

School of Languages, Cultures, and Race
Washington State University
(Approved by 3-Tiered Faculty Vote on 10/24/18)
Revised for Spring 2020 (email vote 4/14/2020)
Revised for Spring 2020 (live vote at 2/22/2021 faculty meeting)

**Guidelines for the Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of
Tenured, Tenure Track, and Career Faculty**

These guidelines seek to expand on and contextualize Tenure and Promotion Policy enacted by Washington State University (WSU) and the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The Faculty Manual presents the official criteria and procedures developed by the University for advancement according to rank (these can be found here: <https://facsen.wsu.edu/documents/2018/08/faculty-manual.pdf/>). The “Statement of Tenure and Promotion Policy of the College of Arts and Sciences” supplements these guidelines and applies them to units within the College (these can be found here: <https://cas.wsu.edu/documents/2016/03/cas-promotion-guidelines.pdf/>). The procedures described in these two documents both provide standards for evaluation and ensure due process for the candidate.

As directed in the CAS statement, the School of Languages, Cultures, and Race (SLCR) has developed criteria and procedures that are specific to this unit. This document recreates each section in the CAS policy document (appearing below in italics) adding specific SLCR practices or policies for tenure and promotion when appropriate. This document should not be construed as being in conflict with the policies developed by CAS or the University (as presented in the Faculty Manual). In case of apparent conflict, the College and the University statements and the Faculty Manual shall take precedence.

An additional level of oversight is required for SLCR faculty in Tri-Cities, and Vancouver. In general, their annual reviews, tenure reviews, and consideration for promotion require input from both Pullman and the local campus, with the signature required of both the CAS Director and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) at their campus.

All of the departments in the College of Arts and Sciences are expected to form and implement effective mentoring committees for untenured, tenure-track, and career track faculty. The function of this mentoring is to advise candidates for tenure and promotion on local and discipline-specific expectations on teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service.

Cases for early promotion and/or tenure must be justified by extraordinary merit. Permission to bring such a case forward must be obtained from the Provost (or the VCAA at the urban campus) *before* the case is prepared. With the agreement of the faculty member, the Chair sends a memo making the case for early promotion and/or tenure to the Provost (and the VCAA for cases in Vancouver and Tri Cities), via the Dean (and the CAS Director for Vancouver or Tri Cities, with a request for signature).

PART I.

PRE-TENURE AND TENURED FACULTY

The School of Languages, Cultures, and Race (SLCR), through its faculty, shall review and consider the evidence in the candidate's tenure and promotion file carefully and objectively, and make judgments based on the criteria in the University, College, and Departmental tenure and promotion guidelines. SLCR recognizes that, in matters pertaining to tenure and promotion of its faculty, Washington State University (WSU) supports performance in accord with the University's mandate as a land grant institution where scholarship/creative work, teaching/learning, and scholarly and community service/outreach are closely interdependent (though weighed differently) and mutually supportive. SLCR also recognizes that evidence and judgment are never perfect or infallible and maintains that the individual's right of appeal is needed to safeguard against inequities. Unless otherwise negotiated and placed in writing at the time of initial appointment, a faculty's record toward tenure and promotion begins with the date of hire at WSU.

Tenure is both an acknowledgement of past accomplishments of the candidate and the likelihood that the candidate will make further significant contributions to the disciplines and interdisciplinary programs associated with the School. Thus, the granting of tenure should not be interpreted completely as a reward for past achievement; rather, it is predicated on the judgment that the candidate will continue her/his record of scholarly productivity, teaching effectiveness, and dedication to service after tenure has been granted.

TENURE CRITERIA

CAS Statement on Tenure Criteria: The areas of evaluation in considering eligibility for tenure are: (a) research, scholarship or creative activity, (b) classroom and individual instruction, (c) external funding at a level appropriate to the candidate's discipline, (d) interactions with colleagues and students, as well as the supervision of graduate students and advising and mentoring of undergraduate students, (e) participation in professional activity, (f) participation in departmental and university service. In the College of Arts and Sciences, criterion (a) is of primary importance, but criterion (b) is significant and the others are important. In view of the responsibilities of the faculty in university governance, judicious participation in extra-departmental assignments is expected. Except in instances in which written agreement specifies otherwise, tenure will not be recommended unless excellence in both research/scholarship/creativity activity and instruction can be satisfactorily demonstrated. The university and college have adopted the teaching portfolio (College policy and format appended, Appendices 1 and 2) as the means of documenting excellence in instruction. Normally, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should be considered simultaneously.

Additional stipulations by the SLCR:

Research

In general, candidates for tenure in the SLCR shall demonstrate a record of high quality scholarship of sufficient volume with potential for strong impact in their chosen field(s) of research. As a general guide, some combination of (co)authored books, (co)edited collections, refereed articles, and book

chapters, published in a peer-reviewed, scholarly publication (domestic or international) will be the basis for the evaluation. Other types of publication that may be evaluated are detailed below. In addition, candidates are expected to have participated in a number of regional, national, and/or international conferences in their area of research. Finally, the candidate shall demonstrate that their productivity will continue after tenure by having a number of projects in the works.

The following guiding principles are applied when evaluating the record of scholarship of all candidates:

1. Emphasis is placed upon clear evidence of a coherent research and publication trajectory that promises continued productivity and growing impact beyond tenure and promotion.
2. Evaluation of performance shall include the methodological and/or theoretical contributions of the candidate's work, as well as the quality of those scholarly contributions already published and those accepted for publication, in order to determine their originality, the extent to which they have made significant advances in their fields, and the extent to which they or any part of them comprise major, sustained works of scholarship. These works include co-authored as-well-as single authored texts and projects. Evaluation shall also include the assessments of external reviewers of the candidate's work.
3. The evidence used to evaluate the candidate's file will include, but not be limited to:
 - All peer-reviewed, published scholarly or creative materials, print or digital.
 - Manuscripts that have been accepted for publication;
 - Letters and/or contracts attesting to the acceptance of unpublished material;
 - Manuscripts submitted and under review for publication;
 - Funded grants;
 - Awards and honors bestowed for research;
 - Pending and unfunded grant proposals;
 - Presentations at conferences and professional meetings.
4. The weight of each publication included in the candidate's file will be determined based on the following:
 - Evidence of a full, peer-review process in the acceptance of the candidate's work;
 - The length, breadth and quality of the work;
 - Whether the work is a single-authored monograph or a co-authored work (in the case of co-authored work, the candidate shall provide her/his level of contribution through a percentage);
 - External recognition and reviews of the work;
 - Frequency of citations regarding the work;
 - Number of reprints of the published work;
 - Quality of the publishing venue.
5. The following types of publication shall be considered for evaluation for tenure. Details must be provided on each individual publication in order to determine the weight to be given to it:

- Monographs. Monographs may be a revised version of the candidate's Ph.D. dissertation or new work.
 - Articles in refereed journals.
 - Chapters in edited collections. Chapters in peer-reviewed edited collections will be evaluated in the same manner as refereed articles.
 - Edited Collections. Collections for which one served as the editor or a co-editor, as well as guest editing special issues of peer-reviewed academic and/or scholarly journals.
 - Translations. Translations related to the person's area of research. These should typically include an introduction, notes, and complete scholarly apparatus.
 - Critical/Textual Editions. Critical/textual editions, which typically include an introduction, notes, and complete scholarly apparatus.
 - Creative works published in scholarly venues and/or by university or academic presses.
 - Other. Examples of publications of a supplementary nature that typically do not carry equal weight to peer-reviewed scholarship, but are still indicative of scholarly productivity may include: book reviews; encyclopedia entries; notes; necrologies; public scholarship (non- refereed); website production; editing; or blog entries related to one's field or the profession. As in other categories above, publication venue, length and quality will determine the weight given to the work.
6. As stipulated in WSU and CAS guidelines, the candidate's record shall include confidential letters from *at least five* external reviewers who are qualified and have agreed to evaluate the quality and quantity of the candidate's published research or other evidence of scholarly or creative activity, as well as the impact of the scholarly or creative activity. The selection of the external reviewers will be handled in the following manner:
- Final selection of the external reviewers shall be made by the Director, in consultation with tenured colleagues in the candidate's area of expertise.
 - The candidate may suggest some external reviewers, but the final list of external reviewers must include a majority of names not suggested by the candidate.
 - The Director shall request a curriculum vitae from each external reviewers and provide the Dean with background information regarding the qualifications and stature of these external reviewers.
 - No former graduate school committee members, thesis chairs, co-authors, or anyone else who cannot provide an impartial evaluation or who could stand to benefit from the tenure and promotion of the candidate shall be selected as an external reviewer. Senior colleagues whom the candidate has met through professional conferences and/or other professional interactions may serve as external reviewers.
7. While recognizing that the research programs of all scholars vary in the extent to which they lend themselves to interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary scholarship, such work is valued and shall be given full consideration in assessing the record of scholarship.
8. While recognizing that scholars' research programs vary in the extent to which they lend themselves to intramural or extramural funding, the candidate's record shall also be evaluated on this criterion as appropriate.

Teaching

Among the characteristics of effective teaching are: knowledge of the subject matter, ability to teach both undergraduate and graduate courses, ability to organize material, ability to foster interest, ability to stimulate students intellectually, knowledge of testing/grading procedures, ability to criticize perceptively and constructively, range of courses; and contributions to curricular transformation and university learning goals.

The following evidence will be examined:

1. Student evaluations. Both undergraduate and graduate courses (when applicable) should be represented. Student evaluations cannot be taken at face value, but must be interpreted. In reading evaluations, one should recognize the identities and social locations of professor/students, type of class, number of students in class and other factors when examining course effectiveness.¹
2. The report of peer evaluators from within the tenured faculty of SLCR, one selected by the candidate and one by the Director. These evaluators will visit the candidate's class at an arranged time during the candidate's third or fourth semester, discuss the class afterwards with the candidate, and each submit a written report to the Director on School letterhead, to which the candidate may respond in writing. The details for performing the observation and writing the report can be found in the following three documents:
 - Additional Ways of Evaluating Effective Teaching
 - Faculty Peer Observation Form
 - CAS Teaching Observation Information and Guide

The report and response will become part of the candidate's record.

3. Pedagogical Statement
4. Syllabi
5. Awards and honors for teaching
6. Other appearances of the candidate in public; e.g., readings, public lectures, guest lectures in others' classes

In addition to classroom performance within both graduate and undergraduate courses, other aspects of teaching competence that will be considered include: supervision of special studies, supervision of graduate students, chairing of graduate committees, sitting on graduate student committees, integration of new technologies, creativity in pedagogy, collaboration, development of innovative teaching techniques or new courses, writing of instructional programs, and participation in interdisciplinary courses.

Service

Service contributions, though not ranked by the university and college as equal in importance with scholarship/creative activity and teaching, are critical to the specific mission of SLCR.

¹ For summary of research on this matter, please see Hurston 2005, http://sun.skidmore.union.edu/sunNET/ResourceFiles/Huston_Race_Gender_TeachingEvals.pdf

These contributions allow faculty members to foster connections with faculty members within the School and WSU generally as well as outside WSU, and they augment the School's visibility. Faculty seeking tenure and promotion shall provide evidence and documentation of appropriate service to the School, college, university, profession, and groups outside of the university, including community service. The School defines service as performance of School, collegiate, university, community, and professional activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance, professional expertise shared with the external community or group, and contributions to a faculty member's profession. Faculty members are encouraged to serve when presented with the opportunity; however, they are advised to avoid becoming overburdened by their service obligations. Indeed, quantity of service is of less importance than is quality. Significantly, while service is an integral part of the faculty role, it cannot substitute for deficiencies or interfere with performance in other areas. Excellence in service to the department, university, profession, and community is reflected in the quality of contributions in such activities as:

1. Acceptance of a share of the administrative tasks of the School
2. Participation in university administrative activities
3. Scholarly presentations to the university community and the public at large
4. Participation in local, state, and/or national community groups and organizations
5. Advising of student groups and organizations
6. Participation in the work of professional associations (officers, panelists, consultants) and in an editorial capacity
7. Publication of articles or newsletters on scholarly matters but directed to a general university or community audience
8. Success in obtaining external funds for the support of service to the department, the university, the profession and the community
9. Reviewing for journals, publishers, or granting agencies
10. Service on editorial boards
11. Service as associate editor or editor for a journal or book series
12. Service as translator/interpreter for the judicial system or other government agencies (including the translation of any text)
13. Organization of community- or University-sponsored events

The above list is not intended to be exhaustive nor is it arranged in an order of significance. Other useful evidence in evaluating these activities includes:

- Letters from committee chairs, supervisor, peers, or others who can compare the candidate's service to that of others
- Published articles describing the candidate's activities
- Copies of publications written for general audience

TENURE PROCEDURES

CAS Statement on Tenure Procedures: Copies of the department and college criteria for tenure and promotion will be provided to new faculty hires, no later than at the time when the offer is

made, normally the criteria are sent with the letter of offer. For joint appointments, the letter of offer will specify which department will be the lead for annual evaluation and tenure and promotion. It is the responsibility of each untenured faculty member to maintain an academic biography that provides material bearing on the criteria identified above. It is the joint responsibility of the faculty member and the Chair to assure that the dossier presents the case fully, clearly and accurately.

CAS Statement on Procedures for Annual Evaluation of “Progress toward Tenure”: *This review is separate from the annual review for performance and salary adjustment.*

Evaluations of the progress of untenured faculty members are to be conducted at the departmental level once a year. The purpose is to advise and direct progress towards tenure or, to recommend termination of employment. This review should assess the faculty member’s cumulative progress towards tenure. Progress towards Tenure reviews should be done at the same time of year as the annual review and they should usually lead logically to the final tenure decision. Similar to the annual review, the urban campus administrator should be consulted when reviewing the progress of faculty members at urban campuses.

Unlike the annual review, the “Progress toward Tenure” review is based on cumulative performance and requires the participation of all tenured faculty in the department. The Chair must also discuss the outcome of the review with the untenured faculty member. The purpose of the discussion is to aid the faculty member in understanding how tenured members view his or her performance in light of the departmental/college criteria and expectations.

If the candidate resides on a campus other than Pullman, the Chair will seek information from relevant individuals at that site. These must include faculty tenured in the department and the appropriate urban campus administrators.

A dated written summary of the discussion of these results and of the implications shall be signed both by the department Chair and the untenured faculty member. The faculty member shall have the right to append a statement concerning this summary; the statement will become a permanent part of the record. A copy of the signed summary is to be provided to the faculty member, the Dean, and, if applicable, to the urban campus CAS Director. The policy for this progress towards tenure review can be found in the Faculty Manual, Section III.3.d.

The process can lead to a recommendation that employment be terminated before the end of the pre-tenure period. The procedure is outlined in Section III.F.1. “Nonreappointment” http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual/.

CAS Statement on Procedures for “Third Year Review”:

Every tenure-track faculty member with a pre-tenure period of six years undergoes a formal “third year” tenure-progress review in the spring of his or her third academic year at WSU. The purpose of this review is to identify relevant strengths and deficiencies with regard to progress towards tenure. The review shall be conducted following the procedures which apply to the tenure review, except that outside letters are not required. The timing for the formal third year review should be negotiated at the time of appointment for faculty appointments with a pre-tenure appointment less than six years. The third year review is optional for faculty appointments

with a pre-tenure period less than three years. The complete policy can be found in Section III.D.2.e. of the Faculty Manual http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual/. For urban campus faculty, information must be obtained from the location by the department Chair.

After consultation with the tenured faculty, the department Chair will make a recommendation that (1) progress is satisfactory, (2) some improvement is required, or (3) substantial improvement required or (4) unsatisfactory. The recommendation is to be forwarded to the Dean and, if applicable, to the urban campus vice chancellor. The Dean will prepare and forward a recommendation to the Provost, along with the case materials and Chair's recommendation. The vice chancellor, if applicable, writes a separate recommendation. The Dean and, if applicable, the vice chancellor, will then reach an agreement with the Provost on retention or non-reappointment.

The purpose of the "Third Year Review" is to identify relevant deficiencies with regard to progress towards tenure. The faculty member, Chair and Dean will receive a letter from the Provost stating the outcome of this review. After the candidate receives the Provost's letter, the Chair must meet with the candidate and discuss the review. In the event the Chair is unavailable, the meeting and discussion should be held with the Dean (or Vice Chancellor in the case of faculty at the urban campuses). Where the results are judged unsatisfactory, the third-year tenure progress review can lead to non-reappointment as described in section III.F.1.

Consideration for Tenure

CAS Statement on Procedures for Tenure Review:

At the time of faculty tenure consideration as specified in their letter of offer (or at hire, for faculty being hired with tenure at senior ranks), the candidate and the Chair shall jointly assure that the case materials as specified by the Provost's office are complete. In particular the following shall be included in the confidential file (a) curriculum vitae; (b) a total of up to 10 relevant research publications, other scholarly and creative contributions and manuscripts in press that makes a compelling case for tenure. These publications and contributions should have been generated while the candidate held a faculty position at Washington State University unless the faculty member has been granted time off of the tenure clock for work done elsewhere. If the selected materials have co-authors or co-investigators, it is the responsibility of the candidate to indicate clearly his/her role in those publications/contributions; (c) confidential letters from at least five well qualified external reviewers evaluating the quality of the candidate's published research or other evidence of scholarly activity, the contribution to the candidate's profession and discipline, and the candidate's professional reputation. Every review letter that is solicited (by the Chair) and received should be included. The reviewers shall be selected by the Chair, and may include ones suggested by the candidate, but should not include present or former collaborators of the candidate, coauthors or thesis/post-doctoral advisors. The majority of letters should not be from the reviewers on the list provided by the candidate. Letters from other WSU faculty are not acceptable. Under no circumstances will a reviewer be paid or compensated in any way for reviewing the candidate's file or writing a letter. (d) a teaching portfolio (no more than 5 pages of narrative) in the format adopted by the College of Arts and Sciences (see Appendices 1 & 2). A statement of context may be included but is not required. If a Context Statement is included it should be limited to two pages.

Following the review of the file and discussion of the record among themselves, the tenured faculty members shall provide recommendations by way of confidential, signed faculty recommendations, a sample of which is supplied in the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines distributed by the Provost's office. The Chair shall assure [sic] that every tenured member (including those on leave, if practical) has an opportunity to review the record and to complete a faculty tenure recommendation form. The Chair must also convey to the faculty the responsibility to participate in the evaluation process and to provide a rationale for their recommendation, whether it is positive or negative. Faculty who have appointments that might provide more than one occasion to participate in evaluations must do so only once. If the candidate resides on a campus other than Pullman, the Chair will seek information from relevant individuals at that site. Note the following requirement specified in the Faculty Manual: "At least five persons who are thoroughly familiar with the attainments of the eligible faculty member must complete this tenure form. When there are not five tenured faculty members in the department, the tenured members shall recommend additional such persons through the Dean to the Provost, who shall determine which of these persons will complete the tenure form." The Chair's recommendation does not count as one of the five.

The Chair shall collate the results and all files are uploaded to a SharePoint site as specified by the Office of the Provost. It is college policy that faculty tenure recommendations and letters of recommendation are privileged information and are to be handled as such. They are not to be shared with the candidate without an official Public Records Request.

All personnel involved with tenure and promotion should realize that state and federal public disclosure laws may limit confidentiality of the file (including faculty recommendation forms and external letters). The Provost's office recommends qualifying statements to be used on all requests for letters of recommendation.

The Dean presents all tenure cases to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. The committee usually consists of 11 members, all tenured Professors or Associate Professors selected by the Dean with recommendations from the Chairs. The Associate Professors and Professors will recommend on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Only Professors will recommend on promotion to Professor. The members review and discuss the record of each candidate, the summary of the departmental evaluation, and the Chair's recommendation. The Chair normally appears before the committee to discuss the candidate's case. Each member records a recommendation on a confidential ballot forwarded to the Dean. All proceedings of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee are confidential. The members' recommendation forms are advisory to the Dean.

The Dean reviews the cumulative record, obtains written input from the urban campus vice chancellor, if applicable, and forwards a recommendation and the documentation to the Provost. The Provost's office generates letters to the faculty members with copies to the Chairs and the Dean. As determined by the Provost's office, there is a period of three days when these letters are to be distributed to the faculty. The Provost's office notifies the Dean's office of the three day notification period and when the letters are ready. The Dean's office distributes the letters to the department Chairs and they distribute them to the faculty members, all on the same day. For faculty at an urban campus, the Dean's office express mails the letters to them and a copy to the urban campus CAS Director to insure that all faculty receive their letters on the same day. Tenure review shall result in either the granting of tenure, to become effective at the beginning of the next academic year following the year in which the tenure review is conducted, or denial of tenure

together with the offering of a one-year terminal appointment. The policy for appeal of denial of tenure follows procedures stated in the most recent update of the Web Faculty Manual, Section III.F.1.

The SLCR adds the following:

At least one week prior to the deadline for submission of tenure evaluations and ballots, the Director shall convene a meeting of all voting members from the School to discuss the candidate's file and qualifications for tenure.

As stipulated in the Faculty Manual, all Associate Professors and Professors in the School will vote on a candidate's file for Associate Professor.

Consideration for Promotion

CAS Statement on Promotion Criteria: *The basic criteria are those outlined above for evaluating tenure. Time in rank is not sufficient by itself. Consideration for promotion is based on the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the candidate's cumulative record. Additional criteria for the ranks are listed below.*

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will depend upon adequate demonstration of the candidate's sustained excellence in the following: scholarly and/or creative contributions; effort and success in obtaining external funding at a level appropriate to the candidate's discipline, if such is required for support of the candidate's research/professional program; supervision of graduate students; and, undergraduate and graduate instruction. Normally, promotion to Associate Professor and tenure should be considered simultaneously.

For promotion to the rank of Professor, in addition to the cumulative qualifications already summarized, a candidate must present evidence of national recognition, reputation for sustained scholarly competence, and an increased level of professional activity. This evidence may include but is not limited to a substantial body of publications, scholarly or creative contributions, a well-established research program with a substantial record of external funding at a level appropriate to the candidate's discipline, effective use of professional leave and other opportunities for self-improvement, service as an editorial referee or editor of learned journal(s), consulting, and invitations to speak to professional societies. The progress made since the faculty member achieved tenure should be clearly indicated. Candidates for promotion to Professor must have made substantial progress beyond the work submitted for promotion to Associate Professor. For example, research publications, scholarly/creative contributions or grants responsible for a favorable tenure decision will not be considered to justify promotion to Professor. Documented evidence that the quality and quantity of the accomplishments of the candidate are at a significantly higher level than that expected of an Associate Professor is required. It should be emphasized that individuals who cannot present a record of continuing excellence in instruction will not be considered favorably for promotion to the rank of Professor, if instruction is part of their assignment. For promotion to Professor, an individual must exhibit mature leadership qualities that are essential for the progress of the department. A teaching portfolio (no more than 5 pages for the narrative) must be included with the promotion materials. On occasion, the rank of Professor will be recommended for individuals who excel in instruction and show clear and convincing evidence of a national or international reputation in teaching. Evidence may include publications in refereed pedagogical journals, recognition by organizations external to WSU, and funding for creative activities in instruction.

The rank of Professor is a faculty rank. As a result, administrative service usually will not justify promotion to Professor, no matter how excellent the work. Administrators can be rewarded for their contributions in other ways (e.g., through salary increases). Faculty members accepting heavy administrative burdens before achieving the rank of Professor may jeopardize their opportunity to meet the standards of teaching and scholarship necessary for promotion.

Only under exceptional circumstances will a faculty member be considered for promotion to Professor prior to serving as an Associate Professor for fewer than five years. In such instances, prior approval for consideration for promotion to Professor must be obtained from the Provost, via the Dean.

The SLCR adds the following:

In accordance with the College of Arts and Sciences' (CAS) explicit criteria for promotion, candidates for the rank of Associate Professor are judged mainly on the basis of their scholarship/creative activity (in alignment with their job description), teaching, and service to the School, College, University, and profession. Time in rank is not sufficient by itself for promotion. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is based on adequate demonstration that the candidate has sustained a high level of scholarly/creative contributions, effectiveness in instruction, and involvement in service activities at the School and professional levels.

Extra care must be exercised in the consideration of promotion to Professor, as it is typically the highest rank faculty will achieve. The rank of Professor is reserved for those who have achieved national and/or international reputation and recognition in their own fields of scholarly or creative specialization, as well as sustained excellence in teaching. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to have established a sustained record of publication and presentation since promotion to Associate Professor, a record that demonstrates a program of scholarship that has merited national and/or international recognition.

Only Professors will vote on a candidate's file for Professor. If the school does not have enough Professors (a minimum of 5 is required for a promotion committee), it is the responsibility of the Director to find the needed members among other (pertinent) academic units within the University.

PROMOTION PROCEDURES

CAS Statement on Promotion Procedures: *The procedures of documentation and review for promotion in rank are similar to those outlined for tenure review.*

Nominations for promotion normally originate with the Chair. Documentation, including letters of evaluation from at least five external reviewers, will be assembled by the Chair and presented for consideration to the tenured departmental faculty members holding academic rank higher than that of the candidate. Under no circumstances will a reviewer be paid or compensated in any way for reviewing the candidate's file or writing a letter. If the candidate resides on a campus other than Pullman, the Chair will seek information from relevant individuals at that site.

The individual faculty member may initiate his/her promotion to Professor. In such cases, that

faculty member may request that the file be forwarded to the Dean, even if the Chair's recommendation is negative. The documentation, including letters of evaluation from external reviewers, will be assembled by the Chair and presented for consideration by relevant tenured department faculty members in accordance with departmental procedures.

The Chair presides at the deliberations of the departmental faculty and determines whether to forward a recommendation for promotion and the accompanying documentation. Recommendation procedures are outlined in the annual distribution of information regarding tenure and promotion from the Provost's office. It is college policy that faculty recommendations for promotion and letters of recommendation are privileged information and are to be handled as such. They are not to be shared with the candidate without an official Public Records Request. The Chair shall collate the results and forward them together with the faculty recommendation forms, documentation, and a confidential recommendation to the Dean in the format specified in the guidelines from the Provost's office. The Dean presents promotion cases to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The Dean considers the cumulative record, obtains input in writing from the urban campus vice chancellor, if applicable, and determines whether or not to forward to the Provost a positive recommendation and the documentation. If the decision is to not forward the documentation the faculty member will be given a written justification. In addition, the faculty member will be given a minimum of five working days to exercise the right to have the documentation forwarded to the Provost regardless of the Dean's decision. Recommendations are reviewed by the Provost.

The SLCR has no further stipulations on this.

PART II.

CAREER TRACK FACULTY

APPOINTMENT, EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROMOTION

CAS Statement regarding Appointment, Evaluation Criteria, and Promotion of Career Track Faculty:

Teaching Career Track

Faculty in the teaching career track have appointments that are primarily oriented toward teaching, with reduced expectations in service and limited or no expectations in research, scholarship, or creative activity. As such, promotion within this career track is determined largely by a continuing excellence in teaching.

General Statement on Excellence in Teaching

In considering a case for promotion in this track, the College values most highly a demonstrated record of achievement and growth, one that demonstrates evolution and innovation in a faculty member's teaching over time. The College also recognizes that teaching occurs in a variety of modes and environments outside of the formal classroom, individual or group lessons, studio, or lab settings. Work such as independent studies, mentoring and informal advising, and advancing student professional development, especially when it is accompanied by evidence of effectiveness,

can thus also be an element of a promotion case in this track.

Excellence in teaching should be presented and assessed through multiple measures and with an attention to the teaching that has occurred throughout a candidate's time in rank. While high student evaluation scores are perhaps the most immediately accessible means of demonstrating excellence in teaching, such scores by themselves will not be determinative for promotion, nor will individual instances of lower teaching evaluations necessarily prevent promotion. Additional measures of teaching excellence may include peer evaluations, participation or leadership in program assessment and development, selection and development of teaching material (both proprietary and open education resources), effective engagement with larger unit and discipline efforts to advance pedagogy and curricula, internal and external awards, and presentation or publication of material regarding teaching in appropriate professional outlets. Two peer evaluations of recent teaching (within the prior three years of an application) must be included in the candidate's promotion materials.

Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor

Candidates for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor are expected in the first instance to demonstrate that their teaching effectively supports course and unit learning outcomes, and that it reflects the current state of knowledge and pedagogy in the discipline. Assignments in service or research, scholarship, and creative activity [if any] will be evaluated by the standards applied to the evaluation of secondary areas within the scholarly track, with particular expectations conditioned by the faculty member's contractual workload.

Regarding teaching, candidates for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor should demonstrate the capacity to effectively communicate course content to students, and their course and assignment designs should be accessible to all students. These designs should also support student success and, where appropriate, active learning. Where appropriate, candidates are expected to help develop these qualities in teaching assistants assigned to their supervision. For promotion to Teaching Associate, the College also particularly values the capacity and commitment for further development as a teacher, especially when these qualities build upon the pedagogical growth a faculty member has already pursued as a Teaching Assistant Professor. Versatility in the classroom, as shown either by teaching a range of classes or by pursuing new methods of teaching within regularly reoccurring set of courses, can also demonstrate that a faculty member continues to develop as a teacher. Such qualities help ensure the continuing level of excellence appropriate to a more senior position in this track.

Promotion to Teaching Professor

Candidates for promotion to Teaching Professor are expected to demonstrate continuing effectiveness in the classroom, as well as elements of pedagogical growth and leadership beyond that which would characterize promotion to Teaching Associate Professor. Assignments in service or research, scholarship, and creative activity [if any] will be evaluated by the standards applied to the evaluation of secondary areas within the scholarly track, with expectations conditioned by the faculty member's contractual workload expectations.

Candidates for promotion to Teaching Professor should demonstrate not only sustained excellence in classroom teaching but also innovation and further growth in their pedagogy, course and

assignment design, and efforts toward student success. The College recognizes that such efforts may expose the faculty member to lower student evaluation scores or unsuccessful moments of teaching. In assessing such instances, and growth in teaching more generally, the College will seek a pattern of iterative growth, one in which a faculty member extends their pedagogy, assesses the results of that change, and makes further adjustments based on those assessments.

Especially for promotion to Teaching Professor, the College also particularly values efforts and initiative toward supporting the growth of colleagues and graduate students (both within and outside the unit) as teachers, and work to enhance a unit's curricula. Candidates seeking promotion to Teaching Professor are expected to take on active leadership roles in such activities within and/or outside their home unit. Such qualities reflect a concern with the larger dimensions of teaching appropriate to the highest teaching-centered rank within the College.

The School of Languages, Cultures, and Race has the following further stipulations for Career Track in Teaching:

1. The minimum required degree for faculty in the Teaching Career Track is a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree in a pertinent area. However, when first created, WSU allowed faculty without terminal degrees to move into these positions. Promotion cases will follow the same procedure regardless of whether the faculty member holds a terminal degree or not.
2. Promotion to Career Associate Professor or Professor is initiated by the Director. All individuals to be considered for promotion are required to develop and maintain a teaching portfolio in the same way as tenure-track or tenured faculty. This review will take place on the same timeline as the tenure-track faculty tenure and promotion review.
3. Among the characteristics of effective teaching are: knowledge of the subject matter, ability to teach both undergraduate and graduate courses (when applicable), ability to organize material, ability to foster interest, ability to stimulate students intellectually, knowledge of testing/grading procedures, ability to criticize perceptively and constructively, range of courses; and contributions to curricular transformation and university learning goals.

The following evidence will be examined:

- Student evaluations. Both undergraduate and graduate courses (when applicable) should be represented. Student evaluations cannot be taken at face value, but must be interpreted. In reading evaluations, one should recognize the identities and social locations of professor/students, type of class, number of students in class and other factors when examining course effectiveness.²
- At least one peer evaluator will come from within the tenured faculty of SLCR. One evaluator will be selected by the candidate and one by the Director. These evaluators will visit the candidate's class at an arranged time during the candidate's third or fourth semester, discuss the class afterwards with the candidate, and each submit a written report to the Director on School letterhead, to which the candidate may respond in writing. The details for performing the observation and writing the

² For summary of research on this matter, please see Hurston 2005,

http://sun.skidmore.union.edu/sunNET/ResourceFiles/Huston_Race_Gender_TeachingEvals.pdf

report can be found in the following three documents:

- Additional Ways of Evaluating Effective Teaching
- Faculty Peer Observation Form
- CAS Teaching Observation Information and Guide

The report and response will become part of the candidate's record.

- Pedagogical Statement
 - Syllabi
 - Awards and honors for teaching
 - Other appearances of the candidate in public; e.g., readings, public lectures, guest lectures in others' classes
4. For promotion from Teaching Assistant Professor to Teaching Associate Professor or from Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching Professor, the candidate's file shall include confidential letters from *at least five* external (to SLCR) reviewers with expertise in the candidate's area of academic activity, and who have agreed to evaluate the quality and quantity of the candidate's teaching record and effectiveness.
 5. The selection of these reviewers will be handled in the following manner:
 - a. Final selection of the external reviewers shall be made by the Director, in consultation with Associate Professors, Professors, and Career Track Associate Professors and Professors, with priority given to those in the candidate's area of expertise, when possible.
 - b. The Director shall request a curriculum vitae from each external reviewer and provide the Dean with background information regarding the qualifications and stature of these reviewers.
 - c. No former graduate school committee members, thesis chairs, co-authors, or anyone else who cannot provide an impartial evaluation or who could stand to benefit from the promotion of the candidate shall be selected as an external reviewer. Senior colleagues whom the candidate has met through professional conferences and/or other professional interactions may serve as external reviewers.
 - d. With the understanding that the terms, "Teaching Assistant Professor," "Teaching Associate Professor" and "Teaching Professor" are not used across academic institutions, each selected reviewer will be provided with a description of the criteria for Teaching Professor and Scholarly Professor, to better situate the evaluation of his/her file.
 6. As stipulated by the Provost Office, all Career and Tenure Track Associate Professors, and Career and Tenure Track Professors in the School will vote on a candidate's file for Teaching Associate Professor. Only Career Track and Tenure Track Professors will be able to vote on a candidate's file for Teaching Professor.

Scholarly Career Track

CAS Faculty in the scholarly career track generally have appointments that include both a primary allocation toward teaching and a significant allocation dedicated to one or more of the following areas: student advising, research or scholarship, creative activity, outreach, practice, educational leadership, administration, or academic service.

Given the resulting diversity of such appointments, and in particular the potential range of secondary duties, all promotion reviews for faculty in the scholarly career track should be informed in the first instance by the specific workload expectations detailed in the candidate's contract. The College recognizes that the needs of a unit or the candidate's professional development may result

in changes in these assignments, especially in a candidate's secondary area(s). Shifts in these areas will thus not necessarily be considered an impediment to a candidate's promotion. In some cases, successful faculty members who have changes in secondary areas may need more time in their current rank in order to achieve the credentials necessary for promotion to the next rank.

General Statement on Excellence in Teaching

In considering the teaching presented for promotion in this track, the College values most highly a demonstrated record of achievement and growth, one that demonstrates evolution and innovation in a faculty member's teaching over time. The College also recognizes that teaching occurs in a variety of environments outside of the formal classroom, individual or group lessons, studio, or lab settings. Work such as independent studies, mentoring and informal advising, and advancing student professional development, especially when it is accompanied by evidence of effectiveness, can thus also be an element of a promotion case in this track.

Excellence in teaching should be presented and assessed through multiple measures and with an attention to the teaching that has occurred throughout a candidate's time in rank. While high student evaluation scores are perhaps the most immediately accessible means of demonstrating excellence in teaching, such scores by themselves will not be determinative for promotion, nor will individual instances of lower teaching evaluations necessarily prevent promotion. Additional measures of teaching excellence may include peer evaluations, participation or leadership in program assessment and development, selection and development of teaching material (both proprietary and open education resources), effective engagement with larger unit and discipline efforts to advance pedagogy and curricula, internal and external awards, and presentation or publication of material regarding teaching in appropriate professional outlets. Two peer evaluations of recent teaching (within the prior three years of an application) must be included in the candidate's promotion materials.

General Statement on Secondary Areas

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

- **Growth:** *within their secondary area(s) candidates should demonstrate increasing levels of accomplishment, responsibility, engagement, and/or leadership.*
- **Coherence:** *activities within secondary area(s) should contribute to candidates developing a particular expertise and a recognizable professional profile.*
- **Impact:** *activities within secondary area(s) should contribute to the advancement of a scholarly field; curricula, programs, or departments; colleges, campuses, or the university as a whole; individual students or student groups; initiatives in research, scholarship, or creative activity; opportunities for public engagement and policy influence; or other defined areas of work beyond individual professional development. Activity that has not secured*

specific outputs or results, such as scholarship “in progress” or new programs still in development, will be recognized but thus accorded lesser significance.

Promotion to Scholarly Associate Professor

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

The teaching of candidates for promotion to Scholarly Associate Professor will be evaluated in adherence with the criteria established for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor, with particular attention being paid to the demonstration of effective communication, accessibility of the course and assignments, support for student success, and the capacity for further development as a teacher. Proportionate to contractual expectations, performance in the secondary area(s) is to be assessed using the criteria detailed above, with particular attention being paid to the qualities of coherence and growth. In terms of impact, candidates emphasizing work internal to WSU, such as advising or program development, should demonstrate an emerging reputation for individual excellence and engagement. Candidates emphasizing externally facing work, such as research/scholarship/creative activity or public engagement and policy efforts, should demonstrate an emerging regional or national reputation in these areas. Letters of support detailing this activity and its impact can be included among a candidate’s materials.

Promotion to Scholarly Professor

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

The teaching of candidates for promotion to Scholarly Professor will be evaluated in adherence with the criteria established for promotion to Teaching Professor. Candidates for promotion to Scholarly Professor who have teaching expectations are expected to demonstrate continuing effectiveness in the classroom, as well as elements of pedagogical growth and active leadership beyond that which would characterize an initial promotion. In particular, candidates should demonstrate qualities of exploration, innovation, and classroom or curricular versatility.

Proportionate to contractual expectations, performance in the secondary area(s) is to be assessed using the criteria detailed above, with particular attention at this level being paid not only to continuing potential for growth but also impactful leadership. Candidates emphasizing work internal to WSU, such as advising or program development, should demonstrate a capacity to translate their individual efforts into work with broader positive impacts among colleagues, curricula, departments and programs, or the university as a whole. Candidates emphasizing externally impactful work, such as research/scholarship/creative activity or public engagement and policy efforts, should demonstrate an established regional, national, or international reputation in these areas. Together such qualities reflect a concern with the larger dimensions of accomplishment appropriate to this rank. Letters of support detailing this activity and its impact can be included among a candidate’s materials.

The School of Languages, Cultures, and Race has the following further stipulations to the Scholarly Career Track:

1. The minimum required degree for faculty in the Scholarly Career Track is a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree in a pertinent area. However, when first created, WSU allowed faculty without terminal degrees to move into these positions. Promotion cases will follow the same procedure regardless of whether the faculty member holds a terminal degree or not.
2. Promotion to Career Associate Professor or Professor is initiated by the Director. All individuals to be considered for promotion are required to develop and maintain a teaching portfolio in the same way as tenure-track or tenured faculty. This review will take place on the same timeline as the tenure-track faculty tenure and promotion review. Evaluation of effective teaching will follow the guidelines stipulated in pages 14 and 15 above for Career Track in Teaching.
3. For promotion from Scholarly Assistant Professor to Scholarly Associate Professor or from Scholarly Associate Professor to Scholarly Professor, the candidate's file shall include confidential letters from *at least five* external (to WSU) reviewers who have expertise in the candidate's area of academic activity, and have agreed to evaluate the quality and quantity of the candidate's teaching record and effectiveness, and any published research, grants, or other evidence of scholarly or creative activity (in the case of Scholarly faculty).
4. The selection of these reviewers will be handled in the following manner:
 - a. Final selection of the external reviewers shall be made by the Director, in consultation with Professors and Career professors, with priority given to those in the candidate's area of expertise, when possible.
 - b. The Director shall request a curriculum vitae from each external reviewer and provide the Dean with background information regarding the qualifications and stature of these reviewers.
 - c. No former graduate school committee members, thesis chairs, co-authors, or anyone else who cannot provide an impartial evaluation or who could stand to benefit from the promotion of the candidate shall be selected as an external reviewer. Senior colleagues whom the candidate has met through professional conferences and/or other professional interactions may serve as external reviewers.
 - d. With the understanding that the terms, "Scholarly Assistant Professor" "Scholarly Associate Professor," and "Scholarly Professor" are not used across academic institutions, each selected reviewer will be provided with a description of the criteria for Teaching Professor and Scholarly Professor, to better situate the evaluation of his/her file.
5. As stipulated by the Provost Office, all Career and Tenure Track Associate Professors, and Career and Tenure Track Professors in the School will vote on a candidate's file for Scholarly Associate Professor. Only Career Track and Tenure Track Professors are able to vote on a candidate's file for Scholarly Professor.