**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 <https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/ahr/promotion-and-tenure>

A Promotion and Tenure Checklist identifying needed documents is also available at <https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/2021-09/08.-oap-promotion-and-tenure-checklist.pdf>

1. Candidates
	1. 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).*
	2. 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.
	3. Describe contract in detail (i.e. teaching load, start-up package, other differences from the “norm”).
	4. Address “urban serving” and community engagement focus in narrative if applicable.
	5. Address contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion if applicable.
	6. 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.
	7. 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.
	8. 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.
	9. Candidates are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the tenure & promotion guidelines developed by their programs/units. <https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/faculty-assembly/appointment-promotion-and-tenure-committee>
	10. Candidates are also encouraged to refer to Appendix A. Appendix A outlines policies regarding external reviewers.
2. Review Committees
	1. 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.
	2. 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.
		1. 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).
	3. 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.
	4. Appendix A outlines policies regarding external reviewers.
	5. Provide external reviewer justification
		1. Why chosen?
		2. From whose list (Candidate or School)?
		3. Final list
		4. 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.
		5. Language to be used with solicitation of external reviewer letters can be found here: <https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/2021-04/uwt_handbook_6_27_12_final.pdf>
		6. 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) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

* 1. Address red flags in review, do not ignore; address any “negative” comments made by external reviewers.
	2. 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.
	3. Describe contract in detail (i.e. teaching load, start-up package, other differences from the “norm”).
	4. Discussions of service sometimes inadequate and needs to be addressed.
	5. Address contribution of faculty member to “urban serving” mission and community engagement to inform scholarly output if applicable.
	6. Address program/school P&T criteria explicitly in review.
	7. Address contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion to inform scholarly output, teaching, and service if applicable.
1. Voting School/Program Faculty Discussion
	1. 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;
	2. 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.
	3. 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).
	4. 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.
2. Dean/Director Review
	1. Dean/Director please see voting school/program faculty discussion guidelines in section (3) above.
	2. 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.
	3. For early tenure or “early” promotion cases, please make a case for why they merit those promotions in a shorter time frame.
	4. 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.
	5. Dean/Director should not pressure the candidates to accept any particular individual on their review committee.
	6. 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.
	7. 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.
	8. 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.
	9. **Addition of Items to the File:**
		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.
3. Faculty Councils
	1. 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.
	2. Faculty Councils are encouraged to examine their unit’s T&P criteria against the backdrop of the mission of the unit and campus.
	3. 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.
4. 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. \*
		1. This (6).3 was approved by the EC on June 11, 2021.

**APPENDIX A.**

**Promotion and Tenure:**

**CAMPUS GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE PROVISIONS OF THE**

**HANDBOOK OF POLICIES FOR UWT**

***Note***: In cases where there is a discrepancy between these guidelines and the UW Faculty Code, the UW Faculty Code takes precedence.

This document outlines general guidelines for implementing the Handbook of Policies, University of Washington Tacoma, regarding promotion and tenure reviews and decisions. Additional guidelines may be required by individual programs. Included are procedures for external review of scholarship, as defined in Section [24-32](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html) of the University Handbook.

**Requesting a Review Committee**:

At any time, professors of less than full rank may ask their program director or dean to form a committee to help guide the candidate in preparing for the review for tenure and/or promotion. For an Assistant Professor to be promoted and granted tenure, a committee must be formed by the end of the fifth contract year. Associate Professors without tenure and Professors without tenure may request a review to change to a tenure track position at any point in their career; the review must take place during the promotion/tenure cycle and, if granted, the change to the tenure-track position is effective only at the beginning of the next academic year.

In requesting that a review committee be formed, a candidate shall submit a brief letter to the candidate’s program director or dean summarizing the candidate’s record in all areas of professional accomplishments (scholarship, teaching, and service) and identifying the fields and/or traditions to which their scholarship relates most closely. This letter is to be used as a resource in identifying potential members of the review committee and will be placed in the candidate’s file.

**Appointment, Composition and Function of the Review Committee:**

The candidate and the program director or dean will work collaboratively in selecting the members of the review committee. Members of the review committee may be chosen from all campuses of the University of Washington. At least two of the members of the committee must be members of the University of Washington Tacoma faculty. Each committee will have no fewer than three and no more than five members, all senior in rank to the candidate. The candidate and the program director or dean must jointly endorse the composition of the review committee. The program director or dean will appoint the committee and will inform the candidate in writing of the committee membership.

The review committee will advise the candidate, guide the candidate in applying for promotion and tenure, and assist in the assembling of appropriate documentation. The review committee will make sure that the candidate’s file includes all items listed in the University of Washington Tacoma Promotion and Tenure Recommendation Checklist. After all materials have been assembled and the external evaluation letters have been added to the candidate’s file, the review committee will evaluate the candidate’s file and vote. The committee chair in collaboration with the rest of the members of the review committee, will write a letter summarizing and evaluating the candidate’s qualifications for promotion and/or tenure. The letter will be submitted to eligible voting faculty from the candidate’s program and placed in the candidate’s file. The full contents of the candidate’s file will be made available to eligible voting faculty (as defined in Section [24-54](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html) A of the University Handbook) from the candidate’s program. Throughout this process, candidates will have access to the file, excluding external evaluations, and will have the right to add comments to the material. The review committee does not have the authority to prevent a candidate from proceeding with the review process.

**The Candidate’s File**:

The candidate's file must include a curriculum vitae or cumulative record, a narrative letter, documentation of teaching effectiveness, documentation of scholarship for review, yearly activity reports, documentation of regular conferences with the director or dean, and external review letters. Faculty who are being considered for promotion from the rank of Assistant to Associate should also include documentation from their third-year review. Please see the UWT Promotion and Tenure Recommendation Checklist for complete details.

# Curriculum Vitae or Cumulative Record

The candidate’s vitae should contain a cumulative record of scholarship, teaching, and service. Precise contents will differ according to discipline. The following items should be included:

1. Education: list institutions, degrees granted, dates
2. Dissertation title
3. Employment
4. Research projects/grants/contracts: list funding agencies, dates, amounts of funding, and individual’s role (PI, CO-PI, other)
5. Honors and awards
6. Service: university, professional, community
7. Curriculum development
8. Areas of teaching expertise
9. Scholarly accomplishments (if applicable, include: bibliography - including page numbers and length, types of publications, whether publication was peer reviewed before acceptance, and whether candidate was the principal author).

# Narrative Letter

The narrative letter is an integrated discussion of an individual’s scholarship, service, and teaching. The purpose of the narrative is to illuminate the contents of the cumulative record and the documentation of teaching effectiveness and scholarship. Research contributions should demonstrate consistent scholarly progress after appointment as Assistant Professor when the candidate is seeking promotion to Associate Professor, or after appointment to Associate Professor when the candidate is seeking promotion to Professor. The letter is addressed to the committee. It is the most important item included in an individual’s file.

# Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness

This documentation should include the following items:

* A list of all courses taught at the UW, with dates;
* A list of all graduate students supervised, each entry specifying student name, thesis/scholarly project topic, degree, dates, and the faculty member’s committee role (chair or member)
* Peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness - Assistant Professors should be evaluated at least once a year; Associate Professors should be evaluated at least once every three years.
* Student course evaluations - all student teaching evaluations since date of last promotion should be included.

Evaluations should show a pattern of effective and competent teaching. Candidates who intend to apply for promotion and/or tenure must provide student and collegial evaluations of their teaching that have been conducted within 12 months of their application for promotion and/or tenure. Candidates should include all student and peer teaching evaluations since their initial employment (for Assistant Professors) or last promotion (for Associate Professors).

# Documentation of Scholarship for Review

Precise contents will differ according to the candidate’s program/school. The candidate should consult their program/school’s tenure and promotion guidelines.

***Yearly Activity Report, Third Year Reviews,***

#  and Documentation of Regular Conferences with the Director or Dean

The candidate must include yearly activity reports, documentation of his/her regular conference with the director or dean, and documentation of his/her third-year review.

## Yearly Activity Reports

Section [24-57](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html) of the University Handbook states, “Yearly activity reports shall be used as a reference and as a course of information for consideration of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. These forms shall be used as evidence for recommendations of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. Such information may be updated by a faculty member at any time during the academic year.” Should the candidate need to update their yearly activity report and/or add additional materials to his/her file, the candidate shall follow the procedures outlined in Appendix C, Ch. 2. Sec.1A below.

## Documentation of Regular Conference with the Director or Dean

Candidates who intend to apply for promotion and/or tenure must include documentation of the regular conference with his/her director or dean within 12 months of their application for promotion and/or tenure.

# External Review Letters

Evaluation by external reviewers who are experts in the candidate's field(s) must be included in the file. Acceptable forms are reviews and/or letters from external reviewers who have evaluated the candidate's demonstrations of scholarship (as defined in Section [2432](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html) of the University Handbook). The external review is based on scholarship or artistic creativity; tenure and promotion depend on more than these factors. The external reviewer should **not** be asked to assess whether the candidate should be promoted here or would be elsewhere.

The chair of the review committee will solicit from the candidate a list of names of scholars qualified to review the candidate's demonstration of scholarship. The review committee will select up to five names from this list and may substitute up to two others not named by the candidate. The external evaluators should be chosen by the program director or dean and faculty review committee.

The review committee must solicit reviews from a minimum of three external reviewers. No more than one external reviewer may be from the candidate's doctoral committee, and no more than two may be from the candidate's degree-granting institution during the candidate’s tenure. The external reviewers will be provided with relevant demonstrations of scholarship and a summary of the candidate's teaching and service record. All letters received from external reviewers will become part of the candidate's file but will not be made available to the candidate.

The committee chair will compose the solicitation letter in consultation with the program director or dean. The solicitation letter should be signed by, and should request return to, the program director or dean.

The letter should state that the unit is considering the candidate for possible promotion and request the following information:

* How and for how long the referee has known the candidate

* The significance, independence, influence, and promise of the candidate's scholarship or creative work and the degree of national/international recognition

* A comparison of the candidate's accomplishments with leading scholars or artists at a similar career stage in the same or related fields

Each evaluator should be provided with the same representative set of the candidates’ scholarly or artistic materials.

**Voting on Promotion and Tenure:**

Procedures for voting on promotion and tenure shall be as prescribed in Sections [24-54](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html) and [25-41](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH25.html) of the *Faculty Code*. The program director or dean will write a letter to the VCAA summarizing the content of the decision leading up to the vote, the number and names of faculty participating in the discussion and vote, the number of eligible voting faculty, and the number of positive and negative votes and abstentions. The program director or dean, who does not vote with the faculty, will write an independent letter of recommendation.

Upon receiving the recommendation from the program director or dean, the VCAA will seek the

advice of the Faculty Council on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure to make sure that current procedures have been followed and to ensure that the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and service are similar in quality to that of current tenured faculty at the

University of Washington Tacoma. The VCAA will forward his/her recommendation with concurrence from the Chancellor to the Provost who makes the decision on behalf of the President.

## Disagreements on Procedures

Candidates who believe that procedures relative to their review have not been properly adhered to have the right to utilize established grievance procedures as set forth in the *Faculty Code* to appeal for redress. A faculty member whose tenure is denied may engage in the administrative and conciliatory proceedings described in [Chapter 27,](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH27.html) and may file a petition for review as provided in Section [25-64.](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH25.html)

APPROVED BY:

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA FACULTY ASSEMBLY

18 May 2012