

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE
(Updated February 2024)

The procedures described below are designed to assist faculty to make informed recommendations concerning the award of promotion and/or tenure within the College of Education. The procedures are divided into eight steps and encompass four levels of review: by the College of Education faculty, by the College of Education Advisory Council (CAC), by the College of Education Dean, and by the UW Provost. All steps and procedures are intended to be consistent with the UW Faculty Code and with policies that can be found on the UW Academic Human Resources website. In cases of apparent discrepancy, please consult the College of Education Human Resources (HR) Director and the Chair of the Faculty Development and Support Committee (FDS).

At the conclusion of these procedures, you will find a policy related to retention offers. You also will find a list of Appendices, including a link to the UW Faculty Code and a link to a document from UW Academic Human Resources entitled, “Promotion and Tenure Overview.”

STEP ONE: MEMORANDUM OF INTENT

(A) The Chair of the Faculty Development and Support Committee (FDS) in consultation with the College of Education Human Resources (HR) Director distributes a Memorandum of Intent to the College of Education faculty. The Memorandum of Intent initiates the process to be considered for promotion and/or tenure. The FDS Chair must distribute the Memorandum of Intent by February 1. A sample **Memorandum of Intent** can be found in **Appendix C**.

To assist faculty with making decisions regarding putting their files forward for promotion and/or tenure, the follow guidelines have been excerpted from [Chapter 24 of the UW Faculty Code](#):

Definitions and Criteria for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

Tenure Rank Faculty

Appointment to the rank of **Associate Professor** requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and research, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient. (Chapter 24-34A)

Tenure-track Assistant Professors are a clock-managed rank that are required to undergo a mandatory review for promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure) in the last year of their second appointment term (normally the sixth year of a tenure-track appointment, but this may vary if the appointment is part-time, or if other adjustments to mandatory review dates have been approved). The promotion to Associate Professor and the granting of tenure are combined into one action for the departmental vote and recommendation.

Appointment to the rank of **Professor** requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching and in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition. (Chapter 24-34A)

Non-tenure rank faculty

Without tenure (WOT) Faculty

Faculty appointed WOT do not hold tenure because all or part of the faculty member's annual University-administered salary is derived from sources other than regularly appropriated state funds. Except for this distinction, WOT faculty members have the same rights, responsibilities, and obligations as tenure-track and tenured faculty members at those ranks. The description of their duties and qualifications for promotion and salary increases for reasons of merit are the same. (Chapter 24-40)

Assistant Professors WOT are a clock-managed rank that must be reviewed for promotion in the last year of the second appointment term (normally the sixth year of an appointment, but this may vary if the appointment is part-time, or if other adjustments to mandatory review dates have been approved).

Research Faculty

Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A [Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor] with a research title requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon research. Tenure is not acquired through service in research appointments. (Chapter 24-34B)

Research Assistant Professors are a clock-managed rank that must be reviewed for promotion in the last year of the second appointment term (normally the sixth year of an appointment, but this may vary if the appointment is part-time, or if other adjustments to mandatory review dates have been approved).

Teaching Faculty

Appointment to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor requires a record of substantial success in teaching and extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline as outlined in the UW Faculty Code (Chapter 24-34B). Promotion from Assistant to Associate Teaching Professor is a non-mandatory promotion. While an Assistant Teaching Professor may elect to go up for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor at any time, **we generally would expect to see at least five years of service as an Assistant Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file.**

Appointment to the rank of Teaching Professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching and a record of excellence in instruction, service, and major contributions to their field as outlined in the UW Faculty Code (Chapter 24-34B): *exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field.* Promotion to Teaching Professor is a non-mandatory promotion. While an Associate Teaching Professor can elect to go up for promotion to Teaching Professor at

any time, we generally expect to see at least five years of service as an Associate Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file.

For more information about these positions see:

<https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/academic-titles-ranks/>
<http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html>

(B) Eligible faculty of any rank, including non-tenured and tenured, who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure during the following academic year must return the Memorandum of Intent to the College HR Director by February 15. *The Memorandum of Intent must include the candidate's written signature or e-signature.*

(C) In the event that a faculty member who must be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure during the following academic year ("mandatory" review) does not sign and return a Memorandum of Intent by February 15, the FDS Chair will attempt to contact the individual to inform him/her that s/he must sign and return the Memorandum of Intent. In this case, the College HR Director must receive the individual's Memorandum of Intent by March 1.

Should the absence of a faculty member during Winter Quarter make it impossible for him/her to sign and return the Memorandum of Intent by March 1, the deadline may be extended to April 15. In order to facilitate the review process, faculty members who are absent during winter quarter are encouraged to sign and return the Memorandum of Intent to the College HR Director as soon as possible.

STEP TWO: FORMATION OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR PROMOTION REVIEW (SPR)

(A) By March 6, the College HR Director informs the FDS Chair and the Chair of Faculty Council (the Faculty President) of all candidates who wish to be considered for promotion and/or promotion and tenure during the academic year.

(B) A total of three faculty members will comprise each candidate's SPR. The candidate nominates one faculty member; the candidate's Area Chair nominates one faculty member; the Faculty Council Chair (FC Chair) nominates one faculty member. Candidates should consult with their Area Chair to determine their nominee. Note: The Area Chair's nominee is separate from the candidate's nominee.

Candidates, Area Chairs, and the FC Chair should not contact their nominees directly. Instead, they should submit their nominees to the FDS Chair; the FDS Chair will then contact each nominee to secure their written agreement to serve on the SPR. See Step Two-D.

(C) All members of the SPR must be: a.) Voting members of the College of Education faculty; b.) Senior in rank to the candidate; and c.) Available to serve on the SPR during Spring Quarter when the SPR is formed and also during the following Fall Quarter when the candidate's file will be reviewed. In the event that a faculty member is not available

to serve on the SPR during Spring Quarter, but will be available to serve on the SPR during the following Fall Quarter, the FDS Chair may invite an alternate faculty member to serve as a substitute during Spring Quarter. In the event that a faculty member is not available to serve on the SPR during Fall Quarter, but will be available to serve on the SPR during Spring Quarter, the FDS Chair may invite an alternate faculty member to serve as a substitute during Fall Quarter. The FDS Chair will make every effort to ensure that each candidate's SPR includes diverse perspectives from the College of Education faculty.

(D) The process for contacting nominees to serve on SPRs proceeds as follows. First, the FDS Chair contacts the candidate to request the name of the candidate's nominee. Upon receiving the name of the candidate's nominee, the FDS chair contacts the nominee to secure their written agreement to serve on the candidate's SPR. The FDS chair then contacts the candidate's Area Chair to request the name of the Area Chair's nominee. Upon receiving the name of the Area Chair's nominee, the FDS Chair contacts the nominee to secure their written agreement to serve on the candidate's SPR. Finally, the FDS Chair contacts the FC Chair to request the name of the FC Chair's nominee. Upon receiving the name of the FC Chair's nominee, the FDS Chair contacts the nominee to secure their written agreement to serve on the candidate's SPR. The FDS Chair must receive written or email consent from each nominee. The FDS Chair transmits each faculty member's consent to the FC Chair.

(E) By the end of the first week of Spring Quarter, the FDS Chair sends a written or email memorandum to each candidate and to the three members of the candidate's SPR. This memorandum confirms the appointment of the candidate's SPR and informs candidates and SPR members of the SPR's charge and responsibilities.

STEP THREE: PROMOTION AND TENURE ORIENTATION SESSIONS

During a March meeting of the general Faculty, the FDS Chair or his/her designee in consultation with the FC Chair, conducts a Promotion/Promotion and Tenure orientation session. While the orientation is intended for candidates and SPR members, all faculty members are strongly encouraged to attend.

In addition, prior to April 15, the Dean and an FDS Representative will conduct a meeting to orient the SPR members to the work of an SPR committee.

STEP FOUR: SPR REVIEW PROCESS

(A) By April 15, candidate submits a copy of his/her initial promotion/tenure file to all members of the SPR. To prepare this file, consult **Appendix D: Guidelines for Preparing Promotion/Tenure Files**.

(B) By April 21, the FDS Chair directs the SPR member nominated by the FC Chair to convene the initial meeting of the SPR. The initial meeting does not include the candidate. The purpose of the initial meeting is to: a.) Select a Chair of the SPR; b.) Review the candidate's file, and identify strengths and weaknesses of the file; and c.) Confirm the timeline for all future SPR activities and meetings. The SPR Chair, selected

during this meeting, will be responsible for convening all subsequent meetings of the SPR and for ensuring the timely completion of all necessary documents.

(C) By April 30, the SPR Chair convenes a meeting of the SPR. This meeting includes the candidate. During this meeting, the SPR ensures that the candidate's file contains (or will contain) all required elements. The SPR should communicate what they see as strengths and weaknesses of the file, and may also make suggestions for how the candidate could improve his/her file. (Note: While tenure track, WOT and teaching Associate Professors must have a peer review of teaching once every three years, they *must* have peer review of teaching in the *year prior to the year they wish to be considered for promotion to the next higher rank.*)

(D) By May 15, the SPR should secure 3-5 scholars at peer institutions who agree to serve as external reviewers who will evaluate the candidate's file. While the SPR may seek the candidate's suggestions for external reviewers, the final selection of external reviewers must be made by the SPR. The final list of external reviewers is *not* shared with the candidate. Consult **Appendix E: Guidelines for Soliciting External Review Letters**. (Note: **Candidates for Associate Teaching Professor may have review letters that are external to the college but internal to UW. Candidates for Full Teaching Professor MUST all be external to UW.**)

(E) By June 15, the SPR should send the candidate's file to each of the external reviewers. Consult **Appendix E: Guidelines for Soliciting External Review Letters**.

(F) By September 30 of the academic year during which the candidate will be considered for tenure and/or promotion, the candidate must finish uploading all finalized documents to his/her file.

(G) By October 11, the SPR meets to discuss the external letters that it has received and consider its recommendation regarding the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion. This meeting does not include the candidate.

(H) By October 15, the SPR prepares a written report of the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion.

The SPR report should clearly state the SPR's recommendation concerning the award of tenure and/or promotion and should demonstrate that its recommendation is based on evidence from the candidate's overall record. In the event that SPR members are not able to reach a consensus recommendation, individual members may prepare separate reports.

The SPR report for all candidates except research faculty must include a summation of the candidate's scholarly productivity or scholarship, teaching effectiveness, and service activity. Each section of the report (scholarly productivity or scholarship, teaching effectiveness, and service activity) should be clearly and separately identified. For research faculty candidates, the written report should focus on the candidate's research.

The SPR report for candidates in teaching faculty appointments should include a summary of the candidate's position description including specific instructional responsibilities, curriculum development, expertise, leadership, program work, etc. as appropriate to the candidate's position and rank. Following, it should include a summation of the candidate's accomplishments and qualification for promotion relative to these criteria, with each section of the report clearly and separately identified.

SPR reports for candidates at all ranks should summarize the comments of external reviewers. The report should clearly explain how reviewers were selected, identify the reviewers' names and institutional affiliations, and describe each reviewer's qualifications to review the candidate's file. For more information, consult **Appendix F: Guidelines for Preparing the SPR Report**.

(I) No later than 14 days before the general faculty review begins, the SPR meets with the candidate to discuss its recommendation.

No later than 8 days before the period of general faculty review begins, the SPR provides the candidate with a redacted version of its written report. The redacted report includes a summary of the external reviewers' comments. To preserve confidentiality, the redacted report must delete all information concerning the identities of the external reviewers.

(J) Upon receiving the SPR's redacted report and recommendation, the candidate decides either to continue with the promotion/tenure process or to withdraw from further consideration. If the candidate wishes to continue, s/he must write a written response to the SPR's redacted report. The candidate's response may state that the candidate has no further comments, or it may respond to any particular aspect of the SPR's redacted report. Consult **Appendix G** for a sample **Response to the Redacted SPR Report**.

The candidate has 7 days to respond to the SPR's redacted report. The candidate must submit his/her written response to his/her SPR Chair no later than 1 day prior to the beginning of the general faculty review. If the candidate wishes to withdraw from further consideration, the SPR's written report will not be presented to the faculty.

(K) If the candidate decides to remain under consideration, the SPR Chair/designee uploads the following documents to the candidate's file: a.) A copy of the full (non-redacted) SPR written report; b.) All of the external letters that it received; and c.) The candidate's written response to the SPR's redacted report. The SPR Chair/designee must upload these materials to the candidate's file no later than 1 day prior to the beginning of the general faculty review of files. For more information, see **Appendix D: Guidelines for Preparing Promotion/Tenure files**. If the candidate does not wish to proceed, return all materials to the candidate.

STEP FIVE: GENERAL FACULTY REVIEW

No later than June 1 of the preceding academic year, the FDS Chair in consultation with the College HR Director establishes the dates when eligible faculty will review

candidates' files. The review period lasts for at least two weeks. It should begin between October 29 and November 6 and should end between November 12 and November 20.

No later than the October general faculty meeting, the FDS Chair explains the procedures for reviewing promotion/tenure files and announces the dates when files will be available for review. The FDS Chair also announces the date of the fall faculty meeting to discuss candidates' files (see Step Six below). At least one day prior to the start of the general faculty review, the FDS Chair distributes a memo reminding all eligible faculty members above the rank of Assistant Professor of the dates and procedures for the general faculty review and the date of the meeting to discuss the candidates' files.

Files will be available for inspection by eligible faculty for a period of no less than two calendar weeks, ending no later than November 20.

STEP SIX: MEETING AND VOTE BY ELIGIBLE FACULTY

(A) On the specified date, the FDS Chair convenes a meeting of all faculty members who are superior in academic rank to one or more candidates being considered for promotion and/or tenure. Faculty with instructional titles shall be considered by faculty who hold an appointment as associate professor or professor or an instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered (Chapter 24-54A). All eligible voting faculty members are expected to attend this meeting. The meeting for all candidates undergoing both mandatory and also non-mandatory review must be completed no later than November 20. The discussion of candidates undergoing mandatory and non-mandatory review typically occurs during the same meeting. In the event that the number of candidates for promotion is so large as to make reasonable consideration within one session difficult, meetings may be scheduled over several sessions. The discussion of any single candidate will not extend beyond one meeting, however.

The meeting(s) will proceed as follows:

- i.) An FDS member who is a Full Professor with voting privileges will chair the meeting. The chair will conduct the meeting in a manner that will allow equal opportunity for the fair consideration of all candidates.
- ii.) The first part of the meeting shall consider Assistant Teaching Professors seeking promotion to Associate Teaching Professors.

Then, the meeting will consider Associate Teaching Professors seeking promotion to Teaching Professors. All voting faculty in the College of Education holding the rank of Teaching Professor and Professor are expected to attend this portion of the meeting.

This discussion will be followed by Assistant Professors seeking tenure/promotion to the rank of Associate Professor whose review is mandatory. This discussion shall be followed by a consideration of Assistant Professors seeking tenure/promotion to the rank of Associate Professor whose review is not mandatory. All voting faculty in the

College of Education holding the rank of Associate Professor or above are expected to attend this portion of the meeting.

iii.) Each candidate will be discussed in turn. A member of the candidate's SPR will provide a summative statement of the SPR's overall recommendation. Following this statement, the chair will open the floor for questions and discussion. If necessary, the chair will ask a discussant to yield the floor to allow all concerned faculty an opportunity to speak. The chair may terminate the discussion of a candidate after a reasonable period in order to allow sufficient time for the discussion of remaining candidates.

iv.) FDS members, or faculty members designated by the FDS Chair, will take notes summarizing the discussion of each candidate. Because the faculty's review is separate from the CAC's review, faculty members who take notes during the faculty meeting should not be members of the CAC. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions must be omitted from the written summary of the faculty discussion. Note-takers should consult **Appendix H: Guidelines for Summarizing Faculty Discussions Regarding Promotion or Tenure of Candidates.**

Following the discussion of Assistant Professors seeking promotion and/or tenure to the rank of Associate Professor, candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Full Professor shall be considered. Voting faculty in the College of Education holding the rank of Full Professor are expected to attend this portion of the meeting. The discussion shall proceed in the manner described in steps (i) through (iv) above.

(B) At the conclusion of the meeting(s), the FDS Chair or his/her designee and the HR Director distribute electronic ballots to all eligible voting faculty members. The voting period will take place over a period of one week and must conclude no later than November 27. All eligible voting faculty members are responsible for submitting their completed electronic ballots by 5:00 p.m. on the last day of the voting period.

(C) No later than 3 days after the conclusion of the faculty meeting, the FDS Chair or his/her designee provides each candidate with a written summary of the faculty's discussion of his/her file.

(D) Candidates must respond in writing to this summary within 7 calendar days. The response may state that the candidate has no further comments, or it may respond to any particular aspect of the written summary. Consult **Appendix I** for a sample **Response to the Summary of the Faculty Meeting Discussion**. Candidates should submit their written response to the FDS Chair or to the FDS Chair's designee no later than 7 days after receiving the summary.

(E) By December 1, the FDS Chair or his/her designee uploads the written summary of the faculty meeting discussion, together with the candidate's written response to the written summary, to the candidate's file. Files are now ready for review by the CAC (see Step Seven below).

STEP SEVEN: REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE ADVISORY COUNCIL (CAC)

The CAC is responsible for reviewing each candidate's file and for making a recommendation regarding promotion/tenure. While the CAC's recommendation considers the faculty's recommendation and vote, the CAC's recommendation is separate from that of the faculty and may differ from it. The CAC's review and recommendation goes to the Dean (see Step Eight). While the Dean considers the CAC's recommendation, the Dean's recommendation and the CAC's recommendation may differ. The Dean forwards the CAC's recommendation to the Provost. A visualization of these review steps can be found here: <https://ap.washington.edu/wp-content/uploads/Undepartmentalized-3.pdf>

The CAC shall be composed of 5 faculty members who are Full Professors in the College of Education and may include faculty in research or teaching positions if there are relevant files under review, per the COE bylaws:

https://education.uw.edu/sites/default/files/mycoe/facstaff/faculty/Faculty%20Code%20revised%20November_20_2020.pdf. CAC members will serve a 2-year term, with at least two members overlapping with members who were elected the previous year.

(A) The election of CAC members will proceed as follows:

i.) The FDS Chair and the FC Chair in consultation with the HR Director will prepare a list of all eligible Full Professors who are available to serve on the CAC. Based on this list, the FDS Chair and the FC Chair will prepare a slate of candidates. The FDS Chair will obtain the consent of each candidate who has been slated to serve on the CAC.

ii.) By May 20, the final slate of candidates will be presented to all College of Education faculty members who are eligible to vote on the slate (including eligible Research faculty). The FDS Chair and the HR Director will construct an electronic ballot, and an electronic vote will be conducted. The voting period will last for one week and must conclude by June 1.

(B) Within two weeks of the conclusion of the faculty vote on candidates' files in November, and no later than December 4, the CAC meets to review each candidate's file. A CAC member may recuse him/herself from discussing a candidate, if s/he served on the candidate's SPR.

(C) The CAC prepares a written report of each candidate's file. The report includes the candidate's vote tally. The CAC report must clearly state its recommendation for each candidate and the reasons for its recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions must be omitted from the CAC report. Consult **Appendix J: Guidelines for Writing the CAC Report**.

(D) The CAC shares its written report and recommendation for each candidate with the Dean. For mandatory reviews, the Dean must receive the CAC report and

recommendation by December 7. For non-mandatory reviews, the Dean must receive the CAC report and recommendation by January 7.

(E) The CAC shares its written report with candidates. The CAC report for each candidate includes the candidate's vote tally. In the event that the recommendation of the CAC is not favorable or conflicts with the faculty vote, the UW Faculty Code stipulates that the CAC must provide a written copy of its report to the candidate. See Chapter 24-54C.

(F) The UW Code provides no opportunity for candidates to respond to the CAC report. See Chapter 24-54C.

STEP EIGHT: DEAN'S REVIEW

(A) Upon receiving the CAC written report and recommendation for each candidate, the Dean writes his/her recommendation. In making his/her recommendation, the Dean will review all of the candidate's materials, including the external letters, the SPR report, the candidate's response to the redacted version of the SPR report, the written summaries from the faculty meeting, the candidate's response to summary of the faculty discussion, the faculty vote, and the CAC report/recommendation. For mandatory reviews, the Dean must submit the candidate's file and Dean's recommendation to the Provost by December 15. For non-mandatory reviews, the Dean must submit the candidate's file and Dean's recommendation to the Provost by February 1.

(B) Chapter 24-54D of the UW Faculty Code provides guidelines by which the Dean shall communicate his/her recommendation to candidates.

If the Dean's recommendation is not favorable, s/he must provide the candidate with his/her initial recommendation and reasons for it prior to submitting his/her letter to the Provost. The Dean or Dean's designee shall discuss the case with the candidate. The candidate may then respond in writing to the Dean within 7 calendar days of this discussion.

If the Dean's recommendation is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, the Dean shall transmit his/her recommendation and the candidate's response, if it exists, to the candidate and to the Provost.

If the Dean's promotion decision is not favorable and not mandatory, and the candidate has written a response to the Dean, the Dean shall transmit his/her recommendation and the candidate's response to the Provost for information purposes.

(C) After the Provost decides the candidate's case, the Dean shall ensure that the candidate is informed in writing in a timely way of the result of the case. If the result is not favorable, the Dean shall provide the reasons for the Provost's decision to the candidate. This will occur approximately 6-8 weeks from submission of the candidate's file to the Academic Personnel Office of the Provost.

Upon review of the candidate's full case by the President and Board of Regents, a formal letter of notification is sent to the candidate. This will occur approximately one month following the Dean's communication of Provost's decision.

Faculty Retention Policy

This policy is in place as approved by the Faculty of the College of Education and may not be edited without another vote by the Faculty. This policy fulfills the requirement under the UW faculty code, Chapter 24-71: Procedures for Allocating Salary Increases.

Prior to preparing a response, the dean shall first consult with the faculty member's area chair and the faculty members of the leadership team of the COE. The dean shall then make the decision about the offer based on their best judgment. The faculty shall vote whether to affirm or amend this policy biennially. Approved February 16, 2018

APPENDICES AND LINKS

Appendix A: Promotion and Tenure: Four Stages of Review

Appendix B: Activity Timeline for Promotion/Tenure

Appendix C: Sample Memorandum of Intent

Appendix D: Guidelines for Preparing Promotion/Tenure Files

Appendix E: Guidelines for Soliciting External Review Letters

Appendix F: Guidelines for Preparing the SPR Written Report

Appendix G: Acknowledging Receipt of Redacted Report from SPR

Appendix H: Guidelines for Summarizing Faculty Discussions Regarding Promotion/Tenure of Candidates

Appendix I: Acknowledging Receipt of Summary of Faculty Meeting Discussion

Appendix J: Guidelines for Preparing the CAC Report

Appendix K: Promotion Guidelines for Teaching Faculty

Link to Chapter 24 of the UW Faculty Code

<http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCGTOC.html>

Link to “Promotion and Tenure Overview” from UW Academic Human Resources

<https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/actions/promotions-tenure/>

APPENDIX A
PROMOTION AND TENURE: FOUR STAGES OF REVIEW

STAGE ONE: COE FACULTY

A. SPR (Sub-committee for Promotion Review) (Spring-Fall)

Composed of three faculty who are senior in rank to candidate—one selected by candidate, one selected by candidate’s Area Chair, one selected by Faculty Council

- i.) Advises candidate re: file including personal statement, CV, publications/artifacts to send to external reviewers, examples of teaching effectiveness, and contributions to service
- ii.) Solicits and reads letters from external reviewers
- iii.) Makes initial determination regarding whether or not candidate should move forward with promotion and/or tenure
- iv.) Assuming candidate moves forward, writes recommendation + report to “make the case” for candidate’s promotion and/or tenure



B. COE faculty senior in rank to candidate (Fall)

- i.) Review candidate’s file
- ii.) Attend and participate in meeting to discuss candidate’s file
- iii.) Vote to support or deny candidate’s promotion and/or tenure



STAGE 2: COLLEGE ADVISORY COUNCIL (CAC) (December)

Full professors elected by COE faculty. Faculty Council slates candidates; faculty vote on slate

- i.) Reviews faculty recommendation, including faculty vote + notes from faculty meeting. Also reviews candidate's complete file (including external review letters, SPR's recommendation, candidate's response to SPR letter and candidate's response to faculty meeting notes)
- ii.) Writes recommendation to support or not support candidate's promotion and/or tenure

Note: In some cases, the CAC's recommendation may differ from that of the faculty and/or the Dean.

Note: The CAC's recommendation goes to the Dean and also to the Provost.



STAGE 3: COE DEAN (December)

- i.) Reviews candidate's file + faculty vote + CAC recommendation/report.
- ii.) Writes letter to Provost to support or not support candidate's promotion and/or tenure.



STAGE 4: UW PROVOST/PRESIDENT (Winter/Spring of the following year)


Note: Promotion/tenure is not final until approved by the UW Provost/President

This flow chart is based on a document from UW Academic Human Resources entitled, "Promotion and Tenure Overview." Scroll to "Additional Resources" and click on

“Promotion Review Process for Un-departmentalized Units”
<http://ap.washington.edu/ahr/resources/tenure-promotion/>

APPENDIX B: ACTIVITY TIMELINE FOR PROMOTION/TENURE
All deadlines and dates appear in chronological order

The following represents a brief overview of timelines and procedures. For a detailed description, consult the College of Education’s “Procedures for Promotion and Tenure” (the narrative document to which this Appendix is attached).

Deadline	Person/ Group	Activity	Step
Feb 1	Chair of Faculty Development and Support (FDS)	Distribute Memorandum of Intent to faculty. (Consult HR Director for faculty list.)	One A
Feb 15 <i>March 1 (absolute deadline)</i> <i>April 15 (if on leave during winter)</i>	All faculty who intend to be considered for promotion/tenure (now referred to as Candidates)	Return Memo of Intent to College HR Director (FDS Chair must follow up with all faculty members whose promotion/tenure review is mandatory during the following academic year, but who do not return a memorandum of intent by Feb 15.)	One B
March 6 	College HR Director	Communicate names of all Candidates to FDS Chair	Two A
	FDS Chair	Contact each Candidate to solicit his/her nominee to serve on his/her Subcommittee for Promotion Review (SPR)	Two B
	Candidate	In consultation with the candidate’s Area Chair, nominate one person to serve on his/her SPR. Submit the name of his/her nominee to FDS Chair in writing (email is acceptable).	
	FDS Chair, Area Chair, Faculty Council (FC) Chair	Determine remaining two members of each Candidate’s SPR. Area Chair nominates one faculty member; FC Chair nominates one faculty member. (In total, three faculty members serve on each SPR, including Candidate’s nominee.)	Two C

	FDS Chair	Obtain written consent from each faculty member nominated to serve on an SPR; submit all written consents to FC Chair	Two D
End of First week of spring quarter	FDS Chair	Send memorandum to each Candidate and to all members of each Candidate's SPR, confirming the formation of the SPR and reviewing the SPR's responsibilities	Two E
March Faculty Meeting	FC Chair or delegate from FDS	Conduct an orientation to the Promotion & Tenure process. All Candidates and SPR members are strongly urged to attend; faculty members who are not Candidates or members of an SPR also are encouraged to attend.	Three
By April 15	Delegate from FDS and Dean	Conduct a meeting to orient the SPR members to the work of an SPR committee.	Three
By April 15	Candidate	Distribute copies of initial promotion/tenure file to all members of the SPR	Four A
By April 21	FDS Chair	Instruct the member of the SPR nominated by Faculty Council to convene first meeting of SPR to (1) select a permanent chair for the SPR, (2) review the Candidate's file, and (3) establish a timeline for all future SPR activities	Four B
By April 30	SPR and Candidate	SPR Chair convenes a meeting of SPR and Candidate to consider how file might be improved	Four C
By May 15	SPR	Request external letters from 3-5 scholars at peer institutions. Note: The final list of external reviewers is <i>not</i> shared with the Candidate.	Four D
By June 1	FDS Chair w/ HR Director	Establish dates for general faculty review of all Candidate files (start range: Oct 29-Nov 6 -- end range: Nov 12-Nov 20); establish dates for faculty meeting to discuss all Candidate files (must occur between Nov 12-20); update P&T Timeline with exact dates.	Five/Six
CAC Present slate by May 20	Faculty Council, FDS chair. w/ HR Director	During the May general faculty meeting, present the slate for the College Advisory Council (CAC). CAC members serve for a 2- year term.	Seven A

Conclude election by June 1		Following the May faculty meeting, eligible faculty vote on the CAC slate. Voting period is 1-week and must conclude by June 1.	
By June 15	SPR	Send candidate's file to each of the 3-5 external reviewers.	Four E
By Sept 30	Candidate	Upload final promotion documents to file	Four F
Oct Faculty Meeting	FDS Chair w/HR Director	FDS Chair discusses procedures and dates for faculty review of Candidate files. Announce the date of the faculty meeting to discuss Candidate files.	Five
By Oct 11	SPR (all members)	Review Candidate's file and external letters; consider final recommendation	Four G
By Oct 15	SPR (all members)	Prepare written report including an overall recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure	Four H
14 days before general faculty review (range: Oct 16-Oct 23)	SPR and Candidate	Meet with Candidate to discuss SPR's findings and recommendation	Four I
8 days before general faculty review (range: Oct 21-Oct 29)	SPR	Provide Candidate with a <u>redacted</u> version of the SPR's recommendation and report, including statement of Candidate's qualifications and a summary of external reviewers' comments	
1 day before general faculty review (range: Oct 28-Nov 5)	Candidate	If Candidate wishes to proceed, Candidate MUST respond in writing to SPR report; return written response to SPR Chair. The written response may state that the Candidate has no further comment on the SPR report. Candidate has 7 days to complete and return his/her response to SPR Chair.	Four J
1 day before general faculty review (range: Oct 28-Nov 5)	SPR	If Candidate wishes to proceed, SPR Chair/designee uploads to candidate's file: a.) non-redacted version of SPR report; b.) all external letters; c.) and Candidate's written response to redacted version of SPR report. If Candidate does not wish to proceed, return all materials to Candidate.	Four K

1 day before general faculty review <i>(range: Oct 28-Nov 5)</i>	Chair of FDS w/HR Director	Distribute a memorandum to eligible voting faculty outlining procedures and dates for general faculty review of Candidate files. Memo should include the date of the faculty meeting to discuss Candidate files.	Five
General Faculty Review <i>(start range: Oct 29-Nov 6)</i> <i>(end range: Nov 12-Nov 20)</i>	All eligible voting faculty above rank of Assistant Professor	Review of Candidate files by eligible faculty. Files will be available for review for a period of 2 weeks (ending no later than Nov 20).	
By Nov 20 <i>(range: Nov 12-20)</i>	Chair of FDS + FDS designees	Convene meeting(s) of all eligible faculty members to discuss qualifications of Candidates and solicit recommendations concerning their promotion and/or tenure. An FDS member who is a Full Prof with voting privileges chairs the meeting. FDS Chair/FDS designees write a summary of faculty discussion for each Candidate. (See Appendix H: Guidelines for Summarizing Faculty Discussion re: Promotion and Tenure of Candidates.)	Six A
By Nov 20 <i>(range: Nov 12-20)</i>	FDS Chair or his/her designee w/HR Director	At the conclusion of the meeting, FDS Chair or his/her designee and HR Director prepare the ballot and submit it electronically to all eligible voting faculty	Six B
<i>(start range: Nov 12-Nov 20)</i> <i>(end range: Nov 20-Nov 27)</i>		Eligible faculty vote by electronic ballot	
No later than 3 days after the conclusion of the general faculty meeting.	FDS Chair /designee	Finalize written summary of faculty discussion for each Candidate, taking care to omit all attributions. FDS Chair or his/her designee gives each Candidate a copy of the summary discussion of the Candidate's file.	Six C
7 calendar days	Candidate	Candidate MUST respond in writing to summary of faculty discussion of his/her file; return response to	Six D

following receipt of summary.		FDS Chair or his/her designee. The written response may state that the Candidate has no further comment on the summary of the faculty discussion. Candidate has 7 days to complete and return his/her response to FDS Chair or his/her designee.	
By Dec 1	FDS Chair or his/her designee	Upload written summary of faculty discussion of Candidate's file, together with Candidate's written response to summary of faculty discussion, to Candidate's file.	Six E
By Dec 4	College Advisory Council (CAC)	Meet to review file and vote tally for each Candidate and determine recommendation for each Candidate. Write summary report and recommendation for each Candidate. Written report for each Candidate includes vote tally. (See Appendix J.)	Seven B
By December 7 (for mandatory) By January 7 (for non-mandatory)	College Advisory Council (CAC)	Finalize report and recommendation for each Candidate; submit to Dean CAC shares its written report and recommendation with each Candidate. (Note: UW Fac. Code stipulates that if the CAC's recommendation is not favorable or conflicts with the faculty vote, the CAC <u>must</u> provide its written report to the Candidate.) Candidates do not respond to CAC report.	Seven C-F
By December 15 th (for mandatory) By January 15 th (for non-mandatory)	Dean	Review complete file for each Candidate and determine recommendation re: promotion/tenure. Forward Candidate's file with Dean's cover letter to the Academic Personnel Office of the Provost. Distribute memorandum to each Candidate outlining reasons for Dean's decision to support or not support promotion and/or tenure. (For more details re: Dean's review, see Step Eight.)	Eight A-B
Spring Qtr	Dean	Upon receipt of promotion and/or tenure decision from the Provost, Dean ensures that Candidate receives timely notification of the result of his/her case. If Provost's decision is not favorable, Dean shall provide the reasons for the Provost's decision to Candidate.	Eight C
	Office of the President	Upon review of Candidate's full case by the University President and Board of Regents, a formal letter of notification is sent to Candidate.	N/A

APPENDIX C: SAMPLE MEMORANDUM OF INTENT

February 1, 20XX

TO: College Faculty

FROM: Chair of the Faculty Development and Support Committee (FDS)

RE: Promotion and Tenure Notification of Intent

Any eligible professorial Assistant or Associate Professor faculty, including tenure-track, WOT, teaching or research wishing to be considered for Tenure and/or Promotion during Autumn Quarter 20XX must inform the College Human Resources (HR) Director of his/her intent by signing at the bottom of this memorandum. Signatures may be submitted electronically.

Return this memorandum with your signature to the College HR Director (Bernadette Dwyer) no later than February 15, 20XX.

All faculty members who are declaring their intent to be considered for promotion and/or tenure are expected to review the UW and COE documents regarding promotion and tenure. The most recent version of these documents can be found on the COE website:

<https://education.uw.edu/my-coe/facstaff/fac-promo>

PLEASE RETURN TO: Bernadette Dwyer, dwyer@uw.edu February 15, 20XX

.....
Yes, I wish to be considered for Promotion/Tenure during Autumn Quarter 20XX.

Signature _____ Date _____

Name (please print)

APPENDIX D: GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROMOTION/TENURE FILES

OVERVIEW

The purpose of these guidelines is to help you prepare your promotion/tenure file for review by faculty senior in rank.

Your file consists of evidence and documentation, which you and your Subcommittee for Promotion (SPR) will use to justify your case for promotion/tenure. For tenure-track and without-tenure (WOT) faculty members, evidence should focus on your cumulative record across the areas of research, teaching, and service. For research faculty members, evidence should focus on your cumulative record of research; evidence of teaching and service also may be included, depending on the individual case. For teaching faculty members, evidence should focus on your cumulative record of instructional excellence, scholarship, experience, and other responsibilities associated with your job description.

You will assemble your promotion/tenure file in consultation with your SPR. You will supply much of the information for your file. Your SPR and the Faculty Development and Support committee (FDS) also will supply some necessary documents. All documents will be uploaded to “Interfolio,” the UW electronic system used for promotion, tenure, and merit. Access to your file in Interfolio will be provided by the HR Director.

Prior to preparing your promotion/tenure file, read through the entire document entitled, “Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure” (the narrative to which this Appendix is attached).

You also may find it helpful to consult a document prepared by the University’s office of Academic Human Resources entitled, “Promotion and Tenure Overview.” Here is the link to that document: <https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/actions/promotions-tenure/>

Finally, you are advised to read Chapter 24 Section 54 of the UW Faculty Code (the section that pertains to promotions). Here is the link. (Click on “Faculty Code” and scroll to Section 54): <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCGTOC.html>

REQUIRED ELEMENTS

The College of Education requires that your file include the following nine elements. **Please also review the Academic HR website for further guidance on assembling your file:** <https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/actions/promotions-tenure/assembly-of-record/>

- 1.) **Personal statement:** Candidate writes and uploads to file.
- 2.) **Current curriculum vitae (CV):** Candidate writes and uploads to file.
- 3.) **Four-six exemplary publications:** Candidate provides and uploads to file.

Note for teaching faculty: “Scholarship is an obligation of all faculty members” ([UW Faculty Code Section 24-32 A](#)).”

Teaching faculty may demonstrate their scholarship in a variety of ways ([Section 24-32](#)), including but not limited to: introduction of new knowledge or methods into course content; creation or use of innovative pedagogical methods; development of new courses, curricula, or course materials; participation in professional conferences; evidence of student performance; receipt of grants or awards; contributions to interdisciplinary teaching; participation and leadership in professional

associations; or significant outreach to professionals at other educational institutions. While they may choose to do so through publication, **such publication shall not be required.**

4.) Evidence of teaching and advising effectiveness (including student ratings and peer evaluations from faculty colleagues): Candidate provides and uploads to file.

Assistant Professors and Teaching Faculty: Peer evaluation of teaching must be conducted every year.

Associate Professors and Teaching faculty: Peer evaluation of teaching must be conducted at least every three years.

***Note: Associate Professors and Teaching faculty must have a peer evaluation of teaching for the year immediately prior to the year they wish to be considered for promotion.*

5.) Evidence of service (College, University, scholarly community, and/or the public): Candidate provides and uploads to file.

6.) Letters from external reviewers: SPR solicits and uploads to file. (The SPR does not share the names of external reviewers or their letters with candidates.)

7.) SPR Report + Recommendation: SPR writes two versions of its report and recommendation. One version is not redacted; the other version is redacted and omits all features that would identify external reviewers. SPR uploads non-redacted version of its report to candidate's file.

8.) Candidate's Response to redacted SPR Report + Recommendation: Candidate writes response to redacted version of SPR's report and gives to SPR Chair. SPR Chair uploads written response to file.

9.) Candidate's Response to Summary Discussion from the fall Faculty Meeting: FDS (and/or FDS designees) writes notes from faculty discussion of candidate's file. Candidate provides written response to notes and gives written response to FDS Chair/designee. FDS Chair/designee uploads candidate's written response to file.

In the next section you will find more detailed information about how to prepare and organize the required elements of your file.

REQUIRED ELEMENTS: DETAILED INFORMATION

1. Personal Statement

Prepare a personal statement, 4-6 pages in length, supporting your candidacy for promotion/tenure. Your statement should focus on the major arguments for your promotion/tenure and should discuss evidence across the areas of research, teaching, scholarship, and service, as appropriate to your position. As noted above, research faculty members should emphasize their cumulative record of research; teaching and service may be included, depending on the individual case. Teaching faculty should emphasize their cumulative record of instructional excellence; research may be included, depending on the individual case.

Ask your SPR for feedback on your personal statement. You can expect to write several drafts of your statement before it is ready to be placed in your file.

2. Curriculum Vitae (CV)

Your CV should list current and past academic positions, your educational history, scholarly products, teaching/advising, service, and relevant experience. Lists of professional experiences and publications should be noted in descending order from the most to the least recent experience or publication. When referencing organizations, associations, journals, and periodicals, provide full names.

Ask your SPR to read through your CV for formatting suggestions and clarity. Your SPR also can help you spot typographical errors.

3. Four to six exemplary publications: Publications should represent the breadth and quality of your scholarly research. Your SPR can help you choose the publications to include in your file.

Teaching Faculty: Your SPR can help you chose the artifacts to include in your file. Artifacts may include samples of curriculum development, course design, policy briefs, etc. Exemplary publications may be included, but are optional.

4. Evidence of teaching effectiveness includes all of the following:

Student Evaluations: Include copies of summary sheets from the University's Instructional Assessment System (IAS). The University Handbook requires that all faculty members must have at least one course evaluated by students every year during which they have teaching responsibilities.

Written peer evaluation(s) of teaching: Peer evaluations by faculty colleagues of your teaching are required annually for Assistant professors. Associate Professors and Associate Teaching Professors must obtain a peer evaluation of teaching at least once every three years. *Associate Professors and Teaching faculty must have a peer evaluation of teaching for the year immediately prior to the year they wish to be considered for promotion.* Peer evaluations may address one or more of the following: written observation of teaching, assessment of teaching materials such as syllabi or lesson plans, assessment of student evaluations or other evidence of student learning, etc.

Summary of student advising (as appropriate to the rank)

- a. Number of Doctoral committees (chair):
- b. Number of Doctoral committees (committee member):
- c. Total number of students awarded the Doctoral degree:
- d. Number of Masters students (chair):
- e. Number of Masters students (committee member, if relevant):
- f. Total number of students awarded the Masters degree:
- g. Number of undergraduate advisees (if relevant):

Additional evidence of teaching (if appropriate/desired): Evidence may include additional written evaluations by peers (beyond the required number), course syllabi, evidence of student achievement or publications, undergraduate and/or on-line courses that you developed, etc. For instructional faculty at teaching faculty ranks, this may include evidence associated with instruction, professional development, curriculum/program design, mentorship, leadership within and outside the College of Education.

** The University has specific requirements for evidence of teaching effectiveness. For more information, click here: <https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/actions/promotions-tenure/>

5. Professional Service

Your CV and personal statement will include a section devoted to your professional service. In addition, your file should include a separate folder that contains evidence of your professional service. You can include a number of things in this folder. For example, you can create a list of organizations and associations with which you have been affiliated. Report inclusive dates of office, special positions, and/or special assignments. Other evidence of professional service can include letters of nomination, appointment, or appreciation.

Evidence of your professional service should highlight your contributions to all of the following areas as appropriate:

- a. College - committees, administration, special projects, etc. (Examples: Faculty Council; Diversity Committee; program development; etc.)
- b. University – committees; administrative work; special projects; etc. (Examples: Faculty Senate; Royalty Research Fund Committee, etc.)
- c. Professional organizations – membership; offices held; program planning; committees; etc. For each organization, specify whether it is local, regional, national or international. (Example: American Educational Research Association, Chairperson, Section H, national; Editorial Board for *Science Education* (journal), regional, etc.)
- d. Community – committees; offices held; consultations; etc. (Examples: State Superintendent of Public Instruction Office, Consultant, Curriculum Writing Committee; Seattle Public Schools, Bilingual Training Program Review Committee, etc.)

6. External Review Letters

Your SPR will solicit 3 to 5 letters from external reviewers at peer institutions. For reasons of confidentiality, you will not see these letters or learn the names of your reviewers. Your SPR will upload the external review letters to your file.

7. SPR Summary Report + Recommendation

The SPR Report summarizes your qualifications for promotion/tenure, includes comments from your external reviewers, and states your SPR's recommendation regarding your case. Your SPR will write two versions of its report. One version includes information that identifies your external reviewers. Your SPR will present this version of its report to the faculty and also will upload it to your file. You do not see this version of your SPR's report.

Your SPR also prepares a second redacted version of its report, which omits all information that could identify your external reviewers. The redacted version of the SPR report will not be included in your file. However, you will see and must respond to the redacted version of your SPR's report. See #8 below.

8. Candidate's response to the SPR Summary Report

According to the UW Faculty Code, you must respond in writing to the redacted version of your SPR's report within 7 days of receiving it. Give your written response to your SPR Chair; you may email your response to your SPR Chair. Your SPR Chair will upload your written response to your file. A sample response can be found Appendix G.

9. Candidate's response to the faculty discussion of candidate's file

Eligible faculty will review your file over a period of at least two weeks. Your file also will be discussed during a faculty meeting that will occur in mid-late November (no later than November 20). The Faculty Development and Support Committee (FDS) will arrange for a faculty member to take notes during the meeting that summarize the faculty's discussion of your file. The notes will not include attributions or identifying information. The FDS Chair or his/her designee will give you a copy of these notes. According to the UW Faculty Code, you must respond in writing to the notes from the faculty meeting within 7 days of receiving them. Give your written response (or email it) to the FDS Chair or his/her designee. (Remember: give your written response to the FDS Chair, not to your SPR Chair.) The FDS Chair will upload your written response to your file. A sample response can be found Appendix I.

Note: After your file has been reviewed and voted on by eligible faculty, it will go to the College Advisory Council (CAC) for review. The CAC will consider all the elements of your file, together with your vote tally, and will write a final report and recommendation to the Dean. (Because the CAC's recommendation is independent of the faculty's recommendation and the Dean's recommendation, it is possible that the CAC's recommendation may differ from that of the Dean and/or the faculty.) The Dean must include the CAC report and recommendation in his/her recommendation to the Provost.

The CAC will give you a copy of its final report and recommendation. The CAC's report will include your vote tally. According to the UW Faculty Code, candidates do not respond to the CAC report

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

In consultation with your SPR, you may choose to include additional evidence in your file.

Additional evidence can include:

- a. Scholarly products beyond the 4-6 required publications described in #3 above (additional peer-reviewed articles, books, and/or chapters; measures that you developed; etc.)
- b. Works accepted for publication but not yet in print
- c. Documents related to internally and externally funded projects
- d. Policy reports/briefs
- e. Professional presentations (list topic, name, place)
- f. Curriculum materials
- g. Program materials/designs
- h. Leadership documents
- i. Documents from community partners/collaborators
- j. Editorials that you wrote
- k. Other

APPENDIX E: GUIDELINES FOR SOLICITING EXTERNAL REVIEW LETTERS

The SPR will request external letters from 3-5 scholars at peer institutions who will evaluate the candidate's scholarship and scholarly reputation. In the case of candidates promoting to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor, it may be appropriate to solicit letters from experts who are external to the College of Education but who are within the UW community, as long as the reviewer is qualified and can provide an “arm’s length” assessment of the candidate’s qualifications for the rank. **Candidates promoting to the rank of Full Teaching Professor MUST have all external review letters be external to UW.**

Before sending a formal letter, the SPR Chair or his/her designee will contact the reviewer by email or phone to explain the nature of the candidate’s position (tenure-track; non-tenure instructional) and the review, and the timeline for the reviewer to complete his/her evaluation. The formal request for evaluation must be made by letter and must be signed by the SPR Chair. Note: The names of external reviewers and their letters are not shared with candidates.

Letters should provide external reviewers with the following information:

- A clear statement of the purpose for the review, including expectations for reviews of candidates considered for Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching professors;
- The date when the reviewer needs to return his/her evaluation to the SPR Chair;
- An explanation that the letter will be confidential and will not be seen by the candidate;
- A copy of the candidate’s personal statement and CV plus four-six scholarly publications (or other relevant artifacts in the case of Assistant/Associate Teaching Professor). Each reviewer should receive the same set of publications.

Letters should ask external reviewers to provide the following information:

- Whether the reviewer knows the candidate and if so, in which capacity and for how long;
- The significance, independence, influence, and promise of the candidate's scholarship, and the degree of national/international recognition. For Assistant/Associate Teaching Professors: the significance, influence, and promise of the candidate’s instruction and/or leadership, particularly work done since coming to the University of Washington;
- A comparison of the candidate's accomplishments with scholars at a similar career stage in the same or related fields.

Note: External reviewers should not be asked to assess whether the candidate should be promoted (a reviewer may, of course, volunteer such an opinion). The external review usually focuses on scholarly achievements; however, the overall decision regarding promotion depends on more than these factors.

IMPORTANT: Academic HR requires that the following information about external reviewers be included in candidates' files. This information must be clearly identified in the file in a section entitled, "External Letters:"

- Original copies of all external review letters;
- An explanation of the selection process for external reviewers, including the reviewers' qualifications, how they were chosen, and the reasons for selecting them;
- A sample of the letter from the SPR Chair requesting evaluation.

** Note: The information in this Appendix is taken from a document supplied by Academic HR entitled, "Promotion and Tenure Overview." For a copy of this document, click here:

<http://ap.washington.edu/ahr/resources/tenure-promotion/>

* * * * *

**Sample Letter Soliciting an External Review
Assistant to Associate: Tenure Track and WOT**

As Chair of Dr. _____'s promotion committee, I wish to thank you for agreeing to evaluate her file and case for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with tenure in the College of Education at the University of Washington. [Letters to evaluate WOT faculty should eliminate the phrase, "with tenure."] According to the University of Washington Faculty Code,

"appointment at the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and research, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient."

Note re: evaluations for WOT Faculty: The UW Faculty Code states the following: "WOT faculty members have the same rights, responsibilities, and obligations as tenure-track and tenured faculty members at those ranks. The description of their duties and qualifications for promotion are the same." The paragraph from the UW Faculty included in letters for WOT candidates thus could be the same as for tenure-track candidates.

As one of several nationally recognized scholars, you are being asked to comment on Dr. ___'s record of scholarship and professional activity. Toward this end, I have enclosed (1) Dr. _____'s current vita; (2) her personal statement making a case for her promotion; and (3) selected reprints of published articles [and book prospectus, preprints, etc. as appropriate]. We ask that your letter comment on the following:

- 1.) Whether you know Dr. _____ and if so, in which capacity and for how long;
- 2.) The significance, independence, influence, and promise of Dr. _____'s scholarship (particularly work done since coming to the University of Washington) and the degree of Dr. _____'s field/national/international recognition; and

NOTE: If a candidate moved to the UW from another institution, change this to:
"The significance, independence, influence, and promise of Dr. _____'s

scholarship (particularly work done since coming to the University of Washington, however, the entirety of the record can be considered) and the degree of Dr. _____'s field/national/international recognition

3.) A comparison of Dr. _____ with other scholars at a similar career stage in the same or related fields.

The following language may not be appropriate in every case: I should note that at the University of Washington, senior faculty are required to vote on an Assistant Professor's promotion and tenure no later than October of their *sixth* academic year. (This is perhaps a year or so earlier than at some other major research universities.)

There never seems to be a time of year that is not busy, so we are especially grateful for your willingness to do this important task. We will need your response (in a letter to me) by the end of August, 20xx, at the latest. Your letter will become part of the official promotion file but seen only by voting faculty senior in rank to the candidate. Please enclose your CV with your evaluation.

Again, thank you very much.

Sincerely,

[Signature of SPR Chair]

**Sample Letter Soliciting an External Review
Associate to Full: Tenure Track and WOT**

As Chair of Dr. _____'s promotion committee, I wish to thank you for agreeing to evaluate her file and case for promotion from Associate to Full Professor in the College of Education at the University of Washington. According to the University of Washington Faculty Code,

“appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition.”

Note re: evaluations for WOT Faculty: The UW Faculty Code states the following: “WOT faculty members have the same rights, responsibilities, and obligations as tenure-track and tenured faculty members at those ranks. The description of their duties and qualifications for promotion are the same.” The paragraph from the UW Faculty included in letters for WOT candidates thus could be the same as for tenure-track candidates.

As one of several nationally recognized scholars, you are being asked to comment on Dr. ____'s record of scholarship and professional activity. Toward this end, I have enclosed (1) Dr. _____'s current vita; (2) her personal statement making a case for her promotion; and (3) selected reprints of published articles [and book prospectus, preprints, etc. as appropriate]. We ask that your letter comment on the following:

- 1.) Whether you know Dr. _____ and if so, in which capacity and for how long;
- 2.) The significance, independence, influence, and promise of Dr. _____'s scholarship (particularly work done since coming to the University of Washington) and the degree of Dr. _____'s national/international recognition; and

NOTE: If a candidate moved to the UW from another institution, change this language to:

“The significance, independence, influence, and promise of Dr. _____'s scholarship (particularly work done since coming to the University of Washington, however, the entirety of the record can be considered) and the degree of Dr. _____'s national/international recognition

- 3.) A comparison of Dr. _____ with other scholars at a similar career stage in the same or related fields.

There never seems to be a time of year that is not busy, so we are especially grateful for your willingness to do this important task. We will need your response (in a letter to me) by the end of August, 20xx, at the latest. Your letter will become part of the official promotion file but seen only by voting faculty senior in rank to the candidate. Please enclose your CV with your evaluation.

Again, thank you very much.

Sincerely,

[Signature of SPR Chair]

Sample Letters Soliciting an External Review for Research Professors Assistant to Associate and Associate to Full

Because external reviews focus on scholarship and research, letters requesting evaluation of research professors can follow the same guidelines as letters requesting evaluation of tenure-track and WOT professors.

However, the paragraph from the UW Faculty Code will need to reflect expectations for research professors. The pertinent information from the UW Faculty Code is as follows:

Research Faculty: Appointment to a rank “with a *research* title requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon research.” (Chapter 24-34B.4)

In light of this stipulation, letters for research professors could state the information from the UW Faculty Code as follows:

Assistant to Associate Professor: “appointment at the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in research”

Associate to Full Professor, tenure-track: “appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition.”

**Sample Letters Soliciting an External Review
Assistant to Associate Teaching Professor
Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor**

As Chair of Dr. _____'s promotion committee, I wish to thank you for agreeing to evaluate her file and case for promotion from Assistant to Associate Teaching Professor (or Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor). According to the University of Washington Faculty Code,

Appointment to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor requires a record of substantial success in teaching and extensive training, competence, and experience in the discipline (Chapter 24-34)". Evidence of exemplary success may take many forms. While an Assistant Teaching Professor may elect to go up for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor at any time, we generally would expect to see at least five years of service as a Assistant Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file.

or

Appointment to the rank of Teaching Professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching and excellence in instruction as demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field (Chapter 24-34)." Evidence of exemplary success may take many forms and the candidate will need to demonstrate evidence of contributions inside and outside of the COE/UW. While an Associate Teaching Professor can elect to go up for promotion to Teaching Professor at any time, we generally expect to see at least five years of service as an Associate Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file.

As one of several nationally recognized scholars, you are being asked to comment on Dr. ___'s record of professional activity. Toward this end, I have enclosed (1) Dr. _____'s current vita; (2) his/her personal statement making a case for her promotion with respect to the criteria associated with this instructional position; and (3) selected evidence of meeting these criteria (Assistant to Associate Teaching Professor: disciplinary training, teaching, service to students, etc.; Associate to Teaching Professor curriculum/program design, leadership in a program/field, instruction, mentorship, national recognition, etc.)

We ask that your letter comment on the following:

- 1.) Whether you know Dr. _____ and if so, in which capacity and for how long;
- 2.) The significance and promise of Dr. _____'s work, particularly work done since coming to the University of Washington).

There never seems to be a time of year that is not busy, so we are especially grateful for your willingness to do this important task. We will need your response (in a letter to me) by the end of August, 20xx, at the latest. Your letter will become part of the official promotion file but seen only by voting faculty senior in rank to the candidate. Please enclose your CV with your evaluation.

Again, thank you very much.

Sincerely,

[Signature of SPR Chair]

APPENDIX F: GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING THE SPR WRITTEN REPORT

General Information

The purpose of the SPR written report is to summarize the candidate's qualifications and to state the SPR's recommendation as to whether the candidate should be promoted and/or granted tenure.

The SPR prepares **two** versions of its report. One version will be added to the candidate's file. This version of the report must provide specific information about external reviewers. The other version of the report will be shared with the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, this version of the report must be redacted to omit all information that might reveal the identities of external reviewers.

In the event that a consensus among the SPR is not reached, individual members may prepare separate reports.

The report must be finalized by October 15 of the academic year in which the candidate's file is being considered for promotion and/or tenure. The SPR provides the candidate with a redacted version of its written report no later than 8 days before the general faculty review.

Guidelines for Recommendation

When making its recommendation, the SPR should keep in mind the following stipulations from the UW Faculty Code:

Assistant to Associate Professor, tenure-track or WOT: "Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in teaching and/or research. For tenured, tenure-eligible, or WOT appointments, both of these shall be required, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient. (Chapter 24-34A.2)

Associate to Full Professor, tenure-track or WOT: "Appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and/or accomplishments in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition. For tenured, tenure-eligible, or WOT appointments, both of these shall be required." (Chapter 24-34A.3)

Note: WOT Faculty: "WOT faculty members have the same rights, responsibilities, and obligations as tenure-track and tenured faculty members at those ranks. The description of their duties and qualifications for promotion and salary increases for reasons of merit are the same." (Chapter 24-40B)

Research Faculty: Appointment to a rank "with a *research* title requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon research." (Chapter 24-34B.5)

Teaching Faculty: Appointment as a teaching faculty requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon teaching. (Chapter 24-34B.3)

Assistant Teaching Professor to Associate Teaching Professor: “Appointment with the title of associate teaching professor requires extensive training, competence, and experience in the discipline.” (Chapter 24-34B.3b)

Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor: “Appointment with the title of teaching professor requires a record of excellence in instruction, which may be demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field.” (Chapter 23-34B.3c)

Substance of the Report

For candidates on tenure-track and WOT appointments, the written report must include a summation of the candidate’s scholarly productivity, teaching effectiveness, and service activity. Each section of the report (scholarly productivity, teaching effectiveness, and service activity) should be clearly and separately identified. For research faculty candidates, the written report should focus on the candidate’s research. For teaching faculty candidates, the written report should focus on the candidate’s instructional excellence.

Effective reports include evidence that clearly demonstrates the candidate’s qualifications for promotion and/or tenure and justifies the SPR’s recommendation.

Summary of Evidence of Scholarly Productivity and/or Scholarship:

The SPR letter should state the name and institutional affiliation of each external reviewer, describe the reviewer’s qualifications, and explain why the SPR chose the reviewer to evaluate the candidate’s scholarship. Quotations from external letters typically provide the most compelling evidence of a candidate’s scholarship, scholarly achievements and productivity. The redacted letter that is shared with candidates must omit all information that could reveal the identities of the external reviewers.

Success in obtaining external funding and in serving as principal investigators for grants and contracts is an important source of evidence for research faculty. Grant production also is an important evidentiary source for many (but not necessarily all) tenure-track candidates. Teaching faculty may serve as principal investigators and engage in external research, but are not required to do so.

Summary of Evidence of Productivity: Associate and Teaching Professors

The SPR letter should state the name and institutional affiliation of each external reviewer, describe the reviewer’s qualifications, and explain why the SPR chose the reviewer to evaluate the candidate for promotion. Quotations from external letters typically provide the most compelling evidence of a candidate’s achievements. The redacted letter that is shared with candidates must omit all information that could reveal the identities of the external reviewers.

SPR letters may highlight and explain the candidate’s samples of curriculum development, course design, policy briefs, etc.

Summary of Evidence of Teaching: Tenure-track, WOT, and Teaching Faculty

Evidence of a candidate’s teaching ability can include (but is not limited to) letters from peer-reviewers in the College of Education, teaching evaluations from students, work with advisees, syllabi, leadership in creating and/or sustaining new programs, success in developing attractive on-

line courses, comments from student advisees, and work with the UW Center for Teaching and Learning. For the Teaching faculty ranks, evidence may be associated with professional development, curriculum/program design, mentorship, leadership within and outside the College of Education)

Summary of Evidence of Service: All ranks

Evidence of service can include (but is not limited to) the candidate's contributions to the College and the University. It also can include leadership in professional organizations and conferences and editorial service to professional journals. Service to the public at the local, state, national, and international levels is a compelling source of evidence for many College of Education faculty members.

Summary of Additional Evidence associated with Associate and Teaching Professors

Associate Teaching Professor is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline (Chapter 24-34B.3). While an Assistant Teaching Professor may elect to go up for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor at any time, we generally would expect to see at least five years of service as an Assistant Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file. Assistant Teaching Professor candidates who wish to be considered for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor will need to address these areas as outlined in the UW Faculty Code: *extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline.*

Teaching Professor is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in instruction is demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field (Chapter 24-34B.3). While an Associate Teaching Professor can elect to go up for promotion to Teaching Professor at any time, we generally expect to see at least five years of service as an Associate Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file. Associate Teaching Professor candidates who wish to be considered for promotion to Teaching Professor will need to address these areas as outlined in the UW Faculty Code: *exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field evidence of contributions inside and outside of the COE/UW.*

**APPENDIX G: ACKNOWLEDGING RECEIPT OF REDACTED REPORT FROM
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR PROMOTION REVIEW (SPR)**

Sample

College of Education

Candidate Name:

Current Rank:

Applicant for Promotion to: [Rank applied for]

Date:

On [date of meeting with Subcommittee for Promotion Review], I received a copy of the redacted summary Report from my Subcommittee for Promotion Review (SPR).

I acknowledge that, according to UW Faculty Code, I have had the opportunity to make a formal written response to the SPR's redacted report.

At this time:

_____ I have elected not to write a response to the redacted report from my SPR. I am returning this form to my SPR Chair, who will place it in my Promotion/Tenure file.

_____ I have prepared a written response to the redacted report from my SPR and have given my response to my SPR. My SPR Chair will place my response and this form in my Promotion/Tenure file.

**APPENDIX H: GUIDELINES FOR SUMMARIZNG FACULTY DISCUSSIONS
REGARDING PROMOTION/TENURE OF CANDIDATES**

**College of Education, University of Washington
Notes from Faculty Meeting Regarding Promotion and/or Tenure**

Members of FDS or designees appointed by the FDS Chair will take notes summarizing the discussion of each candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions must be omitted from the written summary.

Date of Meeting:

Candidate Name:

Name of Scribe/Note-taker:

Recommendation of the SPR:

Discussion of faculty members in attendance:

Strengths

Questions

Concerns

**** Note:** Because the faculty's review of candidates is separate from the CAC's review of candidates, faculty members who take notes during the faculty meeting should not be members of the CAC.

**APPENDIX I: ACKNOWLEDGING RECEIPT OF SUMMARY OF FACULTY MEETING
DISCUSSION**

Sample

College of Education

Candidate Name:

Current Rank:

Applicant for Promotion to: [Rank applied for]

Date:

On [date], I received a summary of the notes of the faculty's discussion about my promotion/tenure file, taken during the meeting of faculty members eligible to review my file.

I acknowledge that, according to UW Faculty Code, I have had the opportunity to make a formal written response to these summary notes.

At this time:

_____ I have elected not to write a response to the summary notes from the faculty meeting. I am returning this form to the Chair of the Faculty Development and Support committee (FDS) or his/her designee, who will place it in my Promotion/Tenure file.

_____ I have prepared a written response to the summary notes from the faculty meeting and have given my response to the Chair of the Faculty Development and Support committee (FDS) or his/her designee. The FDS Chair (or his/her designee) will place my response and this form in my Promotion/Tenure file.

APPENDIX J: GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING THE CAC REPORT

<p style="text-align: center;">College of Education Advisory Council (CAC) Report and Recommendation Regarding Promotion/Tenure</p>
--

Date of CAC Meeting:

Names of CAC Members:

Candidate's Name:

For Tenure-Track, WOT, and Research Candidates: Brief description of candidate's research (1-2 sentences)

For Teaching Faculty Candidates: Brief description of candidate's responsibilities (1-2 sentences)

Recommendation of the Subcommittee for Promotion and Tenure (SPR)

SPR's overall recommendation: Dr. ____'s Subcommittee for Promotion Review "strongly and unanimously recommends that Dr. ____ be promoted to Associate Professor/Professor with tenure..... Associate Teaching Professor/Teaching Professor"

Associate Professor or Full Professor

Candidate's Scholarship: "Drawing on the assessments of five external reviewers, the SPR concludes that Dr. ____'s scholarship..."

Candidate's Teaching + Advising: "As a teacher and advisor, Dr. ____ has excelled..."

Candidate's Service: "Dr. ____ also has an outstanding record of service..."

Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor (selected categories as appropriate to rank and position description - See Appendix F)

Candidate's Teaching + Advising: "As a teacher and advisor, Dr. ____ has excelled..."

Candidate's Service: "Dr. ____ also has an outstanding record of service..."

Candidate's Scholarship: "Drawing on the assessments of five external reviewers, the SPR concludes that Dr. ____'s scholarship..."

Other categories:

Assistant to Associate Teaching Professor: Extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline

Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor: Exemplary success in curriculum design and implementation, student mentoring and service, and leadership to the department, School/College, University, and the field

Summary of Notes from Faculty Discussion

Date of Faculty Meeting:

Faculty Discussion of Candidate's Scholarship:

Faculty Discussion of Candidate's Teaching + Advising:

Faculty Discussion of Candidate's Service:

Faculty Vote

Include number of professors by rank who were eligible to vote, number of professors who voted to support promotion/tenure, number of professors who voted against promotion/tenure, number of professors who abstained, number of professors who did not vote.

CAC Recommendation (adapted to position description and rank)

Example: "Dr. ____ has demonstrated an exceptionally strong record of teaching, scholarship, and service. External letters provide irrefutable support for promotion and tenure. Dr. ____'s SPR unanimously endorses her promotion and tenure. Dr. ____ received (percentage) of positive votes from the faculty. Based on this evidence, the Council unanimously recommends that Dr. ____ be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure."

Note: Because the CAC's recommendation is independent from the faculty's recommendation and also from the Dean's recommendation, it is possible that the CAC's recommendation may differ from that of the Dean and/or the faculty.

Appendix K: Promotion Guidelines for Teaching Faculty

All faculty at the University of Washington are expected to engage in teaching, scholarship and service. The promotion process offers an opportunity for individuals to demonstrate their contributions and impact in these areas as applicable to the role served. The following promotion criteria/guidelines have been developed to support teaching faculty candidates, review committee members and faculty when preparing for, reviewing and analyzing teaching faculty professorial rank promotion files.

Assistant Teaching Professor to Associate Teaching Professor

Appointment to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor requires a record of substantial success in teaching and extensive training, competence, and experience in the discipline (Section 24-34). Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor is a non-mandatory promotion. While an Assistant Teaching Professor may elect to go up for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor at any time, **we generally would expect to see at least five years of service as an Assistant Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file.**

Assistant Teaching Professor candidates who wish to be considered for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor will need to address these areas as outlined in the UW Faculty Code: extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline, and scholarship. Questions for candidates and their committees to consider in order to demonstrate this evidence are provided below. It is not expected that every candidate's file will include answers to each and every question.

- What are the particular knowledge and skills you possess in content or pedagogy and how do you leverage this knowledge and skills within your special instructional role?
- How do you influence teaching and learning within and outside the COE? How do you engage with your peers to improve teaching and learning? If applicable, what conference presentations have you delivered or led? What has been the impact of your peer engagement and/or conference presentations?
- How have your teaching and/or service contributions improved the educational experiences of COE students?
- What special competencies or experiences do you bring from your discipline? This may include work that you engaged in prior to joining the university. How have you utilized these experiences to deepen exploration of content or pedagogy within a program, area or college?

Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor

Appointment to the rank of Teaching Professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching and excellence in instruction as demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field. Promotion to Teaching Professor is a non-mandatory promotion. While an Associate Teaching Professor can elect to go up for promotion to Teaching Professor at any time, **we generally expect to see at least five years of service as an Associate Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file.**

Evidence of exemplary success may take many forms and the candidate will need to demonstrate evidence of contributions inside and outside of the COE/UW that show excellence in instruction as demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field (Section 24-34). Candidates will work with their committees to identify how their work has impacted students, the community and/or the field and address these areas in the personal statement/self-assessment letter and artifacts submitted for review.

While Associate Teaching Professors have many different roles in the COE that vary in their responsibilities, each person going up for Teaching Professor would address these areas as outlined in the UW Faculty Code: excellence in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership. Questions for candidates and their committees to consider in order to demonstrate exemplary success are provided below. It is not expected that every candidate's file will include each and every question.

- What evidence do you have to support excellence in instruction? What honors or awards have you received from within the college, university or field?
- What has been your exemplary impact on learning through teaching and preparing College of Education undergraduate and/or graduate students?
- What successes have you achieved in curriculum design and implementation?
- What innovative and effective pedagogies do you employ in your classes? How have you shared your knowledge of teaching and learning with other members of the college, university or other colleagues?
- What additional or exemplary service have you provided to the college or university beyond COE expectations? How have you been involved in mentoring or supporting peers within the COE or outside of the COE? What have been tangible outputs or outcomes from the service you have delivered?
- What exemplary student mentoring do you provide? If you prepare candidates for special roles, what percent of graduates are serving in those roles? Where are your graduates

serving? Who are your graduates serving? What evidence might you have that your graduates have a positive impact through their roles?

- If you are a program lead or director, what goals had you set for the program and how have you met or exceeded program goals? How have you influenced program design and development? How have your contributions improved program outputs or outcomes?
- What has been your impact on the field? What organizations have you participated in or led and what have been tangible outputs or outcomes from this work
- What community/district/state/national partnerships have you nurtured or led? What tangible outputs or outcomes have come from this work?
- If applicable, what research have you led or supported and how has that work been disseminated to the field? (websites, podcasts, conference papers, publications, etc.)

Teaching faculty scholarship

“Scholarship is an obligation of all faculty members” ([UW Faculty Code Section 24-32 A](#)).”

Teaching faculty may demonstrate their scholarship in a variety of ways ([Section 24-32](#)), including but not limited to: introduction of new knowledge or methods into course content; creation or use of innovative pedagogical methods; development of new courses, curricula, or course materials; participation in professional conferences; evidence of student performance; receipt of grants or awards; contributions to interdisciplinary teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations; or significant outreach to professionals at other educational institutions. While they may choose to do so through publication, **such publication shall not be required.**

For more information on Non-Tenure Professorial Teaching Faculty Rank Roles:
<https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/academic-titles-ranks/professorial/>
<http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#2434>

Link to Chapter 24 of the UW Faculty Code

<http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCGTOC.html>

Link to “Promotion and Tenure Overview” Document from UW Academic Human Resources

<https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/actions/promotions-tenure/>