

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
Minutes
Appointment Tenure and Promotion (APT)
Tuesday, October 12, 2010
CP 103 12:30-1:30pm

1. Approve the minutes from June 2, 2010. Postponed until the next meeting.
2. APT will complete the following this year
 - a. Tasks from AY 2009-10 end of year report
 - b. Compare APT review checklists and summarize the meeting with Marcia Killien, Secretary of the UW Faculty Senate
3. Overview of APT's work last year

Emily Ignacio, Chair of APT, described the committee's work last year. In addition to the reviews, last year APT addressed the ability to maintain full membership representation from each academic program, as codified by the UW Tacoma bylaws. In addition, APT discussed the purview of this committee, which has primarily functioned as oversight on procedures during promotion and tenure reviews.

Discussion regarding consistency of checklists across UWT Handbook, UWT VCAA website, UW Faculty Code (UW Faculty Handbook), and UW Human Resources: Other issues for APT included establishing consistency over the requirements of faculty members' tenure and promotion file. Last year Denise Drevdahl developed a checklist to show the differences (attached). Ignacio stressed the importance of making sure the checklist is aligned. Once the requirements are aligned, the better faculty will be able to make sure their files are complete.

Discussion regarding Annual Evaluations: each program handles this differently. Some programs and individuals are uncertain about what should be included or expected in the annual review. In the past, there have been legal challenges regarding the tenure and/or promotion of a faculty member, and the annual reviews have been an important part of those cases.

Other related discussions:

- it is unclear if there are established guidelines regarding "meritorious" or "extra meritorious". APT asked Ignacio to take this concern to the 10/12 EC meeting for discussion.
- "Annual Reviews" regarding faculty research, teaching and service varies across the campus.
- Discussion about whether an APT member who is reviewing a faculty member's file from his/her program should be recused

- Discussion regarding creating workshops with the VCAA's office on tenure and/or promotion. Ignacio should discuss this with Shelby Fritz between now and the next ATP meeting.
- Discussion on the possibility of working with the Faculty Affairs committee later this Academic Year – after the APT committee has thoroughly examined the code and discussed past Chair Zoe Barsness' 7/14/10 meeting with Marcia Killian - to discuss three issues:
 - o The “Annual Review” process and inclusion of documentation
 - o Third Year review processes
 - o Meritorious and Extra-Meritorious

Motions Approved:

- **The committee approved a motion to require each candidate to submit their program's Tenure and Promotion Guidelines in their file.**

3. The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

ATP Document: Checklist Comparison (May 2010 – composed by Denise Drevdahl)

Item of Concern	UWT Handbook	UWT VCAA checklist	UW Human Resources web page	UW Handbook
Promotion/Tenure Recommendation Checklist		Same as UW except boxes for “Annual evaluations” and “Copy of Program/School T & P Guidelines” added	No box indicating need for “Annual Evaluations”	
Annual evaluations	“The inclusion of yearly evaluations is optional and is the sole decision of the candidate.”		No box indicating need for “Annual Evaluations”	Chapter 24-57: “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.” These “yearly activity reports” are different from the “regular conference with faculty” (UW Handbook, Chapter 24-57).
Outside letters of evaluation	“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 committee chair will compose the solicitation letter in consultation with the program director. The letter should be signed by the committee chair and should request reply to the committee chair.”		“The evaluators should be chosen by the departmental chair/program director and faculty review committee...the solicitation letter should be signed by and should request return to the unit chair/program director.”	
Required Materials for Candidate’s file	Appendix A of UWT handbook, pg. 6 does not match UWT VCAA checklist which does not match UW Human Resources checklist			
Director’s ability to vote	“The program director, who does not vote with the faculty...” (Appendix A)		Letter of recommendation should include “the number of faculty eligible to vote (including if the chair is eligible)” and “whether the chair’s vote is included in the count of votes.”	

