

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

PHILOSOPHY AND POLICIES

Preamble

The promotion and tenure process in the Washington State University College of Pharmacy has been developed to recognize, support, and value faculty success. This document is intended to provide guidance for faculty as they approach career mileposts, and to articulate standards of excellence to evaluators of those faculty. 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-, 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, 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, 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.

This document supports the policies in the *WSU Faculty Manual* on matters of promotion and/or tenure and establishes further guidance for faculty in the College of Pharmacy. 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.

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).

Areas of Faculty Responsibility

Scholarship, and in particular demonstration of excellence in a defined area of inquiry, is essential for advancement in faculty rank regardless of appointment series. Successful candidates for promotion must demonstrate excellence by establishing a productive, sustainable, and high-quality program of scholarship at Washington State University. The overarching criterion for promotion in rank, including promotion that confers tenure, across all appointment series is evidence for establishment of scholarship that is driven by the candidate, well-focused, of high quality (e.g., published in peer-reviewed venues), and sustainable.

- 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 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 head of her or his academic unit, to document scholarly productivity (both quantity and quality) since beginning employment at WSU. This productivity cannot be viewed in isolation, and must be placed in 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 can and should be considered, but special emphasis is placed on work conducted within our institution. The description of an area of scholarly focus is a component of each faculty member's personal strategic document called the *Roadmap for Scholarly Activity*, which is developed collaboratively by the faculty member with the head of her or his academic unit and with the mentoring team. Development of the Roadmap is part of the college's Faculty Mentoring Program, and is described in a separate document. The *Roadmap* will be used in all review processes for promotion to define the candidate's area of expertise and to foster an informed and consistent review of that expertise.

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 the research area 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. 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, 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 teach effectively. All faculty 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 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 of a course takes many forms. For the purposes of this document, the candidate's teaching activities may be placed into two categories:

- Didactic teaching (e.g., delivering traditional lectures or facilitating active learning)
- Experiential teaching (precepting or mentoring students in a clinical or research environment)

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

1. *A Description of Teaching Philosophy Focus* articulates the candidate's approach to the educational mission and defines the candidate's primary area(s) of expertise and contributions to delivery of the college's curricula.
2. *Measures of Teaching Productivity and Performance*: The following are offered as examples of how the candidate may demonstrate the quality and impact of her or his teaching activities.
 - An accounting of quantity of teaching by the candidate, which includes such issues as number of contact hours and students in each didactic course to which the candidate contributed, number of students precepted or mentored (including graduate students), and a description of precepting/mentoring activities. "Contact time" refers to actual instructional activity on the part of the candidate, separate from administrative responsibilities such as attending lectures that are provided by guest speakers.
 - An accounting of administrative activities related to teaching, which include such issues as serving as the instructor of record, the development of new lecture material in a mature course, service on graduate student dissertation or thesis advisory committees, or the development of a new course.
 - An accounting of the quality of teaching, which may be viewed as work product of the instructor and work product of the student. Work product of the instructor would include items such as course syllabi, materials that serve to provide content to students (e.g., novel web-based materials), or material used to assess student performance (e.g., novel methods of examination). Work product of the student may include such items as example term papers, research reports, or a listing of abstracts and publications generated by a graduate student.
 - An accounting of teaching assessments, which include student-based instructor evaluations, peer reviews of teaching, a summary of any teaching awards received, and invitations to teach in other programs or institutions.
 - An accounting of faculty development activities focused on teaching performance (e.g., participation in workshops or short courses, fellowships, or other activities that provide additional teaching credentials).

Clinical practice addresses the critical need for visible role models for students in pharmacy, nutrition, and exercise physiology, and the goal of the College of Pharmacy to emphasize state-of-the-art patient care. Some faculty 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)

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 unit levels
- 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

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 head of her or his academic unit. 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.

Review of progress towards promotion. Each assistant professor, regardless of appointment series, will undergo a separate annual review for progress towards promotion to the rank of associate professor. This review will be conducted by the head of the candidate's academic unit, her or his mentoring team, and all senior faculty in the candidate's academic unit based upon materials submitted by the candidate. The unit head and the mentoring team will meet with the candidate separately to discuss the results of the review, focusing on plans for continued growth and development of the candidate. In advance of the review, the candidate submits to the unit

head a CV (which also is submitted for the annual performance review), and a self-evaluation that outlines accomplishments and challenges encountered during the past year; changes if any in direction of research/scholarship, teaching assignment, or other areas of responsibility; plans and projections for the next year regarding continued growth as a scholar, teacher, and/or clinician; and overall progress towards promotion, with a focus on scholarly productivity.

Intensive review of progress towards tenure. In the special case of assistant professors in the tenure track, an intensive review of progress towards tenure is conducted. 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 tenure, 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 head of her or his academic unit.

Prior to the review, the candidate prepares a dossier that includes an updated CV, all previous progress-towards-tenure reviews, a self-evaluation covering the entire time since appointment to the faculty, a teaching portfolio as described in the WSU Faculty Manual, and an updated *Roadmap for Scholarly Activity*. In addition, the candidate will present a seminar to the college based upon her or his program of scholarship. The candidate's materials will be reviewed by all tenured faculty in her or his unit, and the unit head will gather written recommendations from each of these tenured members. The head of the candidate's academic unit then prepares an evaluation that considers, but is not limited to, the recommendations of the unit's senior faculty. This summary, together with the written recommendations of the tenured faculty, are then reviewed by the Professors Committee, which consists of all tenured professors in the college. Professors from the candidate's home unit, who previously participated in unit-level review of the candidate, do not participate in the review by the Professors Committee. Subsequently, the Dean provides a summary and recommendation to the Provost based upon input from the academic unit and the Professors Committee.

Review for promotion to associate professor. The final review for promotion to the rank of associate professor 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 head of her or his academic unit to document extraordinary productivity and accomplishments. Consideration for early promotions must be approved by the unit head, dean and provost before proceeding.

Documentation and procedures for review of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor are identical to those for the intensive review of progress towards tenure, with the following exceptions:

- A minimum of four external letters of evaluation must be solicited by the head of the candidate's academic unit 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 unit head; 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 (associate professors or professors) at peer institutions (i.e., research-intensive universities in the United States). Additional letters of evaluation, as deemed appropriate by the candidate's unit head, may be solicited from individuals at non-peer institutions, from non-academic organizations, or from international colleagues.
- For consideration of candidates in either the clinical or research tracks, all senior faculty (associate professors and professors) outside of the candidate's home unit, 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 truly national 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 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, unit-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 head of the candidate's unit at least two weeks in advance of unit-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 aspires to be an organization in which individual and collective excellence is encouraged, supported in tangible ways, and expected of faculty, 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 academic unit, and the broader college, to ensure that all faculty 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 are described in a separate document.

Within three months of forming the mentoring team, the candidate will work with the head of her or his academic unit and the mentoring team to develop a *Roadmap for Scholarly Activity*. The specifics of the Roadmap are described in the college's Faculty Mentoring Program.