

**GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE  
IN THE WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF PHARMACY AND PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES**

**PHILOSOPHY AND POLICIES**

***Preamble***

The promotion and tenure process in the Washington State University (WSU) College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences has been developed to recognize, support, and value faculty success. This document is intended to provide guidance for faculty members as they approach career mileposts and to articulate standards of excellence to evaluators of those faculty members. Our goal as a community of scholars and educators is to provide an environment that both fosters and demands growth, development, and excellence in the traditional areas of faculty responsibility: delivering the college's various curricula, pursuing scholarship, and serving the profession and the academic community.

These guidelines apply to all faculty appointment series (clinical-, research-, scholar-, teaching- and tenure-track). It is recognized that individual members of the faculty will have different skills, strengths and responsibilities, and these guidelines have been developed to ensure that all faculty members, regardless of appointment series, have appropriate pathways to promotion. The underlying theme of the college's philosophy is that promotion in rank is reserved for those individuals with a commitment to, and a demonstration of, excellence in their faculty responsibilities. While the process for evaluating the merits of a candidate's case for promotion are, in general, similar for all faculty members, the metrics used to demonstrate excellence will vary based upon appointment series, time in rank, and the specific work assignments and area of focus for an individual candidate. In addition, all faculty members in the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences are expected to have some element of scholarship and service.

This document supports the policies in the *WSU Faculty Manual* on matters of promotion and/or tenure and establishes further guidance for faculty members in the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. The *Faculty Manual* prevails in instances of any disagreement between this document and statements in the *Faculty Manual*. This document is not a replacement for the instructions issued by the Provost's Office for conducting review towards promotion but describes internal procedures and expectations.

***Faculty Appointment Categories for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty***

**Tenured appointment**

Upon having attained tenured status, the faculty members shall continuously be engaged in scholarship, teaching, and service and hold appointment with WSU until retirement, resignation, or termination pursuant to the terms of the *Faculty Manual*.

**Pre-Tenure Appointment**

The faculty member is on probation during the time prior to consideration for tenure. Faculty members will have annual performance reviews in their department that are comprehensive or intensive (see III.C.3.c) to assess their performance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. In their third year, they will be evaluated to determine continuation and progress toward tenure. At a time specified in the offer letter, the University will decide whether to grant tenure.

For the purposes of this document, “tenure” is usually understood to be conferred as a consequence of promotion from the rank of assistant professor to the rank of associate professor in the tenure track. In the instance of initial appointment at the rank of associate professor in the tenure track, the processes associated with consideration for the granting of tenure are identical to those for promotion to associate professor, although the timing of such consideration is shorter after initial appointment (typically three years, but subject to negotiation at the time of initial appointment).

### ***Faculty Appointment Categories (Sub-Tracks) for Career-track Faculty***

Career track faculty members will be assessed for promotion based on the expectation outlined in their contracts. It is expected that all faculty members, regardless of track or sub-track, should devote some component of their effort to teaching, service, and scholarly activities.

#### Clinical

Clinical faculty members are those whose primary responsibilities are clinical practice and/or the supervision and clinic-based instruction of professional students, interns, residents, and/or fellows. Many, but not all, will have major responsibilities in one or more of the following areas:

- research, scholarship, or creative activity
- teaching
- outreach
- educational leadership
- administration
- academic service

Faculty members in this sub-track will have scholarship, teaching, and service responsibilities. Promotion in this sub-track is based on significant achievement and/or a national/international recognition for excellence in clinical practice, teaching, educational leadership, and/or scholarship.

#### Research

Faculty members in the research sub-track track are in non-tenure track research appointments. They predominantly conduct research, scholarship, or creative activity and may serve as principal or co-principal investigators on grants or contracts administered by the university. Typically, the institution has made a commitment of office and research space. Departments and colleges may expect these faculty members to provide all or significant portions of their own salary through extramural funding. While their primary focus will be on research/scholarly activities, faculty members on the research track should exhibit some level of engagement in teaching and service. Promotion in this sub-track is typically based on traditional measures of research or scholarship, i.e., peer-reviewed publications, invited oral presentations, extramural funding, and national/international reputation.

#### Scholar

Faculty members in the scholar sub-track are those who have major responsibilities in at least two of the following areas:

- teaching
- student advising
- research or scholarship
- creative activity
- outreach
- practice

- educational leadership
- administration
- academic service

While faculty members in this sub-track are expected to demonstrate excellence in at least two of the areas listed above, they are also expected to be productive scholars and to contribute to the college's mission via service.

### Teaching

Faculty members in the teaching sub-track are those whose primary responsibility is teaching or student advising. Individuals with a teaching appointment will often have large didactic teaching commitments according to their assignment and contract. Some of the teaching may be done in a clinical setting. In addition, faculty members in this sub-track will have some scholarship and service responsibilities. Promotion criteria will be determined by the department and college but must include evidence of teaching effectiveness, contribution to the academic mission, and innovation-related to teaching.

### **Faculty Titles**

All faculty members in the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences will have these working titles, regardless of track or sub-track designation, with no mention of tenure track versus career track or sub-track:

- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor

Faculty members may wish to indicate their track or sub-track on their curriculum vitae, biosketch, or website in order to accurately reflect the nature of their appointment.

### **Areas of Faculty Responsibility**

**Scholarship** that includes multiple types of research and other creative activities may be in a defined area of inquiry, or in some cases may be broad in scope. Scholarship is essential for advancement in faculty rank, regardless of appointment series

- The scholarship of **discovery** is defined as contributions to foundational knowledge in a discipline, with insight derived from novel observations or new connections in an existing body of knowledge. The scholarship of discovery is understood to represent efforts that drive a discipline forward.
- The scholarship of **application** is defined as problem-identification or problem-solving within a discipline, or as efforts to connect theory to practice. The scholarship of application is understood to represent efforts to make practical use of discoveries, often made by others, within a discipline.
- The scholarship of **education** is defined as exploration of approaches and techniques that enhance student learning or increase educational efficiency, distinct from efforts aimed at self-improvement in instruction.

It is incumbent upon the candidate, together with the chair of her or his department, to document scholarly productivity (both quantitatively and qualitatively) during her or his time of employment at WSU. This productivity cannot be viewed in isolation, and must be placed in the context of expectations articulated in the initial letter of appointment and reinforced or modified in annual

reviews. Scholarly work pursued prior to joining the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences can and should be considered, but major emphasis is placed on work conducted within our institution.

The following elements are intended to help the candidate define, quantify, and communicate the impact of her or his scholarly activity. It should be noted that these elements apply to all forms of scholarship (discovery, application, and teaching), and that no value statements are made regarding one form of scholarship relative to another.

1. *A Description of Scholarly Focus* is intended to provide context for how the candidate's research focus or specialty area fits within the discipline. This description provides the candidate with an opportunity to articulate the importance of her or his research or area of interest and to describe how her or his efforts have made unique contributions to the discipline.
2. *Measures of Scholarly Productivity*: The following are offered as measures of how the candidate may demonstrate the quality and impact of her or his scholarly activities, including how those activities have established the candidate's reputation outside the confines of WSU.
  - Publication of original scholarship in peer-reviewed journals and books represents the "gold standard" for judging an individual's intellectual contributions to the discipline. The publication record should reflect a trajectory of increasing quality and quantity over time. Publications reflecting original scholarship are considered most indicative of the candidate's unique contributions to the discipline. Review articles, books, or chapters that are peer reviewed may represent important contributions or be indicative of the candidate's reputation. However, the candidate should not rely solely on these products to demonstrate trajectory towards promotion. Publications in non-peer-reviewed journals, books, or the lay press are generally not viewed as indicative of scholarly productivity. However, in some cases these types of publications reflect the candidate's standing in the discipline and should be viewed accordingly.
  - For each publication, the candidate must identify her or his role. There should be evidence of a trajectory towards increasing senior authorship, recognizing that many senior authors prefer to place themselves last in the authorship list. It also must be recognized that the authorship list for manuscripts derived from the scholarship of application (including clinical studies) can be long, and that key intellectual contributions may come from one or more subordinate authors.
  - Publication status should be identified as follows: published; in press; accepted with revisions; in review; or submitted but not accepted (as evidence of manuscript preparation and submission).
  - Presentations to the scientific/professional community represent another important avenue through which the candidate can establish a national or international reputation. Invited presentations are weighed more heavily than contributed or accepted presentations, and presentations at national or international meetings are weighed more heavily than those at the regional, state, or local level.
  - In combination with peer-reviewed manuscripts, published abstracts help to define the candidate's contributions to the discipline. Abstracts are often considered to be precursors to completed manuscripts. An imbalance in favor of published abstracts at the expense of peer-reviewed manuscripts may be interpreted as a lack of follow-through or an inability to have one's work consistently pass the test of peer review.

3. *Grantsmanship*: It is recognized that a sustainable program of scholarship typically, but not always, requires extramural funding. The candidate's success in the area of grantsmanship therefore serves two distinct roles in consideration for promotion, especially for those in research and tenure-track appointments. First and foremost, it establishes that the candidate is capable of sustained scholarly activity. Without such evidence for sustained productivity as a scholar, the case for promotion may be difficult, especially when the promotion step in question confers tenure to the candidate. Second, successful grantsmanship helps to support other positive qualities in the candidate: intellectual independence, the ability to convince peers that an idea is worthy of investment, and a growing reputation beyond the boundaries of the home university. While investigator-initiated funding is considered the "gold-standard", funding efforts that support collaborative or interdisciplinary work also is valued. In those cases, the candidate must articulate her or his unique contributions to the funded project. When extramural funding is required for productive and high-quality scholarship, an appropriate portfolio will indicate a trajectory of attempts and successes in such funding. In the specific case of research-track faculty members, the candidate is expected to develop an extramurally funded research program that both demonstrates increasing independence and provides the majority of her or his salary. Overall, the successful candidate demonstrates a trajectory of accomplishment in seeking external funding, with clear evidence of unique intellectual contributions. The following elements are intended to help the candidate define, quantify, and communicate activities in the area of grantsmanship:
  - Current and previously funded grants and contracts that have been awarded while at WSU to support a long-term program of the candidate's independent scholarly activity. The amount, duration, and source of each award all reflect important elements of the candidate's grantsmanship.
  - Proposals pending review that support the candidate's research focus.
  - Grant applications submitted but not funded communicate the candidate's commitment to maintaining a program of sustainable scholarship. Summary statements of application reviews, when available, should be provided.
  - Applications in preparation provide context for ongoing activities in seeking extramural support and should include identification of the target funding agency, the program or RFP number if relevant, and the planned submission date.
  - The candidate's role in collaborative or interdisciplinary grant applications must be clearly described. Supporting documentation from the Principal Investigator is useful.
  - A track record of successful federal funding often is used as the "gold standard" for evaluating grantsmanship. While such funding may add positively to a candidate's reputation, the most important element in reviewing a candidate's funding record is whether it establishes a trajectory leading to a sustained program of scholarship.
  
4. *Engagement with the Academic Community*: The candidate can and should be engaged with colleagues at other institutions, or throughout the broader academic community, in ways that might allow her or his scholarship to have an impact. The following list is offered to illustrate examples of such engagement:
  - Invited presentations (e.g., workshops, discussion groups) related to the candidate's scholarly expertise
  - Use and public dissemination of innovations resulting from the candidate's scholarly activities
  - Role of editor or associate editor for journals, books, or book series
  - Role as a grant application reviewer
  - Service on advisory boards

**Teaching** is understood to represent activities that result in the delivery of the college's various curricula to students. The educational mission of the college demands that faculty members teach effectively. All faculty members in the professorial ranks, regardless of appointment series, are expected to contribute to this mission. The specific teaching role of the candidate is articulated initially in the letter of appointment and is reviewed or modified during the annual review process. The candidate's contributions to the teaching mission can only be evaluated in the context of those expectations.

Teaching a course takes many forms. For the purposes of this document, the candidate's teaching activities may be placed into two categories:

- Didactic (e.g., development of core instruction materials and lesson plans, delivering traditional lectures or facilitating active learning)
- Experiential (e.g., precepting or mentoring students in a clinical or research environment or academic rotations)

**Clinical practice** addresses the critical need for visible role models for students in pharmacy, and the goal of the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences to emphasize state-of-the-art patient care. Some faculty members in the college are involved in direct patient care as part of their college responsibilities. Consequently, patient care activities can and should be considered as a candidate stands for promotion in faculty rank.

The following elements are intended to help the candidate define, quantify, and communicate the impact of her or his clinical practice with respect to the academic mission of the college:

- An accounting of the development of new practice sites or modalities
- An assessment of the benefits (e.g., quality of care, access to care, or controlling costs of care)
- Testimony as to the efficacy of care from clinical supervisors or members of the health care team
- Recognition of excellence in clinical care from outside entities
- Escalating responsibility or promotion at the clinical site (for jointly appointed faculty members)

**Service** is a faculty obligation and must be considered in the granting of promotion. Service is interpreted generally as activities aligned with the college's mission that benefit and contribute to the professional, university or private communities, including outreach/public service, service within the University, and service to scientific or professional organizations, and may include a wide range of activities related to the candidate's area of expertise. All faculty members are expected to demonstrate good citizenship through efforts in the service component.

The following elements are intended to help the candidate define, quantify, and communicate the impact of her or his service:

- A brief description or listing of activities at university, college, and departments
- Advising recognized student organizations
- Membership and offices held in professional and scientific societies
- Review of scientific/professional materials
- Role on professional/scientific advisory boards
- Consulting activities that do not result in personal compensation

Additional consideration for the following elements will be given for the review and promotion of career-track faculty members as appropriate to their positions:

- **Outreach**
- **Educational Leadership**
- **Administration**
- **Student Advising**

## PROCEDURES

**Initial appointment.** Review for promotion should not be viewed as an isolated activity, but a continuum of oversight and mentoring that begins with initial appointment to the faculty. Expectations for performance and productivity, including fractional effort to be devoted to each traditional area of faculty responsibility, are clearly articulated in the initial letter of appointment. Subsequent progress must be evaluated in light of those expectations.

**Annual review.** Every year, each faculty member is reviewed by the chair of her or his department through one of the following procedures:

- an abridged review
- a comprehensive review
- an intensive review

This review is focused on performance during the preceding calendar year and provides an opportunity to plan for the subsequent year. Performance is evaluated in light of the agreed-upon fractional effort to be devoted to scholarship, teaching, and service. If changes in fractional effort are to be implemented, they should be documented as part of the annual review process. All subsequent reviews will take into consideration such changes in effort.

**Intensive review of progress.** An intensive review of progress will be conducted for assistant professors in the tenure track and the career track. This review typically is conducted during the third year of service on the faculty; the precise timing of the review is articulated in the initial letter of appointment. The procedure for the intensive review is identical to that for review of promotion to associate professor, with the exception that outside letters of evaluation are not required. However, such letters are not prohibited and may provide valuable insight and suggestions for both the candidate and the chair of her or his department.

Prior to the review, the candidate prepares a dossier that includes an updated CV, all previous reviews, a self-evaluation (e.g., in the form of a context statement, research statement, and service statement) covering the entire time since appointment to the faculty, and a teaching portfolio as described in the *WSU Faculty Manual*. The candidate's materials will be reviewed by all tenured or career track faculty members in her or his department as appropriate, and the chair will gather written recommendations from each of these members. The candidate's department chair then prepares an evaluation that considers, but is not limited to, the recommendations of the department's participating senior faculty members. This summary, together with the written recommendations of the faculty members, are then reviewed by the Professors Committee, which consists of all tenured or career track full professors in the college. Professors from the candidate's home department, who previously voted in department-level review of the candidate, do not vote, but do participate, during the review by the Professors Committee. For tenure track faculty members, the dean provides a summary and recommendation to the chancellor and the provost based upon input from the department and the Professors Committee. The review does not advance to the provost's office for career track

faculty members; however, the department chair will provide a summary and feedback to the candidate.

**Review for promotion to associate professor.** The final review for promotion to the rank of associate professors in the tenure track or the career track typically occurs during the candidate's sixth year on faculty. The timing of this review is specified in the initial letter of appointment. In unusual cases, the candidate may present for promotion review before the date specified at appointment. In such cases, it will be incumbent upon the candidate and the chair of her or his department to document extraordinary productivity and accomplishments. Consideration for early promotions of tenure track faculty members must be approved by the department chair, dean, chancellor, and provost before proceeding.

Documentation and procedures for review of a candidate for tenure (for tenure track faculty members) and promotion to associate professor for tenure track and career track faculty members are identical to those for the intensive review, with the following exceptions:

- A minimum of four external letters of evaluation must be solicited by the chair of the candidate's department for inclusion in the dossier. At least two of these letters will be solicited from a list of reviewers submitted by the applicant to her or his chair; at least two must come from referees who do not appear on the candidate's list. All four of the required letters must come from senior faculty members (associate professors or professors) at peer institutions. Additional letters of evaluation, as deemed appropriate by the candidate's department chair, may be solicited from individuals at non-peer institutions, from non-academic organizations, or from international colleagues.
- For consideration of candidates in the career sub-tracks, all senior faculty members (associate professors and professors) outside of the candidate's home department, regardless of appointment series, will be invited to the Professors Committee meeting to provide input and advice.

**Review for promotion to professor.** Attainment of the rank of professor, regardless of the appointment series, indicates that, in the opinion of colleagues, a candidate has made outstanding contributions to her or his discipline. A national and/or international reputation must be documented. Typically, consideration of a candidate's qualifications for promotion to the rank of professor would not take place prior to five years of service at the rank of associate professor with the promotion effective at the end of the sixth year. The documentation and procedures for review of a candidate for promotion to professor are identical to those for review of promotion to associate professor. Review will be conducted by those individuals specified in the Provost's Guidelines.

#### **SCHEDULE FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE REVIEW**

Key dates for the review process are published annually by the Provost's office. In general, instructions and relevant forms for the process are distributed in May, together with a list of faculty members scheduled for tenure consideration. Recommendations for action typically must be submitted by the dean to the provost at the beginning of November. In order to accommodate appropriate discussion and oversight, the Professors Committee should meet a minimum of two weeks in advance of the Provost's deadline, department-level review should be completed two weeks prior to the Professors Committee meeting, and all relevant documentation from the candidate and external referees should be obtained by the chair of the candidate's department at least two weeks in advance of department-level review. Specific

dates will be distributed by the Dean's office each year after receipt of instructions from the Provost's office.

### **SUPPORT OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

The College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences aspires to be an organization in which individual and collective excellence is encouraged, supported in tangible ways, and expected of faculty members, students, and staff. In addition, the college recognizes that the vast majority of its financial resources is invested in personnel, and it is in the college's best interest to ensure that procedures and policies are in place to support continued development of all of its members. Consequently, there are certain obligations on the part of the candidate's department, and the broader college, to ensure that all faculty members have an adequate opportunity to experience success, including advancement in rank. These obligations are specified below.

Within the first three months of initial appointment, a mentoring team will be developed. All assistant professors, regardless of appointment series, will have a mentoring team; associate professors, regardless of appointment series, are not required to have a mentoring team but are encouraged to do so. The specifics of the college's Faculty Mentoring Program (<https://pharmacy.wsu.edu/documents/2018/01/faculty-mentoring-program.pdf>) are described in a separate document.

The Associate Dean for Faculty and Student Development is available to advise individual faculty members on a variety of issues, including tenure and promotion, grant applications, and applications for professional awards.