

**CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR AWARDING
PROMOTION AND TENURE
College of Pharmacy
Washington State University**

Introduction

The College of Pharmacy faculty supports the policies in the *WSU Faculty Manual* on matters of promotion and tenure and believes that the criteria therein are sound bases for the determination of eligibility for awarding tenure and for advancement in rank. The faculty also believes that these criteria should be applied with specific reference to the position held and to the performance of the faculty member in fulfilling obligations to the College of Pharmacy, to Washington State University, and to the people of the State of Washington as they are defined in the job description of that position. The following commentary supplements the guidelines outlined in the *Faculty Manual* and explains their application in the College of Pharmacy. In the case of any conflict, the *Faculty Manual* is considered authoritative.

Tenure Criteria

The primary areas of evaluation in considering eligibility for tenure are effectiveness in: teaching, creative research and scholarship, and service activities. While performance in all of these areas may influence a particular tenure decision, teaching, research and scholarship are of primary importance. For faculty members in the Department of Pharmacotherapy, clinical practice (if applicable as part of their job description) is also of primary importance. In view of the responsibilities of the faculty in the University governance, participation in College of Pharmacy and University service assignments is expected. Ability to interact effectively with colleagues, students and staff will be a secondary, but significant consideration. Sensitivity to and an understanding of the profession of pharmacy will also be evaluated. Service contributions to the community and students cannot replace effectiveness in teaching, research and clinical practice.

The performance of the faculty member will be evaluated based on the job description of that position, not his or her source of funding. The relative emphases in the areas of teaching, research, clinical practice, and service as stated in the job description shall be considered when evaluating the faculty member's productivity and effectiveness in each of these areas.

The following criteria shall be considered:

1. Teaching

Because of the significance of instruction within the College of Pharmacy, it is incumbent on all faculty members to display a high level of competence, commitment and concern for students at all levels of instruction. The assessment of teaching competence usually will include review of a recorded lecture, or visits to the teaching site(s) by one or more members of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, and a review of a teaching portfolio prepared by this individual. This portfolio should include:

- A. Names and degrees of undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral students, residents and fellows for whom the candidate has served as the major research advisor.
- B. Evaluation of teaching in writing by colleagues who are familiar with the courses taught by the candidate.
- C. Evaluation of teaching by students.
- D. Contributions to pharmacy education as demonstrated by any of the following:

1. developing a new course or revising an existing course.
2. receiving an educational development grant or directing an experimental educational program.
3. publishing a review article on teaching of a technical nature in a professional journal.
4. authoring or co-authoring all or part of a textbook relevant to his or her discipline.
5. participating as an invited contributor in a national symposium or workshop on some aspect of pharmacy education.
6. publishing on subjects relating to pharmacy education.
7. developing and presenting continuing education programs.
8. receiving a teaching award.
9. establishment and maintenance of an appropriate teaching environment (e.g., patient care setting, research laboratory) to serve as a vehicle for teaching activities.
10. evaluation of advising by advisees, faculty or other means.

Each of the above contributions must be judged by peer review as being of high quality and significance. Items 4 through 6 may also be considered as scholarship if the work meets the recognized standards in the faculty member's discipline for scholarship of discovery, application, synthesis, or teaching.

2. Research and Other Scholarly Activity

It is the policy of the College of Pharmacy to emphasize and promote high quality research and other scholarly activities. The evaluation of the candidate's research program will be based upon both its productivity and quality. The College of Pharmacy, as does the University, recognizes scholarship in discovery, application, synthesis, or teaching as fulfilling a faculty member's obligation to conduct scholarly activity. The assessment of research usually will include:

- A. **Publications:** Major emphasis will be placed on original research published in peer-reviewed journals where the candidate is a primary author. Other scholarly activity will be considered including those relating to teaching or pharmacy practice. The relative quality of journals – examined in the light of journals available within the candidate's discipline and research focus – will be a factor. The candidate will supply reprints of all relevant publications. The role of the candidate in all publications since appointment at Washington State University must be clearly defined.
- B. **Research funding:** The candidate has secured funding from sources outside the University to support his/her research efforts. Documentation will include descriptions of grants funded, and of grants submitted along with a description of their status including scores where relevant; comments of reviewers may be included. The role of the applicant in all funded and submitted grants must be clearly defined. The role of the candidate in all funded grants since appointment at Washington State University must be clearly defined. Potential and actual revenues to the University, College and Department from intellectual property licensing should also be defined.
- C. **Peer recognition:** Examples include invited or juried presentations at national scientific and professional meetings, national awards, service on national review committees and editorial boards, publication of patent applications as well as election to prestigious national organizations that recognize excellence in the discipline.

- D. Quality of work and potential for advancement: Review of the candidate's scholarly efforts by peers, from within the University and outside reviewers, must conclude that the work is scholarly, creative, original and of high quality and significance.
- E. Additional information to be considered will include: contributed presentations at scientific and professional meetings; books, book chapters and monographs; manuscripts accepted for publication with a copy of the acceptance letter; invention disclosures, patent applications/awards.

3. Service

Service is regarded as a valuable faculty activity and shall be considered in the granting of tenure. The assessment of service usually will include evaluation of activities such as: consulting, presenting to potential licensees of intellectual property held by WSU, committee work at College and University levels, advising recognized student organizations, membership and offices held in professional and scientific societies, review of: books, manuscripts, grant proposals, etc., and educational services.

4. Clinical Practice

Because of the critical need for visible role models for pharmacy students, and the goal of pharmacy practice to deliver pharmaceutical care to patients, it is necessary for Department of Pharmacotherapy faculty involved in patient care to demonstrate competence, commitment and innovation in clinical practice.

The assessment of clinical practice competence usually will include:

- A. Development of innovative roles for the pharmacist in a patient care setting.
- B. Written and verbal communications to other health care professionals as evidenced by samples of these communications.
- C. Scholarly writings, other than those considered under Research and Other Scholarly Activity (e.g. newsletter contributions, medication evaluation use reports, drug use policy statements, etc.).
- D. Involvement in creative activities such as new methods in service delivery and design.
- E. Demonstrated direct influence on patient care (as evidenced by examples of approved prescriptive authority protocols, letters of support from medical colleagues or patients, etc.)

Tenure Procedures

Revised May 2006

Approved by Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty in the College of Pharmacy May 24 2006

The following steps are listed in chronological order.

1. Initiation of the Review Process

The Dean shall notify candidates to compile Promotion and Tenure supporting materials as soon as the College receives notification from the Provost's Office identifying eligible faculty, usually the end of May. The Dean will provide instructions received from the Provost Office to assist candidates in correctly compiling their supporting materials. Candidates shall be given sufficient time to compile necessary documentation, usually approximately 7 to 8 weeks. Candidates shall be instructed to seek advice from their Department Chair as well as any mentor(s) and members of the Department Promotion and Tenure committee in preparing the Promotion and Tenure document. In the event that the Department Chair is ineligible to vote on promotion or tenure, such as by lacking the tenure status or rank being sought, a tenured faculty member of sufficient

rank will be appointed to fulfill the duties of the chair as pertaining to the processes described herein.

The Chair and/or the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will review the applicant's supporting materials and may request a meeting with the candidate to help ensure that a complete and accurate document is submitted. The candidate shall be given 48 hours after this meeting to make any necessary revisions and resubmit a corrected version. A sample timetable for review is included as Appendix 1.

2. *External Reviewers and Previous Reviews of the Candidate*

Confidential letters from at least five external evaluators attesting to the candidate's qualifications for promotion will be obtained. The Chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for identifying evaluators and obtaining these letters and including them in the applicant's file. The evaluators should be in the same professional or scientific field as the candidate. The Chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee must briefly describe the qualifications of each person writing an external letter. This may consist of a biographical sketch provided by the writer. Two of the evaluators will be selected from a list of at least four provided by the candidate in consultation with the Chair of the Department, unless the Chair provides to the Dean a written reason why this cannot be done, and the Dean concurs. No letter writer may have a personal relationship with the candidate that goes beyond the normal relationship of a colleague. If the Chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee requests more than the required number of letters, all responses received from the external evaluators by the time that the file moves from the department shall become a part of the candidate's file. The Department Chair adds the past Annual and Progress-towards-tenure Reviews, including any responses from the candidate to these documents, to the file to ensure that tenure and promotion decisions follow logically from past performance reviews.

3. *Department Promotion and Tenure Committee*

It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to ensure that all faculty eligible to vote have available at the time of their votes and deliberations all relevant documents (letter of appointment, complete file), including that from other related units (institutes, research stations, etc.). The Chair must also convey to faculty the responsibility to participate in the evaluation process and to provide a written justification for their vote, whether it is 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.

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of all tenured faculty in the candidate's department including those who will retire prior to the effective date of such grant of tenure. Members of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee at or above the proposed rank for the candidate shall review the candidate's materials and this group shall then meet to discuss the candidate's credentials. The Department Chair shall participate in this meeting as a non-voting member of the committee. At the end of this meeting each faculty member shall vote to either deny or grant indefinite tenure and/or promotion, and provide brief comments to justify this vote. This constitutes the faculty vote. A Department P&T Chair elected from among this group shall generate a report that summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate as discussed by the committee. The report shall be made a part of the Promotion file and included in the beginning of the file for subsequent review, and shall include a tabulation of the vote of the committee (excluding the Department Chair). 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 voting form.

4. *Department Chair's Recommendation*

The Department Chair shall prepare a separate report with his/her recommendation with documentation on whether to deny or grant indefinite tenure and/or promotion. The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee's report, and the Department Chair's report, shall be made a part of the Promotion and Tenure file and included in the front matter of the file for subsequent review by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Evaluation by the Chair should be detailed and interpretive containing analysis of critiques by colleagues and peers. The Chair should outline the process used during unit review and should explain, or at least provide a context for, ballots or external letters that contain negative information about the candidate or that disagree with the overall departmental decision. The Chair's recommendations will not ignore the views of the faculty but need not be in agreement with the results of faculty recommendation forms.

In commenting on the promotion of assistant to associate professor, and/or the granting of tenure, the Chair's analysis should show that the candidate has a potential for national or international prominence, as well as the potential for continued contribution to the University. The Chair should address the question of whether the person would be tenured and/or promoted at the best of our peer institutions.

In commenting on the promotion of associate to full professor, and/or the granting of tenure, the Chair's analysis should stress persistence of quality in teaching, scholarly, and creative activities, as well as increasing service to the institution, professional organizations, and society. The quality and quantity of accomplishments of the full professor are expected to be at a significantly higher level than that of the associate professor. The scope of these accomplishments should also be on a broader national or international level. Attainment of the rank of professor is an indication that, in the opinion of colleagues, the individual has made and continues to make outstanding contributions to the area of their major work assignment. The outstanding contributions that merit promotion to full professor should be clearly specified. Promotions to full professor cannot be justified on the basis of time in rank alone, generally adequate work, etc. National or international prominence is required and must be clearly established in the Chair's analysis.

5. *College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee*

The College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be composed of five members at the rank of Full Professor. Each department of the College shall elect one member. One additional member shall be appointed by the Dean based on recommendations from the elected members from among College Full Professors, and one from one of the following colleges: Business, Sciences, or colleges with professional or graduate programs in the health sciences including Nursing, Veterinary Medicine or WWAMI. A Chair shall be elected by the members from their own ranks. Department chairs should not be part of the College committee.

6. *College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee's Report*

This committee shall convene after the departmental committees have completed their work. Each member of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee shall review the candidate's materials. This group shall then meet to discuss the candidate's credentials. At the end of this meeting each committee member shall vote to either deny or grant promotion and/or tenure, and provide brief comments to justify this vote. Any member of the College-level committee must not vote on candidates from his/her own unit, but should participate fully in all discussions. The Committee Chair shall generate a report that summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate as discussed by the committee. The report may include the vote of the committee (excluding any members from the candidate's department). The College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee's report shall be advisory to the Dean, and made a part of the

Promotion file and included in the beginning of the file for subsequent review. The report shall then be submitted to the Dean.

7. *Dean's Recommendation*

The Dean shall review the cumulative record and forward a recommendation with documentation to the Provost. The Dean's report should outline the process used during the college-level review. In cases where time to tenure/promotion credit has been given for service at another institution, the report indicates how much credit was allowed.

8. *Provost's Review*

The file is then reviewed by the Provost and Vice Provosts and a final decision is made whether to grant or deny tenure and/or promotion.

9. *Appeals*

In case of a decision to deny tenure, the candidate may appeal to the Faculty Status Committee in accordance with the *Faculty Manual*.

Other reviews that affect the promotion and tenure process

1. *Progress Towards Tenure Review*

Regular reviews, as set forth below, shall be conducted annually to advise and direct faculty members' progress toward tenure. Evaluations of non-tenured tenure-track faculty members are to be conducted at the department level at least once a year. These reviews should be done at the same time of year as the annual review. When university rules permit, this review may be combined with the annual review.

Annual pre-tenure reviews are intended to give faculty members feedback about their progress toward tenure. Since the criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor are usually the same, the same attributes and areas of performance are assessed. They are, however, expected to be cumulative and they require feedback from all tenured faculty in the unit, not just the chair.

The Department Chair shall normally coordinate the review process with all tenured faculty members of the unit expected to establish how the evaluation is to be accomplished. These evaluations should, whenever possible, involve all tenured faculty members. Departments are encouraged both to hold a meeting of the tenured faculty and may require written comments be submitted to the chair or equivalent. [As with annual reviews for faculty at distant locations who have a supervisor there (e.g., Program Coordinator), feedback from that distant supervisor should be included in the review materials.] Current copies of college, department, school, or other unit criteria for tenure and promotion, the non-tenured faculty member's updated curriculum vitae, student and peer evaluations and previous progress-toward-tenure signed summaries are to be included in each yearly review of tenure progress where applicable. Following completion of the evaluations, the department chair or equivalent should prepare an accurate written summary of tenured faculty comments; tenured faculty should have the opportunity to review this summary prior to it being shared with the person under review. Each department has the option of providing the candidate with copies of anonymous written comments from tenured faculty members.

The department Chair, or equivalent, shall meet individually with each non-tenured faculty member yearly to discuss results and implications of the evaluation. The purpose of the

conference is to aid the faculty member in understanding how tenured members view his or her performance in light of the departmental criteria. A dated written summary of the discussion of these results and of the implications shall be signed by each non-tenured faculty member and the department Chair, or equivalent. A copy of the signed summary is to be provided to the faculty member. This summary also shall be available, upon request, to each tenured member of the department and to other supervisors if they exist. It is the responsibility of the department chair or equivalent to insure that the above procedures are followed and all parties are aware of their rights and responsibilities associated with the process.

2. *Formal Progress Toward Tenure Review*

A formal progress toward tenure review shall be conducted for all tenure-track faculty. This review normally will occur three years prior to tenure consideration. The Formal Progress Towards Tenure Review shall include the candidate providing a package that contains everything that the final tenure package contains except the letters from external reviewers. The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will evaluate this package and provide detailed input and assessment to the candidate regarding of their progress toward tenure and assist them in establishing goals. These recommendations will be communicated to the candidate at meeting that includes the Dean, the Chair of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Department Chair. A record of the meeting shall be made and placed in the faculty member's personnel file. A copy of the record shall be given to the candidate.

3. *Evaluation of Teaching*

Evaluation of teaching shall be done annually after the faculty member begins teaching and shall be part of the annual review process. The Department Chair is responsible for initiating and documenting teaching evaluations. Annual reviews, student evaluations, and the teaching portfolio shall be used together to evaluate the teaching credentials of the candidates during the Third Year Review and for tenure.

4. *Mentoring*

Mentoring junior faculty is a very important process for faculty growth and improvement and for faculty to set realistic goals. Mentoring shall be made available to all junior faculty upon request to the Department Chair. The Department Chair is responsible for assigning mentors. Junior faculty will be encouraged to seek the assistance of the mentor and report immediately to the Department Chair if s/he feels that they are not receiving sufficient assistance from the mentor.

Promotion Criteria

The basic criteria for promotion are those outlined above for evaluating qualifications for tenure. In addition, the following stipulations shall apply:

1. Time in rank is not relevant by itself. Nominations for promotion are based on the quantitative and qualitative characteristic of the candidate's cumulative record, not on seniority.
2. The following guidelines are to be used by the faculty and the Department and College Promotion and Tenure Committees in considering promotion to the various ranks.

Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of associate professor is based upon both past performance and future potential. The candidate should be growing professionally and be respected for scientific abilities, effective teaching, and scholarly contributions. A growing national reputation should be documented. Promotion to the rank of associate professor will depend, in general, upon adequate demonstration of the candidate's sustained effectiveness in undergraduate and advanced student

training, and scholarly contributions. Effectiveness in rendering professional services will also be considered.

Professor

Promotion to the rank of professor requires recognition of the candidate by the professional peers as a leader in the field of their specialty and by associates as a capable teacher and scholar. Promotion to professor will be based on extraordinary achievements in teaching, research, and other scholarly contributions, and service and/or clinical activities. The candidate will have acquired a national and international reputation, will continue to be productive, and will show potential for yet greater contributions to the college, the profession, and to society. In addition, the candidate must have made important and recognized contributions in the service of the profession and/or scientific community.

Appendix 1 **“A sample time table”**

April - The *Provost's Instructions and Forms on Tenure and Promotion* are distributed to the Colleges. These instructions may be found at: http://provost.wsu.edu/homepage_documents/2004_PT_Guidelines.doc. A list of candidates for tenure is also distributed to each College.

May - The Chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee meets with the candidate to prepare a list of possible external evaluators. The Chair also helps the candidate prepare a dossier to send to external evaluators.

June - The Chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure committee contacts potential external evaluators to determine their ability and willingness to provide an evaluation. Packets are mailed to external evaluators willing to serve. External letters are due back in the Department by mid-August

August - The Department Chair helps the candidate complete the dossier that will be the final tenure and promotion file.

August and September - The Departmental evaluation process occurs.

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

November - Completed tenure and promotion files are sent to the Provost's Office

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

February and March - Tenure and promotion decisions become final and letters describing the decision are sent to faculty members.

March - Successful faculty members are recognized at the Celebration of Excellence Banquet. The Banquet is held during the University Showcase (usually on a Friday night following spring break). The Banquet honors faculty achievements including recognition of University-wide faculty award winners and faculty members granted tenure and/or promotion. In recognition of faculty achievements, the University pays for dinner for each faculty honoree and a guest.