Supplementary Procedures and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

The WSU Faculty Manual outlines the official procedures and criteria for the granting of tenure and advancement in rank. The following supplements these general guidelines and explains their application within the College of Engineering and Architecture. Two sets of criteria for tenure and promotion apply, one to those departments and schools who administer engineering and/or computer science programs, and another to the School of Architecture to account for the character of the various programs. Additional supplementary criteria may be developed by individual departments/schools within the college pertaining to the portion of a program offered at a branch campus or by departments/schools for programs offered only at branch campuses. These should be directed toward the goals and objectives of that particular unit. In such cases, the department/school criteria must be approved by the dean and the provost.

In rare appointments in which the requirement of a position dictates the use of special criteria, those criteria must be approved in writing by the dean and the provost at the time of initial appointment. As stated in the WSU Faculty Manual, weighting of criteria may reflect more localized considerations in cases involving branch campus faculty. Weighting factors should reflect the assigned duties of the faculty member. These weighting factors must be clearly indicated in advance on an annual basis by the chair/director with agreement by the faculty member and approval by the college dean. The weighting factors must be included as a part of the tenure and promotion documentation.

It should be noted that neither promotion nor tenure are automatic but require affirmative action on the part of the university administration.

Procedures for Tenure Review and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

Normally, faculty appointed at the assistant professor level will be recommended for promotion to associate professor at the time of tenure consideration. Consideration of tenure must come in the sixth year of full-time service as an assistant professor unless a shorter period was negotiated at the time of hire. All accomplishments since awarding of the terminal degree are to be used in the evaluation; however, primary importance is placed on accomplishments since coming to Washington State University. In especially meritorious cases tenure consideration and/or promotion may occur early. Especially meritorious cases are those in which the candidate has met the criteria for promotion and/or tenure in fewer than six years.

Persons hired full-time as associate professors must be considered for tenure in the third year of service, and professors in the first year of service, unless shorter periods are negotiated at the time of hire. Persons hired at the rank of professor may be considered for tenure at the time of hire.

1. It is the responsibility of a faculty member to maintain an academic biographical record and file that provides material bearing on criteria for tenure and promotion. It is the joint responsibility of the faculty member and the department chair or school director and/or department/school promotion committee (if such exists) to ensure that the materials submitted present a concise, complete, and accurate case. The materials should be presented in a way to make assessment of the quality of the candidate's performance an integral part of the case for tenure and/or promotion.

2. Each year, the progress of a non-tenured faculty member toward meeting tenure criteria is reviewed by the tenured faculty and the department chair/school director and/or the departmental/school promotion committee. The results of this review are discussed by the department chair/school director with the non-tenured faculty member. A summary of the discussion is put in writing and countersigned by the faculty member with the faculty member having the right to attach a rebuttal to the review summary.
3. A formal tenure progress review will be conducted during the third year of service for faculty initially appointed full-time at the level of assistant professor. If a probationary period of fewer than six years was negotiated at the time of hire, this review should occur three years before the tenure decision must be made, if possible. The purpose of this review is to identify relevant strengths and deficiencies with regard to the conferral of tenure. If the likelihood of development of a tenurable record is considered low, a decision not to reappoint should be made at this time. The results of this tenure progress review shall be provided to the faculty member in writing.

4. At the beginning of the fall semester or earlier, when scheduled for tenure review or when being recommended for promotion, the candidate and the chair/director will jointly review the academic file and assure that it is complete. The department chair/school director or the department/school tenure and promotion committee, in consultation with the candidate and the dean, will obtain at least five letters of recommendation from people outside of Washington State University who are qualified to evaluate the accomplishments of the faculty member in research and scholarly activities or other areas as appropriate. The majority of the external letters will be obtained from reviewers not suggested by the candidate. All external letters received must be included in the documentation forwarded to the dean. In forwarding these letters with promotion and tenure materials, the department chair/school director will identify the qualifications of the external reviewers.

5. In the case of tenure considerations, following review of the file and open discussion of the record, the tenured members of the department/school shall provide signed recommendations using confidential ballots provided by the dean. The chair/director shall assure that every tenured member, including those on leave if practical, has an opportunity to review the record and to complete the confidential ballot.

6. The chair/director shall forward the tenure ballots, together with the documentation and a personal recommendation, to the dean. In the case of promotion alone, the chair/director shall forward the documentation and a recommendation to the dean, after consultation with the tenured associate professors and professors in the department/school. For branch campus faculty, the chair/director shall forward all materials and documentation simultaneously to the dean and the branch campus dean.

7. A College of Engineering and Architecture Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee will review and discuss each tenure and promotion case, and each member will make an individual recommendation to the dean for each case. The committee will review all materials forwarded by the chair/director except the signed tenure ballots. The committee will be composed of six faculty holding the rank of professor from within the college, elected by the college faculty, and one professor from a Washington State University department or school outside the college, appointed by the dean. At least one of the six college faculty members must be from a branch campus and one from the School of Architecture. The remaining four members from within the college will be from specified departments/schools, including biological systems engineering, on a rotating schedule for staggered two-year terms. No individual may serve consecutive full terms. The dean may participate in the committee discussions. In cases involving branch campus faculty the branch campus dean will review all materials and, after consultation with the Branch Campus Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee should one exist, make an independent recommendation regarding tenure and/or promotion and forward it to the dean. Because this recommendation emphasizes local considerations, it will be included in the documentation reviewed by the college dean’s Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee.

8. The dean will review all materials and make an independent recommendation and forward documentation and recommendations (including the dean’s comments about the assessment of each case by the members of the College Advisory Committee) to the provost. Negative recommendations are returned by the dean to the chairs/directors, without being forwarded, with written reasons for the decision.

9. Ultimately, tenure and positive promotion recommendations are submitted by the provost to the president for action and to the Board of Regents for information. Notification of the granting or denial of tenure shall be given in writing to the particular faculty member by the dean within three working days.
after the decision has been made by the dean, the provost, and the president, or designee acting for the president. This notification will include the date that the tenure recommendation will be reported to the Board of Regents.

10. Cases of denial of tenure or promotion may be appealed by the candidate in accordance with the WSU Faculty Manual.

** Procedures for Promotion to Professor **

1. It is the responsibility of a faculty member to maintain an academic biographical record and file that provides material bearing on criteria for promotion. It is the joint responsibility of the faculty member and the department chair/school director and/or department/school promotion committee to ensure that the materials submitted present a concise, complete, and accurate case.

2. Each year, the progress of each associate professor toward promotion is reviewed by the department chair/school director and/or appropriate department/school promotion committee. The results of this review are discussed by the department chair/school director with the faculty member and summarized in the annual review statement if appropriate. As a result of this evaluation, potential candidates for promotion to professor will be identified.

3. At the beginning of the fall semester or earlier, the department chair/school director, after preliminary consultation with the dean and the department/school promotion committee (if such exists), will recommend to the candidate whether or not to proceed with the preparation of complete documentation. Such a recommendation does not commit to the outcome of the evaluation process. Faculty members who are discouraged from pursuing promotion in that year may want to exercise their rights and options in accordance with the WSU Faculty Manual.

4. The department chair/school director or department/school promotion committee, in consultation with the candidate and the dean, will obtain at least five letters of recommendation from peers outside Washington State University who are qualified to evaluate the accomplishments and national/international stature of the faculty member in research and scholarly activities or other areas as appropriate. The majority of the external letters will be obtained from reviewers not suggested by the candidate. All external letters received must be included in the documentation forwarded to the dean. In forwarding these letters with promotion materials, the qualifications of the external reviewers must be identified.

In the case of a department chair or school director being considered for promotion to professor, the dean will be responsible for solicitation of external letters.

5. Following review of the file and open discussion of the record, the professors of the department/school shall provide signed recommendations using confidential ballots. The chair/director shall assure that every professor, including those on leave if practical, has an opportunity to review the record and to complete the confidential ballot.

6. The chair/director shall forward these ballots, together with documentation and a personal recommendation, to the dean. For branch campus faculty, the chair/director shall forward all materials and documentation simultaneously to the dean and the branch campus dean.

7. A College of Engineering and Architecture Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (refer to page 2, item 7, for description of committee) will review and discuss each promotion case, and each member will make an individual recommendation to the dean for each case. The committee will review all materials forwarded by the chair/director except the signed ballots. The dean may participate in the
committee discussions. In cases involving branch campus faculty the branch campus dean will review all materials and, after consultation with the Branch Campus Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee should one exist, make an independent recommendation regarding promotion and forward it to the dean. Because this recommendation emphasizes local considerations, it will be included in the documentation reviewed by the college dean's Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee.

8. The dean will review all materials and make an independent recommendation and forward documentation and recommendations (including the dean's comments about the assessment of each case by the members of the College Advisory Committee) to the provost. Negative recommendations are returned by the dean to the chairs/directors, without being forwarded, with written reasons for the decision.

9. Ultimately, positive promotion recommendations are submitted by the provost to the president for action and to the Board of Regents for information. Notification of the promotion shall be given in writing to the particular faculty member by the dean within three working days after the decision has been made by the dean, the provost, and the president, or designee acting for the president. This notification will include the date that the promotion recommendation will be reported to the Board of Regents.

10. Cases of denial of promotion may be appealed by the candidate in accordance with the WSU Faculty Manual.

Departments/Schools with Engineering and/or Computer Science Programs

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

The areas of evaluation for tenure and promotion consideration are: a) effectiveness in teaching and associated scholarly activities, b) effectiveness in research and scholarly activity, c) professional activities and d) university service.

Persons being considered for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor must have performed adequately in each area of significant activity and show demonstrated outstanding accomplishments either in teaching or in research and scholarly activities. The ability of a faculty member to interact effectively with colleagues and students is also of importance for tenure and promotion evaluation. In addition, the potential for a faculty member to meet the requirements of future promotion to professor must be apparent.

The rank of professor is awarded to those individuals with superior records of accomplishment. Promotion to the rank of professor or initial appointment at that rank requires that the faculty member present evidence of national or international recognition and reputation for research and scholarly contributions. Evidence of continued accomplishments in each of the four areas identified above is also required. National recognition is most often achieved through sustained outstanding accomplishments in research and scholarly activity. An increased level of professional activity and in leadership roles typically accompanies such national or international recognition. Promotion to the rank of professor may be based on national recognition of sustained outstanding accomplishments in teaching and associated scholarly activities.

The faculty manual states that advancement in rank is 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 in rank as associate professor, or equivalent rank . . . demonstrated merit and not years of service is the guiding factor."

For promotion to professor, an individual must exhibit mature leadership qualities that are essential for the progress of the department/school.
While the criteria for promotion to associate professor and professor are similar, they differ in the level of expectation and accomplishments in each of the four areas of evaluation as outlined in the appropriate sections below. The following describes each area of evaluation.

An integral part of the tenure criteria is evidence of the quality of the candidate’s performance as a faculty member.

1. **Effectiveness in Teaching.** Effective teaching requires presenting courses that are current, provide a positive learning environment, ensure that students receive preparation necessary for subsequent courses, and challenge students to attain the learning objectives of the course and the curriculum. Measuring effectiveness in teaching requires student and peer evaluation. Evaluation of teaching and associated scholarly activities in engineering and computer science will consider contributions such as those from the following representative list:

- Teaching in traditional lecture/recitation courses.
- Diversity of courses taught.
- Teaching at both graduate and undergraduate levels.
- Supervising MS and PhD students.
- Development of new or modified courses or curricula.
- Academic advising and other teaching-related interactions with students outside the classroom.
- Developing and publishing textbooks and other innovative teaching methodology or materials.
- Publication of pedagogical papers in appropriate peer-reviewed literature.
- External funding of teaching-related activities.
- Supervising undergraduate independent study projects.
- Teaching in extended education programs.
- Interdisciplinary teaching.
- Teaching design content courses and courses with laboratories.
- Supervising teaching assistants.

Measures and methods that may be used to assess the quality of teaching activities include the following:

- Letters and/or interviews with current and former students.
- Impact on student success after graduation.
- Report of the peer evaluation committee.
- Teaching awards, both from within the University and external.
- Quality of educational papers published assessed through citations and evaluation of their impact.
- Content/competency/currency of teaching and teaching methods as assessed by the peer evaluation committee.
- Application and/or development of innovative teaching methods.
- Involvement in teaching improvement activities.
- Awards won by students under the faculty member’s direction.
- External letters from peers.

2. **Effectiveness in Research.** Effectiveness in research is demonstrated primarily through peer review of the results of research activities. Publication of manuscripts in refereed journals or in refereed proceedings of major conferences and publication of a scholarly book are typical and primary examples of such effectiveness. To place the emphasis upon the quality of these publications and the contributions of the research effort, no more than five selected manuscripts will be used in the evaluation. The candidate must include a statement on the significance and intrinsic merit of each contribution. This statement should include an explanation of their specific contributions in the case of collaborative publications. Evaluation of research or scholarly activity accomplishments in engineering and computer
science will consider contributions such as ones from the following representative list:

- Publication of research papers, books, and book chapters.
- External funding of research.
- Involvement of students in research activities.
- Research papers presented at significant professional meetings, especially invited papers.
- Interdisciplinary research.
- Research resulting in patents.

Measures and methods that may be used to assess the quality of research and scholarly activities include the following:

- Awards for research.
- Invited papers and lectures.
- Record of citations.
- Sustained and continuing productivity.
- Relationship to unit goals and mission.
- Value of results to industry, the state, and the nation.
- Development of new research programs.
- Leadership in collaborative/interdisciplinary research.

3. **Professional Activities.** Evaluation of acceptable accomplishment in professional activities will be based on contributions such as ones from the following representative list:

- Service in editing or reviewing of research or scholarly publications or proposals.
- Service in a leadership role such as chair or an active member of a national committee.
- Service as officer of national professional organizations.
- Registration as a professional engineer and active participation in the National Society of Professional Engineers.
- Service on advisory committees for relevant professional and educational organizations.
- Major consulting in areas of professional expertise.
- Organizing and/or teaching workshops, short courses, or conferences in areas of professional expertise.
- Service to the community, the state, or the nation related to professional expertise.

Measures and methods that may be used to assess the quality of professional activities include the following:

- Sustained service.
- Service awards.
- External letters of commendation/citation.

4. **University Service.** Evaluation of acceptable accomplishment in university service will be based on contributions such as ones from the following representative list:

- Service on department/school, college or university committees.
- Serving as adviser to recognized student organizations.
- Assigned administrative positions or responsibilities.
- Assignment to department/school, college or university-level special task groups.
- Special activities in recruitment or other student affairs areas.
- Development/alumni activities.

Measures and methods that may be used to assess the quality of professional activities include the following:

- Holding leadership positions on committees, task groups, etc.
- Service awards.
- Letters of commendation/citation.
- Assessments of outcomes of service activities.