

POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND PRACTICES FOR TENURE REVIEW
Department of Veterinary Microbiology and Pathology
College of Veterinary Medicine
Washington State University

INTRODUCTION

The policies, procedures, and practices described herein were developed to be in accord with the procedures and policies of Washington State University Faculty Manual. It is expected that this document will provide pre-tenure faculty of the Department of Veterinary Microbiology and Pathology (VMP), not only with the specific policies and procedures related to tenure but also with insight on the perceptions and expectations of the tenured faculty of the Department.

The faculty of VMP believes that a faculty member should focus his or her efforts, time, and energies during the pre-tenure years upon achievement in those areas described in the Role Statement of the faculty member. In general, untenured faculty members should work toward establishing programs in the areas of teaching, public (clinical/diagnostic) service, and/or research, in accord with the descriptions of assignments in their Role Statement, and establish national reputations in these areas.

A mentoring committee will be assigned to each incoming faculty member and shall be composed of members that represent each of the programmatic areas in which the faculty member has a greater than 5% assignment. For example, if the incoming faculty member has a 55% research, 40% teaching and 5% service assignment, the mentoring committee will consist of senior faculty members to guide in the areas of research and teaching.

PROMOTION CRITERIA

The evaluation of the faculty member will be based on the Role Statement for that position. The relative emphases in the areas of teaching, research, clinical service, and academic service as stated in the Role Statement shall be considered when evaluating productivity and effectiveness in each of these areas. The following criteria shall be considered:

Teaching: Because of the significance of teaching within the College of Veterinary Medicine, it is incumbent on all faculty members to display a high level of competency, commitment and concern for students at all levels of instruction. Teaching competence and effectiveness will be evaluated by multiple parameters including, but not necessarily limited to peer evaluations, student evaluations, review of a recorded lecture, or visits to the teaching site(s) by one or more peer faculty or members of a Departmental Mentoring Committee, as appointed by the Chair, and review of a teaching portfolio prepared by the faculty member. It is expected that faculty show consistent effort and productivity each year toward teaching activity commensurate with their role statement.

The teaching portfolio deserves varying emphasis depending on the individual faculty member's Role Statement, but may include these six areas as defined by the "AAMC Toolbox for Evaluating Educators": 1) Teaching, 2) Mentoring and Advising, 3) Learner Assessment, 4)

Curriculum and Program Development, 5) Educational Leadership (and administration), and 6) Educational Research.

Research: In the independent research arena, faculty under review for tenure are expected to show cogent progress toward development of a sustainable, extramurally funded, nationally/internationally recognized research program and provide evidence of programmatic success. This will be judged in four parts: 1) published peer-reviewed research manuscripts, 2) acquisition of extramural funding as PI and other resources as applicable that are necessary to maintain an active research program, 3) reputation in the appropriate field of research and 4) contribution to graduate education.

1) Publication of manuscripts in high-quality refereed journals resulting from research initiated after the appointment to the faculty is required for the award of tenure. While collaborative publication is valued, publication of first and senior-authored are expected commensurate with the level of research appointment. As a general guideline the candidate should expect to publish 8-12 **quality** papers expected commensurate with the level of research appointment. It is expected that the candidate will publish papers that make a significant impact and contribution to the field while developing the candidate's positive reputation. Up to 10 manuscripts will be included in the tenure package. Publications to be considered for tenure include only those that have been accepted, not those in preparation, submitted, or in review. It is expected that faculty show consistent effort and productivity each year toward research and scholarly activity commensurate with their role statement.

2) Faculty with research intensive appointments must secure sufficient extramural funding to sustain their research program and train graduate students. Significant funding as PI will be expected for more research intensive appointments. Implicit in the pursuit of funding is the timely preparation of drafts of proposals, requesting the input of collaborators and mentors with sufficient time available for the incorporation of their suggestions, and the positive attention to and addressing of the critiques provided by past reviewers in the revisions of subsequent grant applications. Collaborative research resulting in refereed publications and acquisition of extramural support as a co-investigator is considered a significant achievement but is not a substitute for establishment of an independent research program. Collaborative research is encouraged, however, faculty should ensure that their contribution is clearly defined with provision of a sub-budget, if appropriate.

3) It is expected that by the time a faculty member is reviewed for tenure they will have demonstrated compelling progress toward establishing a nationally/internationally recognized program. Demonstration of reputation can be through invitations to review grants or serve on grant panels, review for journals, invitations to speak at meetings or institutions and invitations to author reviews.

4) Graduate instruction will be considered as part of the research appointment separable from formal classroom teaching. Success in this category will be indicated by having graduate students and serving on graduate student committees within VMP or within academic departments/units outside of VMP.

Clinical Service: Clinical service/teaching in VMP is defined as clinical diagnostic medicine service conducted within the Washington Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory together with the clinical teaching of DVM students and post-DVM residents associated with that activity. Clinical service/teaching is recognized as an important component of a clinical faculty member's career development and position responsibilities. The clinical faculty members are diverse in terms of clinical areas of expertise and training as well as in assignments.

Faculty with clinical service appointments in their role statement must provide evidence that they are an essential member of the service group, and that there is continuous professional growth in the service area. Evaluation of clinical diagnostic service is based on a combination of evaluation by the faculty supervisor of the service area, diagnostic service parameters such as effective case turnaround time, increasing case load, building of a positive reputation in appropriate subject matter expertise, growth / development of services within the faculty member's subject area, effective implementation of service area quality management system activities, peer evaluations, staff evaluations (if faculty member supervises staff) and evaluation by those clients served by the clinical service. The acquisition of appropriate board certification is judged as documentation of technical competence and is expected of faculty with clinical service appointments. It is expected that faculty with clinical service appointments show consistent effort and productivity each year toward clinical service activity commensurate with their role statement.

There is a component of scholarly activity within clinical service appointments. The evaluation of the candidate's scholarly activity will be based upon both its productivity and quality. The department recognizes scholarship in basic, applied, clinical and education research, discovery, as fulfilling a faculty member's obligation to conduct scholarly activity. Clinical service appointments will result in publication and funding opportunities within the context of performing service work, providing clinical subject matter expertise or pursuing clinical research and discovery activities. Faculty should prioritize these efforts in order to build an area of expertise and positive reputation. It is expected that faculty show consistent effort and productivity each year toward creative research and scholarly activity commensurate with their appointment.

Academic Service: Service is regarded as a valuable faculty activity and shall be considered in the granting of promotion. All faculty are expected to participate in academic service assignments as part of their citizenship responsibilities in the Department, College, and University. Faculty are expected to take these responsibilities seriously and delinquent performance or lack of any academic service in this arena can be considered a negative at the time of tenure review. Effective academic service is not a substitute for meeting the expectations in primary areas of teaching, research, and/or public/clinical/diagnostic service in accordance with the position description.

The assessment of academic service will include evaluation of activities such as:

- 1) serving on Departmental, College and University committees
- 2) advising recognized student organizations,
- 3) membership and offices held in professional and scientific societies,
- 4) peer review of primary manuscripts or books, service on review panels for local, state, or federal

granting agencies, 5) educational services including early and advanced practice experience activities and 6) maintaining resources for the college, i.e. web pages or collections.

TENURE REVIEW DATES

Tenure reviews are conducted during fall semester for faculty scheduled for review in that particular year. The initiation of the process to select external reviewers and the solicitation of these reviews will be prior to the beginning of fall semester.

The year in which a faculty member undergoes tenure review is in almost all cases decided at the time of initial appointment to a tenured faculty position. Faculty members with no previous faculty experience will be reviewed for tenure in their sixth year. Faculty recruited with previous faculty experience can negotiate with the Department Chair and with the approval of the Dean and Provost to be evaluated for tenure at a date earlier than their sixth year. A faculty member can request acceleration of tenure review by one year upon achievements significantly beyond the expectations of their role statement. Denial of tenure upon early review is final and the faculty member cannot subsequently elect to undergo review again during the originally scheduled year. Faculty members who, for valid reasons, are delayed relative to the usual timetable in their efforts to establish their scholarly programs may request an extension of the scheduled date of tenure review. Extensions are typically for one year. Requests for extension must be made prior to the time of the scheduled tenure review and must be submitted to the Department Chair no later than January 1 of the year of the scheduled review.

PRELIMINARY TENURE PROCESSES

The review of progress towards tenure differs from the annual review in that this review requires input from the tenured faculty in VMP. Progress towards tenure reviews will assess the faculty member's **cumulative progress** towards tenure, whereas the annual review is solely based on performance of the current year. Progress towards tenure review is mandated by WSU and is described in the Faculty Manual.

VMP tenured faculty meet to review the faculty member's progress towards tenure report and other files as applicable, and a written summary of the meeting is provided by the Department Chair to the faculty member. The Chair will discuss the outcome of the review with the faculty member as described in the Faculty Manual.

The Third-Year Progress-Toward-Tenure Review is an expanded version of the Progress-Toward-Tenure Review. In addition to the Third-Year Review package, the faculty member presents a public seminar. The tenured faculty meet to discuss progress-toward-tenure and submit ballots to the Chair. The review is similar to the tenure review except that letters are not requested from external reviewers. There must be clear evidence of progress in the establishment of scholarly programs in the primary areas specified in the Role Statement of the faculty member, and potential to remain on a positive trajectory.

STRUCTURE OF THE TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to prepare the package for review by the tenured faculty. A teaching portfolio should be included if appropriate. It is acceptable to solicit input of tenured faculty on the preparation of the curriculum vitae, tenure review package, and teaching portfolio.

A faculty member undergoing tenure review must present a seminar based upon his or her scholarly activities, and in the majority of cases, the seminar will be upon the topic of the faculty member's research. This seminar should be scheduled during early fall semester, prior to the initiation of the internal review process.

The Chair will notify the tenured faculty of the availability of the review package for examination and subsequently schedules a tenure review meeting. The tenure document includes letters from external reviewers. The tenure review meeting is considered an information sharing session and an opportunity to interpret information in the tenure package and to share perceptions with other faculty. The mentoring committee will be expected to lead the discussion and provide pertinent information about the candidate's development. Subsequent to the meeting, tenured faculty will have the opportunity to re-review the tenure and/or teaching portfolio packages and then submit their signed confidential ballot to the Chair. The Chair completes the forms provided by the Provost and forwards them to the Dean of CVM.

The faculty member is notified typically in March of the outcome of the tenure review process through a formal letter from the Provost.

Upon the successful completion of the tenure review process, the Provost's Office returns the packages to the Department. The Provost's Office removes and retains the tenure ballots, the faculty member's curriculum vitae, and the Dean's and Chair's Analysis forms. The Department Chair removes the letters from the external reviewers and the biographical sketches of the external reviewers. The package is then returned to the faculty member.

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

WSU requires letters from a minimum of five external reviewers who can appropriately assess the candidate's achievements as part of the tenure evaluation process. The faculty member under review will provide names of three potential external reviewers, and the tenured faculty will provide suggestions for others. The Chair requests letters from five external reviewers nominated by the tenured faculty and the three external reviewers selected by the faculty member. The tenured faculty may or may not place varying levels of weight upon the comments and recommendations of the external reviewers. Faculty members undergoing review are not to contact potential external reviewers. Individuals who are ineligible to serve as reviewers include former graduate students, the former major faculty advisor, current collaborators, co-authors in the previous five years, and relatives.

The external reviewers will, according to WSU guidelines, be “. . .noted teachers, scholars, researchers, artists, and performers at respected institutions, research centers, or private-sector organizations.” The Department interprets this to mean full Professors, Department Chairs, Associate Deans, Deans, or Associate Professors with the appropriate credentials. Although the

University specifies that letters may be solicited from individuals in “private-sector organizations,” VMP will solicit letters primarily from individuals at academic institutions and secondarily from individuals at government laboratories and research institutes.

WSU requires a short biographical sketch of each external reviewer. Consequently, at the time of the provision of the names of potential external reviewers, faculty members under review as well as tenured faculty suggesting external reviewers will provide a brief synopsis of the reviewer’s credentials.

The Department will send to the external reviewers the faculty member’s curriculum vitae, context statement, research statement and for those faculty for whom it’s appropriate, the teaching portfolio, excluding the appendices. The curriculum vitae will include a listing only of accepted publications; those "in preparation," "submitted for publication," or "under review" should not be included.

Information in a faculty member’s curriculum vitae that changes between the time of submission to external reviewers and the final preparation for internal reviewers should be updated in the curriculum vitae that is submitted as part of the package for review at WSU.

ROLE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

The VMP Department Chair does not cast ballots on matters of tenure. The opinion of the Chair resides in the Chair’s Analysis section of the tenure review documents. The role of the Department Chair at tenure review meetings is to moderate the meeting, answer questions of the tenured faculty on those topics in which the tenured faculty believe the Chair has unique insight, and to provide clarifications and corrections on issues where the Chair believes there are misperceptions. The Chair does not attempt to form a consensus or to create an atmosphere in which it would appear the Chair is attempting influence tenured faculty in a tenure decision.

EVOLVING NATURE OF REVIEWS FOR TENURE

It is important to emphasize that the tenure review process at WSU is an evolving process. Changes are made in the system and process year-by-year. Some of these changes are mandated by revisions of the Faculty Manual, some are mandated by the format of the documents required by the Office of the Provost, some might be changes required by the College of Veterinary Medicine, and some are changes in procedures developed at the level of the Department. Some of the procedures and policies currently in effect may be modified in future years. Likewise, in addition to changes in policies and procedures, standards in the expected attainment of levels of scholarly performance are evolving. What was an acceptable level of performance for the award of tenure in past years may become inadequate in future years.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The tenure review is a confidential process. In order to encourage the candid expression of opinions on the part of tenured faculty and external reviewers, it is essential to maintain, to the extent of the law, the confidentiality of the process. It is prohibited to share with others and, in

particular, to attribute specifically to others, opinions expressed in the confidential tenure review meetings. Likewise, it is prohibited for the tenured faculty that review packages that contain the letters from external reviewers to disclose or divulge the identity or the opinions of the external reviewers to others. In the preliminary tenure review processes, the Chair summarizes and collates the comments of the tenured faculty, but does not attribute the constructive critiques to the individual faculty members that expressed and enunciated the opinions in the confidence of the Progress-Toward-Tenure Review meetings. Likewise, the Department Chair does not divulge to the faculty members under tenure review or third-year progress-toward-tenure review the recommendations expressed on the ballots of specific faculty members. It is within the purview of the Dean or Provost, when asked to do so, to speak or write in generalities regarding collective opinions of the tenured faculty members of the Department.

Appendix 1

“A sample time table for promotion”

The following is an example timetable for preparing and evaluating promotion documents.

April/May - The *Provost's Instructions and Forms on Tenure and Promotion* are distributed to the Colleges. These instructions may be found at: <http://provost.wsu.edu/>.

May – The Department Chair meets with the candidate to prepare a list of possible external evaluators.

June and July – The Department Chair contacts potential external evaluators to determine their ability and willingness to provide an evaluation.

August – The Department Chair will review the applicant's supporting materials and may request a meeting with the candidate to help ensure that a complete and accurate document is submitted. The candidate shall be given 48 hours after this meeting to make any necessary revisions and resubmit a corrected version.

August - Packets are mailed to external evaluators willing to serve. External letters are due back in the Department by mid-September.

September – Following the return of the external evaluations, the Departmental Promotion Review Meeting and faculty balloting occurs.

October and early November - The Department Chair, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and Dean's recommendations are prepared and included in the candidate's file.

November – Completed promotion files are sent to the Provost's Office.

January - The Provost and Vice Provosts evaluate the candidate. The Provost discusses any problematic candidate evaluations and recommendations with the Dean.

February and March – Promotion decisions become final and letters describing the decision are sent to faculty members.

March - Successful faculty members may be recognized at the Celebration of Excellence Banquet held during the University Showcase. The Banquet honors faculty achievements including recognition of University-wide faculty award winners and faculty members granted tenure and/or promotion.