a substantial and demonstrated impact, completed in conjunction with the culmination of a major community, professional, or commercial/industry engagement activity.
- Involvement of graduate students and/or postdoctoral scholars in research activities, with evidence of dissemination.
- Issued patents.

Tier Two
- Published, peer-reviewed books or articles in reputable journals with the candidate as secondary or other author (in these cases, the candidate's contributions must be specified in the curriculum vitae).
- Book chapter in an edited peer reviewed book with the candidate as second or supporting author (accepted by a reputable academic publisher).

- Co-PI (or CO-I) on a successful research-oriented grant of national or international significance (peer-reviewed, disseminated work should emerge from this grant).
- Lead-PI on a successful research-oriented grant of regional significance (peer-reviewed, disseminated work is expected to emerge from this grant).
- Leading, organizing, or presenting workshops surrounding research activities.
- Invitation to build or exhibit completed, peer-reviewed creative designs or construction projects with a demonstrated scholarly component. (Evidence of invitation must be included in the file.)
- Invited paper, keynote or plenary speaker at a conference of regional, national, or international repute.
- Session chair for a regional, national, or international professional or academic conference (includes peer-reviewed selection as chair as well as shaping the session content and selecting and editing papers for presentation).
- Live presentation of peer-reviewed papers in regional, national, or international professional or academic conferences.
- Curatorial roles in reputable regional, national, or international exhibitions or competitions.
- Peer-reviewed poster presentations at regional, national, or international professional or academic conferences.
- Published reviews of books or exhibitions in reputable regional, national, or international journals.
- Transfer or adoption of research or scholarly outcomes in regional, national, or international policy, code, or practices.
- Reviews of candidate's scholarly, creative, or construction work in reputable regional, national, or international publications.
- Citations, bibliographic references, or narrative discussion of candidate's scholarly, creative, or construction work in reputable regional, national, or international publications.
- Public presentations, workshops, reports, publications, designs, site plans, built work, or related activity, with a demonstrated impact, completed in conjunction with a community or commercial/industry engagement exercise.
- Research resulting in IP licensing, commercialization, or contributions to the public domain (such as open source professional articles)
- Involvement of undergraduate students in research activities, with some evidence of dissemination.

Tier Three
- Creative and/or scholarly works-in-progress with potential for tangible peer-reviewed outcomes including publication, construction, grant funding, or awards.
- Submitted or rejected research-oriented grants, fellowships, or awards with candidate as either Lead-PI or Co-PI to agencies of regional, national, or international significance.
- Co-PI (or Co-I) on an accepted research-oriented grant of regional significance.
- Recognition for work in reputable regional, national, or international competitions.
- Demonstrated research activity that contributes to innovative instruction.

- Accepted abstract submission to conferences of regional, national, or international significance.
- Invited lecture, workshop, or short course as part of an academic lecture series.
- Consulting role, with demonstrable scholarly or research component, on major projects in the fields of architecture, construction engineering, construction management, interior design, landscape architecture, or related fields.
- Published, peer-reviewed work in trade (or "for-profit") publications
- Recognition of accomplishments through reputable popular media (magazines, newspapers, websites, television, film, etc.).
- Published work with a scholarly or research component in typically non-peer-reviewed or non-scholarly publications (e.g. newspaper articles, online encyclopedias)
- Public presentations, workshops, reports, publications, designs, site plans, built work, or related activity completed in conjunction with a community or commercial/industry engagement exercise.
- Application for patent.

2. Teaching

The SDC expects teaching excellence for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Candidates should demonstrate, through annual teaching, syllabi, assignments, and their teaching portfolio a clearly defined pedagogical narrative and philosophy. These materials should demonstrate the basic skills of effective instruction, including command of subject matter, organization, clarity of presentation, and the ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity. Furthermore, there should be evidence that candidates are imparting contemporary, up-to-date concepts and/or teaching methods and perspectives to students. Faculty in the SDC are expected to continually assess their effectiveness in teaching and adjust their practices to improve student outcomes. School, college and/or university assessment tools should be employed to demonstrate excellence in teaching. Candidates also should strive to demonstrate that their teaching contributes to the core mission, vision, and values of the SDC: in particular, those that demonstrate integration between the disciplines. Beyond simply teaching classes with students from more than one discipline (this may be part of a candidate's regular teaching assignment), special efforts to create innovations in integrated teaching and/or to bridge traditional borders between disciplines should be articulated. Those who can demonstrate success in this realm shall be provided special commendation, although the forms of "success" must be clearly spelled out in the dossier, and ideally substantiated by external factors (e.g. future collaborations, student evaluations).

Teaching in the SDC will be assessed based on the following criteria:

Tier One
- Consistently high student course evaluations (relative to program, school, or college averages).

- Positive peer reviews of teaching performance.
- Interdisciplinary course participation (e.g. SDC courses) with tangible results of success and/or collaboration between students and/or faculty.
- Teaching awards or honors (including advising or coaching a student competition team that wins an award or honor).
- Development of new courses (beyond or including initial appointment).
- Innovative teaching methods, such as flipped classrooms.
- Development of new course content, assignments, lectures, or other instructional activities within older courses.
- Development of courses for distance or online learning (typically in conjunction with WSU Global Campus).
- Development of continuing professional development courses and training/certificates.
- Securing external funding and support for instruction and/or the publication efforts of students.
- Chair of Ph.D. committee.

Tier Two
- Voluntarily teaching classes beyond a normal teaching load.
- Chair of graduate project with demonstrated teaching effort beyond regular course instruction.
- Advisor of undergraduate thesis in the Honors College.
- Evidence of substantial mentorship of SDC graduate thesis and non-thesis project work.
- Evidence of improvements in instruction through assessment tools.
- Instructional supervision or mentoring of independent and/or special student projects with demonstrable effort on the part of faculty (e.g. 499 courses).
- Participation in, and significant contributions to, school study tours beyond regular or assigned course load.
- Teaching courses with a service learning component (e.g. featuring coordination with the Center for Civic Engagement).
- Leading, organizing, or presenting workshops regarding teaching pedagogy, methods, and/or assessment.
- Invited guest lectures, seminars, or workshops provided to other classes in the SDC and/or university.
- Evidence of regular availability and effective feedback to students (through office hours, written evaluations, and/or online correspondence).
- Positive student rapport, as substantiated by student evaluations.
- Effective supervision of teaching assistants (as demonstrated by grading rubrics, TA feedback on student homework, exams, or papers; tips for teaching assistants, etc.).
- Participation as a PhD committee member (not chair).
- Faculty advisor for a student club (with some evidence of advising beyond simply being listed).
- Advisor or coach of a student competition team.

Tier Three

15

- Committee member (not chair or advisor) of masters-level graduate project or undergraduate thesis in the Honors College.
- Consistent instruction in courses where total classroom contact hours, preparation time, enrollment, or grading exceeds that of other courses in the program or school.
- Development and/or updates of classroom instructional assignments or aids to improve learning and retention of course content.
- Attendance at workshops, seminars, and related events focusing upon improvements or innovations in teaching.

3. Service

Effective service is crucial to the effective operations of the program(s), school, college(s), and university, as well as to the professional growth of the tenure-track faculty candidate. Through involvement with the public, service is also essential to the land-grant mission of the university. Tenure-track faculty are generally not expected to provide service at the same level as their tenured colleagues, particularly in the initial years of their appointment, but must contribute annually in some fashion.

There is no prescribed number of service activities that candidates must accomplish in order to fulfill obligations for tenure and promotion. Candidates who find their service activities overlapping with their teaching or their research, scholarship, and/or creative activities must clarify their efforts with their mentoring committee and the SDC director to ensure that credit is provided in the appropriate category. While not divided into tiers, below, it is understood that some of these service activities require a substantial amount of time and should be acknowledged as such (e.g. organizer of a significant regional, national, or international conference; chair of committee necessary for program accreditation, etc.). Demonstrations of service effectiveness should include some mix of program, school, college, and university service; community service; and/or professional service. Service can include, but is not restricted to, any or all of the following:

Program, school, college, and university service
- Participation in, and contributions to, program, school, college, and/or university committees.
- A significant commitment of time on a school, college, or university task force or other special service activity (e.g., serving on a faculty senate committee).
- Mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students beyond curriculum and courses (e.g. "career" advice, job placement advice, résumé/portfolio recommendations).
- Involvement in student recruitment (e.g., SDC ambassador program, recruiting workshops, Alive!, presentations at high schools and/or community colleges).
- Volunteer work that contributes to the quality of education and overall academic experience of students, such as mentoring student activities in construction (e.g., Habitat for Humanity).
- Lectures or presentations at professional or student organization meetings when such lectures are not otherwise counted for teaching or disseminated design or construction research, scholarship, and/or creative activity.

- Significant participation in program activities necessary for professional accreditation.
- Coordination of school or program-related lectures, exhibitions, or symposia outside of the candidate's normal employment responsibilities or committee work.
- Invited or assigned juries of student work.
- Serving as director, program head, or other major administrative appointment, including interim appointments of such.
- Development/alumni activities.
- Noted effort to attend SDC-sponsored events/activities (e.g. evening lectures, commencement, advisory board meetings, mixers, etc.).

Community service

- Civic service activities (not otherwise counted as peer-reviewed research or scholarship) such as participation on community panels; design, construction, or preservation-related consulting; or landscape restoration.
- Citizen service positions, related to professional expertise, in government agencies, commissions, or private non-profit entities (elected, appointed, or volunteer, with proportionate value acknowledged as appropriate by the mentoring committee).
- Volunteer lectures, tours, and workshops.

Professional service

- Organizer of a significant regional, national, or international conference.
- Volunteer work involving professional expertise that contributes to the organization of professional conferences, design competitions, exhibitions, lectures, or related activities.
- Member of editorial board of journal.
- Invited commentator for session of reputable regional, national, or international conference.
- Invited reviewer or juror for research grant proposals.
- Invited peer-reviewer for submitted abstracts, articles, or papers to a reputable scholarly journal or conference.
- Participation as an officer, on advisory boards, or on committees of regional, national, or international professional organizations.
- Consulting engagements with government, industry, academia, or not-for-profit organizations
- Participation on visiting accreditation teams at other institutions.
- Participation in evaluation of examinations supervised by professional registration boards.
- Membership in regional, national, or international professional organizations.
- Technology transfer to further economic development

III. Procedures and Criteria for Promotion to Professor (tenure-track)

To obtain the rank of Professor, candidates must be making contributions to a major area of the candidate's work assignment that exceed the minimum requirements for associate professor. Promotion to this rank shall be recommended only when candidates have achieved national and/or international recognition and a reputation as an established leader in their field of endeavor. The latter must be documented by a well-established scholarly program, a substantial body and/or celebrated quality of peer-reviewed work, evidence of professional stature, and continued excellence in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; teaching; and service.

Only under extraordinary circumstances will candidates be considered for promotion to professor prior to the end of their fifth year of service as an associate professor, with the promotion, if granted, awarded at the end of the sixth year. Dossier materials shall be due at the end of the academic year at an agreed-upon date between candidate and director, usually in May-June.

A. Mentoring committee

Associate professors, at any time, may request of the SDC director a mentoring committee to help guide them towards promotion. Upon request, the SDC director should engage the candidate about membership composition and work towards appointing a mentoring committee which should consist of at least three full professors, at least one of whom should be in the SDC. The candidate should meet with the mentoring committee at least once every two years following its establishment until such time that the candidate feels ready to prepare a dossier for promotion. If held, brief summaries of these meetings should be provided to the SDC director by a volunteer from the committee, but such reports are not required. Should associate professors choose not to pursue a mentoring program at all, to help gauge the chances of success the SDC highly encourages the candidate to engage informally with full professors during the year prior to dossier preparation.

B. Procedures for promotion to Professor

The procedure for promotion to Professor is similar to that of Associate Professor (II, above). However, there is no requirement that a candidate *must* be considered for promotion following five years of service in rank as an Associate Professor. If the director is of equal rank as the candidate desiring promotion, the director must consult with the dean of the candidate's respective college to appoint a higher-ranked faculty member to see the candidate through the process. Only with prior approval from the dean and/or provost's office can associate professors be involved in the promotion cases of other associate professors.

1. Promotion dossier preparation: By May of the year that material is due in the dean's office, the candidate should complete a promotion dossier that meets the parameters outlined in the *Faculty Manual* and the Office of the Provost and is ready for submission to external reviewers. The candidate, under the guidance of the director (or appointed full professor who has been asked to advance the case) and/or a mentoring committee, shall prepare the dossier.

The dossier should include:

- past annual reviews (for WSU faculty perusal only; they should not be viewed by external reviewers);
- curriculum vitae;
- a narrative statement outlining research, scholarship, and creative activity; teaching; and service (not to exceed two single-spaced pages);
- books, articles, or creative work published and/or in process;
- evidence of successful grant submissions (if applicable);
- a teaching portfolio (no more than five pages);
- a summary of teaching evaluation scores by year;
- a context statement per the provost's guidelines explaining any unusual circumstances of the case; and
- relevant supplementary material (e.g. national and/or international awards including conference presentations, posters, grant applications, evidence of exhibitions, professional or consulting activity, letters of support, unsolicited commendation from colleagues, students, or alumni).
- *Candidates should include only relevant material and, in particular, only material completed since receiving tenure.*

It is the responsibility of the candidate to explicitly outline in the dossier CV, statement(s) and supporting materials the significance of the research, scholarship, and/or creative activity on the field, discipline, or across disciplines. Furthermore, the candidate is responsible for explaining how the various scholarly activities collectively establish the candidate as a national and/or internationally recognized scholar in the field, discipline, or across disciplines.

2. Promotion dossier dissemination for external letters: The candidate shall work with the director in May to identify outside evaluators for external letters and shall provide a list of potential evaluators to the director. A minimum of four (4) letters must be attained from higher-ranking faculty at peer or higher-ranking institutions or from faculty who are widely recognized in the candidate's discipline. No more than half of those external letters shall come from evaluators suggested by the candidate, however.

Once identified, the director must work with the administrative manager to ensure that all dossiers are mailed to external reviewers no later than early June in order to ensure that external reviewers have enough time to evaluate them prior to fall semester. Because external reviewers may still request hard copy dossiers, candidates for promotion to professor, working with the SDC administrative manager, should be prepared to provide both hard copy and digital copies of their dossiers. It is, however, expected that all files viewed and assessed by professors evaluating the case should be done electronically. To maintain confidentiality, a "Sharepoint," "OneDrive," or other related site must be created for the uploading and viewing of files.

3. Promotion colloquium: As with the consideration for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates for the rank of Professor shall be encouraged to present their accomplishments in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; teaching; and

service to the entire SDC faculty and staff in a promotion colloquium, typically during August or September. At least one week prior to the colloquium, the candidate's dossier should be made available to the tenured SDC faculty members holding academic rank higher than that of the candidate. This colloquium should be limited to no more than twenty (20) minutes, after which a question-and-answer period will take place. Following this, only other professors in the school shall remain to discuss the candidate's progress, and final promotion recommendations will be distributed per the guidelines in the *Faculty Manual*. The colloquium presentation at final tenure and promotion is intended to provide context and clarify any questions from the tenured faculty; however, the presentation is not a replacement for the dossier. The dossier is the package that is to be considered when evaluating candidates for tenure and promotion.

4. Promotion recommendations: Professors shall have two weeks following the colloquium to submit completed recommendations based on the evaluation of the dossier and external letters to the school's administrative manager, who shall collect them for the SDC director (or appointed professor who has been asked to advance the case). All professors in the school must fill out a recommendation to grant or defer promotion. Recommendations with more thoughtful and objective analyses of the candidate's case will be taken more seriously than those with little rationale and little effort.

5. Director's assessment: Per the provost's guidelines, the SDC director (or appointed professor who has been asked to advance the case) must collect recommendations from other professors in the unit and write a letter of assessment, which is typically due in the dean's office in August or September. That letter should summarize the recommendations (as well as any discussion), but also must evaluate the candidate's research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; teaching; and service in light of their profession, peers, and school mission. The director also must provide an overall evaluation. It is not expected that the director reveal the content of that letter or decision to the candidate or other professors in the school. It is also not expected that the director meet with the candidate to discuss the progress of the case as it moves forward.

6. Dean's area and provost review: The candidate's dossier, replete with the director's assessment, faculty recommendations, external letters, and annual reviews are to proceed to the dean of VCEA for internal review. A tenure and promotion committee at the college level, comprised of representatives from several college departments, programs, or schools, will review the package and provide a recommendation and written assessment to the dean. The dean will then advance their recommendation (to grant or deny promotion), along with the dossier, to the provost.

C. Criteria for advancement in rank to Professor

Criteria for advancement in rank to Professor are generally the same as those for advancement in rank to Associate Professor (section II.E, above). Unless shifts in workload responsibility between research and teaching have been agreed upon in

writing with the SDC director (to best facilitate the strength of the school), all associate professors will be required to demonstrate excellence in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; teaching; and service for promotion to professor.

Candidates for the rank of Professor must provide documented evidence that the quality and quantity of accomplishments are at a significantly higher level than that expected of an Associate Professor, including disseminated scholarly design or construction research or creative activities. Accomplishments can include innovations in teaching methods carried out in conjunction with the candidate's teaching, but must be disseminated through rigorous peer review. According to the *Faculty Manual,* p. 83, the candidate must also demonstrate "national, and preferably international, prominence" through "some form of recognized achievement reviewed by appropriate professionals for promotion to professor." Candidates in the SDC should be clear about the level and value of "national" or "international" prominence; for example, in some fields, domestic (U.S.)-based organizations, journals, universities, and conferences are considered the pinnacle of research and creative activity. Presenting at a conference abroad or publishing in an international journal, for example, should not automatically be considered of higher value than presenting or publishing in a domestic venue or journal. National and/or international prominence is most often achieved through outstanding accomplishments sustained over several years—with promise of continuation. A high level of professional activity typically accompanies such recognition, including leadership roles in professional organizations.

Evidence of continued accomplishments in all three categories of evaluation identified above (research/scholarship/creative activities; teaching; service and engagement) is also required. Work completed, published, presented, or taught prior to achieving rank as an associate professor may be included in the dossier, but significantly greater weight shall be placed on that which was completed since the initial promotion. Importantly, promotion to full professor will not ordinarily be granted to those faculty members who satisfy only minimal standards of the criteria listed in section II. E., above. Within the three categories of evaluation, all candidates must also demonstrate effective, respectful, and professional interaction with faculty, staff, and students. That interaction should not detract from the progress or advancement of others but is not intended to restrict basic academic freedoms such as dissent or differences in opinion.

1. **Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity**

    In addition to the cumulative qualifications already summarized for tenure and promotion to associate professor (II.E.1, above), a candidate must present evidence of national and/or international recognition, a reputation for sustained scholarly production, and an increased level of professional activity. This evidence may include, but is not limited to, a substantial body of publications; a select few book(s) and/or articles in well-regarded presses or journals; consistent invitations to exhibit or present work at high-quality venues; an established research program with a substantial record of external funding at a level appropriate to the candidate's discipline; major professional service as an editor of peer-reviewed journal(s); invitations to speak to professional organizations or societies; and national and/or international awards.

2. Teaching

The candidate must show evidence of continued development in teaching, as indicated by the criteria listed in II.E.2, above. Special commendation will be provided for those candidates who have made demonstrable efforts to integrate the design and construction disciplines through teaching (beyond simply teaching an SDC course or existing courses with integrated components); who have taken leadership roles within the unit in regards to teaching; or who have made efforts to obtain extramural funding for curriculum development or teaching innovations. While accomplishments in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity will be analyzed more closely for promotion to Professor, it should be emphasized that candidates who cannot present a record of continuing excellence in instruction will not be considered favorably for promotion to this rank. The candidate may request the SDC director to initiate a peer review of teaching (with the assessment included in the dossier). This review could be informal in nature or more formal—according to the protocol referred to in II.C.3, above.

3. Service

The candidate must show evidence of continued and increasing service to the program, school, college(s), university, community, and profession or industry, the categories for which are listed in Section II.E.3, above. Candidates must be able to point to major service contributions in excess of their contributions as an Assistant Professor. These can include, but are not limited to, university task force committees; chairing accreditation processes; curriculum development and/or reorganization; invitations and participation on professional advisory boards; and leadership positions in professional organizations.

IV. Procedures and criteria for promotion of all career-track faculty[5]

A. Overview

Career-track faculty members (scholarly or teaching) are eligible to be granted promotion after six years of service in rank, according to the *Faculty Manual*. Career-track faculty may hold continuous one (1)- to five (5)-year fixed-term or contingent contracts and are eligible to be granted promotion to professor after six *more* years of service in rank. Career-track faculty do not have a set term for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, although six years as an assistant professor is the minimum term in rank to be granted promotion.

Credit toward the six-year minimum requirement as an assistant professor may be given to individuals who transferred with previous years of service at WSU as adjuncts, lecturers, tenure-track faculty, or other designations. Faculty may also remain at the rank of assistant professor and be reappointed to subsequent terms at that rank depending upon the terms of the contract (and provided satisfactory performance continues). Should career-track faculty members (scholarly or teaching) seek promotion, they must undergo a comprehensive review that also includes all the faculty in the unit who hold higher appointments than the candidate filling out a promotion recommendation form. They do not undergo intensive, third-year reviews.

The following faculty members make recommendations on promotion from career-track assistant professor to career-track associate professor (whether to scholarly or teaching): tenured associate professors, tenured professors, career-track associate professors, and career-track professors. The following faculty recommend promotion to career-track professor: tenured professors and career-track professors.

Career-track faculty in the SDC have expectations for accomplishments in teaching and/or service and, depending upon program and school needs, may be expected to hold heavier teaching loads than their tenure-track or tenured colleagues (e.g., a 3-3 load, as opposed to a 2-2 or 2-1 load). Disseminated research, scholarship, and/or creative activities may bolster cases for promotion but should not be used to substitute for excellence in teaching and effectiveness in service.

B. Mentoring for career-track faculty

Within six months of the appointment of the career-track faculty member, the SDC director will appoint a mentoring committee consisting of higher-ranking member(s) of the faculty, with an eye towards those faculty who have established an excellent reputation in those areas required for promotion as either scholars or teachers. (While it may be advisable to have at least one faculty member on the committee who has achieved promotion in the same rank, this does not mean that the mentoring committee should comprise solely of those who have achieved promotion in that precise rank. In other words, a tenured faculty member might be chosen to be a part of this committee).

Mentoring committees are not necessary if the employment is so temporary that promotion will not be an issue and where no guidance is deemed necessary in the performance of the job. Mentoring for scholar or teaching associate professors is

recommended, but—similar to mentoring for associate professors (see III.A, above)—remains optional.

Once appointed, this committee should operate in much the same way as that for tenure-track assistant professors (see II.A, above), but its composition could include a minimum of two faculty members and all should be SDC faculty. Whatever the committee makeup, it should meet with candidates at least once annually and review their accomplishments in the criteria listed below. Similar to the mentoring of tenure-track assistant professors, in a written report to the director the committee will summarize the career-track faculty member's accomplishments, their progress towards promotion, teaching evaluation forms, and any recommendations for improvement. This review should be available to the SDC director prior to the completion of annual reviews by the first day of the spring semester.

C. Procedures for career-track faculty promotion

The procedures for career-track faculty promotion in the SDC will proceed in a manner much the same as that for tenure-track or tenured associate professors and professors (see sections II and III, above). There are some key differences, however, including: 1) external review letters may include those from former students; 2) the content of the dossier should emphasize teaching efforts; and 3) there is no intensive (third-year) review. If the SDC director is not a full professor, for those career-track faculty seeking promotion to scholarly or teaching professor, the director must consult with the dean to determine a higher-ranked faculty member to see the candidate through the process. Career-track or tenured associate professors cannot be involved in the promotion cases for those seeking professor within this rank; only career-track or tenured professors may participate.

The following procedural operations apply both to career-track assistant professors and career-track associate professors seeking promotion:

1. Peer reviews of teaching: At least three times in the five-year period prior to the submission of the promotion dossier, the chair of the mentoring committee shall initiate evaluations of teaching for the candidate. The chair may ask any faculty member of higher rank (including any member of the mentoring committee) to attend instructional session(s) provided by the candidate and evaluate the candidate's teaching. Ideally, the sessions shall be for different classes, and there will be variety in evaluators. Once selected, the candidate and evaluator may work out the best day/time to evaluate.

Following each session, the evaluator(s) shall fill out the peer review teaching form addressing teaching preparation, methods, attitude, knowledge, and overall effectiveness (insofar as their expertise allows). The evaluation form must be shared with the mentoring committee (if one exists), placed in the candidate's file, and included in the promotion dossier.

2. Dossier preparation: Following five years of the candidate's appointment in rank, the candidate shall prepare a dossier of teaching and service accomplishments that includes:
- past annual reviews;

- a no-more-than two-page narrative discussing accomplishments and direction in teaching and service (as well as research, scholarship, and/or creative activity if the candidate so chooses);
- curriculum vitae; teaching portfolio (no more than five pages);
- Summary of teaching evaluations organized by year;
- evidence of teaching innovations and significant service contributions; and
- any supplementary material (e.g., contributions in research, scholarship, or creative activity, letters of support, professional or consulting activity, awards, unsolicited commendation from colleagues, students, or alumni).
- Candidates should be careful to include only relevant material and are encouraged to seek advice from their mentoring committee and/or the director in compiling the dossier.

The dossier should be in accordance with the policies set forth by VCEA, the Office of the Provost, and the *Faculty Manual*. Candidates should be prepared to provide both hard copy and digital copies of their dossiers. It is, however, expected that all files viewed and assessed by SDC faculty as part of the promotion process should be done electronically. To maintain confidentiality, a "Sharepoint," "OneDrive," or other related site must be created for the uploading of files.

3. Letters of support: The candidate should work with the director and mentoring committee to identify four (4) different faculty, professionals, administrators, or former students to write letters of support, although the director may wish to solicit one or two of those letters without consultation from the candidate. While such letters may include those from higher-ranking faculty at peer or higher-ranking institutions, they are not required. However, should letters be obtained from faculty at WSU, those faculty should be from *outside* the SDC, and ideally from faculty of a higher rank than the candidate seeking promotion. Former students, if targeted for letters, should be chosen carefully; students currently in positions of employment with an established rank beyond entry level—and who can speak to the candidate's influence in their career—may carry more weight than those from recent graduates and/or those in entry level positions. To assist in the writing of letters, candidates should be prepared to forward their dossier to all letter writers and must work with the administrative manager in this capacity.

It is highly advisable that all letter requests are sent out no later than in early June in order to ensure that outside evaluators have enough time to inspect the dossier and compose the letter; it is also advisable so that the requisite number of letters (four) is obtained by the time of faculty evaluation. Directors may choose to solicit *more* than the requisite number of letters to ensure that enough are available; however, should more than the minimum eventually come in, the director is obligated to include all of them with the candidate's dossier materials for review.

4. Promotion colloquium: As with tenure-track candidates seeking tenure and promotion, career-track candidates shall be encouraged to present their accomplishments in teaching and service to the entire SDC faculty and staff in a promotion colloquium, typically during August or September of the year prior to the promotion decision. At least one week prior to the colloquium, the candidate's dossier

should be made available to the higher-ranking faculty of the school. This colloquium should be limited to no more than twenty (20) minutes, after which a question-and-answer period will take place. Following this, only faculty of a higher rank shall remain to discuss the candidate's progress, and final promotion recommendations will be distributed to higher-ranking faculty members per the guidelines in the *Faculty Manual*. The colloquium presentation for promotion is intended to provide context and clarify any questions from the faculty, however the presentation is not a replacement for the dossier. The dossier is the package that is to be considered when evaluating candidates for promotion.

5. Promotion recommendations: Higher-ranking faculty members shall have two weeks following the colloquium to submit completed recommendations to the school's administrative manager, who shall collect them for the SDC director. Those recommendations will ask faculty to "recommend promotion" or "defer promotion." All eligible faculty must fill out a recommendation and check one of those two options. Recommendations with more thoughtful and objective analyses of the candidate's case will be taken more seriously than those with little rationale and little effort. Those faculty eligible to complete recommendations are described in the third paragraph of IV.A, above.

6. Director's assessment: The SDC director must collect the recommendations and decide whether to advance the case through a letter to the dean (typically due in the dean's office in August or September, depending upon the college). Should the director wish to move forward with a recommendation for promotion to the dean, that recommendation, using this recommendation form, should summarize faculty recommendations (as well as any discussion), but it should also provide an overall assessment from the director's perspective. It is not expected that the director reveal the content of that letter or decision to the candidate or other school faculty. It is also not expected that the director meet with the candidate to discuss the progress of the case as it moves forward.

7. Dean and provost review: The candidate's dossier, replete with the director's assessment, faculty recommendations, external letters, and annual reviews are to proceed to the VCEA dean. The dean then advances their recommendation (to recommend or defer promotion), along with the dossier, to the Office of the Provost.

V. Definition and criteria for advancement in rank for Scholarly faculty

According to the faculty manual (p. 17), Scholarly faculty members are those who have "significant responsibilities in at least two of the following areas: (a) teaching, (b) student advising, (c) research or scholarship, (d) creative activity, (e) outreach, (f) practice, (g) educational leadership, (h) administration, or (i) academic service. Most faculty in this sub-track will have a significant teaching or student advising responsibility. However, carrying a large teaching or advising load and receiving good student ratings is not sufficient for promotion in this sub-track. Applicants for promotion are expected to demonstrate a scholarly approach to teaching, evidence of teaching effectiveness, and achievement or recognition in one or more of the additional areas (e.g., research/scholarship, educational leadership, outreach, etc.)."

Criteria for advancement in rank for Scholarly faculty are generally the same as those for advancement in rank for tenure-track faculty—at least in the realm of teaching and service (II.E, 2 & 3, above). Scholarly faculty aspiring to promotion in the SDC are not expected to advance a research program (unless this is specified in their contract), but accomplishments in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity should be taken into account in a promotion case. Such activities, however, should not be used to substitute for excellence in teaching and effectiveness in service.

Candidates for promotion to Scholarly Professor will be evaluated using the same general criteria as those desiring promotion to Scholarly Associate Professor but teaching and service accomplishments must be substantial and sustained following the promotion to scholarly associate professor. Work completed or taught prior to achieving rank as a scholarly associate professor may be included in the dossier, but significantly greater weight shall be placed on that which was accomplished since the initial promotion.

Importantly, promotion of Scholarly faculty will not ordinarily be granted to those faculty members who satisfy only minimal standards of the criteria listed in the tiers, below. Within those categories of evaluation, all candidates must also demonstrate effective, respectful, and professional interaction with faculty, staff, and students. That interaction should not detract from the progress or advancement of others but is not intended to restrict basic academic freedoms such as dissent or differences in opinion.

Promotion for scholarly faculty in the SDC will be evaluated as follows:

1. Teaching

The SDC expects teaching excellence for its Scholarly faculty candidates seeking promotion. Candidates should demonstrate, through annual teaching, syllabi, assignments, and their teaching portfolio a clearly defined pedagogical narrative and philosophy (thus, one that emphasizes a "scholarly" approach to teaching, broadly defined). These materials ought also to demonstrate the basic skills of effective instruction, including command of subject matter, organizational skills, clarity of presentation, and the ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity. Furthermore, there should be evidence that candidates are imparting contemporary, up-to-date concepts, ideas, perspectives, and/or teaching methods to students. Scholarly faculty in the SDC are expected to continually assess their effectiveness in teaching and adjust their practices to improve student outcomes.

College and/or university assessment tools should be employed to demonstrate excellence in teaching.

Candidates also should strive to demonstrate that their teaching contributes to the core mission, vision, and values of the SDC: in particular, that which demonstrates integration between the disciplines. Beyond simply teaching classes with students from more than one discipline (this may be part of a candidate's regular teaching assignment), those who make special efforts to adopt integrated methods of instruction; create innovations in integrated teaching; and/or who help bridge traditional borders between disciplines should be recognized. Those who can demonstrate success in this realm shall be provided special commendation, although the forms of "success" must be clearly spelled out in the dossier, and ideally substantiated by external factors (e.g. student evaluations, faculty evaluations of teaching, future collaborations).

The tiers are suggested guidelines by which Scholarly faculty might direct their energies for promotion; they are not intended to be prescriptive. However, scholarly faculty should strive to include at least three (3) items from Tier One (below), but also should include several items from Tier Two and Tier Three. Though it is understood that accomplishments in Tier Two and Tier Three may be necessary to achieve a Tier One product, candidates for promotion in the Scholarly career track should not expect to stack accomplishments in Tier Two or Tier Three and expect to be assessed for excellence in teaching in the SDC. Candidates whose teaching contributions fall exclusively outside of Tier One are urged to communicate regularly with their mentoring committee and director to clarify their teaching contributions towards promotion.

Tier One
- Consistently high student course evaluations (relative to program, school, or college averages).
- Positive peer reviews of teaching performance.
- Interdisciplinary course participation (e.g. SDC courses) with tangible results of success and/or collaboration between students and/or faculty.
- Teaching awards or honors including advising or coaching a student competition team that wins an award or honor.
- Development of new courses (beyond or including initial appointment).
- Innovative teaching methods, such as flipped classrooms.
- Development of new course content, assignments, lectures, or other instructional activities within older courses.
- Securing external funding and support for instruction and/or the publication efforts of students
- Chair of Ph.D. committee (if allowed).

Tier Two
- Voluntarily teaching classes beyond a normal teaching load.
- Chair of graduate project with demonstrated teaching effort beyond regular course instruction.

- Advisor of undergraduate thesis in the Honors College.
- Evidence of substantial mentorship of SDC graduate thesis and non-thesis project work.
- Evidence of improvements in instruction through assessment tools.
- Instructional supervision or mentoring of independent and/or special student projects with demonstrable effort on the part of faculty (e.g. 499 courses).
- Participation in, and significant contributions to, school study tours beyond regular or assigned course load.
- Teaching courses with a service learning component (e.g. featuring coordination with the Center for Civic Engagement).
- Leading, organizing, or presenting workshops regarding teaching pedagogy, methods, and/or assessment.
- Invited guest lectures, seminars, or workshops provided to other classes in the SDC and/or university.
- Evidence of regular availability and effective feedback to students (through office hours, written evaluations, and/or online correspondence).
- Positive student rapport, as substantiated by student evaluations.
- Effective supervision of teaching assistants (as demonstrated by grading rubrics, TA feedback on student homework, exams, or papers; tips for teaching assistants, etc.).
- Participation as a PhD committee member (if allowed).
- Faculty advisor for a student club (with some evidence of advising beyond simply being listed).
- Advisor or coach of a student competition team.

Tier Three
- Committee member (not chair) of masters-level graduate project or undergraduate thesis in the Honors College.
- Consistent instruction in courses where total classroom contact hours, preparation time, enrollment, or grading significantly exceeds that of other courses in the program or school.
- Development and/or updates of classroom instructional assignments or aids to improve learning and retention of course content.
- Attendance at workshops, seminars, and related events focusing upon improvements or innovations in teaching.

2. Service

Effective service is vital to the effective operations of the program(s), SDC, colleges, and the university. Through public involvement, service can be vital to the land-grant mission of the university, and scholarly faculty can play a crucial role here. There is no prescribed number of service activities that Scholarly faculty must accomplish in order to fulfill obligations for promotion. Candidates who find their service activities overlapping with their teaching must clarify their efforts with their mentoring committee and the SDC director to ensure that recognition is given in the appropriate category. Effectiveness in service can include, but is not restricted to, any or all of the following, but should include some mix of program, school, college, university, community, and professional service:

Program, school, college, and university service
- Participation in, and contributions to, program, school, college, and/or university committees.
- A significant commitment of time on a school, college, or university task force or other special service activity (e.g., service on a faculty senate committee).
- Participation in, and contributions to, school study tours beyond regular or assigned course load.
- Advisor of student organizations.
- Mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students beyond curriculum and courses.
- Involvement in student recruitment (e.g., SDC ambassador program, recruiting workshops, Alive! presentations at high schools and/or community colleges).
- Volunteer work that contributes to the quality of education and overall academic experience of students, such as mentoring student activities in construction.
- Lectures or presentations at professional or student organization meetings, when such lectures neither meet the requirements, as listed above, for teaching or disseminated design or construction research, scholarship, and/or creative activity.
- Significant participation in program activities necessary for professional accreditation (e.g. chair).
- Invited or assigned juries of student work.
- Serve as program head or other major administrative appointment.
- Development/alumni activities.
- Noted effort to attend SDC-sponsored events/activities (e.g. evening lectures, commencement, advisory board meetings, mixers, etc.)

Community service
- Civic service activities, such as participation on community panels; construction or preservation-related consulting; or landscape restoration.
- Citizen service positions, related to professional expertise, in government agencies, commissions, or private non-profit entities (elected, appointed, or volunteer, with proportionate value acknowledged as appropriate by the mentoring committee).
Volunteer lectures, tours, and workshops.

Professional service
- Volunteer work involving professional expertise that contributes to the organization of professional conferences, design competitions, or related activities.
- Coordination of lectures, exhibitions, or symposia not part of the candidate's normal employment responsibilities.
- Invited commentator for session of reputable regional, national, or international conference.
- Invited reviewer or juror for research grant proposals.
- Invited peer-reviewer for submitted abstracts, articles, or papers to a reputable scholarly journal or conference.

- Participation on advisory boards or committees of regional, national, or international professional organizations.
- Participation on visiting accreditation teams at other institutions.
- Participation in evaluation of examinations supervised by professional registration boards.
- Membership in regional, national, or international professional organizations.
- Technology transfer to further economic development.

VI. Definition and criteria for advancement in rank for Teaching faculty

According to the faculty manual (p. 18), Teaching faculty members are those "whose primary responsibility is teaching, student advising, or both and with little or no additional expectations in research, scholarship, creative activity, leadership, or academic service. Faculty with a teaching appointment will often have large teaching commitments according to their assignment and contract. In some colleges, teaching may involve teaching in a clinical setting. Promotion criteria will be determined by the department and college but should include evidence of teaching effectiveness and innovation."

The primary responsibility of Teaching faculty in the SDC is to teach specific undergraduate courses, but they could be asked to teach graduate courses provided they have the appropriate credentials. For the purposes of promotion to teaching associate professor, teaching excellence will be the principal criterion.

Teaching faculty members in the SDC are not required to hold a terminal degree in their discipline, but given the professional nature of the SDC's disciplines, should—in that instance—at least have substantial professional experience. Teaching faculty in the SDC have expectations for accomplishments in teaching (100%) and, depending upon program and school needs, may be expected to hold heavier teaching loads than tenure-track, tenured, or scholarly faculty (e.g. a 4-4 load, as opposed to a 3-3-or 2-2 load).

Criteria for advancement to Teaching Associate Professor are generally the same as those for advancement to Scholarly Associate Professor—although Teaching faculty are not expected to advance a research program or provide service, nor are they required to undertake a "scholarly" approach to teaching. However, a scholarly approach to teaching, broadly defined; accomplishments in research, scholarship, and/or creative activities; and/or service should be taken into account in a promotion case—though engagement in the latter activities cannot be used to substitute for excellence in teaching.

Candidates for promotion to Teaching Professor will be evaluated using the same general criteria as those desiring promotion to Teaching Associate Professor, but teaching accomplishments must be substantial and sustained since the promotion to Teaching Associate Professor. Work completed or taught prior to achieving rank as a Teaching Associate Professor may be included in the dossier, but significantly greater weight shall be placed on that which was accomplished since the initial promotion.

Importantly, candidates for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor will not ordinarily be granted to those faculty members who satisfy only minimal standards of the criteria listed in the tiers below. Within those categories of evaluation, all candidates must also demonstrate effective, respectful, and professional interaction with faculty, staff, and students. That interaction should not detract from the progress or advancement of others, but is not intended to restrict basic academic freedoms such as dissent or differences in opinion.

Promotion for Teaching faculty in the SDC will be evaluated as follows:

1. Teaching

The SDC expects teaching excellence for its candidates to Teaching Associate Professor. Candidates should demonstrate—through annual teaching, syllabi, assignments, and their teaching portfolio—evidence of teaching effectiveness and innovation. These materials ought also to demonstrate the basic skills of effective instruction, including command of subject matter, organizational skills, clarity of presentation, and the ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity. Furthermore, there should be evidence that candidates are imparting contemporary, updated concepts and/or teaching methods and perspectives to students. Faculty in the SDC are expected to continually assess their effectiveness in teaching and adjust their practices to improve student outcomes. College and/or university assessment tools should be employed to demonstrate excellence in teaching.

Candidates also should strive to demonstrate that their teaching contributes to the core mission, vision, and values of the SDC: in particular, those that demonstrate integration between the disciplines. Beyond simply teaching classes with students from more than one discipline (this may be part of a candidate's regular teaching assignment), those who make special efforts to adopt integrated methods of instruction; create innovations in integrated teaching; and/or who help bridge traditional borders between disciplines should be recognized. Those who can demonstrate success in this realm shall be provided special commendation, although the forms of "success" must be clearly spelled out in the dossier, and ideally substantiated by external factors (e.g. student evaluations, faculty evaluations of teaching, and future collaborations).

The tiers are suggested guidelines by which Teaching faculty might direct their energies for promotion; they are not intended to be prescriptive. However, Teaching faculty should strive to include at least three (3) items from Tier One (below), but also should include several items from Tier Two and Tier Three. Though it is understood that accomplishments in Tier Two and Tier Three may be necessary to achieve a Tier One product, candidates for promotion in the Teaching career track should not expect to stack accomplishments in Tier Two or Tier Three and expect to be assessed for excellence in teaching in the SDC. Candidates whose teaching contributions fall exclusively outside of Tier One are urged to communicate regularly with their mentoring committee and director to clarify their teaching contributions towards promotion.

Tier One
- Consistently high student course evaluations (relative to program, school, or college averages).
- Positive peer reviews of teaching performance.
- Interdisciplinary course participation (e.g. SDC courses) with tangible results of success and/or collaboration between students and/or faculty.
- Teaching awards or honors including advising or coaching a student competition team that wins an award or honor.
- Development of new courses (beyond or including initial appointment).
- Innovative teaching methods, such as flipped classrooms.
- Development of new course content, assignments, lectures, or other instructional activities within older courses.

- Development of courses for distance or online learning (typically in conjunction with WSU Global Campus).
- Development of continuing professional development courses and training/certificates.
- Securing external funding and support for instruction and/or the publication efforts of students.
- Chair of Ph.D. committee.

Tier Two
- Voluntarily teaching classes beyond a normal teaching load.
- Chair of graduate project with demonstrated teaching effort beyond regular course instruction.
- Advisor of undergraduate thesis in the Honors College.
- Evidence of substantial mentorship of SDC graduate thesis and non-thesis project work.
- Evidence of improvements in instruction through assessment tools.
- Instructional supervision or mentoring of independent and/or special student projects with demonstrable effort on the part of faculty (e.g. 499 courses).
- Participation in, and significant contributions to, school study tours beyond regular or assigned course load.
- Teaching courses with a service learning component (e.g. featuring coordination with the Center for Civic Engagement).
- Leading, organizing, or presenting workshops regarding teaching pedagogy, methods, and/or assessment.
- Invited guest lectures, seminars, or workshops provided to other classes in the SDC and/or university.
- Evidence of regular availability and effective feedback to students (through office hours, written evaluations, and/or online correspondence).
- Positive student rapport, as substantiated by student evaluations.
- Effective supervision of teaching assistants (as demonstrated by grading rubrics, TA feedback on student homework, exams, or papers; tips for teaching assistants, etc.).
- Participation as a PhD committee member (if allowed).
- Faculty advisor for a student club (with some evidence of advising beyond simply being listed).
- Advisor or coach of a student competition team.

Tier Three
- Committee member (not chair) of masters-level graduate project or undergraduate thesis in the Honors College.
- Consistent instruction in courses where total classroom contact hours, preparation time, enrollment, or grading significantly exceeds that of other courses in the program or school.
- Development and/or updates of classroom instructional assignments or aids to improve learning and retention of course content.
- Attendance at workshops, seminars, and related events focusing upon improvements or innovations in teaching.
- Invited or assigned juries of student work.

VII. Endnotes

[1] The SDC Tenure and Promotion Guidelines began in an SDC faculty committee in 2014-15 and refined by SDC leadership team faculty in the summer of 2015 and winter and spring of 2016 before official approval in summer of 2016 by the provost's office. The guidelines were updated by SDC staff in July 2017 to reflect the move of the SDC into one college (VCEA), and then revised by an SDC committee during the 2019-20 academic year, among other details, to match adopted nomenclature and procedures for annual reviews; for the creation of "career-track" faculty (Teaching and Scholarly); and to incorporate new language emphasizing the importance of community, professional, and industry engagement in the SDC. These revisions were unanimously approved by SDC tenure and tenure-track faculty in April of 2020. Minor changes were suggested by the provost's office in August of 2020 and incorporated into another update of this document in the summer of 2021.

[2] Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* defines research inclusively as: 1) the scholarship of discovery, referring to the pursuit of inquiry and investigation in search of new knowledge; 2) the scholarship of integration, consisting of making connections across disciplines and advancing knowledge through synthesis; 3) the scholarship of application, asking how knowledge can be applied to the social issues of the times in a dynamic process that generates and tests new theory and knowledge; 4) the scholarship of teaching, not only including transmitting knowledge, but also transforming and extending that knowledge; and 5) the scholarship of engagement, connecting any of the former dimensions of scholarship to the understanding and solving of pressing social, civic, and ethical problems. See Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered : Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

[3] Resources for community and professionally-engaged faculty to prepare for tenure and promotion (and for reviewers to evaluate such contribution) can be found at this link from the Office of Community Engagement and Partnerships at the University of South Florida and this link from the Engagement Scholarship Consortium.

[4] Peer-reviewed work is technically defined as having been formally-reviewed and evaluated by at least two independent scholars or experts with knowledge of the topic. Peer review, optimally, should also be "blind" reviewed to ensure fairness, and candidates should not be involved in reviewer selection. However, it is understood that some well-respected, high-impact journals, for example, may not be blind peer-reviewed, but are under tight editorial control and remain selective. Provided candidates can make a case for the value of the journal or publication, their work should be judged by evaluators the same way a blind, peer-reviewed publication might. For an example of this situation where is pertains to architecture, for example, see Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, *Research and Scholarship for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointments in Schools of Architecture* (2017), 5.

[5] In 2019, the faculty senate elected to eliminate the "instructor" track and change the nomenclature of "clinical" faculty to "career-track" faculty. In so doing, the senate adopted four different types of career-track faculty: clinical, research, scholarly, and teaching. The instructor track was eliminated. As of the 2020-21 academic year, the SDC has no clinical or research faculty per the new guidelines for those titles; however, it does have faculty with the appointment equivalents of "scholarly" and "teaching" faculty. The current guidelines, therefore, reflect promotion criteria for both scholarly and teaching faculty.