

Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment of College of Built Environments Faculty - Policy and Procedure Document

Updated Oct 22, 2021

(Revisions on August 31, 2021;

updated Sept 16, 2021;

updated Sept 21, 2021;

updated Sept 29, 2021;

update Oct 18, 2021)

Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment of College of Built Environments Faculty - Policy and Procedure Document	1
PART I. Introduction: About this Document	4
PART II. Procedures	4
A. Overview of Promotion & Tenure and Promotion Processes	4
1. Department-Level Procedures—Assembly of Record:	4
2. Department-Level Procedures—Recommendations and Candidate’s Opportunity for Response:	8
a. Faculty Review when there are at least 3 eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s appointing unit	8
b. Chair Review	9
c. Procedures for when there are fewer than 3 eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s appointing Department	10
d. Departmental Assembly and Transmittal of Dossier and Key Documents:	10
3. College-Level Actions	11
a. Associate Dean for Academic Affairs	11
b. CBE College Council	11
c. Dean	11
4. University-Level Actions	12
5. Research Professors: Special Considerations	12
C. Key Dates and Deadlines	13
D. Summary of Promotion and Tenure Documentation	14
E. Reappointment of Assistant Professors	16
1. Overview: Timing, Expectations and Authority	16
2. Recommended Procedure	17
a. Recommended Documents to be submitted by the Candidate for reappointment	17
b. Evaluation and Vote on reappointment	18
c. Submittal to CBE Dean’s Office	19
F. Teaching Professors: Appointment and promotion	20
1. Distinguishing among Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor	20
2. Duration and Timing of Promotion of Assistant Teaching Professors	20
3. Promotion Process for Assistant and Associate Teaching Professors	21
a. Evaluations of Teaching Performance	21
G. Affiliate Faculty	22
1. Departmental Discretion in Appointing Affiliate Faculty	22
2. Eligibility and Timing of Promotion of Affiliate faculty	22
3. Promotion Process for Promotion of Affiliate faculty	22

a. Affiliate Faculty Promotion Submittals	22
b. Evaluations of Teaching Performance	23
c. Confidential External Evaluation Letter(s) for Affiliate Promotions	23
d. Departmental review	24
e. Dean's office review	24
H. Resources and Information	25
1. University Resources	25
2. Academic Human Resources	25
PART III. Criteria and Expectations	26
A. Expectations for Research by CBE Faculty	26
B. Expectations for Achievement in Teaching by CBE Faculty	28
1. Scope of Teaching	28
2. Assessing Teaching Effectiveness	29
C. Service Criteria	32
D. Recommendations to Assistant Professors	33
1. Documentation	33
2. Recommendations to Assistant Professors (Peer Networks)	33
3. Recommendations to Research Assistant Professors (Funding)	34
PART IV. Roles and Responsibilities	34
A. General responsibilities and roles	34
1. Mentoring of Junior Faculty	34
2. Meetings with Chair	34
B. Candidate's Responsibilities	35
C. Chair's Responsibilities	36
D. Review Committee Responsibilities	38
E. Department Faculty Responsibilities	38
F. CBE College Council Responsibilities	39
G. CBE Dean Responsibilities	39
H. UW Provost and President Responsibilities	40

PART I. Introduction: About this Document

This document outlines policies and procedures for Promotion and/or Promotion & Tenure in the College of Built Environments. The information provided in this document is intended to supplement information found in the [UW Faculty Code Section 24-54](#) [[Faculty Code is part of the *Policy Directory* -- better as *Policy Directory*](#)] and [UW Executive Order V](#). This document includes specific guidelines and requirements, and also some general suggestions and recommendations.

IMPORTANT: The University's Office of Academic Personnel (OAP) maintains a detailed current website of the Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines found [HERE](#), which includes relevant references to the Faculty Code [[Policy Directory](#)]. If there is a conflict between this guide and OAP's procedures, OAP's procedures govern.

A high-level visualization of the entire review process can be found here:

- [Departments with 3 or more eligible voting faculty](#)
- [Departments with fewer than 3 eligible voting faculty](#)

Unit heads and relevant committee chairs should familiarize themselves with the workflows described in these visualizations and use them as a handy guide at various stages of the process.]

PART II. Procedures

A. Overview of Promotion & Tenure and Promotion Processes

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

1. Department-Level Procedures—Assembly of Record:

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair early in Winter Quarter.

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

warranted.

In each department an individual or a committee manages the evaluation process. Practices vary. The Chair may coordinate the evaluation process or 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 Promotion & 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.

If the Department has a standing committee to initiate the internal process of promotion or promotion and tenure review, that Committee must have a minimum of three members. A majority of the members of the committee must be Professors. Some members may be Associate Professors. Normally all members will be tenured; however, if a Committee is larger than three members, then one member may be an untenured Research Associate Professor or Research Professor. (For an Associate Professor to Professor promotion case, at least three members must be tenured Professors.)

Once Candidates for Promotion and for Promotion & 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 Promotion & Tenure process. The candidate may also invite a senior faculty mentor. The purpose of this early meeting, typically held in Spring 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.

Candidates should also be encouraged to meet with the CBE Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to ensure that they are familiar with processes at the Dean's level.

The Chair and the Review Committee, or in cases where there is no Review Committee, the Chair and the designated senior faculty member, communicate 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 documentation: “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 the candidate's Career Narrative (also called Self-Assessment), 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

OAP's guidelines for preparing a Curriculum Vitae and Self-Assessment (Career

Narrative) can be found [HERE](#).

Candidates should provide the packages in electronic form, rather than as paper copies--for example as PDFs on flash drives, or as PDFs to be sent via email, or on a password protected Web site. Candidates must discuss the form of the packages with their departments.

a. External Letters of Review

OAP's guidelines for External Letters of Review can be found [HERE](#). 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 Chair, or the designated senior faculty member.

The Chair (and the Review Committee, if requested by the Chair) 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, if any.

External peer reviewers must be selected to be at "arm's length" ("non-conflicted") and from "recognized contributors" to their field. Guidelines for evaluating "recognized contributors" can be found [HERE](#) in the OAP website. Recognized contributors to their field are indicated, for example, by tenure and/or an academic rank senior (to the candidate) at a major research university, frequent citation of their work, or major awards. In some circumstances, members of the professional or governmental community may also serve as appropriate external reviewers. When the promotion recommendation is forwarded to the Dean's office, it should include one sample of the solicitation letter and the Chair's letter should include a statement describing the qualifications of the external reviewers, their relationship (if any) with the candidate, the manner in which they were chosen, and the reasons for the choices.

Arm's length means that the reviewers should "non-conflicted". Arm's length does not mean that the reviewer must never have met the candidate. Rather, arm's length means that reviewers should not be chosen who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the candidate because of a personal relationship.

Examples of what may *not* violate the arm's length requirement include reviewers who may have:

- Appeared on a panel at a conference with candidate
- Served on a granting council selection panel with candidate
- Presented a paper at a conference held at the university where the candidate works
- Presented a guest lecture at the reviewers university of vice versa

Examples of what may violate the arm's length requirement include reviewers who may

be:

- A member of the program or department of the candidate
- A co-author or collaborator with whom the candidate has maintained an ongoing relationship within the past 7 years.
- A close family/friend relationship with candidate
- Any member of the doctoral or masters committee (eg. dissertation, thesis, project, etc.) of the candidate.

The Chair or designated senior faculty member--responsibility for this task varies by department--solicits written evaluations from external reviewers. (Note: The University requires a minimum of three and a maximum of five external review letters. Most CBE departments request five letters, but some departments request only four. The number of requested letters is determined by each department. All letters received must become part of the key documents that are submitted to the Dean's office and eventually to the Provost.)

The letter of solicitation (sample linked) should state that the unit is considering the candidate for possible promotion/tenure and request the following information:

- Whether, and for how long, the reviewer has known the candidate.
- The significance, independence, influence, and promise of the candidate's research, scholarship or creative work (and in particular, work done since beginning an appointment at the University of Washington), as well as the candidate's degree of national/international recognition.
- The success of the candidate's teaching, including consideration of curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership roles in the University and the field, as appropriate for the candidate's rank and title (if the reviewer is able to evaluate this).
- A comparison of the candidate's accomplishments with leading scholars or practitioners at a similar career stage in the same or related fields.

The external reviewer should not be asked to assess whether the candidate should be promoted (but a reviewer may, of course, volunteer such an opinion). References to the *UW Policy Directory* (e.g., Faculty Code Section 24-32 and Section 24-34) and Executive Order 45 may be helpful for providing more context for external reviewers. Reviewers must also be asked for a short current Curriculum Vitae.

The Candidate prepares a complete career dossier for internal review including a career narrative (self-assessment), a curriculum vitae, and complete career documentation including all publications, reports, portfolios, course materials including standard university-approved teaching evaluations, and all similar material as appropriate to the Candidate's particular case. (Materials should be submitted in digital form. Exceptions may include copies of published books, portfolios, and such.) The Candidate delivers the complete career dossier to the Chair or the Review Committee, or the designated senior faculty member by the deadline established for the department-level evaluation to begin.

b. Teaching Evaluations

The UW Faculty Code Section 24-57 A requires that recommendations for promotion and/or tenure include documentation of teaching effectiveness in 2 forms: student evaluation and collegial (peer) evaluation. OAP's teaching evaluations guidelines can be found HERE.

Each CBE Department follows its own procedures for regularly scheduled, standardized student evaluations. UW policy requires a minimum of one course with student evaluations per year; most departments in CBE require more. Assistant Professors (both tenure track and teaching track) must have annual collegial reviews of teaching. Associate Professors ranks must have collegial reviews of teaching at least once every three years.

All candidates for promotion must have at least one collegial review of teaching within one year of the date of application for promotion (a review within six months of the date of application is recommended but not required).

2. Department-Level Procedures—Recommendations and Candidate's Opportunity for Response:

a. Faculty Review when there are at least 3 eligible voting faculty members in the candidate's appointing unit

If a Review Committee is participating in the process, its members review the complete career dossier and the external peer review letters and prepare a written report on the Candidate's qualifications for Promotion or Promotion & Tenure. The Review Committee Chair provides this report to the Department Chair. The candidate must receive a written summary of this report (provided by the Chair) that identifies members of the Review Committee. For purposes of confidentiality, the summary shall omit specific attributions and may omit the vote count. Documentation must be maintained (email record is fine) showing that the Candidate was provided with a copy of the Committee's report. The Candidate must acknowledge receipt of the report (email record is fine) and 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 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 or Promotion & Tenure materials are returned to the Candidate by the department and no further action is taken. Mandatory Promotion & Tenure cases must proceed through subsequent levels of review, no matter what the Review Committee recommends.

The first **mandatory** step of the department faculty review process for candidates with at least 3 eligible voting members in their appointing department involves an

assessment by the department's eligible voting faculty members. These faculty members must receive or have access to a copy of the candidate's record and, where applicable, the review committee report and recommendation, and the candidate's response to the subcommittee report, before the discussion and promotion vote.

Faculty members who are superior in rank to the Candidate meet to review the complete career dossier and the external peer review letters, discuss the Candidate's qualifications for Promotion or Promotion & Tenure, and conduct a vote by secret ballot to recommend Promotion or Promotion & Tenure. HERE is a link to a matrix that describes Faculty Titles Eligible to Vote on Promotion Action.

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.

b. Chair Review

The Chair of the Department prepares a written summary (specific attributions such as names and other personal information *must* be redacted; the faculty vote *may* be redacted) of the faculty deliberations. The Chair provides this summary to the Candidate, who must respond in writing within seven (7) days. The candidate must indicate in the response that they received a copy of the Chair's summary or report. 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 as per the retention norms of the University, and no further action is taken.

However, mandatory Promotion & Tenure cases must proceed through subsequent levels of review regardless of vote counts.

(Note: A vote to postpone, for one year, consideration of a Mandatory Promotion & Tenure case, is possible in unusual cases. Such a vote should only be taken when the candidate clearly demonstrates significant progress toward meeting the criteria for Promotion & Tenure and there is evidence that the candidate will fully meet the criteria established by the *UW Policy Directory* 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, tabulating votes ("yes" votes, "no" votes, "abstentions," and "absent not voting"--votes of all eligible voting faculty must be accounted for), providing the Chair's own assessment of the Candidate's qualifications, and the Chair's own recommendation concerning the case. This memo is added to the materials transmitted to the Dean's Office.

c. Procedures for when there are fewer than 3 eligible voting faculty members in the candidate's appointing Department

For appointing Departments with fewer than 3 eligible voting faculty members, the review is conducted by a Special Review Committee appointed by the Dean of the CBE and the recommendation and vote of the Special Review Committee is used in lieu of a vote by the department faculty. OAP's guidelines in this case can be found [HERE](#).

The Special Review Committee must include all eligible voting faculty in the candidate's unit who are available to serve and may include eligible voting faculty members from other units who have appropriate expertise. Special Review Committee members must be given the opportunity to review the candidate's record, including external letters.

The Special Review Committee must submit a written report and recommendation, and the candidate must receive a written summary of this report that identifies members of the Committee. For purposes of confidentiality, the summary shall omit specific attributions and may omit the vote count.

In CBE the Dean receives the Special Review Committee report first. The Dean may then share it with the candidate, or may delegate the Chair of the Special Review Committee to share the report with the Candidate.

The candidate must respond acknowledging receipt of a physical copy or summary of the report and has the option to provide supplemental information. The candidate's written response must be received within 7 calendar days. Documentation that the candidate was provided a copy of the summary of the subcommittee report and opportunity to respond is to be included in the record forwarded to the Provost.

d. Departmental Assembly and Transmittal of Dossier and Key Documents:

The "key documents" (see Part II, Section D) from a part of the complete career dossier are those which will be included in the Promotion package that is forwarded to the Provost's Office/ Office of Academic Personnel [OAP]. The department is responsible for forwarding the Departmental review section of these to the Dean's office digitally via a secured online folder made especially for this purpose.

All documents must be transmitted digitally.

The complete career dossier, including all of the Candidate's publications, reports, portfolio, course records, teaching evaluations, etc. is also to be delivered digitally to the CBE Dean's Office via a secured online folder made especially for this purpose.

3. College-Level Actions

a. Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

From this point, the CBE Associate Dean for Academic Affairs supervises provision of the Candidate's key documents (including external peer review letters and departmental reviews and reports) and complete career dossier to the College Council, and tracks the progress of each case through all subsequent levels of review.

b. CBE College Council

The CBE College Council reviews the key documents and complete career dossier, discusses the Candidate's qualifications for Promotion or Promotion & Tenure, and the procedures and metrics used by the department in evaluating the Candidate, and conducts a vote to recommend Promotion or Promotion & 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 that is submitted to the Dean. The memo must include: (1) a review and evaluation of the candidate's qualifications; (2) a review of the department's evaluation process; and (3) a recommendation and vote on promotion and/or promotion & tenure. This memo becomes part of the complete career dossier; copies are made and included in the file of key documents.

If the recommendation of the CBE College Council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the recommendation of the College Council with reasons therefore must be provided to the candidate by the Chair of College Council. For confidentiality, the recommendation provided to the candidate shall omit specific attributions and may omit the vote count.

Recommendations of the committee/council that are favorable and not in conflict with the faculty vote do not need to be shared with the candidate.

c. Dean

The Dean reviews the key documents, 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 the Dean's independent evaluation and recommendation in a memo to the Provost. (This memo also includes a brief procedural summary of the case with dates and votes of the department faculty and the College Council.) Although the Dean's letter is part of the case forwarded to the Provost/OAP, it is actually addressed to the University President.

If the Dean's initial recommendation is not favorable, the Dean provides the candidate with this initial recommendation with reasons in writing prior to issuance of decision. The Dean then meets with the Candidate to discuss the case. At this point the candidate has the option to respond in writing within 7 calendar days. If the final

recommendation of the Dean is favorable, or if the case is mandatory, the Dean forwards their recommendation to the Provost with the candidate's response . If the Dean's final recommendation is not favorable, and it is not a mandatory case, and if there is no response from the candidate, the Dean informs the candidate of the final result, and the case is not forwarded to the Provost.

In either case, the candidate must provide a written response acknowledging meeting with the Dean, hearing a review of the case, College Council recommendation and Dean's decision and recommendation.

4. University-Level Actions

Office of Academic Personnel (OAP): The Office of Academic Personnel (OAP) coordinates review of the case by the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and the Provost.

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

Once the Promotion or Promotion & Tenure package has been reviewed, and a decision reached, the Provost sends a letter to the Dean reporting on the 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 may 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.

If the decision is a positive one, the promotion or promotion and tenure become official on September 16 -- the first day of the next Academic Year.

5. Research Professors: Special Considerations

Timing: Research Assistant Professors cannot earn tenure, but do face consideration for reappointment after two years of appointment as a Research Assistant Professor and do face a mandatory requirement to apply for promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor after a continuous period of employment (six years if employed at 1.0 FTE). The rules regarding the "clock" for mandatory consideration for promotion from the title of Research Assistant Professor to the title of Research Associate Professor are identical to the rules for Assistant Professors. As with tenure-track Assistant Professors, a Research Assistant Professor whose appointment is less than 1.0 FTE will receive an extension of time before the year of mandatory consideration for promotion is reached.

Funding: Research faculty members are responsible for generating the grant and contract funding that supports their salaries and benefits at the level of their

appointment. A Research Assistant Professor must demonstrate the capability to generate the funding to support himself or herself at the level of their appointed FTE. Research faculty must demonstrate this capability in three ways: first, by an improving record of generating funding support during the years of appointment as a Research Assistant Professor; second, by evidence of continuing funding already secured to provide support for salary and benefits for the next several years; and third, a clear plan to generate additional continuing funding in future years after funding already secured runs out.

A faculty member who is appointed at 1.0 FTE, but is unable to generate funding that supports (and will continue to support) the salary and benefits at a 1.0 FTE appointment should have their appointment reduced to a level that can be sustained.

A faculty member who is unable to support their appointment (salary and benefits) at a level of at least 0.5 FTE will not be approved for promotion by the Dean or Provost.

C. Key Dates and Deadlines

The *University of Washington Policy Directory* suggests that a faculty member may seek consideration for Promotion or Promotion & Tenure at any time. However, the step-by-step process of creating the Promotion or Promotion & Tenure submission and obtaining required reviews at each level—Department, College, University—necessitates that the Promotion and Promotion & 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 (Promotion & Tenure for Assistant Professors; Promotion for Research Assistant Professors) year as of the following Academic Year, and a list of all the faculty eligible for non-mandatory promotions. This list is distributed to Department Chairs who inform their faculty of their mandatory requirement or non-mandatory eligibility for promotion.

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 or earlier depending on departmental schedules), 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 July (or earlier depending on departmental schedules). Note: Individual departments may set earlier deadlines.

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.

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

November – December 1: 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. (Earlier delivery of materials by December 1 preferred.)

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

Key documents included in the Promotion Package documented at the [OAP website](#) that is forwarded by the Dean to the Provost consist of:

- Promotion and/or tenure recommendation checklist
- Pre-submission Workday Check
- Dean's letter
- Candidate's response to Dean communication(s)
- College Council report
- Confirmation advisory council report sent to candidate -- if unfavorable or conflicts with faculty vote
- Chair's letter of recommendation
- Candidate's response to Chair with confirmation candidate was provided copy of Chair's report or summary with opportunity to respond
- Tenure Split (joint appointment) documentation (if applicable). See [HERE](#)
- Adjunct appointing unit chair/director/campus dean concurrence (if applicable)
- Review Committee report, including names of committee members (if applicable)
- Confirmation candidate was provided copy of Review Committee report with opportunity to respond
- Candidate's Career Narrative (self-assessment)

- Candidate's CV
- All External letters of review received (minimum 3, maximum 5) including a current abbreviated Curriculum Vitae for each reviewer
- Copy of Solicitation Letter (one example is sufficient)
- Collegial Teaching Peer Reviews
- Student teaching evaluations: *Minimum of 1 course/academic year in any year of teaching. Evaluations in the electronic P&T record (PDF) should be in chronological order.*
*Confirmation may be a simple email exchange acknowledging receipt of report and opportunity to respond within 7 calendar days.

From the list above the following are the key documents that must be included in the dossier submitted by the departmental Chair to the Dean:

- Chair's letter of recommendation
- Candidate's written confirmation that candidate was provided copy or summary of Chair's report and recommendation with opportunity to respond (copy of email is fine)
- Tenure Split (joint appointment) documentation (if applicable). See [HERE](#)
- Adjunct appointing unit chair/director/campus dean concurrence (if applicable)
- Review Committee report, including names of committee members (if applicable)
- Confirmation candidate was provided copy of Review Committee report with opportunity to respond *
- Candidate's Career Narrative (self-assessment)
- Candidate's CV
- All External letters of review received (minimum 3, maximum 5) including a current abbreviated Curriculum Vitae for each reviewer
- Copy of Solicitation Letter
- Collegial Teaching Peer Reviews
- Student teaching evaluations: *Minimum of 1 course/academic year in any year of teaching. Evaluations in the electronic P&T record (PDF) should be in chronological order.*
*Confirmation may be a simple email exchange acknowledging receipt of report and opportunity to respond within 7 calendar days.

The Chair must also submit the complete research and teaching package (complete career dossier) of the candidate that was reviewed by the departmental faculty.

E. Reappointment of Assistant Professors

1. Overview: Timing, Expectations and Authority

As per the *Policy Directory* Section 24-41, the initial appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor or Research Assistant Professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. 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 reappointment 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 received an extension of time (for example, for the birth of a child during the first year of appointment as an Assistant Professor). (See Section IV.B. of this document for a discussion of "tenure clock" extensions.) (Note: Extensions must be requested. No extension is awarded unless it is requested.)

1c. The faculty member was initially appointed for a fixed term as an Acting Assistant Professor. (An Acting appointment is usually made because the Ph.D. 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.

An Assistant Professor has only five quarters prior to being considered for reappointment. 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 with Tenure or to Research Associate Professor. Reappointment 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 & Tenure (or Promotion for Research Assistant Professors). Candid assessments should be made of the Assistant Professor's plan in the terms of the criteria for Promotion & Tenure, and in terms of the time available prior to mandatory consideration. In other words, if the Assistant Professor carries out their plan, will they 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 their schedule for mandatory consideration for Promotion & Tenure?

According to the *Policy Directory* (Section 24-41-A) reappointment of Assistant Professors is made by the Dean. Reappointment recommendations are forwarded to the Dean from the Department, but are not typically reviewed by the College Council.

Based on the departmental recommendation, the Dean can approve or deny the reappointment, or decide to postpone the decision by a year. The Dean must notify

the candidate within 30 days of their decision. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the third year of the initial appointment the dean shall decide whether the appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment, or the appointment is not to be renewed; if it is not, the basic appointment is extended to include a fourth and terminal year. If the decision is favorable, the Office of the Dean updates Workday to reflect the same.

2. Recommended Procedure

Experience has shown that Assistant Professor Candidates for Promotion & Tenure (and Research Assistant Professor Candidates for Promotion) are better able to anticipate what will be required if departments use a reappointment process that is a “rehearsal” of the Promotion & Tenure (or Promotion) process.

Therefore, the College of Built Environments recommends the following process.

a. Recommended Documents to be submitted by the Candidate for reappointment

At the time of reappointment--the beginning of the sixth quarter--the Candidate for reappointment should, as a minimum, submit a Curriculum Vitae and a Career Narrative (Self-Assessment).

The Career Narrative (Self-Assessment) 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 must include a record of student teaching evaluations.

The Career Narrative (self-assessment) and Curriculum Vitae, while not as extensive as those addressing the Candidate’s career at the time of consideration for Promotion & Tenure (Promotion for Research Assistant Professors), should nonetheless be prepared to a quality level similar to documents for Promotion & Tenure (Promotion). The quality of content, language, and graphics should all be at the level anticipated for the submittal for Promotion & 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.

The documents prepared by a Research Assistant Professor applying for reappointment must include information about research funding generated to date

and research funding secured for the next several years, as well as plans to build a consistent record of research funding in the future.

b. Evaluation and Vote on reappointment

If a Review Committee is participating in the process, its members review the reappointment 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 & Tenure (Promotion for Research Assistant Professors). 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 reappointment 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 reappointment 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 reappointment 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 reappointment--but should also evaluate the Candidate's plan to achieve Promotion & Tenure (Promotion for Research Assistant Professors). 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 reappointment 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 reappointment. This memo is added to the reappointment submittal.

c. Submittal to CBE Dean's Office

The reappointment 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 not voting, and total number of eligible voters)
 - Reasons for the faculty decision
 - Chair's independent recommendation, with reasons
- Review Committee Report (if the Department has a Review Committee)
- Candidate's Career Narrative (Self-Assessment)
- Candidate's Curriculum Vitae
- Peer Teaching Reviews
- All student evaluation score sheets
- Documentation of sharing of Committee report with Candidate
- Candidate's response(s), if any

- For Joint Appointments: 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.

F. Teaching Professors: Appointment and promotion

1. Distinguishing among Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor

The qualifications for appointment to the faculty with Teaching Professor titles are given in *UW Policy Directory* Section 24-34, subsection B.

Appointments with the title of Assistant Teaching Professor require a demonstration of teaching ability that evidences promise of a successful teaching career.

Appointments with the title of Associate Teaching Professor require more extensive training, competence, and experience in the discipline.

Appointments with the title of Teaching Professor require 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, college, university, and field.

(Previous versions of this document addressed Lecturer titles which are no longer promotion eligible with the establishment of the teaching track in 2020.)

2. Duration and Timing of Promotion of Assistant Teaching Professors

Only Assistant Teaching Professors hired through a competitive process are eligible for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. No Lecturer title is promotable.

Tenure is not acquired under teaching appointments. According to the *Policy Directory* Section 24-41-C:

a. Appointment as an Assistant Teaching Professor shall be for a period not to exceed five years.

b. Appointment as an Associate Teaching Professor shall be for a period not to exceed seven years. The normal appointment period shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

c. Appointment as Teaching Professor shall be for a period not to exceed ten years. The normal appointment period shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

d. At least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of an Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, or Teaching Professor, the Dean shall determine, pursuant to Section 24-53, whether this appointment shall be renewed and shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision. A renewal decision is not required where an initial appointment of an Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, or Teaching Professor is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.

e. Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors, and Teaching Professors are not subject to removal during the term of their appointment except by removal for cause (see Chapter 25, Section 25-51) or for reasons of program elimination (see Chapter 25, Section 25-52).

3. Promotion Process for Assistant and Associate Teaching Professors

An Assistant Teaching Professor, or an Associate Teaching Professor, may, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for appointment as, or promotion to, an Associate Teaching Professor, or Teaching Professor, respectively. The promotion process for an Assistant Teaching Professor seeking promotion to Associate Teaching Professor is the same as the promotion process for an Assistant Professor, other than evaluations of criteria for promotion. The promotion process for an Associate Teaching Professor seeking promotion to Teaching Professor parallels the process for an Associate Professor, other than evaluations of criteria for promotion.

Note: When evaluating Assistant Teaching Professors for promotion, Peer Evaluation Letters are required. Letters must be secured from outside the candidate's academic unit. Letters may be secured from individuals who are internal to the UW. However, for considerations of candidates from Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor, reviewers *must* be external to UW.

a. Evaluations of Teaching Performance

Since Assistant Teaching Professors and Associate Teaching Professors are not typically expected to engage in research (or the production of scholarly work), the focus of the Career Narrative (Self-Assessment) and the Curriculum Vitae should be on Teaching and Service. Expectations of Teaching are described in the Appendix below.

Some CBE Assistant Teaching Professors and Associate Teaching Professors have publications or other scholarly work or professional practice that qualifies as "research" under the *UW Policy Directory*. Candidates who have a record of achievement in any kind of "research" may include sections on research in the Career Narrative (Self-Assessment) and the Curriculum Vitae; however, whether to include this material is the Candidate's choice.

Because Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors, and Teaching Professors serve primarily in teaching roles, it is essential that their teaching be addressed through regular reviews of teaching performance.

Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors, and Teaching Professors must have their courses regularly evaluated by students using the standard UW evaluation forms, and must provide a tabulation of scores on the Curriculum Vitae following the specific policy and formats typical in their department.

Assistant Teaching Professors must have at least one peer teaching review annually following the standard policies of the Department. Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors must have one peer teaching review every three years. An Associate Teaching Professor seeking promotion to Teaching Professor must have at least one peer teaching review in the year before seeking promotion. More frequent peer review of teaching by Associate Teaching Professor may be advisable to build a robust record prior to seeking promotion to Teaching Professor.

G. Affiliate Faculty

According to the *UW Policy Directory*, Section 24-34, subsection B, number 7: "An affiliate appointment requires qualifications comparable to those required for appointment to the corresponding rank or title. It recognizes the professional contribution of an individual whose principal employment responsibilities lie outside the colleges and schools of the University. Affiliate appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held."

1. Departmental Discretion in Appointing Affiliate Faculty

Departments appoint Affiliate faculty at their own discretion. The *UW Policy Directory*

and the College of Built Environments trust that department faculty are able to judge when a part-time faculty member may merit consideration for appointment to an Affiliate position. Department faculty should note that once the Affiliate title is awarded, it cannot be revoked without a vote of the department faculty and an agreement from the person holding the Affiliate title to give up that title. (That is, when the faculty vote to renew an Affiliate appointment, the person will hold the Affiliate title previously awarded.)

2. Eligibility and Timing of Promotion of Affiliate faculty

Promotion of an Affiliate Assistant Professor to Affiliate Associate Professor is not mandatory. There is no mandatory year for consideration for promotion for any person holding an Affiliate title.

3. Promotion Process for Promotion of Affiliate faculty

The promotion process for an Affiliate Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Affiliate Associate Professor or for an Affiliate Associate Professor seeking promotion to Affiliate Professor is similar to, but simplified from, the processes used for ladder-rank (or research) faculty as described below.

a. Affiliate Faculty Promotion Submittals

Candidates for promotion to Affiliate Associate Professor or to Affiliate Professor prepare their own promotion packages following department and CBE guidelines.

Submittals must include a Career Narrative (Self-Assessment) and a complete Curriculum Vitae. Candidates should review the guidelines for these submittals included in this CBE framework document, and should confer with the Department Chair and senior faculty in their departments for advice as to organization and format. Candidates may also contact the CBE Associate Dean for Academic Affairs for advice in this regard.

Since careers of Affiliate faculty may vary widely, it is not possible to provide more than general guidelines for the documents they will produce. However, it must be remembered that the *UW Policy Directory* defines the term "research" very broadly to include "constructive contributions in professional fields, or in the creative arts, such as musical composition, creative writing, or original design in engineering or architecture." Thus, Affiliate faculty should be able to prepare documents, Career Narrative (Self-Assessment) and Curriculum Vitae, with the usual sections addressing Research, Teaching and Service. (There may be exceptions where an Affiliate faculty member does not teach at least occasionally, but these are unusual.)

Additional elements to be reviewed by department faculty may include portfolios or other evidence of achievement in creative achievement and records of teaching and evidence of student work carried out in the Affiliate faculty member's courses or other supervision.

b. Evaluations of Teaching Performance

Almost all Affiliate faculty members teach classes, at least occasionally. Affiliate faculty should have their courses regularly evaluated by students using the standard UW evaluation forms, and must provide a tabulation of scores on the Curriculum Vitae following the specific policy and formats typical in their department. Affiliate faculty members should include UW teaching evaluation forms in their promotion submittals.

Because Affiliate faculty may teach intermittently or on irregular schedules, it may prove difficult to require peer teaching review following the standard policies of the Department. However, if possible, some Peer Teaching Reviews should be conducted, particularly for Affiliate faculty members whose appointments have extended over many years. If Peer Teaching Reviews have been conducted of the Affiliate faculty member seeking promotion, these must be included in the promotion submittal.

c. Confidential External Evaluation Letter(s) for Affiliate Promotions

Departments are required to obtain a minimum of one confidential external review letter for Affiliate faculty seeking promotion.

The letter must come from outside the CBE. A letter (or letter(s)) that come from individuals who are outside the University of Washington is (are) preferred by the Provost/OAP. External reviewers may come from the professional community, from other collegiate level educational institutions, or from others who are sufficiently senior and who are qualified to offer a knowledgeable assessment of the candidate's achievements that qualify the candidate for promotion. A letter from a person in another UW College will be accepted if a letter from an individual external to the UW cannot be obtained.

The minimum package to be provided to external reviewers should include the Candidate's self-assessment (Self-Assessment) and Curriculum Vitae. Additional evidence may also be provided as appropriate (as determined by the Department Chair or senior faculty in consultation with the Candidate).

d. Departmental review

Within a department, the step-by-step review process for Affiliate promotions should follow the standard process the department uses for tenure-track and tenured faculty promotions. The schedule and deadlines should approximate the schedule and deadlines the department uses for non-mandatory promotion cases, although a submittal to the Dean's Office several weeks late is acceptable since Affiliate promotions do not require College Council review.

As with promotion cases for tenure-track and tenured faculty, the Department faculty senior in rank conduct a review and vote on a recommendation.

If the vote is a negative one, the Department Chair meets with the Candidate to discuss the vote and the issues raised by the faculty. The case proceeds no further.

If the vote is a positive one, the Department Chair prepares a brief report of the faculty discussion and vote, and also writes their own recommendation. The Chair then meets with the Candidate, discusses the vote and summarizes the faculty discussion and the Chair's own recommendation. The Candidate must respond in writing within seven days. The case is then transmitted to the CBE Dean's Office.

e. Dean's office review

Because College Council review is not required, Affiliate promotions are due to the CBE Dean's Office on or before January 15. Submittals should include the usual key documents (Chair's letter, record of faculty discussion and vote, Candidate's response, external review letter(s), Narrative, C.V., teaching evaluation numerical summary sheets, teaching peer review letters (if any). One set of originals is all that is required. Additional evidence of creative work and teaching (dossier, course portfolios, examples of student work) need not be transmitted.

In the CBE Dean's Office, the Dean reviews the case, prepares their evaluation, and prepares a recommendation letter. The case is then transmitted to the Provost/OAP.

H. Resources and Information

Promotion and Promotion & 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.

1. University Resources

University of Washington Policy Directory
[Faculty Code and Governance](#)

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)

2. Academic Human Resources

Promotion and Tenure

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

Voting Guidelines

<http://ap.washington.edu/ahr/policies/voting-guidelines/>

Job Class Codes including Position Descriptions (by title)

<https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/academic-titles-ranks/>

PART III. Criteria and Expectations

A. Expectations for Research by CBE Faculty

The goal of the College of Built Environments is excellence in research, which includes creative achievement. The term used in the *University of Washington Policy Directory* is "research"; however, as defined in the *Policy Directory*, "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 & Tenure and for Promotion 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.

According to the *University of Washington Policy Directory* (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, taking into account sub-disciplines and publication differences. 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 management, 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 Policy Directory* construes the term “research” very broadly to include creative achievements of all kinds. The *Policy Directory* makes this clear (Section 24-32):

“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.”

Although there are differences between disciplines and subdisciplines, the criteria for evaluation and the measures of success in scholarship are consistent within a discipline or subdiscipline. 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 subdiscipline. Thus, a Candidate’s career accomplishments are measured in comparison to those of their peers.

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 & Tenure or 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 Promotion & Tenure or Promotion.

For faculty holding “research” titles, standards of excellence must also be applied to the Candidate’s record of generating grant and contract funding. Because faculty with

research titles generate funding that supports their own salaries and benefits, a Candidate with a "research" title must meet a standard of excellence that includes a demonstrated record of generating funding to support themselves, and must provide evidence that they will continue to generate similar funding support in the future.

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 Policy Directory* 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. 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.

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. 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 Policy Directory*, 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 & Tenure and Promotion 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 affected 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. Candidates for Promotion & Tenure or 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 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. 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.

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 & Tenure or 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 self-assessment. 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 *UW Policy Directory* includes "participation in academic advising and counseling" as part of its discussion of the scope of teaching and should be in the self-assessment section addressing teaching, as well as 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 *UW Policy Directory*. University of Washington Policy states that collegial review of teaching by Assistant Professors must take place annually; collegial review of teaching by Associate and full Professors must take place at least every three years, and at least one course must be evaluated by colleagues in the year before applying for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. (Faculty who are on a "fast track," and who may seek promotion from Associate Professor to Professor only three, four, five, or six years after promotion should have peer teaching reviews conducted more often so that a sufficiently robust record of teaching evaluation is available when applying for promotion.) 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 courses and programs in the College of Built Environments makes it difficult 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. 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 & Tenure, and this record must be presented in the key documents submitted to the Dean's Office and in the Promotion package sent forward to the Provost's Office/Academic Human Resources.

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 *UW Policy Directory* 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 (external) 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 self-assessment and Curriculum Vitae.

D. Recommendations to Assistant Professors

1. Documentation

Ideally the Assistant Professor should develop drafts of their Curriculum Vitae and Career Narrative (self-assessment) 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 members who have successfully moved through the Promotion & Tenure process to gain advice, and to request examples of documents that may serve as models.

The *University of Washington Policy Directory* 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 self-assessment and Curriculum Vitae.

However, as the Department Chair may come from a sub-discipline different from the Assistant Professor's field, 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 CBE 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 & Tenure (and for Promotion for Research Assistant Professors). An Assistant Professor must become familiar with the work of distinguished scholars working in their 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 & Tenure (or Promotion).

3. Recommendations to Research Assistant Professors (Funding)

Research faculty members are expected to be able to support themselves (both salary and benefits) from the grant and contract funding they generate. Research Assistant Professors must develop a record of generating research funding. Initially this may be in collaboration with others, but over time a Research Assistant Professor should begin to

show some ability to generate their own research funding, either individually or as P.I. on research project teams. A clear record of funding support already secured sufficient to support the Candidate's salary and benefits for several years after promotion will be required for (mandatory) promotion to Research Associate Professor to be approved.

PART IV. Roles and Responsibilities

A. General responsibilities and roles

From the time an Assistant Professor joins a department faculty, the Chair, senior faculty, and the head of Promotion & 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 & Tenure decision will be easier and fairer. Similar assessments and assistance should be available to Associate Professors.

1. Mentoring of Junior Faculty

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.

2. Meetings with Chair

a. Annual meetings between each Assistant Professor (and each Research Assistant Professor) and the Chair of the Department are required by the *UW Policy Directory* Section 24-57, sub-section C. These meetings should be used for frank discussions of progress towards Promotion and/or Tenure, problems, and where an Assistant Professor can receive additional assistance if needed. Written documentation of these meetings is required by the *UW Policy Directory*. One focus of such meetings should be the review of the Candidate's annually updated Career Narrative (self-assessment) and Curriculum Vitae. Similar annual meetings are also required between the Chair and non-tenured Associate Professors or Professors, and Teaching Assistant Professors.

c. Bi-annual meetings between each Associate Professor (and each Research Associate Professor) and the Chair of the Department are required by the *UW Policy Directory*. 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 *UW Policy Directory*. Similar annual meetings are also required between the Chair and Associate Teaching Professors.

d. Although not related to promotion, meetings every third year between each

Professor (and each Research and Teaching Professor) and the Department chair are required by the *UW Policy Directory*. These meetings will focus on the Professor's career development and goals and might also address the roles the Professor plays in the Department, and may include discussion of mentoring junior faculty.

e. The process of reappointment 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 & Tenure, and to set forth a "plan" to achieve the necessary level of "substantial success" in teaching and research as required by the *UW Policy Directory* for Promotion & Tenure. reappointment is an opportunity for senior faculty in the Department to review progress and to make suggestions for adjustments to the Assistant Professor's "plan." The meeting between the Assistant Professor and the Department Chair in the second year of appointment should include discussion of preparations for submitting for reappointment. (A thorough discussion of reappointment is found in Section V of this document.) [fix numbering to correspond to this new 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 a short list of reviewers to exclude due to conflict of interest.

3. Prepares the "peer review package" including complete self-assessment, complete curriculum vitae, other supporting documentation, and examples of creative work to be sent to external peers for review.

4.a. During the term of appointment as an Assistant Professor, coordinates with Chair or designated senior faculty to verify that annual peer review of teaching is carried out. Verifies with the Department that the Department is keeping a record of all peer teaching reviews. (Note: Maintaining one's own set of copies of all peer teaching reviews is strongly recommended.)

4.b. During the term of appointment as an Associate Professor, coordinates with Chair or designated senior faculty to verify that regular peer review of teaching is carried out, including the required peer review of teaching in the year before seeking promotion to Professor. (Per the *UW Policy Directory* a peer teaching evaluation every third year is the minimum required; more frequent reviews are recommended; a review in the twelve months before applying for promotion is required.) Verifies with the Department that the Department is keeping a record of all peer teaching reviews. (Note: Maintaining one's own set of copies of all peer teaching reviews is strongly recommended.)

5. Prepares the “complete career dossier” for internal review including a complete self-assessment, 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. For faculty holding "research" titles this documentation will include the complete record of grant and contract funding, plus evidence of continuing funding and/or future funding has been secured for the next several years.

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 and the Chair's Recommendation.

8. Responds (within 7 days) in writing to the Dean's summary of the College Council findings and the Dean's own findings, evaluation and recommendation to the Provost.

C. Chair’s Responsibilities

1. Ensures that they and the department faculty are familiar with the rules and guidelines for Promotion & Tenure and Promotion.

2. Holds annual meeting with each Assistant Professor, Research Assistant Professor, and Teaching Assistant Professor; holds bi-annual meetings with each Associate Professor, Research Associate Professor and Associate Teaching Professor; holds meetings every third year with each Professor, Research Professor, and Teaching Professor. Prepares a written record of each meeting -- the content of which must be agreed to by the faculty member as a faithful record of the meeting.

3. Verifies that required collegial reviews of teaching (peer teaching reviews) are taking place (annual reviews for Assistant Professors, and Assistant Teaching Professor; reviews at least every three years for Associate and full Professors and Associate Teaching Professor, and also in the final year before an Associate Professor seeks promotion to Professor or a Associate Teaching Professor seeks promotion to Teaching Professor). Maintains a record of all collegial reviews of teaching as required by *UW Policy Directory 24-57*, sub-section A. Shares collegial reviews of teaching with faculty reviewed.

4. Assembles lists of mandatory and non-mandatory Candidates for Promotion & Tenure and Promotion. Provides copies of lists to the 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 & Tenure or Promotion processes.

6. Determines a list of external reviewers (composed of some “blind” reviewers — that

is, those reviewers unknown to the Candidate -- and some external peer reviewers based on the Candidate's list of potential reviewers, and reviewers to exclude. Chair selects four or five reviewers, and a fifth or sixth alternate reviewer in case one reviewer is unable to perform review.

(Note: In some Departments, particularly if the Chair is a Teaching Associate Professor or Teaching Professor, this task may be delegated to a senior faculty member who takes on the Chair role for managing the promotion process.)

7. Oversees data gathering and department evaluation process.
8. Manages communication with and concurrence from joint appointing department and/or adjunct appointing department, if any.
9. Provides written summary of Review Committee deliberation, if a Committee was involved, to Candidate, and solicits Candidate response (within 7 days).
10. Organizes faculty deliberations and faculty vote. Records/summarizes discussion for use in Chair's memo discussing the case.
11. Provides written summary of faculty deliberation and vote to Candidate, and solicits Candidate response (within 7 days).
12. 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.
13. Verifies that the complete career dossier is assembled. Makes two copies of key documents. Transmits one copy of key documents in digital form to the Dean's Office along with complete career dossier. Retains one copy of key documents in a secure location in the Department.
14. In cases where no department review committee exists, and no senior faculty member has been designated to coordinate the review, performs all duties of the 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 (self-assessment) and Curriculum Vitae, and on contents of peer review packages and complete career dossier.

2. If requested by the Department Chair participates in the Chair's determination of 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. Chair selects four or five reviewers, and a fifth or sixth alternate reviewer in case one reviewer is unable to perform review.

3. If requested, may work with Chair to assist in soliciting written evaluations from teaching peer reviewers.

4. 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.

5. 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 Responsibilities

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

2. Faculty superior in rank to a Candidate for promotion may assist in generating the list of external peer reviewers.

3. Faculty may serve as Teaching Peer Reviewers and prepare teaching peer review letters or reports.

4. Department faculty who are superior in rank to a Candidate review the complete career dossier in detail, and the external peer review letters, to prepare for discussion of the Candidate, and vote on Promotion & 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 a Candidate for Promotion & Tenure, or Promotion.

6. If a Department does not have at least three faculty superior in rank to the Candidate applying for promotion, then the Dean of the College must appoint a Special Review Committee. Department faculty superior in rank must be members of this Committee; additional members will be appointed from the faculty superior in rank in other Departments in the College. This Special Review Committee carries out the review, and prepares a report of their discussion and vote.

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

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

F. CBE College Council Responsibilities

1. Reviews all Candidate materials.
2. Reviews procedures used by the 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 report that summarizes deliberation and vote, and submits this memo to the Dean. This report must address the qualifications of the Candidate and the process used by the Department in its review, and must include a vote to recommend (or not recommend) promotion or Promotion and tenure. Votes of all College Council members must be accounted for (the total number of yes, no, abstention and absent not voting must be equal to the number of College Council Members).

G. CBE Dean Responsibilities

1. Reviews the complete career dossier, including the letters and reports, 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. Meets with the Candidate and reports Dean's findings, evaluation and recommendation to the Provost, and solicits Candidate response (within 7 days).
5. In cases where the Dean's recommendation is to deny Promotion or Promotion & Tenure, may meet with the Department Chair and Candidate to share their expectations, and discuss the likely outcome of the review process. 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 & Tenure.

5. Submits Promotion package (key documents) 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 Responsibilities

1. Reviews the Promotion package forwarded by the CBE Dean's Office, including Dean's memo, College Council memo, and Chair's memo and departmentally generated key documents (including all letters and evaluation/review reports).

2. May request additional information from the College or the Department.

3. Notifies the Dean of the decision with regard to Promotion or Promotion & Tenure.