

Approved by faculty April 29, 2008

TENURE AND PROMOTION HANDBOOK

**College of Education
Washington State University**

Introduction

The College of Education Tenure and Promotion Handbook should be read in conjunction with the *Faculty Manual*, the *Provost's Instructions for Tenure and Promotion*, the *Provost's Instructions for Annual Review* and the *Guide to Washington State University's Policies and Procedures for Evaluating Tenure-track Faculty Members: Tips for Faculty Members, Mentors, Department Chairs, and Deans* (all available at <http://provost.wsu.edu/>). It is incumbent upon each faculty member to be familiar with the promotion and tenure guidelines outlined in these documents. The intent of *The College of Education Tenure and Promotion Handbook* is not to be prescriptive but to provide specific guidelines regarding minimum standards and expectations that demystify and clarify a process that is often perceived as ambiguous. In alignment with the *Guide to Washington State University's Policies and Procedures for Evaluating Tenure-track Faculty Members: Tips for Faculty Members, Mentors, Department Chairs, and Deans*, unless otherwise stated in one's position description, "it is assumed that teaching and scholarship weigh heavily and service expectations are somewhat less (e.g. 40% teaching, 40% scholarship, and 20% service)."

The College of Education Tenure and Promotion Handbook is divided into two parts. The first section addresses procedures for tenure and promotion; the second provides guidelines that outline minimum criteria for success in the tenure and promotion process.

Section I: Procedures for Promotion/Tenure Review

Timing of Evaluations

Department chairs are to perform annual evaluations of all faculty members and convey the results of these evaluations to the faculty member and the dean. In addition, for all non-tenured faculty members, an annual review of progress toward tenure is completed by tenured faculty in the department. A formal "third-year" review of progress toward tenure shall also be completed at the departmental level and forwarded to the dean, normally during the third year of appointment for faculty being considered for tenure after a six year probationary period. Pre-tenure faculty with probationary periods of four or five years shall receive this formal review during their second and third years, respectively. None of the guidelines or timelines contained in this document preclude issuance of a non-renewal notice at any time during the tenure probationary period if it is apparent that the faculty member is failing to meet standards of professional conduct and ethics.

When a faculty member at the rank of assistant professor or associate professor determines, in consultation with the department chair, that promotion consideration is warranted, the review process may be initiated by compiling all necessary information and providing it to the chair with a memorandum requesting such consideration. The schedule for tenure review is specified in the original appointment document. Generally, faculty members holding appointment at the rank of assistant professor will seek promotion and tenure simultaneously, though in special cases one might seek promotion to associate professor in advance of tenure consideration. For faculty hired at WSU as a new assistant professor, tenure review shall normally take place during the sixth year of service at Washington State University with tenure, if granted, to be effective at

the beginning of the seventh year. Under usual circumstances one shall not be considered for tenure while remaining at the rank of assistant professor.

General Considerations

The department chair must convey to tenured faculty the responsibility to participate in the evaluation process and to provide a rationale for their recommendations and votes, whether positive or negative. Faculty who have appointments that might provide more than one occasion to participate (i.e., vote) in evaluations (joint appointments, department chair, dean, etc.) must do so only once. Evaluators at all levels must judge cases on their merit and in relation to department, college, and university expectations and not in comparison with others in the department with tenure already or being considered at the same time. All evaluations should be joint evaluations, if appropriate, and any meetings should include others who have participated in the process, such as chancellors and academic directors at regional campuses, coordinators, etc. In the case of joint appointments (including ones in which the appointment is evenly split between two units), initial letters of appointment must indicate which department is to function as the lead for purposes of faculty evaluation; faculty shall receive only one evaluation, which includes the agreed-upon assessment of the multiple units.

Mentor Committee

During the pre-tenure period, important roles are played by the non-tenured faculty member's mentor committee. This committee is appointed by the department chair in consultation with the non-tenured faculty member and shall typically consist of two or three tenured faculty members, at least one of whom is in the non-tenured faculty member's program or specialty area. In departments with multiple program areas, there may be advantages to including representation from more than one area. Normally, the mentor committee shall remain the same during the entire pre-tenure period, but changes in membership may be requested by the non-tenured faculty member in consultation with the department chair. The mentor committee shall meet with the non-tenured faculty member to review tenure and promotion criteria early in the non-tenured faculty member's first semester in the college and at least once a semester throughout the rest of the pre-tenure period. The mentor committee may serve a number of roles, including the following:

1. Consultation on the tenure and promotion process, including the preparation of materials
2. Clarification of tenure and promotion criteria
3. Oral reports to the tenured faculty on tenure progress (see below)
4. Advisement on professional development
5. Classroom observations

See the document entitled *Mentoring of Tenure-Eligible Faculty Members in the WSU College of Education* for additional details regarding mentoring committees.

Pre-Tenure Reviews

There are three aspects to the pre-tenure review process.

1. Every year a faculty member goes through an *annual review* process that is designed to identify accomplishments for the year. This material is used to indicate areas of contribution and is used to allocate raises in the event they are available. The faculty member's department chair conducts the initial review and provides a written summary report, including a numerical performance rating, to the dean. The dean reviews the chair's summary report and adds his/her numerical rating to the document. These ratings are used, in part, to determine merit salary increases. (In this document, this process will be referred to hereafter as *annual review*.)
2. The *progress toward tenure* review is completed yearly for all pre-tenure faculty. This review is cumulative in that it takes into consideration all scholarly contributions up to the current review period. The purpose of this review is for the department chair, mentor committees, and all tenured faculty to review progress toward tenure up to the date of the review. The annual review and the yearly progress toward tenure review are completed at the departmental level. Hereafter in this document, the progress toward tenure reviews will be referred to as *yearly progress*.
3. The *third year review* is a more comprehensive review that requires faculty to submit a complete set of materials similar to what is required for the promotion and tenure review. These materials are reviewed by the department chair, mentor committees, all tenured faculty members in the department, the dean, and the provost. In this document, the term *third year review* refers to this process.

Following is an outline of materials required for each type of review.

Annual Reviews for Pre-tenure Faculty

To complete the annual review process, faculty must submit the following materials:

1. A completed WORQs form outlining contributions for the calendar year prior to when the reviews are submitted. The annual review is due mid February to early March and covers the period of the previous calendar year. WORQs URL: <https://cahedb.wsu.edu/WORQS/login.aspx?ReturnUrl=/WORQS/Default.aspx>
2. A vita.
3. A Scholarly Activity Description Form for each journal article or scholarly equivalent.
4. Student evaluations and other demonstrations of teaching effectiveness and effort.
5. A self-rating form, with rationale for rating of each category completed.

Additional supporting evidence may be requested by the department chair.

Progress toward Tenure

Materials for the progress toward tenure are cumulative and submitted yearly in all pre-tenure years. In the third year, the yearly progress process is subsumed by the third year review. The goal of the yearly progress toward tenure review is to ready pre-tenure faculty for the third year

and promotion and tenure reviews. Accordingly, materials submitted should start to include all documents required by the Provost's office in anticipation of these reviews. All pre-tenure faculty should consult the Provost's website for any updates about materials to submit so the yearly binder will be in alignment with the Provost's guidelines for third year and promotion and tenure reviews. These materials are presented in a binder and should include:

1. All annual review reports from the chair and yearly progress reports to date.
2. A vita.
3. A narrative summarizing accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, and service.
4. A context statement (if applicable).
5. A teaching portfolio which typically includes a statement of teaching philosophy, objectives, and methods.
6. Student evaluations and other teaching evidence.
7. Research articles.
8. A *Scholarly Activity Description Form* for each journal article or scholarly equivalent.

Third Year Review

The Third Year Review is designed to provide a cumulative and comprehensive review of the faculty member at the third year as a way to monitor prospects for success with the tenure process. The materials for this review should be submitted in accordance with the Provost's guidelines. These guidelines clearly outline the required contents and order of the materials that must be submitted.

These materials include the same materials submitted for the yearly progress toward tenure:

1. All annual review reports by the chair and yearly progress reports to date.
2. A vita.
3. A narrative summarizing accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, and service.
4. A context statement (if applicable).
5. A teaching portfolio.
6. Student evaluations and other forms of teaching assessment, including at least one peer review.
7. A *Scholarly Activity Description Form* for each journal article or scholarly equivalent.
8. Research articles.

The teaching portfolio included in these materials, which describes the faculty member's teaching philosophy, objectives, and methods, must be limited to five pages (this limit does not apply to the appendix or supporting materials). In addition, in the yearly, third-year, and tenure-and-promotion review materials, the candidate may provide an optional written statement of not more than two pages describing the context of his or her appointment. For example, faculty may wish to include information about commitments to student groups, circumstances at regional campuses, or other unique circumstances that are relevant to the evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion.

Review Processes

In both the yearly and third-year reviews, the non-tenured faculty member's mentor committee shall review the submitted materials and discuss the candidate's progress with the candidate. Subsequently, the mentor committee shall make an oral report on tenure progress in terms of the college criteria at a meeting of the tenured faculty in the department, which includes an in-depth analysis of the candidate's scholarly works, focusing on their originality, importance, intellectual rigor and impact. Based on the discussion at this meeting and tenured faculty members' individual reviews of the candidate's materials, tenured faculty submit to the department chair their evaluation of the candidate's tenure progress. For the yearly pre-tenure reviews, evaluation by individual tenured faculty members is provided using a rating and comment form which addresses college criteria for promotion and tenure provided by the department chair for this purpose. For the third-year review, official third-year review ballots are used.

In each case, the department chair prepares a draft written summary evaluating tenure progress based on the individual faculty evaluations, the discussion at the meeting of tenured faculty, and their own evaluation. This summary evaluation is available to tenured faculty members for review before it is presented to the non-tenured faculty member. The department chair's personal assessment of the candidate is not provided to the tenured faculty. Tenured faculty members are notified by the chair regarding the availability of the information. For tenure progress reviews other than the formal third-year review (which is reported by the college to the Provost) the department chair meets individually with the non-tenured faculty member to discuss the results and implications of the pre-tenure review and invite the non-tenured faculty member to react to the written evaluation. A final version of the written evaluation is dated and signed by the non-tenured faculty member and the department chair. The non-tenured faculty member has the right to add a written statement concerning the final document and have it permanently attached to the document. A copy of the written evaluation is provided to the non-tenured faculty member. The mentor committee may, at their discretion or at the request of the non-tenured faculty member, meet with the non-tenured faculty member after the yearly pre-tenure review to provide feedback or discuss perceived strengths and weaknesses identified during the review. Each non-tenured faculty member also has the right to meet with the tenured faculty as a group to discuss his/her pre-tenure review.

It is the responsibility of the unit administrator (usually the chair) to ensure that all faculty eligible to vote during yearly, third year, tenure, and promotion reviews have available at the time of their votes and deliberations all relevant documents (department criteria, complete file, conditions of appointment when appropriate) including those from other related units (institutes, research stations, regional campuses, etc.).

Files are considered complete at the time of the deadline for submission of materials. Additional material may not be added to the file after the deadlines except for the following:

1. A pre-tenured faculty member has listed a publication as "in press" and the article or book is published. If the faculty member wishes the material to be included, it may be substituted for the manuscript in the file. This is a "cosmetic" change and requires no further action.

2. A pre-tenured faculty member who is being evaluated during third-year review or considered for tenure has listed a publication as "submitted" and, after the file leaves the department, the faculty member receives word that the manuscript has been accepted. The pre-tenured faculty member may request reconsideration at the department level if the Provost has not yet rendered a final decision. The pre-tenured faculty member must provide documentation to the department chair, who shall request reconsideration by the voting faculty. Both the original and subsequent votes shall become part of the file sent to the college for reconsideration and then to the Provost. Reconsideration is appropriate to ensure that the best possible case is made for pre-tenured faculty members, who are at a critical juncture in their career.
3. The mentor committee or department chair requests additional materials prior to balloting by departmental faculty.

Faculty use various terms to describe the status of publications: in progress, in revision, under contract, submitted, accepted, in press, etc. *Any publication which is not accompanied by documentation such as a letter of acceptance, signed contract, or other proof of eventual publication shall not be considered as part of the file.*

Tenure and Promotion Review

Tenure and promotion candidates should submit a complete set of materials in accordance with instructions received each year from the Provost's office. As with the third-year review, these shall include a teaching portfolio of 5 pages maximum (not including appendix and supporting materials) and an optional statement of context.

In addition, copies of at least four external letters from individuals of national stature in the candidate's area of expertise who are not employees of Washington State University evaluating the candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure must be available for review by tenured faculty. In cases where a faculty member has a joint appointment or more than one specialization, the department chair may decide, in consultation with the faculty member, to request an additional letter. These letters should be solicited by the department chair and should be from individuals who hold professorial rank at or above that to which the candidate aspires. In no case should letters be sought from individuals who served as faculty advisors, teachers or mentors during a candidate's program of graduate or undergraduate study. While candidates may be asked for names of professional colleagues who might serve as evaluators, candidates should not contact potential reviewers directly and should not reveal to the potential reviewers that they have been recommended to the department chair. The department chair is free to contact persons recommended by the candidate, but at least one letter in the final promotion portfolio must be from an individual not supplied by the faculty member.

The department chair's requests for letters should be couched in neutral terms, asking for "evaluation" rather than "support" and stating that the candidate is being "reviewed" not "recommended" for promotion and/or tenure. The department chair should assure that the language in the letter to external reviewers encourages an impartial, unbiased review of the candidate's professional work and stature in the discipline. The materials submitted to the dean

should contain a brief explanation of the credentials of each outside evaluator, as well as a copy of the letter sent by the department chair seeking the evaluation.

As during the yearly and third-year pre-tenure reviews, the mentor committee meets with the candidate to discuss their tenure and promotion materials. Subsequently, the mentor committee makes an oral report on tenure progress in terms of the college criteria at a meeting of the tenured faculty in the department. The report should provide an overview of the context of the faculty member's work; progress on research, teaching, and service; candidate concerns; and recommendations, if needed, for supporting the faculty member's progress toward promotion and/or tenure. Based on the discussion at this meeting and individual tenured faculty members' own reviews of the candidate's materials, individual faculty submit to the department chair their official tenure and promotion ballots on each candidate.

Ballots cast by tenured faculty members in the department must include comments and rationale. Tenure ballots must be completed with due consideration of the importance of the tenure decision and the need for documentation of support or lack of support for the candidate. A mere vote or a general comment without supporting rationale on the tenure ballot does not suffice. Tenure ballots should be completed with the same care and detail as if one were writing an external review letter for a tenure candidate at another institution of higher education. Inadequate or incomplete tenure ballots carry the possibility of being substantially discounted during the review process.

When promotion/tenure materials are received by the dean with the faculty tenure ballots and recommendation of the department chair, a college review process is initiated. Specifically, the dean seeks the recommendation of the College of Education Faculty Affairs Committee (CEFAC) on each individual who is considered for promotion and/or tenure. All CEFAC members, whether associate or full professors, participate in the evaluation process. Thus, for example, associate professors also take part in deliberations regarding candidates for full professor. However, department chairs (who have their own opportunity to comment) should not be a part of CEFAC deliberations. CEFAC members from the candidate's department may provide comments about the nature and context of the candidate's work, including comments designed to assist the other CEFAC members in interpreting the candidate's line of research and understanding the candidate's publishing venues. CEFAC members from the same department as the candidate should not provide to other CEFAC members either their own personal evaluation of the candidate or a summary of the department's discussion of the candidate. In addition to the materials provided to individual voting faculty, CEFAC members are provided with the evaluations prepared by the department chair and other unit level administrators as well as the faculty vote counts for and against tenure or promotion. The CEFAC assists the dean in evaluating candidates' qualifications for promotion and/or tenure and provides a written recommendation to the dean, but does not state formal votes. After discussion by the CEFAC and consultation with the appropriate department chair, the dean makes a recommendation on each candidate to the provost. The recommendation of CEFAC is reported as part of the dean's analysis and recommendation to the provost.

All necessary materials for individuals to be considered for promotion and/or tenure must be submitted by the department to the dean's office no later than the third week in October in order to allow ample time for review prior to the deadline for submission to the Provost's office.

Synopsis of Tenure and Promotion Steps

1. Copies of college documents on tenure and promotion procedures and criteria shared with untenured faculty during hiring process.
2. Appointment of tenure and promotion Mentor Committee by department chair in consultation with non-tenured faculty member.
3. Meetings of Mentor Committee with non-tenured faculty member at least once a semester throughout pre-tenure period, providing consultation on tenure and promotion procedures, clarification of criteria, advocacy, feedback, and professional advisement.
4. Yearly oral reports by Mentor Committee to the departmental tenured faculty summarizing non-tenured faculty member's progress toward tenure in terms of college tenure and promotion criteria.
5. Yearly ratings and comments on non-tenured faculty member's progress toward tenure by all departmental tenured faculty.
6. Yearly written evaluations by the department chair based on the individual faculty evaluations, discussion at the meeting of tenured faculty, and the chair's own evaluation.
7. Third-year reviews in accordance with instructions provided by Provost's office.
8. At time of final tenure and promotion consideration, submission of tenure and promotion materials in accordance with instructions from Provost's office and college procedures document; timing of tenure decision specified at time of hiring (normally the sixth year for those hired as new assistant professors).
9. Final tenure and promotion review within the college, which includes the following steps:
 - a. Mentor committee meets with candidate to discuss tenure/promotion materials.
 - b. Candidate's tenure/promotion review materials available for tenured faculty review (including external letters).
 - c. Mentor committee oral summary of tenure and promotion progress at meeting of departmental tenured faculty.
 - d. Tenured faculty member submits official tenure/promotion ballots.
 - e. Department chair review and recommendation.
 - f. College-level review and recommendation by CEFAC; materials reviewed by CEFAC include department chair and other unit administrator's recommendations and tenured faculty vote tally.
 - g. Dean's review and recommendation.

Section II: Criteria for Awarding Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

There is no more serious activity for a university faculty than the consideration of colleagues for promotion in rank or granting of indefinite tenure. Both promotion and tenure decisions must be based on demonstrated excellence in scholarly activity, teaching, and service. While all three of these aspects are considered in tenure and promotion decisions, as members of a research institution, faculty must provide evidence of a focused research agenda in addition to demonstrating effectiveness in teaching and research. The purpose of the criteria presented below is to delineate expectations for teaching, scholarly activity, and service. Each of these plays an important role in a faculty member's candidacy for tenure and promotion, but the greatest emphasis is typically placed on scholarly activity. Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor is based on consistent, sustained, and significant achievement in scholarly activity, effective teaching, and sufficient service activities to support the mission of the department, college, and university.

Scholarly Activity

As a research university, expectations regarding the scholarly record of faculty are high. In general, quality is more important than quantity, although there must be sufficient quantity to provide evidence of a significant level of productivity.

Primary Scholarly Activity

Scholarly activity is underscored by several expectations that contribute to the assessment of a scholarly record: (a) continuity, (b) consistency, and (c) quality. The following guidelines provide a general way to consider these criteria.

1. **Continuity:** One expectation of scholarly activity includes continuity, as represented by a clearly-identifiable program of research, publication, or creative works. Overall, the focus of the research should be identifiable and convey an integrated and coherent line of inquiry.
2. **Consistency:** A second expectation involves an ongoing record of scholarly activity in process and outcomes with the goal of satisfying the achievement criteria stated below. For example, having several contiguous years with no accepted publications or equivalent scholarship would not meet this expectation. Having one publication in one year and three in another would evidence consistency.
3. **Quality:** Judgments about quality depend upon the scholarly activity. In each instance, the scholarly venue contributes to this decision. For journals, this includes refereed outlets of importance to the candidate's professional field that are national or international in scope and target an appropriate audience. This also holds for books and book chapters, which may also be evaluated in part on the status of the publisher in the faculty member's academic area (i.e., higher quality would be intimated from national professional organizations and recognized academic publishers than from author-paid publishers), distribution, the professional status of the book's editor and other scholarship

criteria. *The responsibility for contextualizing the quality of scholarly venues lies with the candidate.* This can be addressed on a Scholarly Activity Description Form. For non-text outlets, the candidate holds a higher degree of responsibility to explain the appropriateness of the outlet and its significance. This includes originality, creativity, and rigor of scholarly efforts. Since peer-evaluation and interaction are an integral aspect of research, scholarly and creative activity, evidence of peer responses and review is expected.

Candidates can meet expectations for scholarly activity in a variety of ways. Two general areas apply: refereed publications and refereed presentations.

1. Refereed Publications: The primary currency for demonstrated productivity in publications is refereed scholarly publications with a target *average* of two per year. Journal publications must address the previously explained quality guidelines. Sole or first authorship is valued more highly by the university for tenure and promotion, but co-authorship is still encouraged, particularly with students and cross-disciplinary colleagues. The general guidelines for this area for promotion to associate professor with tenure include a target of a minimum of eight published or verified as in-press publications and an additional two verified as under review. In exceptional cases, the quality and significance of the candidate's overall scholarship record can compensate for a lesser number of publications. Equivalent refereed works can provide evidence of scholarly achievement; however, in most cases, the majority of work should be journal publications. The rigor of the review process determines whether the publication is considered primary or secondary activity. In general, the following accomplishments may be considered as equivalent to one or more journal publication(s) based on quality considerations. The candidate should make clear in his/her documentation how these various types of accomplishments are weighted within his/her specific field:
 - a. Single or co-authored book
 - b. Book chapter
 - c. Edited book
 - d. A principal investigator (or co- PI) for an externally funded research grant
2. Refereed Presentations: Refereed presentations do not replace the target number per year of refereed publications. A general guideline would be, on average, one national or international presentation per year. Refereed presentations should address the scholarly guidelines listed above: (a) continuity, (b) consistency, (c) quality, and (d) achievement.

Candidates should note that, while scholarly work takes many forms and is published in many venues, a balance of venues and formats is expected in any candidate's portfolio.

Secondary Scholarly Activity

With the expectation that emphasis is on refereed journals with a national or international audience, publications that appear in regional refereed journals may count toward the achievement expectation as may publication in a peer-evaluated non-print media, performances and other creative works. Faculty members may be recognized for seeking and receiving funding through fellowships, grants, contracts, commissions and awards as appropriate. Expectations on funding should be consistent with the costs associated with doing research in a given area and the availability of funding. However, a limited amount of secondary activity will be counted toward the achievement expectation. Secondary scholarly work must still demonstrate the expectations noted in the previous section. In addition, candidates are responsible for explaining the work's impact, competitiveness of venue, and contribution to the department/college/field.

The candidate, with accompanying contextual explanation, may also propose other scholarly works that fit his or her research agenda and coincide with the standards of his or her professional community.

Supporting Scholarly Activity

The following types of publications can help establish a candidate's national reputation; however, they do not contribute directly to publication achievement because they do not meet the conditions stated above:

1. Non-refereed conference proceedings
2. Technical reports
3. Refereed proceedings
4. Publications in non-refereed journals
5. Newspaper (op-ed or other) publications
6. Non-refereed book reviews
7. A principal investigator (or co-PI) for an unfunded grant
8. Funded training or other non-research grants

The guidelines in this section apply directly to annual review and yearly progress toward tenure reviews and offer direction for a successful tenure dossier. However, the tenure dossier remains a composite of scholarly activities throughout the probationary period and as such also includes teaching and service.

Teaching

According to the Provost's guidelines, teaching activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. **Instruction**, which can be quite varied, including large enrollment lower-division courses, upper-division courses, graduate courses, honors college courses, seminars, and classroom and distance education courses.

2. **Mentoring** of individuals, including face-to-face guidance of undergraduate students, graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, and others in such areas as special projects, senior projects, thesis and dissertation research, performances, exhibitions, career goals, and life choices. Guiding professional and student clubs may also involve mentoring.
3. **Academic advising**, including guidance of individual students in setting up appropriate programs of instruction while observing academic requirements. It also includes guiding groups of students such as departmental majors.
4. **Educational outreach** in areas in which a faculty member is expert, including Extension, external instructional activities in K-12 schools, other colleges and universities, presentation of public lectures, and lecturing at significant workshops or professional schools.

Especially for academic faculty, evaluation of teaching is a major consideration in annual review and in the tenure and promotion processes. Both *quality* and *quantity* of instructional activities are evaluated. Quantity of instruction will include, but not be limited to, consideration of class sizes, numbers of courses, course levels, whether courses require unusual levels of preparation, and development of new courses. For tenure and promotion, evaluation of the quality of instruction must be based on multiple forms of assessment, such as peer review and student end-of-course evaluations, rather than on a single form. Multiple forms of assessment are also desirable in annual reviews. Evaluation of teaching will take into account special situations, such as a faculty member undertaking more instructional activity than is normally expected or a faculty member supervising or training teaching assistants in laboratory and clinical settings. Evaluation of teaching will also take into account the levels of desirable and actual assistance provided in support of instruction, such as in the form of teaching assistants.

Recognition will be given for creativity in the art of teaching, including submitting grant applications in support of instruction, receiving grant awards or other funds in support of instruction, publishing pedagogical articles, and incorporating instructional innovations in courses. Similarly, learning more about teaching at conferences and workshops, developing significant new courses, applying methods supported by the current pedagogical literature, assessing the quality of instruction, and disseminating instructional innovations and assessments at conferences will be recognized.

In general, effective teaching can be evidenced by one's:

1. Ability to make quality contributions in graduate and/or undergraduate education commensurate with instructional assignment.
2. Competence to teach in area(s) of importance to the department and college.
3. Excellence in instruction documented through multiple sources of data.
4. Availability to students for instructional purposes.

5. Contribution to mentoring and advising of undergraduate and/or graduate students.

Unless otherwise stated in the faculty member's contract, general guidelines that support the university teaching criteria for promotion and tenure include:

1. Four-course teaching load. Consideration is also given to playing a significant role in practica and internships.
2. Positive student teaching reviews (all courses 3.0 on average or greater on 5.0 scale) and peer observations. For the third-year review, the candidate's binder must include all student evaluations, at least one peer observation, and at least one additional document that provides information about teaching quality. For the promotion and tenure review, the candidate's binder must include all student evaluations, one or more peer observations under the purview of the mentoring committee, and at least two additional documents that provide information about teaching quality. These items should be considered in tandem, not in isolation. See below for ways to document teaching quality.
3. Course or program development or revision. Consideration is given to the number and significance of development/revision efforts.

Specific documentation for teaching quality may include:

1. Graduate student completion rates (if applicable).
2. Letters from current and former students explaining the positive impact of your teaching on their professional practice.
3. Teaching artifacts (e.g., syllabi, sample assignments, etc.).
4. Teaching and/or mentor awards and nominations.
5. Professional development activities (documentation of participation in opportunities presented through Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology or other teaching related activities).
6. Mentoring and advising loads (evidence that the candidate contributes to an equitable distribution of undergraduate and/or graduate advising, responds to students' inquiries in a timely manner, makes oneself available for advising appointments).
7. Philosophy about grading.

Service

Service is interpreted generally as activities aligned with teaching and research that benefit and contribute to the professional, university, or external communities. In addition to teaching and research, faculty duties include a substantive service component that, along with teaching and research, is considered in annual evaluations for salary increases, tenure, and promotion decisions. Shared governance, the basic operating principle of the university, is impossible without faculty service.

Guidelines for Involvement in Service

Involvement in service evolves over time and newly hired assistant professors are not expected to take on major service roles in the interest of meeting demands for excellence in research and teaching. The role of an assistant professor is to develop understanding of one's field, department, college, university, and larger communities. Service can play a key role in developing understanding, but it is incumbent on the individual and his or her mentor committee to carefully balance service contributions in light of the emphasis placed on scholarly activity and teaching assignments. While faculty participation in service will be assessed on the basis of quality and quantity it is in no way expected that junior faculty will have service as a focus of their work at this rank. For junior faculty service at the department, college, university, and community level is expected to be a means to familiarize faculty with the workings of these areas and involvement in service at this time would be in a limited capacity. Service to the discipline at this rank is an important means to help junior faculty establish a reputation at the national level. Activities such as reviewing proposals for annual meetings and service as session chairs are ways to become established and appropriate levels of involvement.

Quality of Service Contributions

Service responsibilities need to be taken seriously. Candidates are evaluated on the basis of level of contribution and quality of participation, not on quantity of committees. Faculty should indicate on their vita (1) the committee or service activity, (2) their role, and (3) major tasks completed. Sample vita/ WORQs entries include:

2007 *Journal of General Education*, manuscript reviewer, reviewed three manuscripts.

2008 College of Education Scholarship Committee, member, helped rewrite scholarship guidelines and reviewed applications.

Description of Service Venues

The basic elements comprising service include outreach and university, college, department, professional discipline, and public service.

1. **Outreach and public service**, which are defined broadly to involve activities that benefit communities external to the university, include for example, *but are not limited to*, activities such as contributions to the welfare of a city, school, or public service group; technology transfer to further economic development, or educational outreach to the general public in area of faculty member's expertise.

2. **Professional discipline service** includes for example, *but is not limited to*, activities such as journal and grant reviewing, leadership roles in national or regional professional associations, leadership and contribution to regional and national conferences.
3. **University service** includes for example, *but is not limited to*, activities such as serving as member or chair of university and/or regional campus level committees and task forces involved in tenure and promotion policies, diversity and equity policies, graduate and undergraduate program policies, and university level recruitment (e.g., deans, provosts, president, etc.), organization, production, and support of University events, facilitation of visiting scholars and artists, and involvement with and support of Faculty Senate.
4. **College service** includes for example, *but is not limited to*, activities such as membership or chairing of committees involved with tenure and promotion, curriculum, undergraduate and graduate programs, and college level recruitment.
5. **Departmental service** includes for example, *but is not limited to*, participation or leadership in activities such as recruitment, advising student organizations, development of tenure and promotion practices and policies, graduate and undergraduate program policy development, and curriculum development and policies.

While service is expected and required of all faculty members, its form and composition varies significantly across colleges, disciplines, departments, and faculty ranks. Broad guidelines for number of service assignments that support university criteria for promotion and tenure include the following:

1. Department service. Tenure track: 2-3. Tenured: 3-4
2. College service. Tenure track: 0-1. Tenured: 1-3
3. University service. Tenure track: 0-1. Tenured: 1-3
4. Professional service (outside the university). Tenure track: 0-1; Tenured: 1-3
5. Outreach and Public Service. Tenure track: 0-1; Tenured: 1-3

Implications for Initial Tenure Decisions

It is important that non-tenured faculty monitor their profile of duties and contributions during the pre-tenure period so that they are able to establish a productive and programmatic line of research/scholarship. Mentor committees and department chairs should assist the non-tenured faculty in doing so. Thus, it is important that pre-tenure faculty demonstrate that they will be able to sustain a productive and ongoing program of research as a tenured faculty member, leading eventually, in combination with their other contributions as an associate professor, to promotion to full professor.

General Guidelines and Principles Regarding Promotion to Full Professor

Decisions on promotion to full professor in the College of Education should take into account the following general principles. These guidelines or principles are meant to supplement, not replace, the College of Education Criteria for Promotion and Tenure.

1. **National or International Reputation** – Individuals promoted to full professor should generally have a national or international reputation in their area of expertise. Typically, this will have been attained, at least in part, through publications in national/international journals and presentations at relevant national/international conferences in appropriate areas of expertise.
2. **Diversity of Contribution Profiles** – The college recognizes that individual faculty will differ in the relative balance of effort and responsibility in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service, including external outreach/partnerships and related activities. It is intended that promotion to full professor be possible for individuals with different profiles or patterns of contributions in the above areas, as long as the overall contributions are clearly deserving of promotion and minimal criteria noted elsewhere in these guidelines are met.
3. **Diversity of Programmatic Roles** – Decisions about promotion to full professor should take into account the faculty member's role(s) in his/her primary program(s) and the demands and needs of those programs. For example, faculty whose primary roles are in graduate degree programs with significant thesis/dissertation advising loads should have active programs of research/scholarship, facilitating guidance of students in conducting state-of-the-art research in relevant fields. Similarly, faculty whose departmental roles and responsibilities have required significant program development and coordination duties or outreach/partnership activities should have a valued record in these activities and may, by necessity, have focused somewhat less on research/scholarship.
4. **Significant/Long-term Administrative Roles** – In some cases, long-term (e.g., two or three terms) primary contributions as an important and valued administrator within the college or university (e.g., department chair, associate dean) may represent a special case. For example, multiple terms as an administrator may coincide with limited teaching responsibilities and significantly reduced time available to maintain an on-going research program. These factors can be taken into consideration in decisions about promotion to full professor. However, administrative work alone would not qualify a faculty member for promotion in the absence of ongoing contributions as indicated in point 5 (next).
5. **Ongoing Contributions in Teaching, Service, and Research/Scholarship** – Although individual faculty may differ in their profile of contributions, certain minimal contributions in each of the traditional areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service are reasonable to expect and should be considered in decisions about promotion to full professor. For example, the above principles are not intended to enable faculty to largely discontinue contributions in service or

satisfactory teaching. Although the candidate for full professor may make contributions to the department, college and university in many and varied forms, candidates for promotion full professor should have maintained an ongoing program of research/scholarship and a record of publication and conference presentations sufficient to attain a reasonable level of national or international exposure and recognition. It is also expected that candidates for full professor will have made positive leadership and mentoring contributions within their units.

6. **Time in Rank** –It is assumed that faculty will spend a minimum of five full years in rank as an associate professor prior to applying for promotion. Early application must demonstrate extraordinary achievement in multiple areas and is seldom approved. Because there is no expectation for advancement in rank and, thus, no time requirement, no application will be forward to the Provost unless it has strong support from faculty, the department chair and the dean of the college.