


MEMORANDUM

TO: WSU Extension District Directors

FROM: Linda Kirk Fox 
Associate Dean

DATE: January 20, 2010

SUBJECT: Third-Year Review/Progress toward Tenure Review

Attached are instructions and forms from the Provost for the 2010 Third-Year Tenure Progress Review. Also attached are guidelines for preparing the review materials.

THIRD-YEAR REVIEW

Third-year reviews are to be cumulative and consistent with yearly Pre-tenure Reviews and Annual Review statements. The reviews should consider the accomplishments as well as the overall focus and long-range goals of the person being reviewed. For those with teaching appointments, performance in teaching must be considered carefully, including the teaching portfolio.

It is important that the analysis provided by the District Director present the candidate's strengths as well as any areas needing improvement.

The District Director should provide an advisory ballot for all tenured faculty members in the Department or District. If improved performance is needed, the faculty ballots should indicate exactly what needs improvement. The District Director should discuss with the unit's faculty their responsibility to provide analytical ballot statements. The Business and Finance Office will provide a list of tenured faculty in your district.

Guidelines for preparing each major element (Section) of the third-year progress toward tenure document are included titled WSU Extension Guidelines for Preparing Third-Year Progress toward Tenure (Supplemental to Provost's Guidelines), January 2010.

Please forward the ORIGINAL third year reviews IN A LOCKING, THREE-RING BINDER to the WSU Extension Associate Dean's office by **Friday, March 12, 2010**. In addition to this original binder, districts will also need to upload on SharePoint (<https://sharepoint.cahnrs.wsu.edu/3rdYrReview/10/default.aspx>) (Section 8 – Advisory ballots of tenured faculty and Section 9 – Reprints/creative accomplishments WILL NOT BE UPLOADED.) The Business and Finance Office will be contacting districts with third year review candidates and working with them to upload documents. The Associate Dean's staff will schedule review sessions with appropriate administrators the week of March 15th. The Associate Dean will review each of the dossiers and meet with Program Directors to review each candidate.

REMINDER: The advisory ballots are NOT to be duplicated.

PROMOTION AND TENURE MENTORING/CAREER GUIDANCE COMMITTEE

WSU Extension policy requires that a Promotion and Tenure Mentoring/Career Guidance Committee be appointed as soon as possible and within the first six months of employment for newly hired faculty members. This appointment is very important to the tenure process and must be strictly followed. If a recently hired faculty member does not have a Promotion and Tenure Mentoring/Career Guidance Committee, this Committee must be appointed and the Extension Associate Dean's Office notified no later than January 22, 2010.

YEARLY PRE-TENURE REVIEW OF UNTENURED FACULTY

This is also a reminder that you should complete the yearly Pre-tenure Reviews, as noted in the Provost's December 22, 2009 memo, of all untenured members of your faculty. This is an important part of an ongoing process of mentoring our untenured faculty members. The written summary of the evaluation, signed by untenured faculty member and District Director or Unit Director, is to be submitted at the same time as third-year review materials.

cc/w attachment 1: W. Bayly
D. Bernardo

Attachments:

1. Guidelines for Preparing Third-Year Progress toward Tenure (Supplemental to Provost's Guidelines)
2. Dec. 22, 2009 Provost Bayly Memo and Instructions/Guidelines

WSU Extension
Guidelines for Preparing Third-Year Progress toward Tenure
(Supplemental to Provost's Guidelines)
January 2010

The following guidelines have been developed to assist in the preparation of promotion/tenure documentation in WSU Extension. It addresses some of the common questions and concerns of candidates, administrators, and staff. Guidelines for preparing each major element (Section) of the third-year progress toward tenure document are included.

Those materials to be provided by the District Directors are Sections 1, 3, 8 and those to be submitted by the candidate are Sections 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10.

TITLE PAGE

THIRD-YEAR PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE DOCUMENT FOR (NAME)

District

Appointment

Extension Educator, E-2
Assistant Professor
Assistant Scientist
Extension Specialist, E-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Section 1. Progress Review Form
- Section 2. Current Vita
- Section 3. Previous Annual Reviews and Pre-tenure Reviews
- Section 4. Context Statement (limited to two pages).
- Section 5. Candidate's Contributions and Vision for the Future
- Section 6. Teaching Portfolio (optional)
- Section 7. Research and service statements (optional)

NOTE: In Extension, these statements should be covered in Section 5, Candidate's Contributions and Vision for the Future.

- Section 8. Ballots
- Section 9. Reprints/creative accomplishments
- Section 10. Supporting materials [for example, it is appropriate to include a statement on the faculty member's progress toward tenure from their official mentor(s)]

Section 1. Progress Review Form

The statement and recommendation should:

- Be an evaluative analysis of the candidate's "case" for promotion/tenure, followed by a recommendation for or against the candidate. Note: This is NOT to be an "executive summary" of the contents of the packet. **The evaluative analysis should begin with the candidate's primary area of responsibility. For example, for a candidate with 70% 4-H Youth Development appointment, the analysis should begin with 4-H Youth Development.**
- Document all statements and address all significant concerns/questions in the candidate's record.
- Include an analysis of all prior annual reviews or reviews. Identify trends in these performance evaluations. Analysis should be holistic and integrative across years of service, not a year-by-year disjointed discussion. **The District Director should include a discussion of the merit ratings for each area of program responsibility.**
- Provide context regarding the rationale for votes to deny/defer promotion/tenure. District Director should provide an indication of any special biases, knowledge, insights, and perspectives relative to other faculty, of the faculty member(s) casting votes to defer, and/or an interpretation of the motivation for votes to defer.
- Describe the range of the candidate's responsibilities (job expectations in explicit terms), and provide the social, political, and economic context of the position. This is especially important for extension personnel.
- The administrative summary of extension faculty who has administrative responsibilities should include an evaluation of the candidate's performance of these responsibilities.
- Include an evaluative interpretation of any awards and other recognitions received by the candidate that are listed in the Curriculum Vita. The candidate can provide their interpretation in their statement of contribution.

Section 2. Current Vita

The vita should include the following:

- Degrees earned, dates received, institution granting
- List of supporting materials; to be listed in the following order:
 - Professional article, refereed
 - Professional article, non-refereed
 - Books and chapters in books, monographs
 - Juried design and/or artistic works
 - Abstracts
 - Experiment station bulletins, circulars, etc.
 - Extension bulletins, circulars, etc.
 - Proceedings
 - Computer programs (reviewed software and CD-Rom packages)
 - Variety release
 - Patents granted or applied for
 - Video programs
 - Web pages developed
 - Popular periodicals
 - Other scholarly work (both disciplinary and non-disciplinary)

The following procedures should be followed for publications in each category. They should be listed in reverse chronological order (i.e., 2008-1990). Be sure to list complete citations with the inclusive page numbers for each reference. Those manuscripts, which are not yet published, should be listed after the most recently published manuscript in each category. There should be two categories of unpublished materials. The first will be those that are accepted or in press. A letter of acceptance from the editor or publisher must be attached for any articles listed as being accepted or in press. The second category will be for those papers under review. These are manuscripts that have been submitted for consideration, including those being revised for resubmission to an editor or publisher.

Mark an asterisk when the candidate is a senior author--senior authorship is to mean a situation whereby the candidate is primarily responsible, perhaps along with another individual, for the existence of a publication, including conceiving of the underlying experiment or research project, generating, analyzing, and interpreting the data, and writing and editing the paper. This is as opposed to collaborative or cooperative authorship where the candidate is a member of a team under the direction of someone else.

The following definitions apply:

Publication

Must have an "institutional" publisher (not the author). For example, a paper which appears in a published proceeding is distinguished from one that doesn't. A contract report is a "publication" only if the recipient or another "publisher" is prepared to distribute copies in response to requests. Computer products are in the publication category if the documentation, and the program itself, are available for general distribution through an institutional source. The intent is to exclude from "publications" those materials that no institution is willing to assume responsibility for responding to requests for the material.

Professional Publication

A regular periodical, with or without the term "journal" in its title for which one's professional peers are a significant, if not dominant, fraction of the audience.

Refereed

A refereed professional article is one refereed by one's peers. A "peer," insofar as a disciplinary association is concerned, should have training beyond the bachelor's degree.

It is a common practice in some departments to have some form of internal review before articles are submitted to the institutional publisher. This practice does not result in a "refereed" article. Additionally, the fact that a publication outlet does not accept all manuscripts does not, of itself, make articles published therein refereed.

Several professional associations have a practice of inviting articles on specific topics from selected authors, not necessarily members. In a similar vein, some professional associations have a practice of almost automatically publishing specified addresses presented at their annual meetings. The associated journal may often be the lead journal of the discipline. The above criteria would put these articles in the "non-refereed" category. An argument could be made for a category of "invited" articles.

- List of other materials to support research and creative scholarship including popular press articles, newsletters, slide sets, oral presentations, and other appropriate materials.
- Other vita items per the Provost's instructions, such as university or professional service activities, honors, etc.

Section 3. Previous annual reviews and pre-tenure reviews

Section 4. Context statement

The context statement **is prepared by the candidate** and should be limited to two pages. The statement may include a description of expectations placed on a faculty member by circumstances extant at research stations or urban campuses, the requirement of joint appointments or other special circumstances such as commitments to student groups.

Section 5. Candidate's contributions and vision for the future

Materials listed in this section should **NOT EXCEED** four (4) pages and should **NOT REPEAT** what is reported in the vita, nor should this section merely include a listing of contributions; rather, this section should include an evaluative interpretation of the types of contributions made and their impact. **The candidate should provide a description of his/her extension program(s) in the contribution statement. The program description should include a statement of the problem or scope of the program, its goals or objectives, a brief action plan and measurable outcomes or impact.**

Overall, the candidate should address the question, “What am I trying to contribute to the state, nation, science, and society; what contributions have I succeeded in making; and what contributions will I make in the future?” The contribution statement should not be a list of contributions, but rather the evaluative interpretation of the types of contributions made and their impact.

Teamwork and collaboration are valued aspects of faculty efforts. As such, it is important to indicate ways in which the candidate’s activities have included team projects or collaboration. The statement should clearly illustrate the candidate’s contribution to the team effort.

Extension candidate contribution statements, are more effective in describing productivity in job functions when they are clearly organized and explicitly define objective (target problems), methods (proposed solutions), and results (tangible measures of success). Extension faculty should bear in mind that some of the reviewers of promotion/tenure documents are academicians who, although experienced in teaching and research activities, may have little understanding or appreciation for extension functions and activities.

- What are my program goals?
 - What is my program approach?
 - How is my program being evaluated, and how am I reacting to evaluative feedback?
 - What are my tangible program products?
- Regarding research activities:

Provide a brief narrative, for major publications or groups of publications, explaining who conceived of experiments or research projects, who did the work, who analyzed and interpreted the data, and who wrote and edited the paper. Address the question above about the contribution to science and society and future contributions.

- Regarding teaching and advising activities:

Include in Section 6, Teaching portfolio.

Section 6. Teaching Portfolio (optional)

Teaching portfolio (includes goals, responsibilities, evaluations, results, and appendix, or exhibits), the narrative is limited to five pages.

Follow the Provost's Guidelines for the Teaching Portfolio. Refer to:
http://provost.wsu.edu/teaching_portfolio/index.html

Section 7. Research and Professional Service Statements (optional)

Section 8. Ballots

Each recommendation should be followed by frank, objective comments in its justification.

Completed ballots are not to be seen by tenured faculty.

Section 9. Reprints/Creative Accomplishments

Section 10. Supporting Materials

Client evaluations of program effectiveness should be included. These evaluations refer to the perceptions of clientele regarding the effectiveness of presentations and programs of extension faculty with which they have had first-hand experience. In many cases, these evaluations may be numerous, in which case they will need to be summarized similar to the summarization of teaching evaluations.

Peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness and advising can be included in this Tab. These evaluations could be letters from colleagues, alumni, and others able to evaluate the faculty member's teaching and/or advising.

Please provide a summary of these data.