

# Promotion, Tenure and Re-appointment for ladder-rank faculty

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. About this Document

This document outlines the framework for Promotion and/or Tenure in the College of Built Environments. The information provided in this document is intended to assist all participants (faculty, staff, and administrators) at various levels in the Promotion and/or Tenure process in the College of Built Environments. This document includes specific guidelines and requirements, and also general suggestions and recommendations regarding "best practices." This document also provides information about re-appointment procedures for Assistant Professors.

Policies and guidelines governing the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) process have been established at many different levels within the hierarchy of the University of Washington, from individual department-level criteria to the university-wide criteria described in the *University of Washington Handbook*. This multiplicity of policies and guidelines may occasionally be confusing. This website describes a comprehensive process, citing resources and reference material for each step. This website also describes the broader principles governing the Promotion and Tenure process, citing best practices and common pitfalls.

While re-appointment of Assistant Professors is governed by simpler policies and procedures, reappointment is an important step toward Promotion and Tenure. Therefore, this website also describes the re-appointment process in detail. Although re-appointment precedes consideration for Promotion and Tenure, the process for re-appointment in the College of Built Environments is modeled on the process for Promotion and Tenure; indeed, it may be considered preparation ("practice") for the faculty member's future Promotion and Tenure process. Therefore, the discussion of re-appointment follows the discussion of Promotion and Tenure.

This document is divided into several sections:

I. INTRODUCTION: The introductory section describes the purpose of this document, provides a broad overview of the Promotion and Tenure process, identifies important deadlines and recommended begin dates, and points to additional administrative and policy resources for further reading.

II. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA: The Standards and Criteria section describes the performance standards and some possible metrics that may be considered in evaluating Candidates for Promotion and Tenure within the College of Built Environments.

III. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: The Roles and Responsibilities section describes the Promotion and Tenure process from the vantage points of different process constituents, from the Candidate for Promotion to the Provost.

IV. PROCEDURES: The Procedures section provides important information about specific aspects of the process. This section cites source policy and recommendations in the University of Washington Handbook, the Academic Human Resources web pages, and elsewhere.

V. RE-APPOINTMENT: The Re-appointment section provides a complete discussion of the reappointment process in the College of Built Environments. This section explains how Departments should use re-appointment as a way to aid Assistant Professors in preparing for the Promotion and Tenure process.

The Appendix contains templates and instructional documents to provide more perspective on policies and procedures. The Attachments section includes boilerplate letters and instructional documents which illustrate some detail of the Promotion and Tenure process.

## B. Overview of Promotion and Tenure Process

This section describes the Promotion and Tenure Process in very broad terms. Later sections in this document provide more detail about participants' roles, exceptions, and other considerations.

### 1. Department-Level Procedures—Data Assembly:

No later than Spring Quarter, the Department Chair assembles a list of faculty who wish to be considered for Promotion and/or Tenure the following Autumn Quarter. Candidates are most often identified through self-selection, or because they are compelled to participate (mandatory consideration) in the Promotion and/or Tenure process in accordance with *UW Handbook*. Faculty may also nominate their colleagues if they believe consideration for Promotion and/or Tenure is warranted.

In each department an individual or a committee manages the evaluation process. Practices vary. The Chair may coordinate the evaluation processor the Chair may appoint a Review Committee or a senior faculty member to coordinate the process. Some departments have a standing committee to address Promotion and Tenure. In other departments the faculty senior to the Candidate(s) under consideration may function as a "committee of the whole." In cases where no Review Committee is appointed, the Chair, or a senior faculty member designated by the Chair, performs many of the functions of the Review Committee in managing the process and assembling the evaluation of the Candidate.

Once Candidates for Promotion and Tenure have been identified in Spring Quarter, the Chair typically meets with each Candidate. Attendees include the Chair, the head of the Review Committee if any, or the senior faculty member coordinating the review process if any, the Candidate, and any administrative personnel who may be involved in the Promotion and/or Tenure process. The purpose of this early meeting, typically held in Spring Quarter or very early in Summer Quarter prior to submittal of the Candidate's materials is to describe the process, identify roles, clarify the "time-line," begin to identify possible external peer reviewers, and initiate the departmental process.

The Review Committee or in cases where no Review Committee has been formed, the Chair or the designated senior faculty member communicates to all parties involved the "time-line" including deadlines and milestones for the data gathering and evaluation process, and ensures that the complete dossier is delivered to the College by the appropriate deadline.

The Candidate prepares two kinds of dossiers: Multiple "peer review packages" for external review, and a "complete career dossier" for internal review by the Department and College. The external peer review package includes a career narrative, a Curriculum Vitae, and all other supporting documentation, including representative publications, reports, portfolios, course materials, and all similar material as appropriate to the Candidate's particular case and individual department policy. The Candidate delivers the necessary copies, typically five to six copies of the peer review package depending on the Department, to be sent to reviewer. Early in the process, the Candidate also develops a list of potential external reviewers, and occasionally a brief list of individuals to be excluded as potential reviewers. The Candidate delivers this material to the Review Committee, or the Chair, or the designated senior faculty member.

The Chair and the Review Committee (or, if no Review Committee is established, the Chair and/or the designated senior faculty member) independently generate a list of external reviewers, then merges that list with the Candidate's reviewer suggestions to generate a final list of external reviewers, taking into consideration the Candidate's reviewer exclusion list.

The Review Committee, Chair, or designated senior faculty member--responsibility for this task varies by department--solicits written evaluations from external reviewers. A copy of the solicitation letter is added to the peer review package. All responses to the written solicitation are collected and added to the Candidate's complete career dossier (although they may be filed separately for confidentiality and security).

The Candidate prepares a complete career dossier for internal review including a career narrative, a curriculum vitae, and complete career documentation, including all publications--originals strongly preferred, reports, portfolios, course materials including standard university-approved teaching evaluations, and all similar material as appropriate to the Candidate's particular case. The Candidate delivers the complete career dossier, often several boxes of materials, to the Chair, the Review Committee, or the designated senior faculty member by the deadline established for the department-level evaluation to begin.

Collegial review of teaching, including collegial reviews conducted within one year of the date of application for promotion, is also required. In some departments the Candidate must submit a list of potential teaching peer reviewers. The Candidate delivers this list to the Chair, or the Review Committee, or the designated senior faculty member. The Review Committee, Chair, or designated senior faculty member solicits written evaluations of teaching performance from the teaching peer reviewers. A copy of the solicitation letter, and all responses become part of the Candidate's complete career dossier (although they may be filed separately for confidentiality and security). Some departments may have a regularly scheduled, standardized, process for collegial review of teaching; departments with such processes may submit the regular reviews, as long as a sufficient number of recent confidential collegial reviews of teaching are included.

## **2. Department-Level Procedures—Evaluation:**

**Faculty Review:** If a Review Committee is participating in the process, its members review the complete career dossier and prepare a written report on the Candidate's qualifications for Promotion and/or Tenure. The Review Committee Chair provides this report to the Department Chair, or the Review Committee Chair, or both, and meets with the Candidate. The Candidate must respond in writing within seven (7) days of the meeting. This report, and the Candidate's response, become part of the complete career dossier. If no Review Committee is involved, this step is omitted from the process.

If a majority of committee members vote not to recommend Promotion and the case in question is non-mandatory, the Candidate must decide, within seven (7) days of receipt of the summary, whether to continue the process. The Candidate must provide this decision to the Chair in writing. If the Candidate decides to discontinue the process, the Promotion and Tenure materials are returned to the Candidate by the department and no further action is taken. Mandatory Promotion and Tenure cases must proceed through subsequent levels of review, no matter what the Review Committee recommends.

Faculty members who are superior in rank to the Candidate meet to review the complete career dossier, discuss the Candidate's qualifications for Promotion and/or Tenure, and conduct a vote to recommend Promotion and/or Tenure. In some departments, the discussion of the Candidate's qualifications is initiated in one meeting with all faculty except the Candidate present, then time--often a week--is allowed for further review of the Candidate's materials by individual faculty, and the vote takes place at a second meeting limited to faculty senior in rank to the Candidate. If a Review Committee was formed, a representative of the Review Committee delivers the report on the Candidate's qualifications to the attendees at or near the beginning of the first meeting.

**Chair Review:** The Chair of the Department prepares a written summary of the faculty deliberations including the results of the vote. The Chair provides this summary to the Candidate, who must respond in writing within seven (7) days. This summary and the Candidate's response, are both added to the complete career dossier.

In cases where a majority of faculty members vote to deny Promotion and the case in question is not a mandatory one, the Candidate must decide within seven (7) days of receipt of the Chair's summary whether to continue the process. The Candidate must provide this decision to the Chair in writing. If the Candidate decides to discontinue the process, the Promotion and Tenure materials are kept on file--separate from the faculty member's personnel file--by the department, and no further action is taken. Mandatory Promotion and Tenure cases must proceed through subsequent levels of review.

(Note: A vote to postpone, for one year, consideration of a Mandatory Promotion and Tenure case, is possible in unusual cases. Such a vote should only be taken when the candidate clearly significant demonstrates progress

toward meeting the criteria for Promotion and Tenure and there is evidence that the candidate will fully meet the criteria established by the *University Handbook* if there is a delay of one year. Because the case is a mandatory one, it must proceed through every step in the process from the Department level, to the College and then to the Provost. For the postponement to be granted, the Dean and the Provost must concur.)

The Chair of the Department prepares a confidential memo to the Dean, summarizing the faculty deliberations, providing the chair's own assessment of the Candidate's qualifications, and the Chair's own recommendation concerning the case. This memo, and Minutes of the faculty meetings where the case was considered if the department customarily records Minutes is added to the complete career dossier.

### **3. Departmental Assembly and Transmittal of Dossier and copies of Key Documents:**

The "key documents" (see Part I, Section D, below) from the complete career dossier are those which will be included in the Promotion package that is forwarded to the Provost's Office. The department is responsible for making two copies of the key documents. One of these copies, the department's "file copy," is retained in the department. For security and confidentiality this file should be separate from the faculty member's regular personnel file. The original, including originals of all review letters received, and one complete copy of the key documents along with the complete career dossier, including all of the Candidate's publications, reports, portfolio, course records, teaching evaluations, etc.—usually one or more boxes of materials—are forwarded to the College of Built Environments Dean's Office.

### **4. College-Level Actions**

Associate Dean: From this point, the CBE Associate Dean for Academic Affairs supervises provision of the Candidate's complete career dossier to the College Council, and tracks the progress of each case through all subsequent levels of review.

College Council: The CBE College Council reviews the complete career dossier, discusses the Candidate's qualifications for Promotion and/or Tenure, and the procedures and metrics used by the department in evaluating the Candidate, and conducts a vote to recommend Promotion and/or Tenure. The College Council may interview the Department Chair as part of the deliberation process, but this interview is not required. The deliberation process and vote are documented in a confidential memo which is submitted to the Dean. This memo becomes part of the complete career dossier; multiple copies are made and included in the file of key documents.

Dean: The Dean reviews the complete career dossier, the report of the Review Committee (if any), the report of the Chair, and report of the College Council. In considering the Candidate's qualifications for Promotion, the Dean may solicit the opinions and advice of other parties. The Dean documents his or her independent evaluation and recommendation in a memo to the Provost.

In cases where the Dean's recommendation is to deny Promotion and/or Tenure, the Dean will meet with the Department Chair and Candidate to discuss his/her expectations and the likely outcome of the review process, such as denial of Promotion and/or Tenure, extension, or some other outcome. The Dean summarizes this discussion in writing after the meeting.

The Promotion package, made up of the Dean's Memo, College Council Memo, and the key documents from the dossier, is forwarded to the Academic Human Resources office. Two sets of documents are forwarded: one set of forwarded documents must include the originals with original ink signatures of all letters, review reports, etc.; the second set will be a complete copy.

### **5. University-Level Actions**

Academic Human Resources: The Academic Human Resources office coordinates review of the case by the Vice Provost of Academic Personnel and the Provost.

Vice Provost/Provost: The Vice Provost of Academic Personnel or the Provost may request additional information from the Department or the College.

Once the Promotion package has been reviewed, and a decision reached, the Provost sends a letter to the Dean reporting on his/her decision. The Dean then notifies the Chair and Candidate of the outcome.

President: If the decision is positive, the Candidate will also receive a letter from the President during Spring Quarter. If the decision is negative, the Dean will provide a letter to the Candidate describing the decision, and any further actions or outcomes resulting from the decision, such as option to resubmit the dossier during the following year, granting a final year of employment, or some other action.

## C. Key Dates and Deadlines in Promotion and Tenure Process

The *University of Washington Handbook* suggests that a faculty member may seek consideration for Promotion at any time. However, the step-by-step process of creating the Promotion submission and obtaining required reviews at each level—Department, College, University—necessitates that the Promotion and Tenure be governed by an annual calendar beginning no later than Spring Quarter of the academic year prior to the year in which the applicant wishes to be considered. Dates and deadlines are as follows:

**March 1 to March 15:** College of Built Environments Dean's Office generates a list of faculty members who will be in their mandatory Promotion year as of the following Academic Year. This list is distributed only to Department Chairs whose departments include mandatory cases.

**March 25 to April 10:** Departments poll faculty for non-mandatory cases for the following Academic Year.

April-early-September: Candidates and departments begin the information gathering process, including peer review package preparation and complete career dossier preparation, identification of external evaluators (for mandatory cases, provide names by July 1), and solicitation and receipt of evaluation letters. Peer review packages for mandatory cases should be available to be sent to external reviewers no later than 20 August.

**Mid-September – October 22:** Review Committee report finalized and faculty vote conducted for mandatory cases. Chair meets with Candidates, completes confidential memo to Dean for all mandatory cases. Departments generate list of non-mandatory cases to be put forward for Promotion.

**October 22 Deadline:** Complete career dossiers and required copies of key documents for mandatory cases are due to the College of Built Environments Dean's Office.

**December 15 Deadline:** Promotion packages for mandatory cases, including Dean's recommendation, are due to the Provost, via Academic Human Resources.

**November – December 22:** Review Committee report finalized and faculty vote conducted for non-mandatory cases. Chair meets with Candidates, completes confidential memo to Dean for all non-mandatory cases.

**December 22 Deadline:** Complete career dossiers and required copies of key documents for non-mandatory cases are due to the College of Built Environments Dean's Office.

**February 1 Deadline:** Promotion packages for non-mandatory cases, including Dean's recommendation, are due to the Provost, via Academic Human Resources.

NOTE: Review of *new appointments* to the rank of Associate Professor, Professor, Research Associate Professor or Research Professor may occur at any time during the Academic Year.

## **D. Summary of Promotion and Tenure Documentation**

### **1. Documentation forwarded by Departments to Dean's Office**

- a. Key documents included in the Promotion Package to be sent to the Provost's Office consist of:
- Chair's letter of recommendation
  - Concurrence of adjunct appointment; and/or joint appointment as applicable
  - Candidate's written statement/response to faculty vote
  - Minutes of Faculty Meeting(s), or official record of voting
  - Report of Review Committee, if department Review initiated by Committee
  - Career Narrative
  - Curriculum vitae
  - Letters from external reviewers, including short Curriculum Vitae of each
  - Sample of letter sent to external reviewers (recommended, not strictly required)
  - Letters from internal reviewers/teaching peers, or other evidence of collegial peer review of teaching
  - Student teaching evaluation tabulation sheets (not required for Research appointments)
- b. Additional documents to be submitted by Departments are the Candidate's complete career dossier, including all publications, reports, portfolio, course materials, evidence of teaching performance, etc., as appropriate to the Candidate's particular case.

### **2. Documents College Council will review**

College Council reviews all of the key documents included in the Promotion Package plus the Candidate's complete career dossier, including all publications, reports, portfolio, course materials, evidence of teaching performance, etc., as appropriate to the Candidate's particular case.

## **E. Resources and Information**

Promotion and Tenure cases are reviewed in succession at the Department level, College level, and the University level.

Department-level policies and administrative resources are beyond the scope of this document; Chairs should ensure that these policies and administrative resources are clearly identified and available to the faculty.

This website is the primary source of information provided by the College of Built Environments. Individuals with questions should contact the CBE Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

### **University Resources**

University of Washington Handbook

<http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsenate/handbook/handbook.html>

Voting Membership in the Faculty (vol. 2, ch. 21, sec. 21-32)

Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members (vol. 2, ch. 24)

Tenure of the Faculty (vol. 2, ch. 25)

<http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsenate/handbook/Volume2.html>

Academic Human Resources

Promotion and Tenure Voting

<http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/admin/voting.html>

Position Descriptions (by title)

[http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/jcc\\_rank.html](http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/jcc_rank.html)

## II. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

### A. Expectations for Creative Achievement by CBE Faculty

The goal of the College of Built Environments is excellence in creative achievement by its faculty. The term used in the *University of Washington Handbook* is "research"; however, as defined in the *Handbook*, "research" is broadly construed including funded and unfunded research, scholarly inquiry, and creative activities of all kinds (see below). Accordingly, excellence is the principal requirement for Promotion and Tenure in the College.

Excellence within the College of Built Environments may be achieved in many different ways. The College is a broad and inclusive unit that recognizes that the strength of its professional and academic programs, and of the College as a whole, depends on an intellectually engaged faculty who successfully pursue diverse career paths, and academic and professional activities. It is the responsibility of individual faculty members to identify and pursue their particular career directions, with the achievement of excellence as the measure of success.

According to the *University of Washington Handbook* (vol. 2, ch. 24, sec. 24-34):

"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."

"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."

All Promotions in the College of Built Environments are considered against a standard of excellence, but the variety of the departments, and sub-disciplines within departments, means that there will be differences between Promotion cases for a given rank. This is inevitable for several reasons. There is the obvious problem of comparing accomplishments in one sub-discipline in the College with those in another, for example landscape architectural history, construction engineering, design computing, and professional practice of urban design. There are also significant publication differences among these fields. Some sub-disciplines have a tradition of publishing full-length synthetic works (books in architectural history, for example), while others place great importance on peer-reviewed conference publication (as in design computing, for example). Other conditions, such as the relative balance between applied and theoretical work especially for those involved in professional practice, the availability of funding, involvement in doctoral education, etc., influence the career development of faculty in the College in different ways.

Fortunately, the *University of Washington Handbook* construes the term "research" very broadly to include creative achievements of all kinds. The *Handbook* makes this clear (vol. 2, ch. 24, sec. 2432):

"The creative function of a university requires faculty devoted to inquiry and research, whose attainment may be in the realm of scholarly investigation, in constructive contributions in professional fields, or in the creative arts, such as musical composition, creative writing, or original design in engineering or architecture. While numbers (publications, grant dollars, students) provide some measure of such accomplishment, more important is the quality of the faculty member's published or other creative work.

"Important elements in evaluating the scholarly ability and attainments of faculty members include the range and variety of their intellectual interests; the receipt of grants, awards, and fellowships; the professional and/or public impact of their work; and their success in directing productive work by advanced students and in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods. Other important elements of scholarly achievement include involvement in and contributions to interdisciplinary research and teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations, and in the editing of professional journals; the judgment of professional colleagues; and membership on boards and committees."

Though there are differences between disciplines and sub-disciplines, the criteria for evaluation and the measures of success in scholarship are consistent within a discipline or sub-discipline. Accordingly, the College of Built Environments defines excellence in research with respect to the criteria used and standards of excellence applied by the best departments in the Candidate's discipline or sub-discipline. Thus, a Candidate's career accomplishments are measured in comparison to those of his/her peers.

In an academic career that will typically last for several decades, excellence in creative achievement can also be measured in terms of sustained commitment to high quality achievement. Not only should the Candidate's current achievements be considered, but an assessment of whether the Candidate will continue to be productive in the future should be addressed. This consideration is especially important in the case of Tenure, but it should be assessed for all Promotion cases.

When departments consider Candidates for Promotion, they should apply the criteria and standards of excellence of the best departments in their discipline, and make evaluations based on the standard of excellence as established by leading peers in the Candidate's sub-discipline. Evidence of the impact and influence of the Candidate's creative work should be identified, as should instances of distinction based on peer evaluation. External letters of evaluation or "peer review letters" should be sought from leaders in the field capable of independently assessing the Candidate's accomplishments against the standard of excellence. The department should also assess the Candidate's "career trajectory" and the likelihood the Candidate will continue to be a productive scholar after the Promotion.

## **B. Expectations for Achievement in Teaching by CBE Faculty**

Parallel to the goal of excellence in creative achievement among the faculty, the College of Built Environments has also set the goal of excellence in teaching. In considering the creative achievement of faculty, the criteria and standards for teaching are intended to encourage faculty to do their jobs well, and to provide a framework for acknowledging the accomplishments in teaching appropriate to university faculty. The accumulation of a record of excellence in teaching is a constructive process parallel to building a strong record in creative work.

### **1. Scope of Teaching**

Just as the *University of Washington Handbook* construes the term "research" very broadly to include creative achievements of all kinds, the *Handbook* recognizes the broad scope of activities involved in teaching, and a variety of methods that may be used to evaluate teaching (vol. 2, ch. 24, sec. 24-32):

"The scope of faculty teaching is broader than conventional classroom instruction; it comprises a variety of teaching formats and media, including undergraduate and graduate instruction for matriculated students, and special training or educational outreach. The educational function of a university requires faculty who can teach effectively. Instruction must be judged according to its essential purposes and the conditions which they impose. Some elements in assessing effective teaching include the ability to organize and conduct a course of study appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter; the consistency with which the teacher brings to the students the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline; the ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments; the extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate which enables the students to articulate the ideas they are exploring; the availability of the teacher to the student beyond the classroom environment; and the regularity with which the teacher examines or reexamines the organization and readings for a course of study and explores new approaches to effective educational methods. A major activity related to teaching is the instructor's participation in academic advising and counseling, whether this takes the form of assisting students to select courses or discussing the students' long-range goals. The assessment of teaching effectiveness shall include student and faculty evaluation. Where possible, measures of student achievements in terms of their academic and professional careers, life skills, and citizenship should be considered."

Within the College of Built Environments faculty teaching efforts may be conceptually divided into the following categories: (1) classroom instruction, including lecture, seminar and similar teaching; (2) studio instruction, including both on-site and off-site studios as well as design/build; and (3) individual instruction in the forms of thesis supervision, independent study, special projects and the like. While the primary emphasis in this section is on classroom and studio teaching, this should not be interpreted as a disregard for individual instruction. The nature of individual instruction is such that it is more difficult to evaluate in isolation. A complete record of teaching performance must include a record of individual instruction such as thesis supervision, independent study, special projects and the like, and if possible, information that demonstrates the quality of the training received by individual students in these contexts. However, this section primarily focuses on classroom instruction and studio instruction grouped under the term “course instruction.”

Excellence in teaching should be measured by its “effectiveness.” Is the faculty member an “effective” teacher? As with research/creative achievement, the interpretation of achievement in teaching will be made by those making the evaluation—department faculty, Department Chair, College Council, Dean and Provost.

The College of Built Environments expects all faculty to engage in continuing efforts to improve their teaching performance through improvements in the presentation of individual courses. Improvements may include modernizing/updating the curricula and content of courses, updating/modernizing the teaching methods used in courses, and, as appropriate, the offering of new courses. Because faculty will, for the most part, teach many of the same courses year-after-year, or will teach similar courses year-after-year, the expectation of excellence in teaching will be measured in part in terms of improving performance especially in the early years of teaching, and consistency of performance throughout the teaching career. Accumulation of a consistent record of effectiveness in individual courses will require a process of curricular modification, modernization, and innovation. Overall, the level of achievement should be improving or consistently high; however, the process of trying new directions and methods may involve occasional missteps and corrections. Thus, it is normal that in any faculty teaching record there will be some anomalies that represent unsuccessful changes. Such anomalies are not cause for concern when measured against a backdrop of otherwise effective teaching created by the overall record.

Although determinations of faculty teaching assignments rest with the Chair of each Department, it is expected that departments in the College of Built Environments will regularize the teaching assignments of new faculty within no more than a year or two after arrival at the University of Washington. For each faculty member to build a record of improvement and a consistent record of effectiveness in teaching, it is essential that each faculty member have relatively regular annual teaching assignments, especially as they approach consideration for Promotion and Tenure.

## **2. Assessing Teaching Effectiveness**

There are multiple measures of teaching effectiveness. The University of Washington requires both student evaluations of teaching and collegial evaluations of teaching. Given the breadth of the scope of teaching as described in the *University Handbook*, no list of evaluation tools for teaching can be complete. Within the framework of the College of Built Environments, some measures of teaching performance have routinely been used. The following discussion addresses some of the most common ways in which teaching effectiveness has been evaluated, but it is not an exhaustive list. Candidates seeking Promotion should submit a variety of evidence of teaching effectiveness to allow the fairest possible evaluation of teaching performance.

University of Washington Student Course Evaluations: Standard UW student course evaluations are a significant source of data for the teaching evaluation procedure and must be included in Promotion and Tenure dossiers in the College of Built Environments. Student evaluations are by their nature limited to an evaluation of classroom performance. Because many factors outside the instructor’s control, such as class size or required vs. elective, can have a significant effect on student evaluation ratings, responsible interpretation of student evaluation ratings must consider such factors. Similarly, because evaluations for an individual course can be effected by factors not relevant to the teaching evaluation process, a single course evaluation cannot provide reliable information. Despite these limitations, student evaluations of a number of courses, when considered as a group, can provide useful information: the larger the number of evaluations provided, the more complete the picture of teaching effectiveness is likely to be.

However, such evaluations must not be considered alone, but should be considered together with other demonstrations of teaching performance.

The decision of how many courses should be evaluated using standard UW course evaluations is made at the departmental level. Faculty in several departments in the College of Built Environments have voted that all courses taught in their department should be evaluated using standard UW course evaluation forms. Evaluation of all courses using standard forms gives the most complete picture of teaching effectiveness that can be achieved using these forms.

Candidates for Promotion in the College of Built Environments must submit a complete set of copies of all of the numerical summary forms provided to the faculty member by the University of Washington Office of Educational Assessment. These forms may be accompanied by a selection of copies of the individual student (yellow) comment sheets. (A complete set of copies of all individual student comment sheets for all courses taught need not be submitted.) Numerical forms and sample yellow sheets may also be components of course portfolios, as described below.

Student course evaluations should always be considered in the context of other evidence of teaching performance. Especially in the case of studio courses, experience has shown that the best student work may not always be produced in the studios that receive the highest numerical evaluations on the student course evaluation forms.

**Course Portfolios:** Candidates for Promotion in the College of Built Environments should include a complete “course portfolio,” representing the most recent version of each course regularly taught, as part of their complete career dossier. The contents of the course portfolio should be determined by the faculty member, but will typically include at least the following: syllabi, reading lists, assignments, tests, and samples of student work—copies of papers, studio projects, etc. For courses that have web sites with daily sets of images as in history lecture courses for example, a web address and password should be provided. Evidence of teaching evaluation should also be part of each course portfolio. Ideally course portfolios will be organized in a way that makes them easily accessible for review—one typical approach in the College of Built Environments has been to submit a loose-leaf notebook for each course with the different sections divided by pages with tabs.

Candidates may also submit complete “course portfolios,” representing courses taught only occasionally, as part of their complete career dossier. However, it is not necessary to submit such a course portfolio for every course.

Course portfolios containing samples of student work are especially important for studio faculty. Because studio courses with the identical course name and number may be quite different from one year to the next, faculty who teach studios should use their judgment relative to deciding which studios and how many studios to represent in course portfolios. The advice of the department Chair and/or senior faculty may be useful in this regard.

**Individual Student Teaching:** Candidates for Promotion in the College of Built Environments should include a record of individual student instruction if this is part of their teaching as part of the Curriculum Vitae, and should discuss individual instruction in the Career Narrative. Representative products of individual instruction, such as dissertations and theses completed under the Candidate’s supervision, independent projects completed under the Candidate’s supervision, and similar projects should be submitted as part of the complete career dossier.

**Advising and Counseling:** The *University Handbook* includes “participation in academic advising and counseling” as part of its discussion of the scope of teaching. A faculty member who plays a role in advising and counseling, as well as assisting students to select courses or discussing the students’ long-range goals should discuss this activity in the Career Narrative section addressing teaching, and list this activity on the Curriculum Vitae under teaching.

**Peer Reviews of Teaching:** Collegial reviews of teaching are another important source of information regarding teaching performance. Recent collegial peer review of teaching is a requirement under the *University of Washington Handbook*. (University of Washington policy states that collegial review of teaching by Assistant Professors should take place annually; collegial review of teaching by Associate and full Professors should take place at least every

three years.) Peer review of teaching may consist of review of course materials or course portfolios, review of classroom performance, and/or review of student work produced or other student performance in the Candidate's courses. Ideally all appropriate methods of peer review of teaching will be applied to provide a full and balanced appraisal of teaching performance.

The diversity of course and programs in the College of Built Environments makes it impossible to require one particular method of collegial evaluation of teaching to produce the required report on teaching effectiveness that is part of the documentation for Promotion and/or Tenure. Practices vary by department. Some departments solicit teaching peer review letters from a list of faculty and others as appropriate, and include these as part of the complete career dossier. Other departments include course materials in the external peer review packages, and ask external peers to comment, then supplement these comments with the record of departmental mentoring and regular teaching reviews. Other departments may have other methods. In any case, each department must develop a method of evaluating teaching and must use the same method(s) for all evaluations so that uniform standards are applied in that department. The Chair of the department should not have sole responsibility for conducting the evaluation, and evaluators need not all be senior faculty. A record of recent peer evaluation of teaching must be included in the Department's review of each Candidate for Promotion or Promotion and Tenure, and this record must be presented in some form in the complete career dossier submitted to the Dean's Office and in the Promotion package sent forward to the Provost's Office.

A useful reference is the booklet "Evaluating Teaching," available from the Center for Instructional Development and Research.

## **C. Service Criteria**

Service is work performed primarily in the role of a representative of the department, College, University, or a professional or community organization, rather than for the individual credit of the faculty member. A faculty member's primary service responsibilities are those duties agreed to at the departmental level. Such duties may include membership on department, College, and University committees, as well as involvement in organizations outside the University and other forms of academic and professional administration.

Service is not listed in the *University Handbook* among the criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor or to full Professor. Thus, no Promotion case at any level can be built with service as its central pillar. Nonetheless, service is essential to the department, College and University and to the larger communities, particularly the professional communities that are stakeholders in the disciplines and departments of the College. It is the responsibility of every faculty member to share equitably in service duties during their academic careers. However, it is common and acceptable for departments to limit the service duties of junior faculty until they have established their research and teaching programs.

Promotion at any level will normally require the demonstration of "satisfactory" levels of service. The definition of "satisfactory" must be imprecise as it will depend on the stage of the faculty member's career, as well as the specific circumstances in each department, and relationships to communities external to the department, College, and University.

While service contributions of Candidates for Promotion to Associate Professor may necessarily be limited, Promotion to full Professor will normally require the demonstration of satisfactory service contributions—that is, service that roughly corresponds to the competent execution of the faculty member's fair share of the various committee and other administrative tasks required for the department and College to operate.

Because the College of Built Environments is composed of departments with accredited professional programs and with relationships to external professional communities with recognized professional organizations, outstanding professional service may be a measure of "recognition" as required in the criteria for Promotion to the rank of Professor.

As with the other components of Promotion cases, outstanding service at this level may be taken into account when comparing research and teaching accomplishments to Candidates with weaker service records. However, while inadequate service may, on its own, be enough to postpone or prevent Promotion to full Professor, outstanding service, on its own, will in no case, be sufficient grounds for Promotion.

A Candidate for Promotion must provide a record of service in the Career Narrative and Curriculum Vitae.

### III. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN TENURE AND PROMOTION

#### A. General responsibilities and roles

1. From the time an Assistant Professor joins a department faculty, the Chair, senior faculty, and the head of Promotion and Tenure Committee, if such a committee exists in the Department, should help the Assistant Professor to identify issues and aid the Assistant Professor in addressing them. Candid assessments at an early date are critical so that the evaluation at the time of a Promotion and Tenure decision will be easier and fairer. Similar assessments and assistance should be available to Associate Professors.
2. Mentoring of junior faculty is a significant responsibility of each Department Chair, and all senior faculty. Each department should have procedures established to assure that the Chair and the faculty carry out this responsibility consistently and successfully.
3. Meetings with Chair:
  - a. Annual meetings between each Assistant Professor and the Chair of the Department are required by the *University Handbook*. These meetings should be used for frank discussions of progress towards Promotion and Tenure, problems, and where an Assistant Professor can receive additional assistance if needed. Written documentation of these meetings is required by the *University Handbook*. One focus of such meetings should be the review of the Candidate's annually updated career narrative and curriculum vitae.
  - b. Bi-annual meetings between each Associate Professor and the Chair of the Department are required by the *University Handbook*. These meetings should be used for frank discussions of progress towards Promotion, problems, and where an Associate Professor can receive additional assistance if needed. Written documentation of these meetings is required by the *University Handbook*.
4. The process of re-appointment of an Assistant Professor to a second contract is an opportunity for the Assistant Professor to prepare written documents similar to those which will be required for Promotion and Tenure, and to set forth a "plan" to achieve the necessary level of "substantial success" in teaching and research as required by the *University Handbook* for Promotion and Tenure. Re-appointment is an opportunity for senior faculty in the Department to review progress and to make suggestions for adjustments to the Assistant Professor's "plan." (A thorough discussion of re-appointment is found in Section V of this document.)

#### B. Candidate's Responsibilities

1. Notifies Chair of intent to pursue Promotion and/or Tenure (non-mandatory cases only).
2. Provides Chair or designated senior faculty member or Review Committee with list of potential external reviewers--five or more external reviewers should be identified. Provides Chair or designated senior faculty member or Review Committee with short list of reviewers to exclude due to conflict of interest.
3. Prepares the "peer review package" including complete career narrative, complete curriculum vitae, other supporting documentation, and examples of creative work to be sent to external peers for review. Prepares five (5) or six (6) copies of the package (exact number depends on Department).
4. Provides Chair or designated senior faculty member or Review Committee with list of potential teaching peer reviewers--five or more teaching peer reviewers should be identified--if the Department's policy is to use separate teaching peer reviewers as part of the teaching evaluation process.
5. Prepares the "complete career dossier" for internal review including a complete career narrative, a complete

curriculum vitae, and complete career documentation, including all publications (originals strongly preferred), reports, portfolios, course materials, and all similar material as appropriate to the Candidate's particular case.

6. Reviews and responds (within 7 days) in writing to Review Committee Report, if any.
7. Reviews and responds (within 7 days) in writing to Chair's Summary of Faculty Deliberations.

### **C. Chair's Responsibilities**

1. Ensures that he/she and the department faculty are familiar with the rules and guidelines for Promotion and Tenure.
2. Holds annual meeting with each Assistant Professor; holds bi-annual meetings with each Associate Professor.
3. Verifies that required collegial reviews of teaching are taking place (annual reviews for Assistant Professors; reviews at least every three years for Associate and full Professors).
4. Assembles lists of mandatory and non-mandatory Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure. Provides copies of lists to College of Built Environments Dean's Office.
5. Convenes introductory meeting with each Candidate, including Review Committee chair if any or designated senior faculty member if any, and any others involved in Promotion and Tenure processes.
6. Oversees data gathering and department evaluation process.
7. Provides written summary of Review Committee deliberation if a Committee was involved to Candidate, and solicits Candidate response (within 7 days).
8. Organizes faculty deliberations and faculty vote.
9. Provides written summary of faculty deliberation and vote to Candidate, and solicits Candidate response (within 7 days).
10. Writes letter/memo to Dean summarizing the faculty evaluation, recording the faculty vote, and providing an independent assessment of the Candidate's qualifications for Promotion/Tenure.
11. Assures that the complete career dossier is assembled. Makes two copies of key documents. Transmits original and one copy of key documents to Dean's Office along with complete career dossier. Retains one copy of key documents in secure location in Department.
12. In cases where no department review committee exists, and no senior faculty member has been designated to coordinate the review, performs all duties of review committee and/or senior faculty member except the generation of committee report.

### **D. Review Committee Responsibilities**

Note: The following list of responsibilities is approximate. All Departments must carry out these responsibilities, but the precise allocation of responsibilities among the Chair, the Review Committee, if any, or the designated senior faculty member, if any, is determined within the Department.

1. Reviews and advises Candidate on career narrative and curriculum vitae, and on contents of "peer review packages" and "complete career dossier."

2. Manages communication with and concurrence from joint appointing department, if any.

3. Working with the Department Chair establishes a list of external reviewers (“blind” reviewers — that is, those reviewers unknown to the Candidate), and chooses external peer reviewers based on this list and the Candidate’s lists of potential reviewers, and reviewers to exclude. Selects four or five reviewers, and a fifth or sixth alternate reviewer in case one reviewer is unable to perform review.

Note: The Provost requires three to five external peer reviews. Experience has shown it is to the benefit of the Candidate to have more review letters rather than fewer. Most CBE Departments seek five external review letters; however, in at least one CBE department the norm is four external letters. Note: All review letters received must be forwarded.

4. Works with Chair or independently depending on Departmental custom, solicits written evaluations from external reviewers. A copy of this solicitation letter is added to the dossier (although they may be filed separately for confidentiality and security). Also requests short Curriculum Vitae or career summary from each external reviewer.

5. Works with Chair or independently depending on Departmental custom, solicits written evaluations from teaching peer reviewers, if teaching peer review letters are a part of the Department’s teaching evaluation process. A copy of this solicitation letter is added to the dossier.

6. Assembles all external peer review letters, and all teaching peer review letters, if any, and includes in complete career dossier (although they may be filed separately for confidentiality and security).

7. Generates a report of the Candidate’s qualifications for Promotion and/or Tenure, including votes by secret ballot on recommendations. Shares this report with the Department Chair. Depending on department custom, the Department Chair, head of the Review Committee or senior faculty member coordinating the review, shares a copy of the Committee Report with the Candidate, and solicits a Candidate response within seven (7) days of delivery. A copy of this report, and the Candidate response are added to the complete career dossier.

8. Delivers report on Candidate qualifications to the attendees of the faculty meetings to review and to vote on Candidate’s Promotion and/or Tenure.

## **E. Department Faculty**

1. Department Faculty who are superior in rank to the Candidate participate in mentoring and advising faculty who are junior to them.

2. Depending upon department policy, faculty superior in rank to the Candidate may assist in generating list of external peer reviewers.

3. Depending on department policy, faculty may serve as teaching peer reviewers and prepare teaching peer review letters or other teaching evaluation reports.

4. Department Faculty who are superior in rank to the Candidate review the complete career dossier in detail to prepare for discussion of the Candidate, and vote on Promotion and Tenure, or Promotion.

5. Department Faculty who are superior in rank meet to discuss the Candidate’s qualifications, and vote (by secret ballot) whether to recommend Candidate for Promotion and Tenure, or Promotion.

(Note: A vote to postpone, for one year, consideration of a Mandatory Promotion and Tenure case, is possible in unusual cases. Such a vote should only be taken when the candidate clearly significant demonstrates progress toward meeting the criteria for Promotion and Tenure and there is evidence that the candidate will fully meet the criteria established by the *University Handbook* if there is a delay of one year. Because the case is a mandatory one, it must proceed through every step in the process from the Department level, to the College and then to the Provost. For the postponement to be granted, the Dean and the Provost must concur.)

6. May serve additional roles and functions, depending upon departmental policy.

## **F. CBE College Council**

1. Reviews the complete career dossier, including materials submitted by the Candidate, all review letters, Review Committee report (if any), Faculty Meeting Minutes (if any), Chair's letter/memo, Candidate's response(s) for each Candidate for Promotion and Tenure, or Promotion.
2. Reviews procedures used by Department. Discusses the Candidate's qualifications for Promotion and/or Tenure. May interview the Department Chair as part of the deliberation process.
3. Conducts a vote by secret ballot supporting or differing from Department faculty action.
4. Prepares a confidential memo that summarizes deliberation and vote, and submits this memo to the Dean.

## **G. CBE Dean**

1. Reviews the complete career dossier, including the Chair's memo and the College Council memo.
2. May solicit the opinions and advice of other parties.
3. Prepares as a memo a confidential assessment and recommendation to the Provost.
4. In cases where the Dean's recommendation is to deny Promotion and/or Tenure, meets with the Department Chair and Candidate to share his/her expectations, and discuss the likely outcome of the review process, for example; denial of Promotion and/or Tenure, extension, or some other outcome. This meeting is summarized in a confidential memo to the Chair and Candidate. If the case is non-mandatory, and the recommendation of the Dean is negative, the process ends at this point and it is not sent to the Provost's Office. If the case is mandatory, it is sent forward even if the Dean's recommendation is to deny Promotion and Tenure.
5. Submits Promotion package to Provost's Office, unless Dean's recommendation is to deny, and the case is non-mandatory.
6. Notifies Chair and Candidate of the final decision of the Provost and any further actions or outcomes of this decision.

## **H. UW Provost and President**

1. Reviews the Promotion package forwarded by the CBE Dean's Office, including Chair's memo, College Council memo, and Dean's memo and departmentally generated key documents.
2. May request additional information from the College or the Department.
3. Notifies the Dean of his/her decision with regard to Promotion and/or Tenure.

## IV. PROCEDURES AND CHECKLISTS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

### A. Organizing the Process

The Department Chair is ultimately responsible for organizing and overseeing the overall department-level Promotion and Tenure, or Promotion processes, including data gathering, evaluation, and submitting the final complete career dossier with all reports and evaluations to the College of Built Environments Dean's Office. In some Departments, elements of this responsibility are delegated to departmental Review Committee, and/or shared with a senior faculty member who may take responsibility for coordinating the process. Because of variations in the distribution of responsibility, it is difficult to describe precisely the roles of all of the above-named participants in this document. Departments are encouraged to document their specific processes in writing and to share these processes with Candidates at the beginning of each new Promotion and Tenure process.

An initial meeting held in Spring Quarter with each Candidate for Promotion and/or Promotion and Tenure the following Autumn should include the following elements:

1. Review of Department Promotion and Tenure Review Criteria. Ideally, of course, the Department criteria should be given to new Assistant Professors in their first quarter of employment in the Department.
2. A timeline, including milestones and intermediate deadlines for data gathering, evaluation, and submission of peer review packages and complete career dossier.
3. A list of participants in the Promotion and Tenure process, including the Review Committee Chair, if the Department has such a Committee, or the senior faculty member who will coordinate the process, if the Department Chair delegates day-to-day responsibility for the process to a senior faculty member, and a description of the role of each participant.
4. A list of relevant College and University policies and resources.

### B. Identifying Candidates for Promotion and Tenure: Chair's Role

Candidates, or faculty members for whom some personnel action will be evaluated by the College Council, the Dean, and the Provost, are typically identified by departments. In general there are four groups of Candidates to be considered:

1. Mandatory Promotion and Tenure cases consist of Assistant Professors and Mandatory Promotion cases consist of Research Assistant Professors who have entered into their mandatory Promotion year. The period of time between a faculty member's appointment and mandatory year is usually, but not always, six years. This period of time is often called the "Tenure clock," a phrase which can be misleading when applied to Research Assistant Professors, who cannot attain Tenure. The policy which dictates this duration is located in the *University of Washington Handbook* (Volume 2, Chapter 24, Section 24-41, Section B for policy on Assistant Professors, and Section G for policy on Research Assistant Professors).

A faculty member's "Tenure clock" may in exceptional circumstances extend beyond a period of six years. In some cases the extension of the Tenure clock happens automatically, and in some cases the extension must be requested. These exceptional circumstances are described below:

- 1a. The faculty member's appointment began after the half-way point of the Academic Year. Assistant Professors who begin an appointment on or after December 17, and Research Assistant Professors who begin their appointment on or after January 2 will have this first partial appointment year automatically waived. Their Tenure clock will automatically begin with the following Academic Year.

1b. The faculty member took six months or more of medical or family leave in a given Academic Year, or the faculty member became a parent, or other family care responsibilities have interrupted a faculty member's dedication to teaching or scholarship. In any of these cases, the faculty member may request extension of his or her Tenure clock. Note: The extension is not automatic, but must be requested — the request should be made at the time of the medical leave, the birth or adoption of a child, or other interruption due to family circumstances. Requests must be made in writing, typically in the form of a letter explaining the basis for the request.

1c. An Assistant Professor worked less than 90% Full-Time-Equivalent (FTE). Assistant Professors who work greater than 50% FTE and less than 90% FTE will have their Tenure clock automatically extended an additional one to three years. (More information on the underlying policy can be found at: [http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/wp/Assistant\\_Professor.html](http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/wp/Assistant_Professor.html). This rule also applies to research-track faculty.)

1d. Circumstances beyond the faculty member's control interrupted or delayed the faculty member's ability to focus on teaching or scholarship. Such extensions are unusual, and must be requested in writing prior to the faculty member's mandatory year. Extension requests are submitted by the Chair to the Provost, via the Dean's Office.

During Winter Quarter, the College of Built Environments Dean's Office will distribute to department chairs a list of faculty members who appear to be entering their mandatory year during the following Academic Year. Departments are asked to compare this list to their own records. This early review should allow adequate time for departments to notify faculty members and/or resolve any Tenure-clock concerns prior to the following Academic Year.

2. Non-mandatory cases consist of faculty members who wish to be considered for Promotion voluntarily. Note that this category includes Promotion of:

2a. Assistant Professors or Research Assistant Professors who have not yet reached their mandatory year

2b. Associate and Research Associate Professors

2c. Affiliate faculty

Note: Lecturers are not considered "promotable" by the Provost's Office. Current Lecturers may be appointed to a Senior Lecturer position, and Departments may make decisions regarding Senior Lecturer appointments using a process similar to that for ladder-rank faculty; however, this is technically not considered a Promotion and is not required to be reviewed by the College Council.

Practices for identifying non-mandatory cases may vary by department but usually involve a call for nominations, including self-nominations, by the Department Chair typically early in Spring Quarter. Each faculty member below the rank of Professor who submits his/her name must be considered for Promotion.

3. Mandatory Tenure Reviews are required for each faculty member appointed at a higher rank to the special "Associate or Full Professor Without Tenure 3-Year" title. Faculty appointed as "Associate or Full Professor Without Tenure" face a mandatory Tenure consideration during their second year of appointment. This review normally takes place in Spring Quarter of the second year. Candidates must assemble materials by early Winter Quarter so the department may solicit the necessary external peer review letters to allow for completion of the review process in Spring Quarter. Submittal requirements are similar to those for Promotion and Tenure.

4. Track adjustments are also subject to formal review. Typical examples include: a faculty member has elected to "jump tracks" from a Tenure-track to research track appointment or vice-versa; or a faculty member without Tenure for reasons of funding who is being considered for Tenure when a new funding line becomes available. When a track change is considered, the Department Chair is encouraged to contact the College of Built Environments Dean's Office.

Note: New appointments to a higher-than-entry-level rank consist of faculty members hired into the rank of Associate Professor, Professor, Research Associate Professor or Research Professor. New appointments to these ranks may happen at any time and are not subject to the same deadlines as the cases listed above. When a new appointment to higher-than-entry-level rank is considered, the Department Chair is should contact the College of Built Environments Dean's Office. Note: In general, new appointments at higher-than-entry-level rank may be made only if the advertisement for the position indicated that the appointment might be made at such a rank.

## C. Preparing Materials to Submit: Candidate's Role

1. Documentation to be submitted: The Candidate assembles his/her peer review packages and his/her complete career dossier. The peer review package for external review includes the Career Narrative, the Curriculum Vitae, and all other supporting documentation, including representative publications, reports, portfolios, course materials, and all similar material as appropriate to the Candidate's particular case, and individual department policy. The complete career dossier for internal review includes the complete career narrative, the complete curriculum vitae, and complete career documentation, including all publications (originals strongly preferred), reports, portfolios, course materials, and all similar material as appropriate to the Candidate's particular case.

1a. Career Narrative: The Candidate's Career Narrative is the document in which the Candidate states his/her case. In some UW Colleges or Schools this narrative is called the "Advocacy Document." This document is typically five to nine pages. The first section of the Career Narrative should exactly quote the criteria from the *University of Washington Handbook* for the rank to which the Candidate is seeking Promotion, and then should frame the Candidate's research, scholarship, practice and/or other creative achievements to indicate how these achievements meet the specific criteria. Achievements in teaching should also be framed in similar fashion since the criteria for each rank includes a level of achievement in both research (meaning creative achievement), and teaching. As appropriate, the Candidate may wish to address goals, direction, and impacts.

In the second section, the Candidate should provide a roughly chronological discussion of his/her achievements in research/creative achievement. Although a discussion of the Candidate's complete career is appropriate, in most cases the majority of selected contributions will have been completed after appointment as Assistant Professor when seeking Promotion to Associate Professor, or after appointment to Associate Professor when seeking Promotion to Professor. (Occasionally a candidate may be appointed who has compiled a substantial record of teaching and/or research prior to arrival at the UW, and the candidate may seek early Promotion and Tenure (or Promotion if appointed at advanced rank). In such cases, the narrative will likely include a longer discussion of achievements prior to appointment at UW.)

In the third section, the Candidate should provide a roughly chronological discussion of his/her achievements in teaching. Again, although the full career should be addressed the emphasis will be on teaching completed after appointment as Assistant Professor when seeking Promotion to Associate Professor, or after appointment to Associate Professor when seeking Promotion to Professor (except in rare cases where a substantial record of teaching has been compiled prior to appointment at UW). The section on teaching should also indicate how the Candidate's teaching draws upon or benefits from the Candidate's research/creative achievement.

The final section of the Career Narrative should be a brief account of significant service contributions.

Each Career Narrative will be tailored to the Candidate's specific areas of creative achievement and teaching, and will reflect the standards for achievement in the Candidate's sub-discipline. Depending on the Candidate's areas of focus, any of the following may be appropriate:

--The Candidate may assess her/his own performance, how s/he has responded to performance recommendations from mentors, or has otherwise sought to improve the record of research/creative achievement, and teaching.

--If the Candidate has been involved in collaborative projects or has been a co-author of a published work, and indicates the Candidate's precise contributions.

--If the Candidate has been involved in creative work that leads to direct impact beyond the academy, for example technology transfer to industry, or standards or codes adopted by a government agency, or a standards organization based on Candidate's work, this impact should be discussed.

--The Career Narrative should reference what the Candidate considers to be his or her most significant research/creative work achievements to date, should explain their significance, and mention their impact or potential impact.

--Candidates for Promotion to full Professor for which the criteria include "national or international recognition" should discuss how their creative achievement meets this standard of recognition, for example through citation by others, publication of design work in professional journals, awards, invitations to lecture, and all other indications of recognition. Candidates for Promotion to Associate Professor may choose to include evidence of recognition if they or their work has already begun to win recognition.

--Candidates may include a brief discussion of their anticipated future activities in the research and teaching sections of the Narrative. However, the discussion of future plans should be succinct. The emphasis of the reviewers will be on the Candidate's achievements to date that meet the criteria for Promotion and Tenure, or for Promotion.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to solicit feedback, for example from colleagues, and/or the Department Chair and/or Review Committee Chair on the quality of the Career Narrative. Candidates may also ask to see the Career Narratives of faculty who have recently been promoted, and to consider their statements as models for structure and language. However, Candidates must remember that seeing another faculty member's Career Narrative is a privilege, not a right. Further, each faculty member's career is unique, and therefore each Career Narrative should be specific to the Candidate's career.

1b. Curriculum Vitae: While the structure of the Curriculum Vitae will be specific to the Candidate, some general recommendations and minimum expectations can be established. In general the Curriculum Vitae should be as complete as the Candidate can make it. The Curriculum Vitae should cover the Candidate's entire academic career. The Curriculum Vitae should be structured in outline format.

For ease in review, the Curriculum Vitae should be organized with sections paralleling the Career Narrative: Research/Creative Achievement, Teaching, and Service. The Research/Creative Achievement section may have sub-sections as appropriate to the Candidate's specific areas of expertise, but will often include Education, Research/Scholarship, and Professional Practice. As appropriate, the Service section may include sub-sections for Department/College/University Service, Professional/Academic Service, and Community Service.

However the Candidate organizes the Curriculum Vitae, the following information must be included at the appropriate locations:

- Education – including at least institutions, degrees granted, dates
- Ph.D. dissertation title is required if the final degree is Ph.D.
- Master's Thesis title is optional if the terminal degree is a professionally accredited Master's degree
- Research/Creative Achievement: products/results, for example: publications, designs/constructed structures, research grants/contracts with funding agencies and amounts of funding, professional practice/consulting, lectures/presentations, etc. Bibliographies should be in full bibliographic format — refereed publication should be identified; lectures, talks, presentations should include dates and type of presentation — refereed, invited, keynote, panel, etc.
- Teaching: employment --institutions including UW, positions, dates; courses taught with dates; course improvements, teaching aids; individual instruction; table of course evaluation scores from individual course evaluations;
- Service: internal to UW Department, College, University (include list of all committees and dates of service; external to UW, including Professional/Academic organization service and community service as appropriate

The above outline is not a complete outline for a Curriculum Vitae. It is only a starting point. Each Candidate will have many individual career achievements that should be included in the Curriculum Vitae that are not included in this outline. Candidates are strongly encouraged to solicit feedback from colleagues, and/or the Department Chair, and/or Review Committee Chair, for example, on the content, organization, and quality of the Curriculum Vitae. Candidates may also ask to see the Curriculum Vitae of faculty who have recently been promoted and to consider their Curriculum Vitae as models for content and organization. However, Candidates must remember that seeing another faculty member's Curriculum Vitae is a privilege, and not a right. Further, each faculty member's career is unique and therefore each Curriculum Vitae should be specific to the Candidate's individual career.

## **V. RE-APPOINTMENT EXPECTATIONS AND PROCESS**

### **A. General Comments**

#### **1. Timing**

The initial appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor and Research Assistant Professor at the University of Washington is for a three-year term. The University requires that at the end of the second year, or the sixth quarter of the appointment, a vote be taken by the senior faculty either for re-appointment to a second term--three years except for those whose appointments are less than 1.0 FTE--or for the termination of the appointment at the end of the following academic year, at the end of the third year of employment.

A new appointee may, in exceptional circumstances, have longer than five quarters prior to reappointment. These exceptional circumstances are described below:

1a. The faculty member's appointment began after the half-way point of the Academic Year. Assistant Professors who begin an appointment on or after December 17, and Research Assistant Professors who begin their appointment on or after January 2 will have this first partial appointment year automatically waived. Their five quarters will automatically begin, at the same time as the Tenure clock, with the following Academic Year.

1b. The faculty member was initially appointed for a fixed term as an Acting Assistant Professor. (An Acting appointment is made because the dissertation is not complete.) The five quarters will automatically begin, at the same time as the Tenure clock, when the appointment is converted from Acting Assistant Professor to Assistant Professor.

#### **2. Expectations**

An Assistant Professor has only five quarters prior to being considered for re-appointment. Five quarters is not a lot of time in which to build an extensive record, but it is sufficient time for an Assistant Professor to begin to build a record of achievement, and to plan for the next several years prior to mandatory consideration for Promotion to Associate Professor. Re-appointment is, therefore, not only an opportunity for the senior faculty in the Department formally to review progress by an Assistant Professor, but also the opportunity formally to review the Assistant Professor's plan to achieve Promotion and Tenure. Candid assessments should be made of the Assistant Professor's plan in the terms of the criteria for Promotion and Tenure, and in terms of the time available prior to mandatory consideration. In other words, if the Assistant Professor carries out his/her plan, will he/she meet the criteria of "substantial success in teaching and in research," and does the Assistant Professor realistically have sufficient time to carry out the plan prior to his/her schedule for mandatory consideration for Promotion and Tenure?

#### **3. Authority for Re-appointment**

According to the *University of Washington Handbook*, re-appointment of Assistant Professors is primarily a departmental decision. Re-appointments are forwarded to the Dean, but are not typically reviewed by the College Council. The Dean notifies the Assistant Professor of the faculty decision regarding re-appointment, and forwards a copy of the letter to the Academic Human Resources office.

### **B. Recommended Procedure**

Because authority over re-appointment rests with Departments, the College of Built Environments cannot dictate the procedure that CBE departments must follow. However, experience has shown that Assistant Professor Candidates for Promotion and Tenure are better able to anticipate what will be required if departments use a re-appointment process that is a "rehearsal" of the Promotion and Tenure process. Therefore, the College of Built Environments strongly recommends the following process.

## **1. Recommended Documents to be submitted by the Candidate for Re-appointment**

At the time of re-appointment--the beginning of the sixth quarter--the Candidate for reappointment should, as a minimum, submit a Curriculum Vitae and a Career Narrative.

The Career Narrative should have the usual sections addressing research/creative achievement, teaching, and service. The research/creative achievement and teaching sections should include: one part discussing accomplishments to date (past to present), and a second part discussing plans for the next several years (future). The narrative should clearly indicate how the Candidate's plan for the next several years will produce results that will meet the criterion of "substantial success."

The Curriculum Vitae should have the usual sections covering research/creative achievement including educational background, teaching, and service. The teaching section should include a record of teaching evaluations.

The Career Narrative and Curriculum Vitae, while not as extensive as those addressing the Candidate's career at the time of consideration for Promotion and Tenure, should nonetheless be prepared to a quality level similar to documents for Promotion and Tenure. The quality of content, language, and graphics should all be at the level anticipated for the submittal for Promotion and Tenure. This quality will enable the senior faculty and Department Chair to give the clearest advice to the Candidate.

Some departments may request that Candidates submit additional documents such as sample course materials, student course evaluations, sample publications and draft publications, sample portfolio, and/or similar documents.

## **2. Evaluation and Vote on Re-appointment**

If a Review Committee is participating in the process, its members review the re-appointment submittal and typically prepare a written report on the Candidate's qualifications for reappointment. This report will usually address both the Candidate's accomplishments to date, and the Candidate's plan for achieving Promotion and Tenure. The Review Committee Chair provides this report to the Department Chair, who may meet with the Candidate (in some departments the Review Committee Chair may meet directly with the Candidate), who may respond within seven (7) days. This report, and the Candidate's response, if in writing, are added to the re-appointment submittal. If no Review Committee is involved, this step is omitted from the process.

Faculty members who are superior in rank to the Candidate meet to review the re-appointment submittal. Often the discussion of the Candidate's qualifications may be initiated in one meeting, then time, often a week, will be allowed for further review of the Candidate's re-appointment submittal by individual faculty, and then a vote will take place at a second meeting. (Such a delay is not required, but is a practice in some departments.) If a Review Committee was formed, a representative of the Review Committee typically delivers the report on the Candidate's qualifications to the attendees at or near the beginning of the first meeting.

If no Review Committee is involved, the faculty should help the Chair prepare a written evaluation to be shared with the Candidate. This evaluation should discuss accomplishments to date--the primary basis for re-appointment--but should also evaluate the Candidate's plan to achieve Promotion and Tenure. The Candidate should be given a realistic assessment of whether the plan will produce results that rise to the level of "substantial success" and whether the plan is realistically achievable in the time available before mandatory consideration. Recommendations for adjustments can also be made at this time.

The Chair of the Department prepares a written summary of the faculty deliberations and vote. The Chair provides this summary to the Candidate, who may respond within seven (7) days. This summary, and the Candidate's response, if any, are both added to the re-appointment submittal.

The Chair of the Department prepares a memo to the Dean, summarizing the faculty deliberations, and provides

the Chair's own assessment of the Candidate's qualifications and the Chair's own recommendation concerning re-appointment. This memo, and Minutes of the faculty meetings where the case was considered if the Department customarily records Minutes, is added to the reappointment submittal.

### 3. Submittal to CBE Dean's Office

The re-appointment submittal sent to the Dean's Office should include the following documentation:

Letter from the chair, reporting the following items:

- the departmental recommendation, including the term of appointment
- the faculty vote (votes for, against, abstaining, absent, and total number of eligible voters)
- reasons for the faculty decision
- chair's independent recommendation
- an assessment of the Candidate's research, teaching (if applicable), and service; or a brief analysis of the character and quality of functions performed in the department

Review Committee Report (if the Department has a Review Committee)

Candidate's Career Narrative (if required by Department)

Current Curriculum Vitae

Review of teaching (unless this is covered by the Review Committee Report or other documentation)

Joint appointment: Report from secondary department when the Candidate holds a joint appointment in another academic unit; the primary department initiating the recommendation must ensure that a complete recommendation from the secondary department (with the faculty vote, chair's recommendation, and any other pertinent information) is included in the documentation.

Adjunct appointment: No action relative to reappointment is required from the secondary department when the Candidate holds an adjunct appointment in another academic department.

## C. Recommendations to Assistant Professors

### 1. Documentation

Ideally the Assistant Professor should develop drafts of his/her Curriculum Vitae and Career Narrative in the first year of appointment. These documents should be developed with the assistance of the Department Chair and/or any appropriate senior faculty mentor(s). The new Assistant Professor is urged to seek out faculty who have successfully moved through the Tenure and Promotion process to gain advice, and to request examples of documents that may serve as models.

The *University Handbook* requires that all Assistant Professors meet annually with the Department Chair. One focus of such meetings should be the review of the Candidate's annually updated Career Narrative and Curriculum Vitae.

However, as the Department Chair may come from a sub-discipline different from the Assistant Professor's field, for example the Chair might come from design computing while the Assistant Professor may be an urban historian, Assistant Professors should seek out senior faculty mentors. Mentors may be found not only in the Assistant Professor's own Department, but may be found in other Departments in the CAU P or elsewhere in the University.

The Department Chair and senior faculty mentors should provide constructive criticism, advice, and help develop the career plan.

## **2. Recommendations to Assistant Professors (Peer networks)**

Part of the process of building an academic career includes developing a network of peers in one's sub-discipline within, but especially outside, the University. External peer review is required by the University for consideration for Promotion and Tenure. An Assistant Professor must become familiar with the work of distinguished scholars working in his/her area of expertise, and is advised to build relationships with senior scholars who may serve as external peer reviewers when the Assistant Professor seeks Promotion and Tenure.

## **VI. APPENDIX**

Note: This section is currently in development.