

TO: UW TACOMA DEANS and DIRECTORS and Faculty Councils: GUIDELINES FROM UWT APT COMMITTEE 2017-18 (updated April 2019 and June 2021), Approved by the Executive Council on May 6, 2019.

General Guidelines

Promotional Timelines and Forms are available on the UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly Website at <http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/academic-affairs/promotion-tenure>

A Promotion and Tenure Checklist identifying needed documents is also available at <http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/AcademicAffairs/ahr/NEW%20checklist%202017.1.pdf>

(1) Candidates

- a. Provide multi-authored publication contribution in CV. A brief statement for each multi-authored publication should suffice (for example, *equal contribution on all aspects*; *designed study and collected and analyzed data*).
- b. Explicitly justify non-mandatory (early) review for tenure and promotion from Asst. to Assoc. Prof and Promotion to Full Professor or Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer in short time frames if applicable.
- c. Describe contract in detail (i.e. teaching load, start-up package, other differences from the “norm”).
- d. Address “urban serving” and community engagement focus in narrative if applicable.
- e. Address contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion if applicable.
- f. Candidates are advised that they be mindful of the length of their narratives and are strongly encouraged to be concise and direct in their narratives.
- g. Candidates do have a clear say in the composition of their review committees and should not be pressured to accept anyone on their review committees by the Dean or Senior Faculty.
- h. Candidates who have not spent as much time on the UW Tacoma Faculty (for example those going up for promotion in a relatively short time frame), should feel free to include additional information that could strengthen their case (such as teaching evaluations from another institution). Note: If candidates are providing teaching evaluations from another institution they should provide all evaluations for an Academic Year or Years or not cherry pick evaluations.
- i. Candidates are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the tenure & promotion guidelines developed by their programs/units. <http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/faculty-assembly/appointment-promotion-tenure>
- j. Candidates are also encouraged to refer to Appendix A of the University of Tacoma Faculty Handbook. Appendix A outlines policies regarding external reviewers. http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/UWT_handbook_7.13.17_final_0.pdf

(2) Review Committees

- a. Review committees may be comprised of members who have a mentoring relationship with the candidate, or who have collaborated with the candidate on scholarly/teaching activities. However, such review committee members need to be mindful that when

they serve on the review committee, they are performing an “independent” and “impartial” evaluation of the candidate’s record.

- b. Therefore, review committee members should distance themselves from reviewing/editing or commenting on the candidate’s materials in advance of the actual review to avoid the appearance of bias.
 - i. During the review, the committee may ask for additional materials/information if they deem it important to consideration of the candidate’s case (document these requests and the additional materials provided).
- c. Review committee members should not coach the candidates as to whom the candidate should include in their list of external reviewers and review committee members should not solicit opinions from the candidate on who should be included in the school’s list of external reviewers.
- d. Appendix A of the UW Tacoma Faculty Handbooks outlines policies regarding external reviewers.
http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/UWT_handbook_7.13.17_final_0.pdf

e. Provide external reviewer justification

- i. Why chosen?
- ii. From whose list (Candidate or School)?
- iii. Final list
- iv. We strongly recommend that reviewers be chosen from both candidate and school lists. Attention should be paid to credibility and sufficient independence of external reviewers. In the event an external reviewer who is chosen falls into both lists the review committee is requested to provide a justification for the same.
- v. Language to be used with solicitation of external reviewer letters can be found here
http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/global/documents/chancellor/policy_on_letters_to_external_reviewer.pdf
- vi. [APT recommends that the following summary form be included in the external reviewer section](#)

Name, Title, Faculty Rank and Institutional Affiliation of External Reviewer	Reviewer Came From Whose List (Candidate List or School List).	Reason Reviewer Was Chosen (brief summary of reasons)	Was Letter Provided by External Reviewer (Y or N)

f. Address red flags in review, do not ignore; address any “negative” comments made by

- external reviewers.
- g. Explicitly justify non-mandatory (early) review for tenure and promotion from Asst. to Assoc. Prof and Promotion to Full Professor or Senior or Principal Lecturer in short time frames if applicable.
 - h. Describe contract in detail (i.e. teaching load, start-up package, other differences from the “norm”).
 - i. Discussions of service sometimes inadequate and needs to be addressed.
 - j. Address contribution of faculty member to “urban serving” mission and community engagement to inform scholarly output if applicable.
 - k. Address program/school P&T criteria explicitly in review.
 - l. Address contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion to inform scholarly output, teaching, and service if applicable.

(3) Voting School/Program Faculty Discussion

- a. The Dean/Director is responsible for preparing an accurate summary of the discussion conducted by the voting faculty to reflect the meeting proceedings. The summary is not a forum to add information that was not part of the actual discussion;
- b. Once this summary is prepared, the voting faculty must be informed and be given access to the summary and be accorded the opportunity to issue corrections and address any omissions within 48 hours.
- c. If there are negative votes, summary should try and include reasons stated for negative votes (or indicate if no reason given by those who voted negatively).
- d. The letter written by Dean/Director to the candidate and the summary and information on the outcome of the faculty vote (Dean/Director does not provide vote tally but simply if the vote was favorable or unfavorable) provided to the candidate must be shared with the voting faculty on the same day it is shared with the candidate.

(4) Dean/Director Review

- a. Dean/Director please see voting school/program faculty discussion guidelines in section (3) above.
- b. Clearly identify "any outside the UWT typical" resources given to candidate (such as reduced teaching loads) and how their performance is commensurable to those resources given.
- c. For early tenure or “early” promotion cases, please make a case for why they merit those promotions in a shorter time frame.
- d. In cases where there is significant difference of opinion among the faculty voting on a case, the Dean/Director's letter, while making a recommendation, should try and address the concerns of the other perspective and clarify why the Dean/Director does not agree with the contrarian (to Dean/Director's recommendation) views.
- e. Dean/Director should not pressure the candidates to accept any particular individual on their review committee.
- f. Dean/Director letter should strive for consistency between the letter and information contained in annual performance reviews. In the event of inconsistency between information in annual reviews and promotion review, Deans and Directors should clearly explain reasons for the same.
- g. Dean/Director letters should ideally be a synopsis of an ongoing conversation with the candidate and make clear how the candidate has made progress towards promotion.

The letter should also provide context of candidate's trajectory and highlight any special circumstances or special tasks undertaken.

- h. Deans/Directors are requested to keep the Chair of the Review Committee in the loop regarding the responses from contacted external reviewers. This is good practice to ensure that the final list of external reviewers represents the desired range of expertise and independence with respect to the candidate.
- i. **Addition of Items to the File:** As noted in Chapter 2, Appendix A of the UW Tacoma Faculty Handbook, **Sec. 1: The Tenure and Promotion File A)** After the time a candidate's file for tenure and/or promotion is evaluated by the review committee, should the candidate wish to add material to the file, the candidate must: 1. inform the review committee and program director/dean regarding the addition to the file, if the academic unit's faculty vote has not yet taken place 2. if the academic unit's vote has already taken place, the candidate must inform the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (EVCAA) about the addition to the file. In both cases, the material must be clearly annotated including the letter(s) informing the review committee, program director/dean, and/or EVCAA regarding the addition to the file, and the date the material is added. All materials shall be placed in a separate folder and labeled as such, making it clear the material is an addendum. There will be a log denoting the date and time the committee, director/dean, and/or Academic Affairs Office accepted the additional material.

(5) Faculty Councils

- a. Faculty Councils are encouraged to regularly review their unit's T&P criteria to ensure that they have kept pace with developments and priorities of the campus and those of the program/unit.
- b. Faculty Councils are encouraged to examine their unit's T&P criteria against the backdrop of the mission of the unit and campus.
- c. In schools/programs with limited number of Full Professors, the Faculty Council could consider developing a list of potential review committee members from other units within UW Tacoma or within the University of Washington.

(6) APT Deliberation

- 1. Dean/Director may be contacted to seek clarifications.
- 2. As noted in the footnote on page 2 of Form TP 6, an APT member who is in the same program as the candidate or have served on their review committee even when they are a faculty member in a different school or program under review must recuse themselves from the vote on that candidate's file. The faculty of the same department or a review committee member from a different school can be present during the discussion but shall only engage in the discussion to clarify issues for the committee if called upon to do so.
- 3. APT deliberation should take place with the understanding that the committee will undertake a procedural and substantive review of all candidate files for the academic year 2021-2022 with the understanding that the charge is to be reviewed and clarified by EC during that same year.*

*This (6).3 was approved by the EC on June 11, 2021.