

**WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**COLLEGE OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS**

**CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES**  
**FOR**  
**PRETENURE REVIEWS, THIRD YEAR REVIEWS,**  
**TENURE, AND PROMOTION**

Passed  
November, 2002

Effective Fall Semester 2004

## CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
A. Authority for Establishing Review Criteria and Procedures .....	1
B. Minimum Requirements .....	1
<b>II. CRITERIA FOR PRE-TENURE REVIEW</b> .....	2
A. Introduction .....	2
B. General Criteria for Third Year Tenure Review.....	2
C. Minimum Criteria for Establishing Satisfactory Progress towards Tenure in the College of Business and Economics .....	2
<b>III. CRITERIA FOR THIRD YEAR TENURE REVIEW</b> .....	3
A. Introduction .....	3
B. General Criteria for Third Year Tenure Review.....	3
C. Minimum Criteria for Establishing Satisfactory Progress towards Tenure in the College of Business and Economics at the Time of Third Year Tenure Review.....	3
D. Example of a Minimally Acceptable Record at the Time of Third Year Tenure Review .....	4
<b>IV. CRITERIA FOR GRANTING TENURE</b> .....	4
A. Introduction .....	4
B. General Criteria for Granting Tenure .....	5
C. Specific Criteria for Granting Tenure in the College of Business and Economics.....	6
1. <i>Academic Research Requirements for Tenure</i> .....	6
2. <i>Teaching Requirements for Tenure</i> .....	9
3. <i>Service Requirements for Tenure</i> .....	11
D. Professionalism .....	13
1. Professionalism Defined .....	13
<b>V. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION IN RANK</b> .....	13
A. Introduction .....	13
B. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor.....	14
C. Criteria for Promotion to Professor .....	14
<b>VI. GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR PRETENURE AND TENUREREVIEWS</b> .....	14
A. Introduction .....	14
B. Procedures for Pre-Tenure and Tenure Review.....	15
1. <i>Notification of Review</i> .....	15
2. <i>First Two Pre-Tenure Reviews</i> .....	15
a. <i>Procedure in the Event of an Unsatisfactory Performance Determination at the Unit Level</i> .....	15
b. <i>Final Determination of Satisfactory Progress towards Tenure</i> .....	15
c. <i>Procedure in the Event of an Unsatisfactory Determination</i> .....	15

3. <i>Third Year Pre-Tenure Review</i> .....	16
a. <i>Discussion of Evaluation following Review by Promotion and Tenure Committee</i> .....	16
b. <i>Opportunity for Response in the Event of an Adverse Evaluation from the Unit and/or Promotion and Tenure Committee</i> .....	16
c. <i>Review by Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research</i> .....	17
d. <i>Final Determination of Satisfactory Progress towards Tenure</i> .....	17
e. <i>Procedure in the Event of an Unsatisfactory Determination of Progress towards Tenure</i> .	17
4. <i>Last Two Pre-Tenure Reviews</i> .....	17
5. <i>Final Tenure Review</i> .....	17
a. <i>Preparation of the Tenure Packet</i> .....	17
b. <i>Selection of Outside Reviewers</i> .....	18
c. <i>Unit Review</i> .....	19
d. <i>Review by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee</i> .....	19
e. <i>Dean's Review</i> .....	19
f. <i>Provost's Review</i> .....	20
g. <i>Final Determination for the Granting of Tenure</i> .....	20
h. <i>Candidate's Right to Notice</i> .....	20
i. <i>Candidate's Right to Withdraw Candidacy</i> .....	20
j. <i>Procedure in the Event of an Unsatisfactory Determination to Grant Tenure</i> .....	20
<b>VII. GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION REVIEWS</b> .....	20
A. <i>Introduction</i> .....	21
B. <i>Notification of Deadlines</i> .....	21
C. <i>Initiation of Promotion Review</i> .....	21
D. <i>The Promotion Packet</i> .....	22
E. <i>Selection of Outside Reviewers</i> .....	22
F. <i>Unit Review</i> .....	22
G. <i>Unit Head's Review</i> .....	22
H. <i>Candidate's Right to Proceed in the Event of a Negative Unit Recommendation</i> .....	22
I. <i>College Promotion and Tenure Committee Review</i> .....	22
J. <i>Candidate's Right to Proceed in the Event of a Negative Promotion and Tenure Committee Recommendation</i> .....	23
K. <i>Dean's Review</i> .....	23
L. <i>Provost's Review</i> .....	23
M. <i>Final Determination for Promotion</i> .....	23
<b>VIII. ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES FOR BRANCH CAMPUS FACULTY</b> .....	23
A. <i>Pre-Tenure Review</i> .....	23
B. <i>Third-Year, Tenure and Promotion Reviews</i> .....	24
<b>Appendix: Summary of Promotion and Tenure Procedures</b> .....	25

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The review of tenure-track faculty during the third year of employment, the granting of tenure, and the promotion of faculty to Associate Professor and to Professor in the College of Business and Economics (hereinafter College) are based on a candidate's performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service, expectations of future performance in these areas, professional behavior in the conduct of their university duties, and on the possession of an appropriate terminal degree. The specific criteria in these areas are specified in this document along with defining terms. Procedures for the promotion and tenure process are summarized in a separate section at the end of this document.

### **A. Authority for Establishing Review Criteria and Procedures**

The granting of tenure implies a long-term commitment on the part of Washington State University and is, consequently, the most critical decision made regarding a faculty member. Such commitments must be limited to persons who are judged most likely to be an asset to the College and Washington State University for the rest of their careers.

Section III, D. 5. b. of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual* states:

*“Colleges, departments, schools, and other units shall develop written criteria for tenure and promotion that are to be used in all progress-toward-tenure reviews and all tenure or promotion decisions. Criteria documents shall also delineate the process the unit will follow in its yearly reviews of the progress of untenured faculty. The criteria shall be developed with representative input from tenured faculty in the unit, and shall be approved by majority vote of all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the unit. The same procedure shall be followed in revising the criteria or review process. Proposed new or revised criteria and review processes shall be provided to relevant administrators and to the Provost. After administrative approval, a copy of the new or revised criteria and description of the process shall be provided to every faculty member of the college, department, school or other unit, and an additional copy shall be filed with the Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate.”*

Pursuant to the *Faculty Manual* directive, this document describes promotion and tenure evaluation procedures and evaluative criteria regarding research, teaching, service, and professionalism for the College on all campuses of Washington State University.

### **B. Minimum Requirements**

This document outlines the **minimum requirements** for the College. Each unit within the College is required to maintain its own criteria for third year review, and the granting of tenure and promotion, appropriate to its area, in a published document that meets, or exceeds, the minimum requirements set out in this document on each relevant dimension. Proposed new or revised departmental and unit criteria and review processes shall be submitted to College's Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs and Research for submission to the Dean and the Provost.

## **II. CRITERIA FOR PRE-TENURE REVIEW**

### **A. Introduction**

Pre-tenure review is conducted at the departmental level each academic year prior to tenure consideration. These reviews are to involve all tenured faculty members. The procedures for yearly pre-tenure progress reviews are set out in Section III.D.3.d. of the *Washington State University*

*Faculty Manual*. The general criteria that a candidate must satisfy for this review are also set out in the *Washington State University Faculty Manual*. Specific minimum criteria applicable to candidates in the departments and units within the College are set out below.

### **B. General Criteria for Pre-Tenure Review**

The general criteria for pre-tenure review of tenure-track faculty are set out Section III.D.3.e. of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual*. That provision states:

*“Satisfactory progress toward meeting tenure requirements must be demonstrated for continued appointment prior to tenure. In addition to the yearly reviews, a formal tenure progress review shall be conducted for all faculty members who were initially appointed full time at the level of Assistant Professor, or equivalent. This review normally will occur three years prior to tenure consideration. This review is optional for appointments with a pre-tenure period less than three years and should be negotiated at the time of appointment. The tenure progress review shall be conducted by those eligible to perform final tenure evaluations, and follow similar procedures as they apply to final tenure consideration, except for external professional evaluations. The purpose of this review is to identify relevant deficiencies with regard to progress toward tenure. The results of the tenure progress review shall be made available to the faculty member. The Chair shall provide the faculty member with written comments on progress at the third-year review. Where the results are judged unsatisfactory, the third-year tenure progress review can lead to nonreappointment as described on section [III.F.1.e]. In this event, the faculty member may, within thirty calendar days after notification of nonreappointment, petition the Faculty Status Committee to review the decision upon an allegation of inadequate consideration, an allegation of violation of academic freedom, or an allegation of substantial procedural irregularity.”*

### **C. Minimum Criteria for Establishing Satisfactory Progress towards Tenure in the College of Business and Economics**

The granting of tenure to academic faculty in the College is recommended on the basis of performance on three criteria: teaching, research, and service. In addition, in each of these areas, and in all aspects of their conduct as representatives of the College and University, candidates are expected to act in a professional manner as defined in Section III.D.5(a) of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual*. Pre-tenure review is conducted annually to insure that a candidate is establishing a record such that *it is likely* that the candidate will meet the requirements in *each critical area* to satisfy his or her third-year tenure review and to be granted tenure at the end of the tenure review period. The pre-tenure review is also intended to provide guidance to the candidate for meeting the requirements of third-year tenure review and to attain tenure.

## **III. CRITERIA FOR THIRD YEAR TENURE REVIEW**

### **A. Introduction**

Third year tenure review is held during the academic year three years prior to tenure consideration. Due dates will be set by the Provost’s office and communicated to the unit heads, and the faculty being reviewed, by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research. The general criteria that a candidate must satisfy for this review are set out in the *Washington State University Faculty Manual*. Specific minimum criteria applicable to candidates in the departments and units within the College are set out below.

## **B. General Criteria for Third Year Tenure Review**

The general criteria for third year review of tenure-track faculty are set out Section III.D.3.e. of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual*, which is set out above in Section II.B of this document.

## **C. Minimum Criteria for Establishing Satisfactory Progress towards Tenure in the College of Business and Economics at the time of Third Year Tenure Review**

The granting of tenure to academic faculty in the College is recommended on the basis of performance on three criteria: teaching, research, and service. In addition, in each of these areas, and in all aspects of their conduct as representatives of the College and University, candidates are expected to act in a professional manner as defined in Section III.D.5(a) of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual*. At the time of the third year review, a candidate is expected to have established a record in each of these areas such that *it is likely that in each area* the candidate will meet the requirements to be granted tenure at the end of the tenure review period.

## **D. Example of a Minimally Acceptable Record at the Time of Third Year Tenure Review**

To assist candidates who are preparing for third year tenure review, the following is an example of a minimally acceptable record for a candidate at the time of third year review:

**1. Research:** One or more articles published or accepted in refereed journals within the candidate's discipline or closely related disciplines of at least Tier II, B level quality (as defined by the department's or unit's *target journal list*). In addition, a sufficient number of research projects should be under review, or in preparation for submission, to make it likely that research productivity will be sufficient for meeting the minimum level at the time of tenure review.

**2. Teaching:** Evaluations of the candidate's teaching performance by students (as measured by compulsory College evaluation tools) that average at, or above, 65% of the maximum overall teaching effectiveness score, (currently EVAL = 2.6) or which show a clear trend of improvement to meet that level; evidence (from the candidate's teaching portfolio, student comments, peer review, unit head's comments, and the like) that the candidate maintains rigor in his or her courses; evidence that the candidate has a professional rapport with students (in areas such as advising, mentoring, and the supervision of research projects); and evidence that the candidate shows promise in developing quality teaching techniques and instructional materials.

**3. Service:** Prior to the third year, service expectations are minimal. Active participation in departmental or unit committees and activities is desirable.

## **IV. CRITERIA FOR GRANTING TENURE**

### **A. Introduction**

Tenure is defined in the *Revised Code Washington* 28B.50.851(1): as "a faculty appointment for an indefinite period of time which may be revoked only for adequate cause and by due process." Section III.D.3.f of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual* provides:

*"The final tenure review for faculty members initially appointed full time at the level of Assistant Professor, or equivalent, shall normally occur no later than the sixth year of*

*appointment. This final review may occur earlier in especially meritorious cases at the request of the appropriate Dean, and with the consent of the Provost, department Chair, and faculty member. ... [T]enure consideration for faculty members initially appointed full time at the level of Associate Professor or full Professor, or other comparable ranks, shall be in the third year and first year of service respectively. Tenure review shall result in either the granting of tenure, to become effective at the beginning of the academic year following the year in which the tenure review is conducted, or the denial of tenure and the offering of a one-year terminal appointment. The decision to deny tenure must be communicated to the faculty member by no later than May 15 of the review year.”*

Candidates initially appointed at the level of Assistant Professor whose tenure consideration is delayed due to extraordinary circumstances as specified in Section III.D.4.b. of *Washington State University Faculty Manual* shall be judged by the same standards as those seeking promotion and tenure during their sixth year. The general criteria for granting tenure are set out *Washington State University Faculty Manual*. Specific minimum criteria applicable to tenure-track faculty in departments and units within the College are set out below.

### **B. General Criteria for Granting Tenure**

Section III.D.3.b of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual* establishes the general criteria for granting tenure to academic faculty. This section provides:

*“...These criteria and secondary criteria approved at the area or unit level must be directly and substantially relevant to the professional responsibilities associated with the position. In addition, each faculty member is subject to evaluation for his or her contributions to the effective functioning of the department, or equivalent unit, and for adherence to high ethical and professional standards.*

#### *(1) Criteria for Academic Faculty*

*The general criteria cover a wide range of faculty assignments and apply to faculty located at campuses, research stations, extension centers, and other locations. The differentiation and relative weights among these criteria may not be precisely defined and may vary from unit to unit or even with regard to different faculty members. The approved criteria for the college and department or other unit are developed within the framework of these criteria but are more specific to the function of the individual unit.*

*The following primary criteria in addition to acceptable professional training are used in evaluating the qualification of a member of the academic faculty for possible advancement in rank and tenure:*

- (a) Teaching effectiveness in credit courses using appropriate modes and techniques*
- (b) Teaching and leadership effectiveness in workshops, short courses and conferences.*
- (c) Effectiveness in advising and/or supervising students, undergraduate and graduate as appropriate.*
- (d) Productivity in research or creative scholarship; ability to obtain external funding for teaching, research and service.*
- (e) Service to the institution and to the public.”*

### **C. Specific Criteria for Granting Tenure in the College of Business and Economics**

The granting of tenure to academic faculty in the College of Business and Economics is recommended on the basis of performance on three criteria: teaching, research, and service. Within each of these areas a candidate must meet the minimum requirements as specified in the following paragraphs. However, just meeting the minimum College standards will not necessarily result in the granting of tenure. Successful candidates will also meet or exceed the appropriate departmental standards. It is expected that a successful candidate for tenure will exceed the absolute College minimums in one or more areas.

In addition, in each of these areas, and in all aspects of their conduct as representatives of the College and University, candidates are expected to act in a professional manner as defined in Section III.D.5(a) of the Washington State University Faculty Manual, which states: “To qualify for tenure, the faculty member is expected to observe all policies applying to faculty in section II of the Faculty Manual: Freedom, Responsibility, and Discipline.”

#### ***1. Academic Research Requirements for Tenure***

The College is committed to Washington State University’s goal to compete with the major research universities in the nation. The expectation, therefore, is that an Assistant Professor who is a candidate for tenure should be on track to establishing a national reputation as a scholar in his or her particular specialization. Candidates should show evidence of a consistent stream of research at all stages including acceptances, revision requests, working papers and research in progress. An Associate Professor who is a candidate for tenure is expected to have progressed farther in establishing a national research reputation proportionate to the number of years the candidate has been in academia beyond the normal six years when an Assistant Professor is ordinarily reviewed for tenure. A Professor is expected to have established a national reputation as a scholar in his or her particular specialization.

##### ***a. Academic Research Defined***

Academic research assumes a variety of forms and represents contributions in the theoretical/conceptual, methodological, or substantive (applied) domains. Contributions to academic research include generating theories, methods, and reporting substantive findings; validating theories or testing methods; analyzing and synthesizing existing knowledge. Creative work can take other forms such as creations of new forms of business organizations, new ways of measuring productive effectiveness, or other advances in the knowledge and practice of business. Even in these situations, however, the results of the creative activity should be summarized in writing and published. Finally, while research in cooperation with other scholars is encouraged, the candidate should be concerned with the development of a distinct **individual** reputation as a scholar.

##### ***b. National Reputation Defined***

In determining if a candidate is working towards or has established a national reputation, both the **quality** and **quantity** of a candidate’s research are considered. **Quality** relates to (1) importance of the information revealed, (2) conceptual/theoretical sophistication, and (3) methodological rigor. Original breakthroughs in conceptual frameworks, conclusions, and methods are considered of higher quality than new contextual applications, works exhibiting minor variations, or those repeating familiar themes in the literature. As a practical matter, quality is determined by the outlets in which a candidate’s research is published. Thus, a candidate is expected to publish in Tier I, Level A or A-, and Tier II, Level B+ or B journals.

As stated in Section III.D.5(b) of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual*: “Long-term support of faculty members requires commitment in terms of salary and other resources; therefore, criteria for tenure must include consideration of contributions toward program objectives.”

Therefore, a tenure candidate’s published research must be:

- consistent with the strategic mission and objectives of the College and Washington State University and;
- related to topics considered significant by external reviewers in the candidate’s field of specialization.

A candidate’s national reputation also arises from having a minimum **quantity** of publication in quality journals.

***c. Minimum Quality and Quantity Requirements for Tenure in the College of Business and Economics***

The following table (Table 1) shows the *minimum requirements* for research in terms of the quality and quantity of journal publications and acceptances for candidates seeking tenure. It describes the requirements for an Assistant Professor under consideration for tenure at the end of his or her sixth academic year and for an Associate Professor under consideration for tenure at the end of his or her twelfth academic year. An Assistant Professor with fewer than six years of academic experience nevertheless must meet the requirements shown. An Associate Professor is expected to meet at least the same requirements as that of an Assistant Professor, and for those Associate Professors with more than six academic years of experience but fewer than twelve, to have a publication record proportionately better than that of an Assistant Professor at the end of his or her sixth academic year. Similarly, a Professor is expected to meet at least the same requirements as that of an Associate Professor, and for those Professors with more than twelve academic years of experience, to have a publication record proportionately better than that of an Associate Professor at the end of his or her twelfth academic year.

It is important to note that Section III.D.3.b. (1), of the *Faculty Manual*, defines the primary criteria for evaluating research as “research, creative scholarship, or professional achievement, including the ability to obtain external funding for teaching, research, and extension projects.” Table 1 establishes the College of Business and Economics' minimum expectations for creative scholarship. However, in appropriate cases, other factors for evaluating research, including *preeminent* basic research, *widely recognized* publications, an *exceptional* research reputation, the award of *prominent* research prizes, and the ability to obtain *significant* external funding, or other evidence of excellence in research may be considered to offset deficiencies in a candidate's publication record.

*Table 1 – Minimum Publication Requirements for Tenure/Promotion Candidates*

RANK	MINIMUM JOURNAL PUBLICATION REQUIREMENTS
<b><u>Assistant Professor</u></b> (candidate for tenure at the end of sixth academic year) *	One (1) Tier I, Level A journal and four (4) Tier I, A- and/or Tier II, B+ or B; or Two (2) Tier I, Level A journals and two (2) Tier I, A- and/or Tier II, B+ or B; or Three (3) Tier I, Level A journals.

<p><b><u>Associate Professor</u></b> (candidate for promotion and/or tenure at the end of twelfth academic year)</p>	<p>Two (2) Tier I, Level A journals and eight (8) Tier I, A- and/or Tier II, B+ or B; or Three (3) Tier I, Level A journals and six (6) Tier I, A- and/or Tier II, B+ or B; or Four (4) Tier I, Level A journals and four (4) Tier I, A- and/or Tier II, B+ or B; or Five (5) Tier I, Level A journals and two (2) Tier I, A- and/or Tier II, B+ or B; or Six (6) Tier I, Level A journals.</p>
--	---

\* The tenure review process for Assistant Professors commences at the beginning of a candidate's sixth academic year as outlined in Section VI.B.5 of this document.

***d. Other Research Contributions That Will Strengthen a Tenure Candidate's Record***

In addition to meeting the minimum requirements of publishing in Tier I and Tier II journals, a candidate for tenure can enhance his or her research record with other publications and research-related activities. Publications that will enhance a candidate's application include: (1) scholarly books; (2) scholarly book chapters or monographs; (3) articles in the highest quality refereed proceedings; (4) textbooks; and (5) articles in high-quality non-refereed professional journals.

Research-related activities that will enhance a candidate's application include: (1) presentation of research papers at prestigious meetings of academic societies or associations; (2) acquisition of peer-reviewed research grants/contracts from outside the University; (3) Reviewing articles for Tier I, A or A- journals and (4) chairing research sessions and discussing research papers at prestigious conferences.

***2. Teaching Requirements for Tenure***

The College seeks to maintain a reputation for having excellent teachers both at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

***a. Teaching Defined***

Teaching is a multifaceted endeavor including classroom teaching, working with and mentoring students outside the formal classroom setting, advising students, and developing courses, curricula, and teaching materials.

***b. Teaching Excellence Defined***

An excellent teacher is one who, on a continuing basis, not just in the year a candidate is seeking tenure:

- has a thorough knowledge of the subject matter of the courses taught;
- maintains instructional currency as defined in the guidelines of the Academy of Collegiate Schools of Business (see attachment 1);
- maintains rigor with regard to course standards (e.g. clearly specified grading criteria; reasonable grade distributions, use of class time);
- demonstrates an ability to develop new courses, or to make substantial revisions in old ones at the undergraduate and/or graduate level;
- demonstrates an enthusiasm regarding the process of teaching;

- conducts courses at the scheduled course meeting times;
- maintains a professional relationship with students, staff, and colleagues;
- has a reputation among current and former students as an effective teacher;
- spends adequate time with students outside the classroom;
- is flexible and cooperative in carrying a full share of the department's teaching responsibilities over the long term;
- adopts effective teaching styles appropriate to each learning environment in order to motivate students and react with sensitivity to their educational needs;
- keeps current with developments in the candidate's field and applying these developments to create new courses and/or modernize existing courses;
- takes a conscientious and active interest in student affairs and welfare, including curricular-related advising of both undergraduate and graduate students when appropriate; effectiveness and consistency in the doctoral program, including recruiting, student supervision, research, and committee service;
- authors publications relating to teaching, including journals, textbooks, case studies, software, and new teaching aids and/or methods.

***c. Minimum Teaching Requirements for Tenure in the College of Business and Economics***

A candidate for tenure:

1. must have evaluations of his or her teaching performance by students (as measured by compulsory College evaluation tools) over the six most recent semesters that either have:

A mean score on the College' current overall teaching effectiveness measure (currently EVAL) of at least 65% of the maximum score (currently 2.6 on EVAL)

or

must have 50% or more scores at or above the College average for the same level of courses and method of delivery;

2. must demonstrate (from the candidate's teaching portfolio, student comments, peer review, unit head's comments, outside reviewer's comments or other sources) that he or she maintains rigor in his or her courses;
3. must demonstrate that the candidate has a professional rapport with students (in the areas of mentoring and the supervision of research projects); and
4. must demonstrate (from syllabuses and course materials) that the content of his courses is current and up-to-date.

***d. Other Teaching Contributions That Will strengthen a Tenure Candidate's Record***

In addition, to meeting the minimum teaching requirements listed above, a candidate for tenure can enhance his or her teaching record with additional evidence of teaching excellence.

This additional evidence of teaching excellence may include: (1) receiving honors and awards for teaching; (2) developing innovative teaching techniques, including online courses, (3) developing innovative instructional material and methods, such as textbooks, work books, cases and exercises, visual media, and computer software related to the candidate's teaching; (4) chairing of dissertation and thesis committees; (5) serving on dissertation and thesis committees; (6) helping students with non-dissertation research projects; (7) publishing materials and making presentations dealing with pedagogy, curricula, or similar educational issues; (8) developing new courses and curricula; (9) participating in student organizations; and (10) reviewing text books for academic journals.

### ***3. Service Requirements for Tenure***

Candidates for tenure are expected to provide service to the university and one or more of its external constituencies. In doing so, candidates are expected to represent Washington State University in a professional and dignified manner.

#### ***a. Service Constituencies***

There are a number of constituencies that university faculty may wish to serve. Among the constituencies and the types of service that are appropriate for tenure candidates are the following:

1. *Washington State University, the College, and the State:* (1) Service committees at the University, College, unit-level and WSU Faculty Senate duties; (2) Continuing education programs; (3) Administrative responsibilities and functions; and (4) Special projects for the University and agencies of the State of Washington.
2. *The Candidate's Profession:* (1) Editorial review board membership for academic journals (acknowledging the differential value of the Tier and grade rankings of journals by the College discussed elsewhere); (2) Leadership roles in the administration of professional organizations and major conferences; (3) Reviews of papers for high-quality academic journals and organizations (also acknowledging differential value across publication outlets); (4) Service on government committees or task forces; (5) Service as an external reviewer for promotion and tenure decisions at other colleges and universities.
3. *Business and Not-for-Profit Organizations:* (1) Pro bono consulting work; (2) Presentations to business and professional groups, (3) Articles in association press outlets.

#### ***b. Minimum Service Requirements for Tenure in the College of Business and Economics***

The level of service expected of candidates for tenure will vary depending on their years of academic experience. The following table (Table 2) shows the minimum record for service for candidates seeking tenure. It describes the requirements for an Assistant Professor under consideration for tenure at the end of his or her sixth academic year and for an Associate Professor under consideration for tenure at the end of his or her twelfth academic year. An Assistant Professor with fewer than six years of academic experience nevertheless must meet the requirements shown. An Associate Professor is expected to meet at least the same requirements as that of an Assistant Professor, and for those Associate Professors with more than six academic years of experience but fewer than twelve, to have a service record proportionately better than that of an Assistant Professor at the end of his or her sixth academic year. Similarly, a Professor is expected to meet at least the same requirements as that of an Associate Professor, and for those Professors with more than twelve academic years of experience, to have a

service record proportionately better than that of an Associate Professor at the end of his or her twelfth academic year.

*Table 2 – Minimum Service Requirements for Tenure/Promotion Candidates*

RANK	MINIMUM SERVICE REQUIREMENTS
<b>Assistant Professor</b> (candidate for tenure at the end of sixth academic year) *	Ongoing active participation in departmental or unit committees and activities; and some service on College or university committees, or to external constituencies.
<b>Associate Professor</b> (candidate for promotion and/or tenure at the end of twelfth academic year)	Ongoing active participation in departmental or unit committees and activities; and participation on College or university committees, the Faculty Senate, or similar activities for the most recent five or more years; and service to two of the constituencies in the candidate’s profession, as listed above.

\* The tenure review process for Assistant Professors commences at the beginning of a candidate’s sixth academic year as outlined in Section VI.B.5 of this document.

**D. Professionalism**

All candidates for tenure are expected to act in a professional manner in all aspects of their conduct as representatives of the College and University.

**1. Professionalism Defined**

Section III.D.5(a) of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual* specifies: “To qualify for tenure, the faculty member is expected to observe all policies applying to faculty in section II of the *Faculty Manual: Freedom, Responsibility, and Discipline.*”

Professionalism in the university context is the requirement to be in full compliance with Section II of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual*, which addresses academic freedom, faculty responsibilities and professional ethics. This compliance is required for the granting of tenure.

Candidates for tenure are advised that support of the tenured faculty in their unit is largely dependent on the perception that the candidate has made, and will continue to make, a significant and unique contribution to the well being of the unit in both quantifiable and non-quantifiable ways. It is important that each faculty member defines and functions in a role, which makes a significant contribution to the productivity and progress of his or her unit. If a candidate for tenure is deemed by the tenured faculty of that unit to have hampered unit effectiveness by breach of the principles set out in the previous paragraph, the granting of tenure is unlikely. This issue is addressed in Section III.D.3. of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual* on “General Criteria for Faculty Review” which states: “... In addition, each faculty member is subject to evaluation for his or her contributions to the effective functioning of the department, or equivalent unit, and for adherence to high ethical and professional standards.”

## **V. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION IN RANK**

As stated in Section III.4.a. of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual*, the criteria for promotion in rank are the same as those for the granting of tenure.

### **A. Introduction**

Section III.4.c. of the *Washington State University Faculty Manual* provides:

*“Increases in salary and advancement in rank are not automatic. Promotion is not to be regarded as guaranteed upon completion of a given term of service. It is rare for a faculty member to attain the level of distinction expected for promotion to Professor, or equivalent, before the sixth year as Associate Professor, or equivalent rank, nor promotion to Associate Professor, or equivalent, before the sixth year as Assistant Professor. In both cases, demonstrated merit, and not years of service, is the guiding factor.”*

### **B. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor**

The criteria for promotion of a candidate with the rank of Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor are the same as those for granting tenure to an Assistant Professor during the sixth year of academic employment. See Section IV of this document. Candidates whose promotion and tenure consideration is delayed due to extraordinary circumstances as specified in Section III.4.b. of *Washington State University Faculty Manual* shall be judged by the same standards as those seeking promotion and tenure during their sixth year.

### **C. Criteria for Promotion to Professor**

The criteria for promotion of a candidate with the rank of Associate Professor to the rank of Professor are the same as those for granting tenure to an Associate Professor during the twelfth year of academic employment. See Section IV of this document. If a candidate is nominated for promotion in a later year, the criteria for promotion are more stringent. However, promotion could also be justified by a record of sufficient productivity in the most recent six years.

## **VI. GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR PRETENURE AND TENURE REVIEW**

### **A. Introduction**

The criteria and procedures relevant to tenure recommendations are generally comparable to those relating to promotion and are consistent with the provisions in the *Washington State University Faculty Manual* Section III. D. 5. The major consideration in the pre-tenure and tenure decisions is the potential of the candidate to continue to develop professionally. The Appendix contains a summary of promotion and tenure procedures.

All procedures relevant to tenure and pretenure are monitored and governed by the office of the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research. Procedures for activities in years prior to the final tenure decision are specified in this section but generally follow the *Faculty Manual* sections regarding “Yearly reviews of tenure progress,” “Formal tenure progress review,” and “Final tenure review” Sections III. D. 3. d., e., and f. respectively. In summary, the procedures call for an annual

review of performance up to the sixth year of service during which the final decision is made. Procedures relevant to pre-tenure and tenure review are delineated below.

## **B. Procedure for Pre-Tenure and Tenure Review**

### ***1. Notification of Review***

Prior to the beginning of the fall semester a notice shall be sent from the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research to each unit head calling attention to the review process for all faculty members who are non-tenured, and indicating the deadline for receipt of unit reviews and/or packet materials in the Associate Dean's office. The unit head shall then notify all non-tenured faculty members no later than September 15 that the review is being undertaken, inform them of the procedures to be followed, and give them relevant deadlines.

### ***2. First Two Pre-Tenure Reviews***

For the first two years of the faculty member's tenure probationary period, the annual review is conducted at the unit level only. The review, conducted by all tenured faculty in the unit, includes the categories of research, teaching, service, and professionalism. The unit head prepares a memorandum summarizing this review, provides a copy to the faculty member, and discusses the contents of the review with the faculty member. The unit head obtains the faculty member's signature as an indication of receipt of the copy. As with annual reviews, a faculty member's signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the evaluation. The memorandum is then forwarded to the office of the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research where it is placed in the faculty member's pre-tenure file.

#### ***a. Procedure in the Event of an Unsatisfactory Performance Determination at the Unit Level***

Should the unit determine that a faculty member is making unsatisfactory performance towards tenure during either of the faculty member's first two years of academic service, the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research shall review the recommendation and prepare an evaluation of the faculty member performance and forward this evaluation along with the candidate's pre-tenure file to the Dean.

#### ***b. Final Determination of Satisfactory Progress towards Tenure***

As provided in Section III.F.1 of the *Faculty Manual*, final determination as to whether or not a candidate is making satisfactory progress towards tenure rests with the Dean.

#### ***c. Procedure in the Event of an Unsatisfactory Determination***

If the Dean determines progress is unsatisfactory, the faculty member will be offered a terminal appointment as provided in Section III.F.1 of the *Faculty Manual*. The decision determining unsatisfactory progress and the offer of a terminal appointment will be communicated to the faculty member by the faculty member's unit head no later than May 15 of the review year.

### ***3. Third Year Pre-Tenure Reviews***

Section III.D.3.e. of the *Faculty Manual* provides:

*“In addition to the yearly reviews, a formal tenure progress review shall be conducted for all faculty members who were initially appointed full time at the level of Assistant Professor, or equivalent. This review normally will occur three years prior to tenure consideration. This review is optional for appointments with a pre-tenure period less than three years and*

*should be negotiated at the time of appointment. The tenure progress review shall be conducted by those eligible to perform final tenure evaluations, and follow similar procedures as they apply to final tenure consideration, except for external professional evaluations. The purpose of this review is to identify relevant deficiencies with regard to progress toward tenure. The results of the tenure progress review shall be made available to the faculty member. The Chair shall provide the faculty member with written comments on progress at the third-year review. Where the results are judged unsatisfactory, the third-year tenure progress review can lead to nonreappointment as described in section [III.F.1 of the Faculty Manual]. In this event, the faculty member may, within thirty calendar days after notification of nonreappointment, petition the Faculty Status Committee to review the decision upon an allegation of inadequate consideration, an allegation of violation of academic freedom, or an allegation of substantial procedural irregularity.”*

The procedure for third year tenure review is the same as that for Final Tenure Review, discussed in Section VI.B.5 of this document, except as outlined here

***a. Discussion of Evaluation following Review by Promotion and Tenure Committee***

The unit head shall deliver and discuss with the each individual undergoing third year review the content of evaluations from the candidate’s unit. The unit head will also discuss the individual’s plans for future contributions. The unit head may invite the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research to participate in the discussion.

The unit head then signs the evaluation and secures the individual’s signature on the form provided, attesting that the individual has seen and discussed the evaluation; such a signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the evaluation. A copy is given to the faculty member; a copy is retained in the unit files; a copy is sent to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research.

***b. Opportunity for Response in the Event of an Adverse Evaluation from the Unit and/or Promotion and Tenure Committee***

Should either the candidate’s unit or the Promotion and Tenure Committee produce a negative evaluation of a candidate’s progress during the third year review, the candidate will be offered the opportunity to respond in writing to the evaluation and to offer supplemental written evidence in support of his or her candidacy.

***c. Review by Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research***

With respect to each third year review candidate the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research prepares an evaluation of the candidate and forwards this assessment along with the candidate’s complete tenure packet, and evaluations from the candidate’s unit and the Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Dean.

***d. Final Determination of Satisfactory Progress towards Tenure***

As provided in Section III.F.1 of the *Faculty Manual*, final determination as to whether or not a candidate is making satisfactory progress towards tenure rests with the Dean. The Dean shall forward his final determination to the Provost’s Office on or before the published deadline for tenure packet submission established by the Provost’s Office.

***e. Procedure in the Event of an Unsatisfactory Determination of Progress towards Tenure***

If the Dean determines progress is unsatisfactory, the faculty member will be offered a terminal appointment as provide in Section III.F.1 of the *Faculty Manual*. The decision determining

unsatisfactory progress and the offer of the one year terminal appointment will be communicated to the faculty member by the faculty member's unit head no later than May 15 of the review year.

#### ***4. Last Two Pre-Tenure Reviews***

For the last two years of a faculty member's tenure probationary period, the annual review is conducted at the unit level only and in accordance with the same procedures set out for the review during the first two years service as set out in Section VI.B.2. of this document.

#### ***5. Final Tenure Reviews***

For each individual who will be completing the sixth year toward tenure—unless review occurs earlier or later in accordance with the procedures set out in Section III.D.3.f. of the *Faculty Manual*—a formal tenure review is conducted. This review is based on a tenure packet that the faculty member under review submits to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research and evaluation materials submitted by the candidate's primary unit.

##### ***a. Preparation of the Tenure Packet***

The unit head should advise and/or assist the candidate, as appropriate, in preparation of his or her tenure packet. The tenure packet is made up of a teaching portfolio as described in Section III.D.5.d of the *Faculty Manual* and a resume as describe in Section III.D.5.e of the *Faculty Manual*. It is particularly important for the candidate to supply materials from his/her private files that would otherwise be unavailable to reviewers.

##### ***b. Selection of Outside Reviewers***

Prior to June 1 of a year in which a unit has candidates to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, the unit's head is to submit to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research the names of at least six individuals outside of Washington State University who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the candidate's packet. In preparing this list, the unit head will invite the candidate to submit names that he/she would like to have included.

##### ***(1) Criteria for Selecting Outside Reviewers***

Criteria for the selection of outside reviewers include their scholarly reputation, academic rank, their institution (i.e., peer or better), relationships with the candidate, and rationale for seeking their input. Individuals in the following categories would be considered qualified (in rank order) for selection as an outside reviewer if they have expertise in the appropriate field of study:

1. Editors of Tier I journals,
2. Endowed or named Professors in respected programs at AACSB accredited institutions,
3. Department chairs at peer or better institutions,
4. Editors of Tier II journals,
5. At a minimum, full Professors at peer or better institutions.

##### ***(2). Limitations on the Eligibility of Outside Reviewers***

The credibility of an outside reviewer is determined by their ability to make an objective and detached evaluation of the candidate's qualifications. Accordingly, persons who served on a candidate's doctoral committee, or those from the institution granting their Ph.D., other contemporaries from that institution, or co-authors are generally inappropriate choices as outside reviewers. In cases where one of these individuals meets the other qualifications listed above, she or

he may be included as an outside reviewer. In no case, however, will more than one (1) outside reviewer with such ties to the candidate be allowed.

*(3) Solicitation of Outside Reviews*

Outside letters are requested by the unit head with the prior consent from the Associate Dean's Office. Approximately half the names of those requested to evaluate a candidate's promotion packet should be recommended by the candidate with the remaining evaluators chosen by the unit head in consultation with the Associate Dean. The candidate must decide whether to waive access to these letters. If he or she chooses not to waive access, the reviewers are to be so informed. If a candidate chooses to waive access to the letters, the unit head is to provide the candidate, upon receipt of the last of the letters, with a general summary of the reviewers' comments without revealing the reviewers' identities.

To insure that the return rate is high, unit heads should contact potential reviewers well in advance of any deadlines and secure agreements from them that they will write an evaluation and submit it in a timely manner.

*(4) Criteria for Evaluation*

Letters sent to the external reviewers will ask the reviewers to evaluate a candidate's research in terms of the quality of the scholarly journals in which the research appears, and to rank the journals in which a candidate has published according to their prominence. To comment on the importance of the candidate's basic research, the extent to which the candidate's publications are cited and read, the extent of the candidate's professional reputation, the noteworthiness of any research prizes the candidate may have won, and the importance of any grants that the candidate may have received. And, additionally, to comment on the candidate's likely future research productivity.

***c. Unit Review***

Section III.D.3.f of the *Faculty Manual* provides:

*“At the time of tenure consideration, all faculty members with tenure in the candidate's department, including those who will retire prior to the effective date of such grant of tenure, are given the opportunity to fill out a form [hereinafter “tenure ballot”] on which the following alternative recommendations are provided: (1) to grant tenure and (2) to deny the granting of tenure. 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 unit, the tenured members shall recommend additional such persons through the principal administrative officers to the Provost, who shall determine which of these persons will complete the tenure form.”*

Tenure ballots will be forwarded, by the unit head, to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research.

***d. Review by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee***

A candidate's tenure packet, including outside reviews but not tenure ballots, is reviewed by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee to determine whether a candidate has met the College and unit criteria for being granted tenure. This determination is made by majority vote, except that the representative on the Committee from the candidate's school, department or unit shall not vote. The

Committee will then prepare a written recommendation that tenure be granted or denied. This recommendation is forwarded to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research.

***e. Dean's Review***

With respect to each candidate for tenure the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research in consultation with the Dean prepares an evaluation of the candidate and forwards this assessment along with the candidate's complete tenure packet and evaluations from their unit and the Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Provost's office. The Dean's recommendation is forwarded along with the packet and evaluations on or before the published deadline for doing so established by the Provost's Office.

***f. Provost's Review***

The Provost's office, after review of the tenure packet and relevant evaluations makes a recommendation to the Office of the President.

***g. Final Determination for the Granting of Tenure***

Final approval for the granting of tenure rests with the President of the University and the Board of Regents.

***h. Candidate's Right to Notice***

At the conclusion of each stage of the College tenure review (that is: the unit review, the review by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Dean's review) the unit head will provide the candidate with a summary of the recommendation made at each stage. In the case of the unit review, the unit head will provide a summary of the contents of the tenure ballots without disclosing the names of the individuals casting the ballots.

***i. Candidate's Right to Withdraw Candidacy***

Following a candidate's receipt of notice of the recommendation made at any stage of the College tenure review as described in the preceding paragraph a candidate is entitled to withdraw his or her candidacy and request a one-year terminal appointment as described in Section III.D.3.f. of the *Faculty Manual*.

***j. Procedure in the Event of an Unsatisfactory Determination to Grant Tenure***

As provided in Section III.D.3.f. of the *Faculty Manual*:

*"Tenure review shall result in either the granting of tenure, to become effective at the beginning of the academic year following the year in which the tenure review is conducted, or the denial of tenure and the offering of a one-year terminal appointment. The decision to deny tenure must be communicated [by the unit head] to the faculty member by no later than May 15 of the review year."*

## **VII. GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION REVIEWS**

The promotion process is administered by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research in the College of Business and Economics, whose task it is to see that relevant deadlines are publicized, adhered to, and that the promotion packets are secure. All candidates for promotion will be given full and fair consideration based on the guidelines outline in the Washington State University *Faculty Manual* and the current Promotion and Tenure document.

### **A. Introduction**

As outlined in the Faculty Manual, consideration for promotion to Associate Professor is considered in parallel with consideration for tenure except in those cases where a faculty member was hired as an Associate Professor without tenure. Furthermore, the *Faculty Manual* suggests that promotion of a faculty member to Associate Professor prior to the sixth year tenure decision point should be pursued only in especially meritorious cases or where time in academic appointments at other institutions are credited toward the tenure clock. Promotion to Associate Professor is based on both accomplishment and promise. A faculty member needs to achieve a level of performance that meets the requirements for the Associate Professor level versus merely being “on track” for eventual tenure. In effect, the required evidence of accomplishment for such a promotion must be equivalent to that required for awarding Associate rank to someone being hired from outside the University. Thus, early promotion to Associate Professor is expected to be an unusual case. If a candidate wishes to be considered for early promotion to Associate Professor, the decision to proceed should be made in consultation and agreement among the candidate, the candidate’s unit head, and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research before preparation of a promotion packet.

Promotion to Professor is normally considered after the completion of the sixth year as an Associate Professor. It is rare for a faculty member to attain the appropriate level of distinction at an earlier date. Only in cases of exceptional merit will faculty be granted promotion with a time in rank of less than six years.

### **B. Notification of Deadlines**

During spring semester the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research shall send a notice to each unit head announcing when promotion packets are due in the Associate Dean’s office during fall semester. The relevant deadlines follow the same general timeline each year with the expectation that the packets are typically forwarded to the Provost’s office by the end of October.

### **C. Initiation of Promotion Review**

Promotion recommendations may be initiated by the faculty member on his/her own behalf, by a faculty colleague, or by the unit head after consultation with the tenured members of the unit. Once begun, the recommendation is processed through all steps in the evaluation procedure, unless formally withdrawn by the faculty member under consideration.

Prior to June 1 of each year, unit heads are to submit to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research the names of all faculty members who are being nominated for promotion in the following academic year.

### **D. The Promotion Packet**

A candidate is to prepare a promotion packet that consists of the same materials as those for a tenure packet as discussed in Section VI.B.5.a. of this document.

### **E. Selection of Outside Reviewers**

The procedures for selecting outside reviewers for promotion are the same as those for selecting outside reviewers for tenure discussed in Section VI.B.5.b of this document.

### **F. Unit Review**

The procedures for conducting the unit review for promotion are the same as those for conducting the unit review for tenure as discussed in Section VI.B.5.c. of this document, except that in the case of

candidates being considered for promotion to Professor, only faculty members who are Professors may participate in the review.

**G. Unit Head's Review**

The unit head is expected to consult with all tenured members of the department or a formally constituted department faculty advisory committee (e.g., faculty members of Full rank constitute those evaluating a faculty member who is being considered for promotion to Full rank) in arriving at his/her recommendations concerning promotion. This recommendation will be communicated to the candidate prior to being forwarded to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research.

The unit head will submit all promotion packets to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research in advance of the deadline specified in Section VII.B of this document.

**H. Candidate's Right to Proceed in the Event of a Negative Unit Recommendation**

If senior faculty in the unit and/or the unit head conclude that a faculty member should not pursue promotion during a given year, the faculty member has the option to initiate his/her own recommendation and must be advised of this option by the unit head. The faculty person is also informed that such an individually initiated recommendation will be fully and fairly considered while being forwarded through the appropriate promotion processes, irrespective of department or unit head endorsements (or lack thereof) that might be added to it, unless subsequently withdrawn by the candidate.

**I. College Promotion and Tenure Committee Review**

The Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research will forward all promotion packets to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee for its review. The review process is the same as that discussed for final tenure review in Section VI.B.5.c. of this document.

**J. Candidate's Right to Proceed in the Event of a Negative Promotion and Tenure Committee Recommendation**

In the event that the Promotion and Tenure Committee does not favorably endorse a candidate for promotion, the Associate for Faculty Affairs and Research will notify the unit head and the unit head will notify the candidate. The candidate may then decide whether to withdraw his/her promotion packet (for the current year) or to send it forward without the favorable endorsement of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. If the candidate chooses to continue pursuing promotion, the Dean and Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research add an evaluation to the packet and it is forwarded to the Provost's office as outlined below.

**K. Dean's Review**

The review process is the same as that discussed for final tenure review in Section VI.B.5.d. of this document.

**L. Provost's Review**

The review process is the same as that discussed for final tenure review in Section VI.B.5.e. of this document.

**M. Final Determination for Promotion**

Final approval for promotion rests with the President of the University and the Board of Regents.

### **VIII. ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES FOR BRANCH CAMPUS FACULTY**

Faculty members who reside on campuses other than the Pullman campus are to be evaluated by the same criteria as Pullman campus faculty, but through an augmented process. Specifically, the input of other CBE faculty members, the Program Director and the Campus Dean at the faculty member's local campus will be considered in the tenure and promotion process.

#### **A. Pre-Tenure Reviews**

In addition to the review conducted by the tenured faculty of the candidate's unit, a second parallel review is conducted by the tenured CBE faculty members at the local campus. The Program Director then prepares a memorandum summarizing this review, provides a copy to the faculty member, and discusses the contents of the review with the faculty member. The Program Director obtains the faculty member's signature as an indication of the receipt of the copy. As with annual reviews, a faculty member's signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the evaluation. Copies of the memorandum are then forwarded to the Campus Dean and the CBE Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research, where it is placed in the faculty member's pre-tenure file. Final determination as to whether a candidate is making satisfactory progress will be made by the CBE Dean and the Campus Dean.

#### **B. Third-year, Tenure and Promotion Reviews**

The Program Director, upon consultation with the local CBE faculty will write a memorandum that evaluates the research, teaching, service and professionalism of the faculty member under review, focusing on the faculty member's activities at the local campus. This memorandum is then forwarded to the faculty member's unit head, the CBE Dean and the Campus Dean. The unit head will provide the contents of this memorandum to the unit tenured faculty during the unit progress review meeting.

The Campus Dean may also direct the Program Director to conduct a formal ballot of the local campus tenured CBE faculty members. The results of this ballot will be provided as advisory input to the CBE Dean and the Campus Dean.

**Appendix: Summary of Promotion and Tenure Procedures**

	Required Action and Responsible Parties
Outside Reviewers	List of potential outside reviewers prepared by the unit head in consultation with candidate.
Solicitation of Outside Letters of Recommendation	In consultation with Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research, unit head selects outside reviewers from the lists and solicits evaluations, in writing, from each designated outside reviewer. <b>Candidate must decide whether or not to waive access to outside reviewers' letters.</b>
Responsibility for Packet Preparation	Unit head assists candidate in tenure and/or promotion packet preparation. <b>Unit head to provide candidates who have waived access to outside reviewers' letters with a summary of those letters.</b>
Packet Evaluation (Unit level)	(1) Appropriate faculty within unit (all tenured faculty for assistant to Associate decision; all Full Professors for Associate to Full decision) prepare ballots evaluating candidate; (2) unit head prepares summary ballot evaluating candidate. <b>Unit head to notify candidate of the nature of the unit level recommendation.</b>
Packet Evaluation (College level)	(1) Promotion & Tenure Committee prepares written evaluation of candidate; (2) Dean and Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research and Campus Deans, where appropriate, prepare written evaluation of candidate. <b>Unit head to notify the candidate of the nature of the Promotion &amp; Tenure Committee's evaluation and the Dean's recommendation. The Promotion and Tenure Committee's evaluation, the Dean's recommendation,</b> and unit ballots are forwarded to Provost's office.
Packet Evaluation (University level)	Provost's office evaluates packet and all relevant ballots and prepares recommendation to President's office.
Final Evaluation	(1) President and (2) Board of Regents act as appropriate on Provost's recommendation.