

**GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, TENURE, AND PROMOTION**

**SCHOOL OF ECONOMIC SCIENCES**

Washington State University

Table of Contents

Introduction .....	2
Annual Review.....	4
Research and Scholarship.....	4
Teaching .....	5
Extension.....	6
Service .....	7
Tenure.....	8
Annual Review of Progress Toward Tenure.....	9
Third-Year Review .....	10
Promotion.....	11
Appendix - Annual Activity Report.....	13

## Introduction

Establishing guidelines for the evaluation of faculty performance for annual review, promotion, and tenure is a key responsibility of the faculty. In accordance with the Washington State University *Faculty Manual*, School faculty will be recognized for activities that fulfill the University's responsibilities in teaching, research, extension, and service.

Annual reviews will focus on the accomplishments and contributions of each faculty member to the SES and the University over the past year. SES does not expect each faculty member to contribute in the same way. Given the potential for comparative strengths among faculty members, each faculty member, in conjunction with the SES Director, will establish personal performance expectations for the coming year, including individualized expectations for the evaluation of each activity. The assigned tasks and evaluation of overall performance should consider the individual's mix of appointment, stage-of-career, and role within the School. The annual review affords the opportunity to discuss plans and establish goals for future research, teaching, extension, and service activities and the weighing of these activities to be used in the following year's evaluation.

While the guidelines are organized according to the research, teaching, extension, and service categories, final recommendations must reflect the overall performance of each individual, and this evaluation will give recognition to the mix of teaching, extension, and research tasks assigned to each individual, as well as service to the School, College, University, professional associations, academic journals, governments, and the public. The annual review score for each faculty member will consist of a weighted average of evaluations for research, teaching, extension, and service activities based on agreed-upon duties in research, teaching, service and extension/outreach and engagement.

The annual review of each faculty member is intended to provide feedback about the faculty member's performance relative to the School's expectations and it forms the basis for determining any merit salary increases. In the event that merit salary increases are not available in a particular year, the annual review for that year will be carried forward and considered in the determination of merit salary increases when they become available. This is to comply with the faculty manual and to insure that salaries reflect annual reviews, career contributions, and market conditions.

The annual review of untenured faculty, in conjunction with the formal progress towards tenure review, provides each faculty member with information about the School's assessment about progress towards promotion and tenure to associate professor. The annual review of associate professors may include information about progress towards promotion to full professor. For specific details about promotion and tenure follow the annual review guidelines.

The intent of these guidelines is to ensure that promotion, tenure, and annual review decisions are made in recognition of high quality professional performance. While the recognition of quality is subjective, these guidelines provide common standards of performance where possible and ensure that those making judgments have adequate information about the faculty's overall performance.

At least once each year, each faculty member will provide the Director with a current curriculum vitae and a completed annual review form (see appendix), and the Director will consult with each faculty member about his or her research, teaching, extension, and service activities.

Any conflicts between this policy statement and the *Faculty Manual* must be resolved in favor of the *Faculty Manual*.

## Annual Review

### *Research and Scholarship*

The School of Economic Sciences emphasizes, promotes, and rewards active research programs. A fundamental goal of scholarship is the generation of new knowledge. Good scholarship can contribute to the growth of disciplinary knowledge, increase knowledge of the world we live in, and contribute to the resolution of problems facing society. Moreover, an active research program keeps faculty current in their field, promotes good teaching, contributes to the supervision of graduate student research, and brings national and international recognition to the School and University. Research and scholarship, at various and appropriate outlets, are an expected activity of all faculty.

The primary measure of scholarship is evidence from peer evaluation. The Director will evaluate faculty performance on research and scholarship by taking into consideration the quality of the work based on peer review. Refereed publications (books, journal articles, and papers in edited volumes) are indirect measures and direct evidence of an active research program. They are widely accepted as sound measures of scholarship and hence are the primary tool used in the evaluation of the research dimension. Faculty are expected to publish in appropriate outlets.

Peer-reviewed research supports the traditional aspirations of scientific study, but is not the only way to measure research output. Additional measures of scholarship impact include citations of work by peers, use of the research in public discourse, invitations to speak at scholarly conferences or important policy arenas, reference to work in respected reviews of the field, and research honors and awards by peers. Other indicators of research productivity include extramurally funded, research grants; bulletins, reports, and testimony before governmental agencies; presentations at professional meetings; book reviews in professional journals; internally funded research grants (for untenured assistant professor); and working papers. The professional value of grants allocated through a peer-reviewed and or competitive process will be duly acknowledged in the annual review process.

In the annual process of establishing expectations for individual faculty members, consideration will be given to identifying the most appropriate and effective outlets and quality measures for a given faculty member's research programs.

Consideration will be given to the quality of journal or book publisher, the contribution of the faculty member to the research if the number of authors is greater than one, whether the paper is an article, note, comment, or case study, and the intended audience. Publications in the primary general and field journals and with leading academic publishers have the highest priority.

If deemed appropriate by the Director, one faculty meeting each year should be allocated to tenured faculty discussing and communicating their research expectations with untenured faculty. The topics of discussion might include quality v. quantity of publication, the interpretation of co-authorship, the assessment of grant submissions and awards, and other research issues.

### *Teaching*

A primary responsibility of the School of Economic Sciences is to provide excellent instruction in both undergraduate and graduate courses and to individual student research projects. Because of the general interest in economics and the applicability of economics to many disciplines, this responsibility requires instructor contact with students with a variety of interests.

The School of Economic Sciences is known for high quality instruction and advising. It is the policy of the School to promote and reward those efforts that maintain and enhance our instructional program at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Annual assessment of the teaching activities of each faculty member will involve consideration of the teaching load and teaching quality, as well as advising of both undergraduate and graduate students.

The Director is responsible for determining and measuring the teaching loads of faculty members subject to the faculty member's specific appointment. The factors to be considered in comparing teaching loads are: classroom contact hours; variations in preparation time, grading responsibilities and office hour requirements as a result of differences in the course type, level, or enrollment; new preparations; supervision of doctoral research, master's and special study programs; special committee assignments related to the teaching program of the School; time spent in preparing grant proposals and administering grants for the general purpose of improving instruction.

Teaching quality includes subject command, good judgment in organizing courses and presenting material, enthusiasm, intellectual integrity, and rapport with students. Evaluation of teaching performance is made on the basis of student evaluations, course syllabi and other course materials such as assignments and examinations, reports on any class visits by the Director or other peer review, reports of high-quality teaching or valid complaints, information on performance of students in subsequent courses, honors and awards for good teaching, and the willingness to support students in terms of job information, references and student advising. When student evaluations are used, the entire evaluation is to be considered and not just the mean of one summary statistic. Due consideration should be given to the distribution of responses to all questions and the effect of outliers on averages, particularly in small classes. The summary statistics of each of the categories may not be appropriate for evaluation of every course. The faculty member should propose and agree with the Director the categories appropriate for the course. When appropriate the questions asked students should be tailored to each course. Faculty

are expected to maintain high standards in the classroom. Faculty are encouraged to provide any information providing evidence of their teaching ability.

A formal peer review of teaching by the mentor committee of the candidate occurs prior to the third year review. It shall include classroom observations or review of distance delivery interface, student interviews, and review of class materials.

In addition to the classroom performance, other aspects of teaching to be taken into account will include: supervision of special study programs and master's and doctoral research; service on graduate student committees; development of innovative teaching techniques or materials; successful external funding for the improvement of the teaching program; co-author with current WSU/SES students; and special committee assignments related to the teaching program of the School.

It is the policy of the School to reward good teaching and discourage poor teaching. Innovation is encouraged and School resources will be used to develop the most appropriate teaching techniques. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to inform the Director of special teaching techniques that have improved teaching quality. In addition, the School will administer and compile student evaluations for each course every semester. These will be returned to the instructors.

#### *Extension*

A primary function of the School of Economic Sciences is to generate and distribute broad-based, pragmatic economic information to the public. Effective engagement or two-way communication is expected with constituency groups. Extension faculty convey and transmit this information in a manner that renders it of immediate value to practical decision-making and public policy. Equally important, extension faculty should receive input from constituency groups through venues including but not limited to or listening to constituency groups and reading industry publications to identify broad based needs issues and opportunity faced in their constituency. In the process of this engagement, extension faculty are expected to work directly with the School's research colleagues and/or those from other disciplines. In support of their engagement, extension faculty are expected to set priorities and develop their own relevant applied research programs.

The faculty member and the Director shall establish scholarship expectations which are supportive to, and appropriate for, his/her extension appointment and consistent with the Unit, College, University, and professional expectations. Assessment of extension performance shall be based on a faculty member's ability to professionally fulfill those functions commensurate with the specific nature and composition of his or her functional assignment.

Research scholarship expectations for a faculty member on 100% extension appointment are similar to those for a faculty member on 100% academic appoint-

ment. Due to different complementarities between Research and Extension and Research and Teaching an acceptable portfolio of refereed journal publications might be but is not required to be weighted more heavily towards multi-disciplinary journals relevant to the extension position and less heavily towards top tier economics journals than what is expected of a faculty member with a 100% academic appointment. To assure appropriate incentives to develop an outstanding Extension educational program, annual review weights for extension appointments may but is not required to be weighted somewhat more heavily on education (extension education) and less heavily on scholarship (primarily peer-reviewed journal articles) than for academic and academic-research appointments.

A faculty member's extension program and activities shall be evaluated according to the professional expectation for department based extension faculty document, including: the demonstrated quality of presentations, workshops, and other means utilized for information delivery as evidenced directly by clientele evaluation; the number and quality of appropriate peer-reviewed scholarly activities; the demand for and utilization of information delivery and engagement.

Other indicators of extension productivity include, but shall not be limited to, funded grants which support research and extension efforts, graduate students, or other personnel within the School, or project activity external to the School; invitations to testify before institutional entities and government agencies, presentations at professional or industry trade association meetings; and honors awarded by scholarly, professional or clientele organizations.

### *Service*

Service activities are regarded as meritorious faculty activity. The Director will evaluate each faculty member on service activities, giving due credit especially to those activities that further the ability of the SES to achieve its goals, and which bring recognition to the SES for its world class programs, both within the University, and internationally, through professional organizations and public service. Service activities should usually require a small fraction of faculty time and so service usually will be weighted less than teaching and research in the reward structure. Instances of extraordinary service shall be recognized, particularly when they have been requested or imposed.

Meritorious service activities include: service to the School, College(s), and University through committees and other assignments for which release time has not been given (the School committee structure is designed to equalize this workload, but extraordinary contributions should be rewarded); professional service, including serving as a referee for major professional journals, editorships or serving on editorial boards, and service to professional and community organizations; general service, including appearance as discussant, service on national or state committees, and work for government agencies and private foundations.

## Tenure

The general guidelines and procedures for promotion and tenure at Washington State University are outlined in the *Faculty Manual* and in the Instructions and Forms on Tenure and Promotion distributed by the Office of the Provost. Individual academic units are responsible for defining the criteria and procedures appropriate to their unique objectives. Since the Colleges also contribute to promotion and tenure decisions, the guidelines for the faculty member's College of appointment also should be consulted. Each untenured faculty member shall be provided a copy of the SES guidelines, as well as those of the College within 90 days of initial employment.

The criteria set forth below are intended to ensure that faculty given tenure in the School of Economic Sciences will contribute toward achieving the long-term goals of the School with respect to its teaching, research, service and extension programs. The granting of tenure commits the School and University to a lifelong relationship and can be made only after a comprehensive evaluation of each candidate's contributions. The tenure decision is a forward-looking decision made on the basis of an established record.

Research and teaching effectiveness receive the greatest weight in tenure evaluation for candidates with primarily research and teaching appointments. A positive recommendation for tenure must be based upon strong performance in both research and teaching and demonstrated excellence in at least one of these areas.

A research program is evaluated primarily by its refereed publications. Other factors taken into account include the extent and nature of the contribution in both sole-authored and collaborative work, non-refereed publications; the existence of a focused research agenda; the receipt of externally funded grants; and the presentation of papers at professional meetings. A strong performance in research is one that establishes the individual as a significant, independent contributor to his or her field with the potential for national distinction.

Evaluation of the research program shall include reviews by at least four external professionals in the faculty member's research area. Instructions for the selection of references and the solicitation of letters are provided by the Provost. Solicitation of letters on tenure candidates will be done in early May so that responses can be received by the preferred time of at least three weeks prior to when tenure ballots must be completed.

The University requires the submission of a teaching portfolio as a means of compiling information about a faculty member's teaching that forms the basis of evaluating teaching performance for the tenure decision. The types of information to be included in the teaching portfolio are outlined in the *Faculty Manual*. The promise of a strong performance in teaching is that the individual has established or



is well on the way to establishing effectiveness in the classroom and in guiding individual research.

Performance on extension activities by faculty with extension appointments shall be given consideration in the tenure decision in a manner consistent with the proportion of the extension appointment. Extension faculty must have a demonstrated ability to establish and conduct extension programs relevant to their assignment. This ability will be evaluated according to the criteria used for annual review.

Other significant areas of evaluation include the extent of participation in School, College, and University service, and the ability to interact effectively with students and other faculty. Serious deficiency in one or more of these areas is sufficient for a negative recommendation for tenure. In view of the responsibilities of the faculty in university governance, judicious participation in School, College, or University committee assignments is expected. A record of consistently conscientious performance of assigned functions, such as conducting classes, advising students, and meeting School needs, is also expected.

Faculty input to the final tenure decision process will be in accord with procedures specified in the *Faculty Manual*. It is preferred that at least three weeks before tenure ballots are to be completed, the Director shall afford access by all tenured faculty to the tenure review files and external evaluations. The Director also shall schedule a meeting of the School's tenured faculty at a time prior to the ballot completion date at which the performance of candidates shall be discussed. All tenured faculty complete a ballot and forward it to the Director. The Director shall forward the ballots, along with the Director's recommendation, to the Dean(s).

Documentation of scholarship on multi-authored publications should include indicators and descriptions of your significant contributions of your work. Below is the indicators from CAHNRS and SES that should be used for your publications.

- a. Developed the initial idea – CAHNRS
- b. Obtained or provided funds or other resources – CAHNRS
- c. Collected data – CAHNRS
- d. **Developed theoretical model – SES**
- e. Analyzed data – CAHNRS
- f. Wrote/created product – CAHNRS
- g. Edited product – CAHNRS

#### *Annual Review of Progress toward Tenure*

Each year, all non-tenured tenure-track faculty will be reviewed for progress toward tenure. Interim evaluations of the non-tenured faculty are intended to advise the candidate of strengths and weaknesses in performance; to recommend

ways to improve progress towards tenure; and, if necessary, to indicate when the possibility of tenure is remote.

The Director shall appoint a tenure advisory committee for each tenure-track assistant professor. This committee will consist of between two and four tenured faculty members. The committee will be appointed soon after the new faculty members official starting date of employment. The tenure advisory committee and the Director will advise the new faculty member with respect to policies, procedures, and performance expectations of the School, the relevant College, and the University. This committee also will give advice on matters related to professional improvement and advancement. Such advice can take the form of informal reviews of manuscripts, informal advice on research or extension programs, and informal advice on teaching methods. Each affected non-tenured faculty member shall be strongly encouraged, but is not required, to solicit and utilize the services of their committee.

In addition, the School's tenured faculty will meet as a group each spring to discuss each tenure-track faculty member's performance over the previous calendar year. Tenured faculty also can provide written comments about faculty member's performance to the Director. In accordance with the *Faculty Manual*, the Director shall provide a detailed, written summary of the tenured faculty discussion of the candidate's performance relative to the School's expectations.

#### *Third-Year Tenure Review*

A more formal review of an individual's progress toward tenure is made during the third year as an assistant professor. This interim review is similar to the final review except that no external evaluations are sought. Each tenured faculty member submits a recommendation ballot that indicates whether progress toward tenure is satisfactory, needs some improvement or is unsatisfactory. Unsatisfactory performance can result in non-reappointment.

## Promotion

Promotion from assistant to associate professor is normally part of the tenure decision. The procedure for promotion from associate to full professor is similar to the procedure for granting tenure and is described in the *Faculty Manual*. Consideration for promotion to full professor usually does not occur until a faculty member has been an associate professor for a minimum of six years.

For faculty with primarily research and teaching appointments, promotion to full professor requires a well-established reputation in the faculty member's primary research area. Evidence of a well-established reputation includes (but is not limited to) distinction for the quality of his or her contribution to the discipline, especially in refereed publications, citations, invitations to present papers, and the evaluation of the candidate's standing in the profession by at least four external referees. The Provost provides instructions for the selection of referees and the solicitation of letters.

The candidate also should have established a reputation as an effective teacher, both in the classroom and in the guidance of graduate student research, and have demonstrated a willingness and ability to provide service in the support of the School, College(s), and University programs.

Performance on extension activities by faculty with extension appointments shall be given consideration in the promotion decision in a manner consistent with the proportion of the extension appointment. Extension faculty must have a demonstrated ability to establish and conduct extension programs relevant to their assignment. This ability will be evaluated according to the criteria used for annual review.

The Director shall notify all full professors of recommendations for promotion from associate to full professor. This notification shall also schedule a meeting of full professors to consider the recommendations. Such meetings shall usually be no later than three weeks prior to when promotion recommendations must reach the relevant Dean.

The Director shall afford access by relevant faculty to the review files of promotion candidates. Copies of the curriculum vita, faculty review forms completed since employment or last promotion, and evaluation letters and those to be considered will be mailed to relevant off-campus faculty along with a ballot. All full professors will complete a ballot and forward it to the Director. The Director shall forward the ballots, along with the Director's recommendation, to the Dean(s).

Documentation of scholarship on multi-authored publications should include indicators and descriptions of your significant contributions of your work. Below is the indicators from CAHNRS and SES that should be used for your publications.

- a. Developed the initial idea – CAHNRS
- b. Obtained or provided funds or other resources – CAHNRS
- c. Collected data – CAHNRS
- d. **Developed theoretical model – SES**
- e. Analyzed data – CAHNRS
- f. Wrote/created product – CAHNRS
- g. Edited product – CAHNRS

**Appendix**  
**Annual Activity Report 20xx**

Name	Report Date
Title	Date of Last Promotion
	Appointment Date
Appointment Split	
Appointment Type	
Department/Unit	
Location	

**Teaching**

Credit Courses (the following is answered for each credit course.)

Semester:  
Credits:  
Contact Hours:  
Number of Students:  
Team Taught:  
Responsibility: xx%  
Course Development and Revision:  
Significant Accomplishments:  
Synopsis of Student Evaluations:  
Synopsis of Peer Evaluations:

**Other Teaching Activities**

Activity:  
Description:

**Advising**

Undergraduate:  
Masters Major Advisor:  
Doctoral Major Advisor:  
Master Committee Member:  
Doctoral Committee Member:  
Postdoctoral:  
Student Clubs and Groups:  
Advising Contributions:  
Recruiting Activities:  
Other Advising Activities:

**Extension Projects/Programs**

(The following is answered for each project/program.)

Funding:

Briefing Report

Situation/Need:

Inputs/Outputs:

Outcomes/Impacts:

Collaborators:

Location of Benefit:

Indicators:

Personnel

**Scholarly Activities / Other Output**

(The following is answered for each scholarly output.)

Category: (e.g. journal article, book chapter, presentation, etc.)

Completed/published, accepted - in press, submitted, or work in progress:

Peer Reviewed:

Description / citation:

Author(s):

**CRIS Research (one of the following for each project. Only for faculty with ARC appts.)**

AD-421 Progress Report			
1. Accession	Agency Identification No.	5. Work Unit/Project No.	6. Status
7. Title			
12. Investigator Names(s) (Last Name and Initials)			
30. Termination Date			
85. Progress Report			
86. Impact Statement			
87. Publications			

**Grants, Research, Gifts and Fees**

Title (one for each grant proposal)

Status (funded, pending or not-funded):

Funding Source:

Submitted Through:

Amount Requested:

Amount Received:

Amount Available:

Dates:

Principal Investigator(s) (Last Name, Initials)

Non-WSU-CAHNRS PI or collaborators:

# Undergraduate Students Supported:

# Graduate Students Supported:

# Staff Supported:

# Postdocs Supported:

Technical Support:

Report – Results and Impacts:

**Major Accomplishments**

(list each goal and progress)

Previous Year's Goal:

Accomplishment:

**Goals for Next Year**

Goal:

**Honors and awards:**

**Professional Development Activities**

**Professional Membership (list including any offices held)**

**Self-specified**

Category:

Narrative:

**Service (fill out the following for each service activity)**

Category:

Narrative:

**Activity to Collect Stakeholder Input**

(fill out the following for each activity)

Stakeholder Input Activity:

**Work Place Effort**

Positive Workplace Environment:

Discrimination Free Workplace: