

College of Built Environments Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion

Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment of CBE Faculty – Policy and Procedure

Updated April 2026

(Revisions on August 31, 2021;

updated Sept 16, 2021;

updated Sept 21, 2021;

updated Sept 29, 2021;

update Oct 18, 2021)

Revisions in March 2026 in response to provost's call for review

Revisions in 2025 Reflecting changes to the UW Faculty Code

Faculty Senate Class A Legislation 173 + 176

Effective June 2024 and June 2025 respectively

and the implementation of Interfolio RPT promotion management software

Table of Contents

Introduction

PART 1. Criteria and Expectations.....	6
1.1. Overview for all Ranks and Titles.....	6
1.2. Promotion Criteria by Rank and Title.....	6
1.2.1. Scholarship, Research, and Creative Works.....	7
1.2.2. Effective Teaching	7
1.2.3. Service Criteria.....	8
1.3. Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	10
1.3.1. Scholarship	10
1.3.2. Teaching.....	11
1.3.3. Service.....	12
1.3.4. Conclusion	12
1.4. Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor	13
1.4.1. Scholarship	13
1.4.2. Teaching.....	14
1.4.3. Service.....	15
1.4.4. Conclusion	15
1.5. Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor.....	16
1.5.1. Scholarship	16
1.5.2. Teaching.....	17
1.5.3. Service.....	17
1.6. Guidelines for Promotion to Full Teaching Professor	19
1.6.1. Scholarship	19
1.6.2. Teaching.....	20
1.6.3. Service.....	21
1.7. Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Research Professor	22
1.7.1. Research Advising and Mentorship	23
1.7.2. Service.....	23
1.7.3. Conclusion	23
1.8. Guidelines for Promotion to Research Professor	24
1.8.1. Expectations for promotion to Research Professor.	24
1.8.2. Scholarship	24
1.8.3. Research Advising and Mentorship	25

1.8.4.	Service.....	25
1.8.5.	Conclusion	26
PART 2.	Procedures	27
2.1.	Department-level Procedures	27
2.1.1.	Assembly of Record	28
2.1.2.	External Letters of Review	29
2.1.3.	Teaching Evaluations.....	31
2.1.4.	Department Recommendations and Candidate's Response.....	31
	• Faculty Review with at least 3 eligible voting faculty	31
	• Procedures with fewer than 3 eligible voting faculty	32
	• Chair Review and Candidate's Response	32
	• Departmental Check and Transmittal of Interfolio Case:	33
2.2.	College-Level Procedure	33
2.2.1.	CBE Elected Faculty Council.....	33
2.2.2.	Dean.....	33
2.2.3.	University-Level Procedure	34
2.3.	Research Track Faculty: Special Considerations.....	34
2.4.	Teaching Track Faculty: Appointment and Promotion	35
2.4.1.	Timing of Promotion of Assistant Teaching Professors.....	35
2.4.2.	Promotion Process for Assistant and Associate Teaching Professors	35
	• Evaluations of Teaching Performance	36
2.5.	Affiliate Faculty	36
2.5.1.	Departmental Discretion in Appointing Affiliate Faculty.....	36
2.5.2.	Eligibility and Timing of Promotion of Affiliate Faculty	37
2.5.3.	Promotion Process for Promotion of Affiliate Faculty	37
2.5.4.	Affiliate Faculty Promotion Submittals.....	37
2.5.5.	Evaluations of Teaching Performance	37
2.5.6.	Confidential External Evaluation Letter(s) for Affiliate Promotions	38
2.5.7.	Departmental Review.....	38
2.5.8.	Dean's Office Review.....	38
2.6.	Reappointment of Assistant Professors	39
2.6.1.	Timing, Expectations, and Authority	39
2.6.2.	Recommended Procedure	40

• Reappointment Documents to be submitted by the Candidate.....	40
• Evaluation and Vote on Reappointment	40
• Submittal to CBE Dean's Office.....	41
PART 3. Roles and Responsibilities	42
3.1. Mentoring of Junior Faculty	42
3.2. Meetings with Chair	42
3.3. Candidate's Responsibilities	42
3.4. Chair's Responsibilities.....	43
3.5. Subcommittee Responsibilities.....	44
3.6. Department Faculty Responsibilities	45
3.7. CBE Elected Faculty Council Responsibilities	45
3.8. CBE Dean Responsibilities	46
3.9. UW Provost and President Responsibilities	46
PART 4. Appendices.....	47
Appendix A. Key Dates and Deadlines	47
Appendix B. Summary of Promotion and Tenure Documentation	48
Appendix C. Resources and Information	49
C.1. University Resources	49
C.2. UW Office of Academic Personnel & Faculty (APF).....	49

Introduction

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

The document has been conceived to support faculty who are interested in applying for promotion, as well as departments and the dean's office who process the application:

Part 1 discusses criteria and expectations for a successful promotion or tenure and promotion case. It spells out the expectations for each type of promotion available to faculty at the College of Built Environments (CBE), by rank and track.

Part 2 provides a step-by-step overview of the phases of the application process, in which the candidate, department, and the dean's office must collaborate to move the case through the required review steps before it can be submitted to the provost's office for final review.

Part 3 outlines the roles and requirements of the individuals and committees involved in the review process. The appendices provide additional details on the CBE tenure and promotion process.

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

Department Chairs, review committees, and members of the Elected Faculty Council should familiarize themselves with the workflows described in these visualizations and use them to guide various stages of the process.

PART 1. Criteria and Expectations

1.1. Overview for all Ranks and Titles

The decisions to grant tenure or to promote a faculty member are among the most important the College of Built Environments (CBE) and its departments make. When promoting a faculty member, the college makes a decision that combines an assessment of the individual's records to date with a projection of the individual's career.

The precise expectations vary across the departments within the CBE and across the University, but they all involve some measure of quality, quantity, and trajectory in the record. There is no single scale that can be used even within a department, as the possible combinations of quantity, quality, and trajectory are innumerable. However, there are general principles that are applied as uniformly as possible across all cases.

The CBE has faculty in three tracks—tenure track, teaching track, and research track—and offers two levels of promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to (Full) Professor in each track.

In each case, scholarship and research, teaching, and service should be evaluated relative to the percentage given to each area of activity in the appointment letter of the individual faculty member. Most tenure-track faculty, for example, have an assignment of 40% scholarship and research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. The CBE provides specific guidelines for each track and for each level of promotion.

1.2. Promotion Criteria by Rank and Title

The *UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-34](#), defines the promotion criteria by the qualifications for appointment at specific ranks and titles:

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:

UW Faculty Code [Section 24-34.A.2](#): Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor

“Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in teaching and/or research. For tenured, tenure-eligible, or WOT appointments, both of these shall be required, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient.”

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor:

UW Faculty Code [Section 24-34.A.3](#): Appointment to the rank of Professor

“Appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and/or accomplishments in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition. For tenured, tenure-eligible, or WOT appointments, both of these shall be required.”

Tenure-track Faculty

Promotion to the ranks of associate professor or professor **with tenure** requires qualifications as described above and documented in *UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-34.A](#).

Teaching-track Faculty

Promotion to the ranks of associate professor or professor **with a teaching title** requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank above, **with primary emphasis upon teaching**, as described in *UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-34.B.3](#).

Research-track Faculty

Promotion to the ranks of associate professor or professor **with a research title** requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank above, **with primary emphasis upon research**, as described in *UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-34.B.5](#). Research faculty titles and the qualifications for them are described in *UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-35](#).

The following three sections describe the three areas of activity considered in promotion cases. For promotion criteria specific to ranks and tracks, please see sections 2.3-2.8.

1.2.1. Scholarship, Research, and Creative Works

The goal of the CBE is to achieve excellence in scholarship, research, and creative expression. The terms "scholarship, research, and creative expression" are broadly construed in the *UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-32.A-B](#).

Scholarly excellence for Promotion & Tenure and for Promotion in the College of Built Environments may be demonstrated in 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.

All promotions in the CBE are evaluated against a standard of excellence, but the variety of departments and sub-disciplines within departments means that there will be differences between promotion cases for a given rank and/or title, taking into account sub-disciplinary and publication differences.

When departments consider Candidates for Promotion & Tenure or for Promotion, they should apply standards and criteria commensurate with peer institutions in the candidate's discipline or subdiscipline. Evidence of the impact and influence of the Candidate's creative work should be identified, as should instances of distinction based on peer evaluation by reviewers external to the UW. For teaching faculty, some of the letters may be from faculty in different units outside the CBE at the University of Washington. 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.

1.2.2. Effective Teaching

In parallel with the goal of excellence in scholarship, the CBE has also set the expectation of excellence in teaching. The criteria and standards for teaching are intended to encourage faculty to perform the instructional component of their jobs well and to provide a framework for assessing and acknowledging teaching accomplishments appropriate to university faculty. The [Faculty Code Directory](#) recognizes the broad scope of teaching activities, including critical engagement, intellectual inquiry, discussion, and the sharing of research findings and professional debates, through a variety of teaching formats [[Section 24-32.C](#)].

The University requires faculty to routinely reflect on and refine their teaching practices. Excellence in teaching should be measured by its "effectiveness." Instruction must be judged according to each of the following core elements of effective teaching as described in the *UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-32.C](#):

“-Aligned: Effective teaching is intentionally designed and organized to help learners meet learning objectives.

-Inclusive and equitable: Effective teaching considers learners’ experiences and creates opportunities for each learner to thrive.

-Active and engaged: Effective teaching creates opportunities for learners to critically engage ideas and each other.

-Growth-oriented: Effective teaching creates opportunities for learners to learn through practice and provides feedback that helps them grow their knowledge and abilities.

-Relevant: Effective teaching helps learners understand why what they are learning matters and prepares them for future learning and life after the UW.”

Although determinations of faculty teaching assignments rest with the Chair of each Department, it is expected that departments in the CBE will develop relatively consistent teaching assignments for new faculty within a year or two of arrival at UW. 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.

The UW requires that two forms of teaching assessment and evaluation—student course evaluations of teaching and peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness—are regularly conducted [*UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-57.A](#)]. In addition to these two forms of teaching evaluation, Candidates seeking promotion should submit a variety of evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as course portfolios, documentation of individual student teaching, and teaching awards, to allow the fairest possible evaluation of teaching performance.

1.2.3. 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. The level of expected service is identified as a percentage of expected activities in the faculty’s appointment letter.

Service is not listed among the criteria *for Promotion in* the UW Faculty Code. Thus, no Promotion case at any level can be built with service as its central pillar. Nonetheless, service is essential to the Department, the College, and the 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 junior faculty’s service duties until they have established their research and/or teaching programs.

Promotion at any level will normally require demonstrating “satisfactory” levels of service. The definition of “satisfactory” depends 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 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.

Outstanding external professional service to national and international professional communities may be a measure of “recognition” in the field 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 considered 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 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.

1.3. Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The University of Washington Faculty Code specifies the following qualifications for appointment to Associate Professor with tenure:

“Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in teaching and/or research. For tenured, tenure-eligible, or WOT appointments, both of these shall be required, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient. [*Faculty Code* [Section 24-34.A.2](#)]

1.3.1. Scholarship

As a premier research university, we have high expectations for the independent scholarly record, including scholarship, research, and creative works, of our faculty. In general, quality is more important than quantity, although there must be sufficient quantity to provide evidence of a significant level of scholarly productivity. Several factors influence the assessment of the quality of a scholarly record.

- At the junior level, quality is usually demonstrated by the reputation of the journals or presses where the individual publishes, the caliber of the exhibit or performance venue, and early signs of the scholarship's impact.
- Outside funding of research from foundations and institutes (in those disciplines where it is available) can be viewed as a significant part of the scholarly record, depending on the relative size of the grant and the significance of the questions posed.
- The impact/significance of the scholarship is most often determined by the comments from outside reviewers. External assessments, such as awards and published reviews, can also serve as indicators.
- The candidate's personal statement is an important guide to the significance of each scholarly piece and its connections to the others. The statement should articulate the intellectual agenda(s) that motivates the individual's work and provides the context to substantiate the significance and impact of the work.
- The composition of the portfolio of published works also matters. A collection of good but unconnected articles may not produce the same sense of impact that a set of articles advancing a coherent line of scholarship would. It is not unprecedented, though, for faculty to shift scholarly areas of focus, even at the junior level. The personal statement provided by the candidate is a very important guide to the significance of each scholarly piece and their connection to each other.
- Another issue is the connection of published work to the dissertation. Highly regarded articles from the dissertation do count, but not as much as highly regarded articles reflecting scholarship beyond the dissertation. For those disciplines where a book is considered standard for tenure, a book based on the dissertation that shows significant extensions and revisions is regarded more highly than one that does not.
- In the creative arts and design, tenure portfolios can reflect the faculty member's creative expression—including exhibitions, performances, and reviews thereof. As with all faculty members, the significance of the work and career trajectory is of paramount importance.
- The scholarly record should provide clear evidence of independent thinking and research/performance. Thus, although many junior scholars continue to do some

collaborative work with a former Ph.D. or postdoc advisor, it is important to establish a record of growing independence from former advisors.

- Invitations to speak at other universities and prestigious events add to the scholarly record but generally play a relatively minor role, independent of other measures of the scholarly record and compared with, for example, publications.
- We do encourage interdisciplinary and collaborative work; thus, joint or co-authored books, articles, and creative works are given important weight. It is, however, necessary to identify the contributions of the candidate to these works. A significant portion of the overall scholarly record should include works to which the candidate (and, as appropriate, their students) has made the primary contributions. The case must clearly identify each individual's role in collaborative work.
- Sustained scholarly activity, as seen in conference participation, publications, grants, or performances and exhibitions, demonstrates scholarly engagement and attainment.
- Community-engaged and globally engaged scholarship, entrepreneurship, and innovation are all encouraged. Likewise, we encourage making the scholarship open and available to the broader community. Such activities should be described in the research statement.

Given that the tenure decision is very much about future expectations, the trajectory of scholarly productivity is carefully considered.

1.3.2. Teaching

A good teaching record is a necessary part of a successful tenure and promotion case. Tenure will not be granted in the CBE without evidence of good teaching. An exceptional teaching record can compensate for a more limited scholarly record, but it cannot substitute for an unacceptable scholarly record. Teaching is viewed broadly, including curriculum planning, course design, student reactions and success, and mentoring. Evidence of success in these areas will be judged using the following materials.

- **Self-assessment.** The Candidate's personal statement provides a great opportunity to explain the overall teaching record and the steps taken to improve the teaching quality in response to feedback. The statement should address how the candidate's teaching practice addresses the core elements of effective teaching, as described in Section 24-32.C of the Faculty Code.
- **Student evaluations.** Candidates are expected to have course evaluations for a large percentage, if not all, of the courses taught at the UW. Special interest is placed on evaluations of the instructor's contribution to the class, the overall quality of the class, and, especially, the amount students learned.
- **Peer reviews.** The Faculty Code calls for peer review each year for Assistant Professors, and these reviews are an important part of the candidate's record. Ideally, the reviewer will be provided with a full portfolio of the course being reviewed, including a statement of course objectives and philosophy, before visiting a class (although classroom visitation is not formally required in the peer evaluation process). It is best if the file includes peer reviews from several different faculty colleagues. Especially in interdisciplinary courses, it may be useful to have peer reviews from faculty in different disciplines. Constructive criticism is expected in most peer reviews.

- **Mentoring record.** A very important part of our teaching responsibilities takes place outside of any specific course. Advising students, both undergraduate and graduate, is a significant contribution to the University's teaching mission. At the time of promotion to Professor, a faculty member will have a significant record of working with and mentoring students, including, where appropriate, chairing graduate student committees. The demonstrated success of one's students (both undergraduate and graduate) can be valuable testimony of a faculty member's contributions.

As with scholarship, there is a fundamental expectation that teaching quality will improve over time. Most faculty show marked improvement during their first years as they gain experience and support.

1.3.3. Service

Communities thrive when all members contribute to the common good. Thus, we expect that candidates for tenure and promotion will be involved in the life of their department, and, hopefully, in the life of the University and their national associations. The University and the College have also made engagement with the broader public one of our institutional goals and encourage public scholarship. It is desirable to show evidence of contributions to or engagement with the broader community, and in some cases, this may be part of the job expectations. For junior faculty, this is usually much less important to the evaluation than is service to the department and the University. It is understood that junior faculty will devote less time to service than tenured faculty members.

1.3.4. Conclusion

The College and the University seek to appoint individuals who will be intellectually independent and capable of fulfilling leadership roles in their fields and in the University. We provide additional resources during the pre-tenure years to support career development that we hope — and expect — will lead to a successful tenure and promotion decision, based on the principles outlined in this document. The CBE values the many and varied contributions made by faculty. Each promotion case is evaluated on its own merits, taking into account the specific expectations of each department and the general expectations of the College and the University. It is important to stress, however, that ultimately individuals are responsible for their own professional success.

1.4. Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor

The University of Washington Faculty Code specifies the following qualifications for appointment to Full Professor with tenure:

“Appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and/or accomplishments in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition. For tenured, tenure-eligible, or WOT appointments, both of these shall be required.” *Faculty Code* [Section 24-34.A.3](#)

1.4.1. Scholarship

As a premier research university, our expectations regarding the independent scholarly record of our faculty are high. In general, quality is more important than quantity, although there must be sufficient quantity to provide evidence of a significant level of scholarly productivity and impact. For promotion to Professor, the faculty member should have established themselves as a major researcher, scholar, or creative artist at the national and often international level. At this stage of the career, the scholarly record will typically be larger and reflect a more mature formulation of questions and a richer exploration of them. Although the faculty member's entire scholarly career is evaluated, emphasis is placed on work developed since the time of promotion to Associate Professor. Several factors influence the assessment of the quality of a scholarly record.

- Quality and national or international reputation can be demonstrated by indicators of the impact of scholarship, such as the number of citations and the prestige of the journals (e.g. impact scores) or presses in which the individual publishes, or of the exhibit venue.
- Outside funding of research from foundations and institutes (in those disciplines where it is available) can be viewed as a significant part of the scholarly record, depending on the size of the grant, the significance of the questions posed, and the prestige of the granting institution.
- The impact/significance of the scholarship is also evidenced by the comments from outside reviewers. External assessments, such as awards and published reviews, can also serve as indicators.
- The candidate's self-assessment is an important guide to the significance of each scholarly piece and its connections to the others. The statement should articulate the intellectual agenda(s) that motivate the individual's work and provide the context to substantiate the significance and impact of the work.
- In the creative arts and design, promotion portfolios will reflect the faculty member's creative work, including works of art, exhibitions, performances, and reviews thereof. As with all faculty members, the significance of the work and career trajectory is paramount.
- Invitations to speak at other universities and prestigious events add to the scholarly record but generally play a relatively minor role, independent of other measures of the scholarly record and compared with, for example, publications.
- We do encourage interdisciplinary and collaborative work; thus, joint or co-authored books, articles, and creative works are given important weight. It is, however, necessary to identify the contributions of the candidate to these articles and works. A significant portion of the overall scholarly record should include works to which the candidate (and

as appropriate, their students) has made the primary contributions. The case must clearly identify each individual's role in collaborative work.

- Community-engaged and globally engaged scholarship, entrepreneurship, and innovation are all encouraged. Likewise, we encourage making the scholarship open and available to the broader community. Such activities should be described in the research statement of the self-assessment.
- Sustained scholarly activity, as seen in conference participation, publications, grants, or performances and exhibitions, demonstrates scholarly engagement and attainment.

1.4.2. Teaching

A good teaching record is a necessary part of a successful promotion case. Promotion will not be granted in the CBE without evidence of good teaching. An exceptional teaching record can compensate for a more limited scholarly record, but it cannot substitute for an unacceptable scholarly record. Teaching is viewed broadly, including curriculum planning, course design, student reactions and success, and mentoring. Evidence of success in these areas will be judged using the following materials.

- **Self-assessment.** The Candidate's personal statement provides a great opportunity to explain the overall teaching record and the steps taken to improve the teaching quality in response to feedback. The statement should address how the candidate's teaching practice addresses the core elements of effective teaching, as described in [Section 24-32.C](#) of the *UW Faculty Code*.
- **Student evaluations.** Candidates are expected to have course evaluations for a substantial percentage of the courses taught at the UW. Special emphasis is placed on evaluating the instructor's contribution to the class, the overall quality of the class, and, especially, the amount students learned.
- **Peer reviews.** The Faculty Code requires peer review at least triennially for Associate Professors, and these reviews are an important part of the candidate's record. Ideally, the reviewer will be provided with a full portfolio of the course being reviewed, including a statement of course objectives and philosophy, before visiting a class—though classroom visitation is not formally required in the peer evaluation process. It is best if the file includes peer reviews from several different faculty colleagues. Especially in interdisciplinary courses, it may be useful to have peer reviews from faculty in different disciplines. Constructive criticism is expected in most peer reviews. The *UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-57.A](#) requires that a peer evaluation be conducted prior to promotion, regardless of the triennial evaluation schedule.
- **Mentoring record.** A very important part of our teaching responsibilities takes place outside of any specific course. Advising students, both undergraduate and graduate, is a significant contribution to the University's teaching mission. At the time of promotion to Professor, a faculty member will have a significant record of working with and mentoring students, including, where appropriate, chairing graduate student committees. The demonstrated success of one's students (both undergraduate and graduate) can be valuable testimony of a faculty member's contributions.

1.4.3. Service

Communities thrive when all members contribute to the common good. Thus, we expect that Candidates for Promotion will have been involved in the life of their department, in the life of the University, and in their national associations. The University and the College have also made engagement with the broader public one of our institutional goals and encourage public scholarship. It is desirable to show evidence of contributions to or engagement with the broader community, and in some cases, this may be part of the job expectations. Whereas junior faculty commit less of their time to service, tenured faculty members are expected to play a greater role in this area.

1.4.4. Conclusion

Faculty members, especially post-tenure, can take various approaches to scholarship, teaching, and service, emphasizing one or another at different times in a career. The CBE values the many and varied contributions made by faculty. Promotion to the highest academic rank will be consistent with the expectations of a research university. Each promotion case is evaluated on its own merits, taking into account the specific expectations of each department and the general expectations of the College and the University. The College is eager to work with faculty toward promotion to this rank. It is important to stress, however, that ultimately individuals are responsible for their own professional success.

1.5. Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

The University of Washington Faculty Code specifies the following qualifications for appointment to Associate Teaching Professor:

“Associate Teaching Professor is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline” [\[Section 24-34.B.2\]](#).

The College is guided by the Faculty Code in assessing whether candidates’ cases provide evidence of broad and sustained contributions to instruction. This document elaborates on the scope and meaning of “extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline” while recognizing that there is no single scale that can be used to judge the quantity, quality, and trajectory evidenced in promotion cases. The particular portfolios of candidates for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor may vary widely depending on opportunities and expectations across the CBE departments. Given the nature of teaching track positions, it is important to note that the activities described below are assumed to be grounded in a strong record of teaching excellence within the faculty member’s home department. In the context of diverse Associate Teaching Professor profiles and experiences, the general principles detailed here are applied as uniformly as possible across all promotion cases by the Elected Faculty Council and the Dean. In keeping with the traditional functions of all faculty, we use the categories of “Teaching,” “Service,” and “Scholarship” to structure the general principles below.

1.5.1. Scholarship

The Faculty Code states that “Scholarship, the essence of effective teaching and research, is the obligation of all members of the faculty.” [\[Section 24-32.A\]](#) With respect to teaching faculty of all ranks, the Code further states that teaching faculty

“may demonstrate their scholarship in a variety of ways, including but not limited to: introduction of new knowledge or methods into course content; creation or use of innovative pedagogical methods; development of new courses, curricula, or course materials; participation in professional conferences; evidence of excellent student performance; receipt of grants or awards; contributions to interdisciplinary teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations; or significant outreach to professionals at other educational institutions. While they may choose to do so through publication, such publication shall not be required.” [\[Section 24-34.B.4\]](#)

Published scholarship is thus not an explicit component of most teaching track faculty positions, nor is it a requirement for promotion to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor. However, where published scholarship is considered as part of the promotion case, such scholarship **should directly enhance the faculty member’s teaching expertise**. Through this work, the faculty member contributes to the teaching in their unit or field. Some examples might include:

- Research on pedagogy, either published or presented at scholarly conferences.
- Research on the scholarship of teaching and learning, either published or presented at scholarly conferences.

- Research on the content area of the faculty member's teaching specialty, either published or presented at scholarly conferences.

1.5.2. Teaching

The University expects a trajectory of high-quality classroom teaching from Assistant Teaching Professors, as well as activities that enhance the teaching mission of the University, including curriculum planning, course design, student reactions and success, and mentoring. Evidence of success in these areas will be judged using the following materials.

- **Self-assessment.** The Candidate's personal statement provides an opportunity to explain the overall teaching record and the steps taken to improve teaching quality in response to feedback. The statement should address how the candidate's teaching practice addresses the core elements of effective teaching, which are described in [Section 24-32.C](#) of the *UW Faculty Code*.
- **Student evaluations.** Candidates are expected to have course evaluations for a large percentage, if not all, of the courses taught at the UW. Special interest is placed on evaluations of the instructor's contribution to the class, the overall quality of the class, and, especially, the amount students learned.
- **Peer reviews.** The *UW Faculty Code* calls for peer review each year for Assistant Professors. These reviews are an important part of the candidate's record. Ideally, the reviewer will be provided with a full portfolio of the course being reviewed, including a statement of course objectives and philosophy, before visiting a class (although classroom visitation is not formally required in the peer evaluation process). It is best if the file includes peer reviews from several different faculty colleagues. Especially in interdisciplinary courses, it may be useful to have peer reviews from faculty in different disciplines. Constructive criticism is expected in most peer reviews.

The promotion case must also provide evidence of the faculty member's "extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline". Some examples of evidence of "extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline" include:

- A strong record of excellence in student and collegial teaching evaluations
- Supervision and mentoring of students in independent study, fieldwork, and research projects
- A nomination for a teaching or mentorship award (e.g., from the CBE or University, or field-specific regional/national association)
- Creative and effective use of innovative pedagogical strategies, including new technologies
- Demonstrated commitment to promoting diversity, equity, access, and inclusion in student instruction

1.5.3. Service

Service to the department, College, University, and/or discipline can serve as evidence of a faculty member's "extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline" [*UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-34.B](#)]. The key to service in the promotion to Associate Teaching Professor is a sustained record of contributions to the University's teaching mission through

greater involvement and higher levels of responsibility in department-level or CBE-level teaching issues, and engagement in University- or discipline-wide teaching programs.

Service that indicates **contributions to teaching at the University-level** may include:

- Participation in programs including, but not limited to, the Center for Teaching and Learning, Faculty Fellows, Teaching Assistant training workshops, UW Advance, teaching workshops for faculty, and bridge/enrichment programs for students.
- Membership in College-level and University-level advisory groups related to teaching and student affairs
- Outreach activities to the community beyond the University that are directly tied to the faculty member's teaching expertise
- Service as faculty advisor for student associations at the university level.

Service that evidences **contributions to teaching at the College-level** may focus on curriculum development and/or coordination in the following ways:

- Participation in department-level and college-level curricular and/or administrative activities
- Participation in department-level and college-level committees focused on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion
- Mentoring colleagues, teaching assistants, and peer facilitators in instructional matters
- Service as faculty advisor for student associations at the unit level
- Participation in student services related to teaching and learning (e.g., study centers, computing laboratories)
- Participation in academic advising and counseling

Service that evidences contributions to **teaching at the field-level** may include:

- Participation in workshops, conferences, competitions and exhibitions
- Service to scholarly journals related to teaching and learning, membership in professional associations that focus on teaching and learning.

1.6. Guidelines for Promotion to Full Teaching Professor

The University of Washington Faculty Code specifies the following qualifications for appointment to Teaching Professor:

“Appointment with the title of teaching professor requires a record of excellence in instruction, which may be demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field.” [\[Section 24-34.B.3.c\]](#)

The College is guided by the Faculty Code in assessing whether candidates’ cases provide evidence of broad and sustained contributions to instruction beyond the classroom and beyond the department. This document elaborates on the scope and meaning of “exemplary” contributions, while recognizing that there is no single scale that can be used to judge the quantity, quality, and trajectory evidenced in promotion cases. The particular portfolios of candidates for promotion to Teaching Professor may vary widely depending on opportunities and expectations across units within the College. Given the nature of Teaching Professor positions, it is important to note that the activities described below are assumed to be grounded in a sustained record of teaching excellence within the individual’s home unit. In the context of diverse Teaching Professor profiles and experiences, the general principles detailed here are applied as uniformly as possible across all promotion cases by the Elected Faculty Council and the Dean. In keeping with the traditional functions of all faculty, we use the categories of “Teaching,” “Service,” and “Scholarship” to structure the general principles below.

1.6.1. Scholarship

The Faculty Code states that “Scholarship, the essence of effective teaching and research, is the obligation of all members of the faculty.” [\[Section 24-32.A\]](#) With respect to teaching faculty of all ranks, the Code further states that teaching faculty

“may demonstrate their scholarship in a variety of ways, including but not limited to: introduction of new knowledge or methods into course content; creation or use of innovative pedagogical methods; development of new courses, curricula, or course materials; participation in professional conferences; evidence of excellent student performance; receipt of grants or awards; contributions to interdisciplinary teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations; or significant outreach to professionals at other educational institutions. While they may choose to do so through publication, such publication shall not be required.” [\[Section 24-34.B.4\]](#)

Published scholarship is thus not an explicit component of Teaching Professor positions, nor is it a requirement for promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor. However, when published scholarship is considered as part of the promotion case, it should directly enhance the faculty member’s teaching excellence. Through this work, the faculty member contributes to teaching in their field or discipline. Some examples might include:

- Research on pedagogy, either published or presented at scholarly conferences
- Research on the scholarship of teaching and learning, either published or presented at scholarly conferences

- Research on the content area of the faculty member's teaching specialty, either published or presented at scholarly conferences.

1.6.2. Teaching

The University expects consistently high-quality classroom teaching from Associate Teaching Professors as well as activities to enhance the teaching mission of the University through activities that could include curriculum planning, course design, student reactions and success, and mentoring. Evidence of success in these areas will be judged using the following materials.

- **Self-Assessment.** The personal statement provides an opportunity to explain the overall teaching record and the steps taken to improve the quality of teaching in response to feedback. The statement should address how the candidate's teaching practice addresses the core elements of effective teaching, which are described in [Section 24-32.C](#) of the *UW Faculty Code*.
- **Student evaluations.** Candidates are expected to have course evaluations for a large percentage, if not all, of the courses taught at the UW. Special interest is placed on evaluations of the instructor's contribution to the class, the overall quality of the class, and, especially, the amount students learned.
- **Peer reviews.** The Faculty Code calls for peer review at least triennially for Associate Professors, and these are an important part of the candidate's record. Ideally, the reviewer will be provided with a full portfolio of the course being reviewed, including a statement of course objectives and philosophy, before visiting a class—though classroom visitation is not formally required in the peer evaluation process. It is best if the file includes peer reviews from several different faculty colleagues. Especially in cases of interdisciplinary courses, it may be useful to have peer reviews by faculty in different disciplines. Constructive criticism is expected in most peer reviews. The [Faculty Code Section 24-57 A](#) requires that a peer evaluation be conducted prior to promotion, regardless of the triennial evaluation schedule.

The promotion case for promotion to teaching professor must also provide evidence not only of the faculty member's sustained excellence in instruction in their unit, but also at the College, University, and/or field level. Some examples of evidence of recognition of teaching excellence include:

- Sustained excellence in student and collegial teaching evaluations
- A departmental or unit-based teaching award
- A field-specific teaching award from a regional or national association
- A university teaching award
- Leadership in curricular or pedagogical innovations beyond the faculty member's own department
- Commendations or awards for excellence in mentorship
- Demonstrated success in promoting diversity, equity, access and inclusion in student instruction
- Success in securing national grants to support instructional excellence.

1.6.3. Service

Service to the department, College, University, and/or field can also serve as evidence of a faculty member's contributions to exemplary teaching. The key to service in the promotion to Teaching Professor is a sustained record of contributions to the teaching mission of the University through university-wide teaching programs, central leadership in unit-level teaching issues, and/or engagement in discipline- or field-level curriculum development. The promotion file should build a case for sustained, substantive contributions to teaching through service at the University, unit and/or field, regional or national level.

Service that indicates contributions to **teaching at the University level** may include:

- Participation as a planner or facilitator in programs including, but not limited to, the Center for Teaching and Learning, Faculty Fellows, Teaching Assistant training workshops, UW Advance, teaching workshops for faculty, and bridge/enrichment programs for students.
- Membership in or chairing of faculty councils related to teaching.
- Participation in university-level advisory groups or selection committees related to teaching.
- Outreach activities to the community beyond the University that is directly tied to the faculty member's teaching expertise.
- Service on unit-, college-, and/or university-level committees that foster diversity, equity, access, and inclusion of students, faculty, and/or staff.

Service that evidences contributions to teaching **at the College level** may focus on curriculum development, coordination, and/or oversight in the following ways:

- Serving as chair, associate or assistant chair of the department or College
- Serving as director of undergraduate or graduate studies
- Leadership in formulating departmental or unit-level learning goals
- Membership in interdisciplinary committees charged with curriculum development
- Serving as faculty advisor for student associations
- Directing clinics, organizing experiential learning opportunities, or special academic training programs where these are not a regular element in the faculty member's duties

Service that evidences contributions to teaching at the field level may include:

- Service to scholarly journals related to teaching and learning
- Membership in professional associations that focus on teaching and learning
- Receipt of grant funds to pursue research in the scholarship of teaching and learning

1.7. Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Research Professor

The University of Washington Faculty Code specifies that promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor requires **a record of substantial success in teaching and/or research**. The qualifications correspond to those prescribed for the rank of associate professor with tenure, with primary emphasis upon research. Tenure is not acquired under research appointments. This document elaborates on this section of the Code from the CBE's perspective.

As a premier research university, our expectations regarding the independent scholarly record of our faculty are high. In general, quality is more important than quantity, although there must be sufficient quantity to provide evidence of a significant level of scholarly productivity. Several factors influence the assessment of the quality of a scholarly record.

- At the junior level, quality is most often demonstrated by the quality of the journals or presses in which the individual publishes or the quality of the exhibit or performance venue.
- Outside funding of research from foundations and institutes (in those disciplines where it is available) can be viewed as a significant part of the scholarly record, depending on the relative size of the grant and the significance of the questions posed.
- The impact/significance of the scholarship is most often verified by the comments from outside reviewers. External assessments, such as awards and published reviews, can also serve as indicators.
- The personal statement provided by the candidate is an important guide to the significance of each scholarly piece and their connections to each other. The statement should articulate the intellectual agenda(s) that motivates the individual's work.
- The composition of the portfolio of published works also matters. A collection of good but unconnected articles may not produce the same sense of impact that a set of articles advancing a coherent line of scholarship would. It is not unprecedented, though, for faculty to shift scholarly areas of focus, even at the junior level. The personal statement provided by the candidate is a very important guide to the significance of each scholarly piece and their connection to each other.
- Another issue is the connection of published work to the dissertation. Highly regarded articles from the dissertation do count, but not as much as highly regarded articles reflecting scholarship beyond the dissertation. For those disciplines where a book is considered standard for promotion, a book based on the dissertation that shows significant extensions and revisions is regarded more highly than one that does not.
- In the creative arts, portfolios will reflect the faculty member's creative work—including exhibitions, performances, and reviews thereof. As with all faculty members, the significance of the work and a positive career trajectory are of paramount importance.
- The scholarly record should provide clear evidence of independent thinking and research/performance. Thus, although many junior scholars continue to do some collaborative work with a former Ph.D. or postdoc advisor, it is important to establish a record of growing independence from former advisors.

- Invitations to talk at other universities and prestigious events add to the scholarly record but generally play a relatively minor role independent of other measures of the scholarly record.
- We do encourage collaborative work; thus joint and co-authored works are given important weight. It is, however, necessary to identify the contributions of the candidate to these works. A significant portion of the overall research record should include works to which the candidate has made the primary contributions.
- Sustained scholarly activity as seen in conference participation, publications, grants, or performances, and exhibitions demonstrates scholarly engagement and attainment.

Given that the decision regarding promotion is very much about future expectations, the trajectory of scholarly productivity is carefully considered.

1.7.1. Research Advising and Mentorship

Research track faculty do not have formal classroom teaching duties as part of their regular appointments. Strong mentorship in research is a necessary part of a successful promotion. The advising of postdoctoral fellows and students, both undergraduate and graduate, is a significant contribution to the teaching mission of the University. At the time of promotion to Research Associate Professor, a faculty member should have a strong record of working with and mentoring students, including, where appropriate, chairing graduate student committees. The demonstrated success of one's students (both undergraduate and graduate) can be valuable testimony of a faculty member's contributions.

1.7.2. Service

Communities thrive when all members contribute to the common good. Thus, we expect that candidates for promotion will have been involved in the life of their department, and, hopefully, in the life of the University and their national associations. The University and the College have also made engagement with the broader public one of our institutional goals and encourage public scholarship. It is desirable to show evidence of contributions to or engagement with the broader community, and in some cases this may be part of the job expectations. For junior faculty, this is usually much less important to the evaluation than is service to the department and University. It is understood that junior faculty will commit less of their time to service.

1.7.3. Conclusion

The College and the University seek to appoint individuals who will be intellectually independent and capable of fulfilling leadership roles in their fields and in the University. We provide additional resources during the early career years to support career development that we hope—and expect—will lead to a successful promotion decision based on the principles outlined in this document. The CBE values the many and varied contributions made by faculty. Each promotion case is evaluated on its own merits, taking into account the specific expectations of each department and the general expectations of the College and the University. It is important to stress, however, that ultimately individuals are responsible for their own professional success.

1.8. Guidelines for Promotion to Research Professor

The University of Washington Faculty Code specifies that promotion to the rank of Research Professor requires **outstanding, mature scholarship, as evidenced by accomplishments in research and mentorship, evaluated in terms of national or international recognition**. The qualifications correspond to those prescribed for the rank of (full) professor with tenure, with primary emphasis upon research. Tenure is not acquired under research appointments. This document elaborates on this section of the Code from the CBE's perspective.

1.8.1. Expectations for promotion to Research Professor.

The decision about promotion to the rank of Research Professor is based on the same three fundamental criteria that guide evaluations for promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor, namely scholarship, mentorship, and service. For promotion to Research Professor, the expectations of attainment in these three areas are higher than for promotion to Research Associate Professor. The precise expectations vary widely over the units within the College and across the University, but the common denominator is documented evidence of outstanding quality, productivity, and scholarly impact. As is the case with promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor, there is no single scale that can be used even within a single academic unit, as there are many compelling combinations of quantity, quality, and pace of scholarly activity. However, there are general principles that are applied as uniformly as possible across all cases by the Elected Faculty Council and the Dean.

Unlike promotion to Research Associate Professor with its six-year promotion clock, promotion to Research Professor has no mandated time period. Statistically, within the CBE, time in rank at the Research Associate Professor level varies by department, but there is also a significant range of time in rank within departments. By Faculty Code, every faculty member below the rank of Research Professor should be considered annually for possible promotion and has the right to request a promotion review. Also, by Code, Research Associate Professors meet at least biannually with their chair to discuss progress toward promotion. It is important that the faculty member and chair candidly discuss progress toward promotion and the department's and the College's expectations for promotion.

1.8.2. Scholarship

As a premier research university, our expectations regarding the independent scholarly record of our faculty are high. In general, quality is more important than quantity, although there must be sufficient quantity to provide evidence of a significant level of scholarly productivity and impact. For promotion to Research Professor, the faculty member should have established themselves as a major researcher, scholar, or creative artist at the national and often international level. At this stage of career, the scholarly record will normally be larger and also reflect a more mature formulation of questions and a richer exploration of them. A faculty member's entire scholarly career is evaluated, with emphasis placed on work developed since the time of promotion to Research Associate Professor. Several factors influence the assessment of the quality of a scholarly record.

- Quality and national or international reputation can be demonstrated by indicators of the impact of scholarship, such as the number of citations and the prestige of the journals (e.g. impact scores) or presses in which the individual publishes, or of the exhibit venue.
- Outside funding of research from foundations and institutes (in those disciplines where it is available) can be viewed as a significant part of the scholarly record, depending on the size of the grant, the significance of the questions posed, and the prestige of the granting institution.
- The impact/significance of the scholarship is also evidenced by the comments from outside reviewers. External assessments, such as awards and published reviews, can also serve as indicators.
- The candidate's self-assessment is an important guide to the significance of each scholarly piece and its connections to the others. The statement should articulate the intellectual agenda(s) that motivate the individual's work and provide the context to substantiate the significance and impact of the work.
- In the creative arts and design, promotion portfolios will reflect the faculty member's creative work, including works of art, exhibitions, performances, and reviews thereof. As with all faculty members, the significance of the work and career trajectory is paramount.
- Invitations to speak at other universities and prestigious events add to the scholarly record but generally play a relatively minor role, independent of other measures of the scholarly record and compared with, for example, publications.
- We do encourage interdisciplinary and collaborative work; thus, joint or co-authored books, articles, and creative works are given important weight. It is, however, necessary to identify the contributions of the candidate to these articles and works. A significant portion of the overall scholarly record should include works to which the candidate (and as appropriate, their students) has made the primary contributions. The case must clearly identify each individual's role in collaborative work.
- Community-engaged and globally engaged scholarship, entrepreneurship, and innovation are all encouraged. Likewise, we encourage making the scholarship open and available to the broader community. Such activities should be described in the research statement of the self-assessment.
- Sustained scholarly activity, as seen in conference participation, publications, grants, or performances and exhibitions, demonstrates scholarly engagement and attainment.

1.8.3. Research Advising and Mentorship

Research track faculty do not have formal classroom teaching duties as part of their regular appointments. Strong mentorship in research is a necessary part of a successful promotion. The advising of postdoctoral fellows and students, both undergraduate and graduate, is a significant contribution to the teaching mission of the University. At the time of promotion to Research Professor, a faculty member will have a strong record of working with and mentoring students, including, where appropriate, chairing graduate student committees. The demonstrated success of one's students (both undergraduate and graduate) can be valuable testimony of a faculty member's contributions.

1.8.4. Service

Communities thrive when all members contribute to the common good. Thus, we expect that candidates for promotion will be involved in the life of their department, in the life of the

University, and in their national associations. The University and the College have also made engagement with the broader public one of our institutional goals and encourage public scholarship. It is desirable to show evidence of contributions to or engagement with the broader community and in some cases may be part of the job expectations. Candidates for promotion to full Professor are expected to play a greater role in this area.

1.8.5. Conclusion

Faculty members, especially post-tenure, can take various approaches to scholarship, mentorship, and service, emphasizing one or another at different times in a career. The CBE values the many and varied contributions made by faculty. Each promotion case is evaluated on its own merits, considering the specific expectations of each department and the general expectations of the College and the University. The College is eager to work with faculty toward promotion to this rank. It is important to stress, however, that ultimately individuals are responsible for their own professional success.

PART 2. Procedures

The UW Promotion/Tenure process is complex and multi-step, taking over a year from start to final decision. *UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-54](#) regulates this process, among other things, describing the actions individuals or committees take when reviewing a promotion candidate's record and the candidate's options for responding to those actions. The latter have been amended in 2024 to make the process more transparent for the candidate. The promotion process takes the candidate's case through three distinct review phases:

- **Department (appointing unit) Review**
 - Subcommittee Review/ Faculty Vote
 - Chair Recommendation
- **College Review**
 - Elected Faculty Council Review
 - Dean's Recommendation
- **University Review**
 - Provost's Review

The University's Office of Academic Personnel & Faculty (APF) maintains a detailed current website of the Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines [HERE](#), which includes relevant references to the *UW Faculty Code*. If there is a conflict between this guide and APF's procedures, APF'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](#)

In these two workflow charts, the department-level review varies by department size, measured by the number of eligible (higher-ranking) voting faculty. The UW voting faculty is defined in *UW Faculty Code* [Section 21-32](#).

2.1. Department-level Procedures

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 [*UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-54](#)]

No later than the second week of Spring Quarter, the Department Chair (or Chair's Designee) assembles a list of all faculty who wish to or are required 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 Faculty Code* [Section 25-41](#).

If the Department Chair is not higher in rank and title than the Candidate, the department must designate a Chair's Designee who is higher in rank and title than the Candidate to conduct the Promotion or Promotion and Tenure process.

The Department Chair or Chair's Designee coordinates the departmental review process. Departments with more than three (3) eligible voting members may establish an Optional Subcommittee to review Promotion and Tenure cases first, before all eligible voting faculty review and vote on the case. The faculty senior to the Candidate under consideration may function as a "committee of the whole."

Departments with fewer than three (3) eligible voting faculty are required to form a Subcommittee of at least three (3) members, which must include all voting faculty superior in rank and title in the department and may include faculty superior in rank and title in other units with appropriate expertise.

Any Subcommittee that initiates the promotion or promotion and tenure review process must have a minimum of three members. The members of the committee must be superior in rank to the candidate. The Department Chair, the Dean (if applicable), and faculty members who will review the case at a later point as an EFC member cannot serve on the Subcommittee.

The APF provides a promotion [matrix](#) that identifies which faculty are eligible to vote on which promotion cases, based on their ranks and titles. The voting membership in the faculty is governed by the UW Faculty Code [Section 21-32](#).

During the entire review process, each individual has only one vote or recommendation (such as the Department Chair and Dean).

Once Candidates for Promotion and Tenure or for Promotion have been identified in Spring Quarter, the Chair or Chair's Designee typically meets with each Candidate. Attendees may include the Chair/ Chair's Designee, a representative of the Subcommittee, the Candidate, and any administrative personnel who may be involved in the Promotion or Promotion & Tenure process. The candidate may also invite a senior faculty member as a mentor. The purpose of this early meeting, typically held in Spring Quarter prior to the submittal of the Candidate's materials, is to describe the process, identify roles, clarify the "timeline," begin identifying possible external peer reviewers, and initiate the departmental process. Candidates should also meet with the CBE Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to ensure that they are familiar with processes at the Dean's level.

The UW Provost sets the submission dates for promotion cases to the Provost's Office each year. The APF publishes them [HERE](#). The CBE Dean's Office develops a timeline for all departments in the college.

Within this framework, the Department Chair/Chair's Designee and/or Subcommittee develop a timeline to meet the above set deadlines. The Chair/Chair's Designee communicates the timeline, including all deadlines and milestones, to all parties involved on the department level in the data-gathering and evaluation process, and ensures that the complete case is submitted to the College by the appropriate deadline.

2.1.1. Assembly of Record

The candidate is responsible for assembling the promotion record following the guidelines published by the candidate's college (this document) [*UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-54.A.2](#)]

APF's guidelines for preparing a Curriculum Vitae and Self-Assessment (formerly called Career Narrative) can be found [HERE](#).

The Candidate prepares documentation in time for two deadlines: documents for external review must be uploaded by June 30, while additional documents for review by the department, college, and university must be added by September 10.

The external peer reviewers will be given access to the candidate's documents via the Interfolio RPT Platform. At this point, the record should include a Self-Assessment (formerly called Career Narrative), a Curriculum Vitae, and all other supporting documentation, including representative publications, reports, portfolios, course materials, and all similar material as appropriate to the Candidate's particular case and individual department policy.

Candidates must prepare all materials as digital files (PDF format) for uploading to their individual case portal in the Interfolio RPT platform as a single secure place.

2.1.2. External Letters of Review

All recommendations for promotion and/or tenure that are forwarded to the provost must include at least three confidential evaluations by external reviewers [[UW Faculty Code Section 24-54](#)]. APF's guidelines for External Letters of Review can be found [HERE](#). Early in the process, the Candidate develops a list of potential external reviewers and occasionally a brief list of individuals to exclude as potential reviewers. The Candidate delivers this material to the Chair or the Chair's Designee.

The Chair or the Chair's Designee (and the Subcommittee, if requested by the Chair/ Chair's Designee) generates 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 faculty at a major research university with tenure and/or an academic rank senior to the candidate seeking promotion. As indicated in the [APF guidelines](#), for evaluating assistant teaching professors, it may be appropriate to solicit letters from experts who are external to the candidate's academic unit, the CBE, but who are internal to the UW. It is expected that if faculty members internal to UW are providing an evaluation, the individual can provide an arm's-length review.

External peer reviewers must be at "arm's length" ("non-conflicted"). (See a list of examples below). "Arm's length" does not mean that the reviewer must never have met the candidate. Rather, it 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 the Candidate
- Served on a granting council selection panel with the Candidate
- Presented a paper at a conference held at the university where the candidate works
- Presented a guest lecture at the reviewer's university or vice versa

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

- A member of the program, department, or college 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 the Candidate
- Any member of the doctoral or master's committee (eg. dissertation, thesis, project, etc.) of the Candidate.
- For teaching faculty, a colleague with whom the Candidate has co-taught.

[External reviewers](#) must be “recognized contributors” to their field. Guidelines for evaluating “recognized contributors” can be found [HERE](#) on the APF website. Indicators of being a recognized contributor include 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. All data related to the qualification and solicitation of the external reviewers is collected in the [External Reviewer Grid](#) available on the [APF website](#). The Chair’s letter of recommendation to the Dean 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.

The Chair or the Chair’s Designee solicits written evaluations from external reviewers. 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 requested and received are noted in the required [External Reviewer Grid](#) and are uploaded to Interfolio.

The [letter of solicitation](#) (letter templates can be found [HERE](#)) should state that the unit is considering the candidate for possible promotion/tenure and request the following information:

Tenure-track and Research Track-Faculty

- Whether, how well, 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—including work done since beginning an appointment at the University of Washington and particularly since the last promotion.
- Description of the potential or actual impact of the candidate’s scholarly contributions on the discipline and related fields.
- The degree to which the candidate has a national/international reputation.
- Any relevant observations about the candidate’s teaching/mentorship, service, and leadership that are useful for the assessment of the case.
- A comparison of the candidate’s accomplishments with those of leading scholars or practitioners at a similar career stage in the same or related fields.
- Any relevant observations about the candidate’s teaching/mentorship, service, and leadership.

Teaching-track Faculty

- Whether, how well, and for how long the reviewer has known the candidate.
- The significance, influence, innovation, and promise of the candidate’s scholarship and teaching/mentorship, including the description of the potential or actual impact of the candidate’s scholarly contributions on the discipline and related fields.
- The degree to which the candidate has a national/international reputation.
- Some comparison of the candidate’s accomplishments with those of other teaching-focused faculty at a similar career stage in the same or related fields.
- Any relevant observations about the candidate’s service and leadership.

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 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.

2.1.3. Teaching Evaluations

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

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 CBE departments require more. Assistant Professors (both tenure-track and teaching-track) must have annual collegial reviews of their teaching. Associate Professor 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). Peer reviews should refer to the elements of effective teaching described in the *UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-32.C](#) as follows:

- **“Aligned:** Effective teaching is intentionally designed and organized to help learners meet learning objectives.
- **Inclusive and equitable:** Effective teaching considers learners' experiences and creates opportunities for each learner to thrive.
- **Active and engaged:** Effective teaching creates opportunities for learners to critically engage with ideas and each other.
- **Growth-oriented:** Effective teaching creates opportunities for learners to learn through practice and provides feedback that helps them grow their knowledge and abilities.
- **Relevant:** Effective teaching helps learners understand why what they are learning matters and prepares them for future learning and life after the UW.”

2.1.4. Department Recommendations and Candidate's Response

• Faculty Review with at least 3 eligible voting faculty

If an Optional Subcommittee is participating in the process, its members review the complete record (career dossier) and the external peer review letters and prepare a written report on the Candidate's qualifications for Promotion or Promotion & Tenure. The Optional Subcommittee provides this report to the Department Chair or the Chair's Designee. The candidate must receive a written summary of this report (provided by the Chair/Chair's Designee) that identifies members of the Optional Subcommittee. For purposes of confidentiality, the summary shall omit specific attributions. 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 case. APF's guidelines in this case can be found [HERE](#) and the workflows for departments with three (3) or more eligible voting faculty has been visualized [HERE](#).

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/Chair's Designee in writing. If the Candidate decides to discontinue the process, their letter is uploaded to Interfolio and their case is closed. However, mandatory Promotion

& Tenure cases must proceed through subsequent levels of review, regardless of the Optional Subcommittee's recommendation.

The first mandatory step of the department faculty review process for candidates with at least three (3) eligible (superior in rank and title) voting members in their appointing department involves an assessment by the department's eligible voting faculty members. These faculty members must have access to the candidate's record and, where applicable, the Optional Subcommittee report and recommendation, and the candidate's response to the Optional Subcommittee report, before the discussion and promotion vote.

Faculty members who are superior in rank to the Candidate meet to review the complete case (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.

• Procedures with fewer than 3 eligible voting faculty

For appointing Departments with fewer than three (3) eligible voting faculty members, the review is conducted by a Subcommittee appointed by the Dean of the CBE, and the recommendation and vote of the Subcommittee is used in lieu of a vote by the department faculty. APF's guidelines in this case can be found [HERE](#) and the workflows for departments with fewer than three (3) eligible voting faculty has been visualized [HERE](#).

The Subcommittee 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. Subcommittee members must be given the opportunity to review the candidate's record, including external letters.

The Subcommittee must submit a written report ideally using the standard form ([SCC Committee Summary Form](#)) provided [by the APF](#) and a recommendation. In CBE, the Chair receives the Subcommittee report first. The Chair then shares it with the candidate.

The report needs to identify members of the Committee. For purposes of confidentiality, the summary shall omit specific attributions. The overall vote on the case should be reported. Abstentions should not be used to avoid a decision on a complex case. When sufficient information is available to support decision-making, as should be true for any promotion or tenure case under review, favorable, unfavorable, and recused for conflict are the most appropriate options.

The candidate must respond and acknowledge receipt of the report within 7 calendar days. At this time, the Candidate also has the option to provide supplemental information in response to the report. Documentation that the candidate was provided a copy of the summary of the subcommittee report and opportunity to respond are all uploaded to the case in Interfolio, which is then forwarded to the Office of the Provost.

• Chair Review and Candidate's Response

The Chair of the Department (or a Chair's Designee of higher rank and title than the Candidate) prepares a substantive summary of the faculty deliberation that includes concerns raised and counter arguments as well as the faculty recommendation (specific attributions such as names and other personal information *must* be redacted; the faculty vote *may* be redacted) The Chair also writes an independent analysis and recommendation. The Chair

provides the summary and their own analysis 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 and recommendation. The Chair may amend their finding after receipt of the candidate response. These documents are all added to the case in Interfolio.

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 case is closed in Interfolio. 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.

- **Departmental Check and Transmittal of Interfolio Case:**

The department Administrator checks that all required documents and forms from the candidate and the department review are uploaded and then forwards the case to the college level of review. This includes all of the evidence provided by the candidate regarding their research and teaching.

2.2. College-Level Procedure

2.2.1. CBE Elected Faculty Council

The CBE Elected Faculty Council reviews the full case, discusses the Candidate's qualifications for Promotion or Promotion & Tenure, the procedures and metrics used by the department in evaluating the Candidate, and conducts a vote on whether to recommend Promotion or Promotion & Tenure. The deliberation process and vote are documented using the standard form ([SCC Committee Summary Form](#)) provided [by the APF](#), or in a confidential memo. 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. The form or the memo is uploaded to Interfolio, and the case is forwarded to the Dean.

If the recommendation of the CBE Elected Faculty Council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the recommendation of the Elected Faculty Council is provided to the candidate along with the Dean's report. Recommendations of the Elected Faculty Council that are favorable and not in conflict with the faculty vote do not need to be shared with the candidate.

2.2.2. Dean

The Dean reviews the case in its entirety. 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 Elected Faculty Council. Although the Dean's letter is part of the case forwarded to the Provost/APF, it is actually addressed to the University President.

If the Dean's recommendation is positive, the Dean forwards the case to the Provost's office. There is no provision for a candidate response. If the Dean's recommendation is not positive, the Dean provides the candidate with this initial recommendation, including reasons, in writing prior to the issuance of the decision; this is also provided to the department chair. 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, and the Chair may respond within 5 days. The Dean forwards their final recommendation to the Provost with the candidate's response.

The candidate must provide a written response acknowledging meeting with the Dean, hearing a review of the case, and receiving the Elected Faculty Council recommendation and Dean's decision and recommendation.

2.2.3. University-Level Procedure

The Office of Academic Personnel (APF) coordinates review of the case by the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and the Provost. The Provost reviews the Promotion or Promotion & Tenure package and reaches a decision.

If the decision is positive, the Provost informs the Dean and the President. The Dean then notifies the Chair and Candidate of the outcome. The Candidate will also receive a letter from the President and Provost during the Spring Quarter. The promotion or promotion and tenure becomes official on September 16 -- the first day of the next Academic Year (for 9-month appointments).

If the decision is negative, the Provost prepares a written summary of the initial decision and may request additional information for clarification from the Department or the College to clarify. The summary is transmitted to the Dean, Chair, and Candidate. The Dean and Chair may respond in 5 calendar days, with a copy to the Candidate. The Candidate may respond within 7 calendar days. The Provost reviews any responses prior to issuing a final decision and informs the dean.

The Dean informs the Candidate and Chair of the final decision and reasons therefor, and any further actions or outcomes resulting from the decision, such as the option to resubmit the dossier during the following year, detailed expectations for the coming year, granting a final year of employment, or some other action.

2.3. Research Track Faculty: 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 promotion consideration 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 themselves 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.

2.4. Teaching Track Faculty: Appointment and Promotion

2.4.1. 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 *UW Faculty Code Section 24-41*:

- 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](#)).

2.4.2. 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.

• 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 Faculty Code*. 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 evaluated 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.

2.5. Affiliate Faculty

According to the *UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-34.B](#):

"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."

2.5.1. Departmental Discretion in Appointing Affiliate Faculty

Departments appoint Affiliate faculty at their own discretion. The *UW Faculty Code* and the CBE trust that department faculty can 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 by the department faculty and an agreement from the person holding the Affiliate title to relinquish it. (That is, when the faculty vote to renew an Affiliate appointment, the person will hold the Affiliate title previously awarded.)

2.5.2. 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.

2.5.3. 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 the reappointment process used for Assistant Professors.

2.5.4. Affiliate Faculty Promotion Submittals

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

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

Since the careers of Affiliate faculty may vary widely, it is not possible to provide more than general guidelines for the documents they will produce. Affiliate faculty should be able to prepare documents, Self-Assessment (Career Narrative), and Curriculum Vitae, with the usual sections addressing Scholarship/Research/Creative Work, Teaching, and Service.

Additional elements to be reviewed by department faculty may include portfolios or other evidence of creative achievements, records of teaching, and evidence of student work carried out in the Affiliate faculty member's courses or other supervision. Affiliate faculty reviews are not processed through Interfolio RPT; departments will continue to collect required documents in a case folder in a secure online location with managed sharing functions.

2.5.5. 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.

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

Departments are no longer required to obtain a minimum of one confidential external review letter for Affiliate faculty seeking promotion. The procurement of external evaluation letters will be at the discretion of the candidate in consultation with the chair.

A letter (or letter(s)) that come from individuals who are outside the University of Washington is (are) preferred. 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 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).

2.5.7. Departmental Review

Within a department, the process for Affiliate promotions should follow the standard process the department uses for assistant professor reviews. The schedule and deadlines should approximate the schedule and deadlines the department uses for assistant professor reviews. Affiliate promotions do not require Elected Faculty Council review.

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

2.5.8. Dean's Office Review

Affiliate promotions may be forwarded to the Dean's Office up until the end of March. 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). Additional evidence of creative work and teaching (dossier, course portfolios, examples of student work) need not be transmitted. All documents should be in the form of PDFs that are shared via secure folders.

The Dean's Office provides the Elected Faculty Council with the candidates' documents so that the council members can conduct an equivalent review as in other promotion cases.

In the CBE Dean's Office, the Dean reviews the case, prepares their evaluation, and prepares a recommendation memo to the file and a letter to the candidate with a copy to the chair.

2.6. Reappointment of Assistant Professors

2.6.1. Timing, Expectations, and Authority

As per the *UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-41](#), the initial appointment to the rank of tenure-track Assistant Professor, Assistant Research Professor, and Assistant Teaching 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 *UW Faculty Code* [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 Elected Faculty 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.

2.6.2. 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. However, re-appointments are not processed through Interfolio RPT; departments will continue to collect required documents in a case folder in a secure online location with managed sharing functions. The CBE recommends the following process:

• Reappointment Documents to be submitted by the Candidate

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 Self-assessment (career narrative) 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.

• 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. 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.

• 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.

PART 3. Roles and Responsibilities

3.1. 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 ensure that the Chair and the faculty carry out this responsibility consistently and successfully.

From the time an Assistant Professor joins a department's faculty, the Chair and senior faculty should help the Assistant Professor identify issues and aid 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.

3.2. Meetings with Chair

Annual meetings between each Assistant Professor (all tracks) and the Department Chair are required by the *UW Faculty Code Section 24-57.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 Self-assessment (Career Narrative) and Curriculum Vitae. Similar annual meetings are also required between the Chair and non-tenured Associate Professors or Professors.

Bi-annual meetings between each Associate Professor (all tracks) and the Department Chair 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 Faculty Code*.

Although not related to promotion, meetings every third year between each Professor (all tracks) and the Department Chair are required by the *UW Faculty Code*. These meetings will focus on the Professor's career development and goals and may also address the roles the Professor plays in the Department, including mentoring junior faculty.

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 Faculty Code* 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 the appointment should include a discussion of preparations for submitting the reappointment application.

3.3. Candidate's Responsibilities

1. Notifies Chair of intent to pursue Promotion and/or Tenure (non-mandatory cases only).
2. Provides Chair, designated senior faculty member, or Subcommittee with a list of potential external reviewers. Five or more external reviewers should be identified. The Candidate may also provide a short list of reviewers to exclude due to a conflict of interest.

3. Prepares the “peer review package” including a complete Self-assessment, a 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 the Chair or designated senior faculty to verify that the 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 Faculty Code* 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 “record” (career dossier) for internal review, including a complete Self-assessment, a complete Curriculum Vitae, and complete career documentation, including PDFs of primary publications, 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 that continuing funding and/or future funding have been secured for the next several years.

The candidate will upload these documents to their case file in Interfolio or will transmit them to the department administrator for upload.

6. Reviews and responds (within 7 days) in writing to the Subcommittee 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 Elected Faculty Council findings and the Dean's own findings, evaluation, and recommendation to the Provost.

3.4. 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 meetings with each Assistant Professor, Assistant Research Professor, and Assistant Teaching Professor; holds bi-annual meetings with each Associate Professor, Associate Research 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 an Associate Teaching Professor seeks promotion to Teaching Professor). Maintains a record of all collegial reviews of teaching as required by the *UW Faculty Code* [Section 24-57.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 CBE 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. The chair selects four or five reviewers, and a fifth or sixth alternate reviewer in case one reviewer is unable to perform the review.

(Note: In some Departments, particularly if the Chair is an Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor, this task may be delegated to a Chair's Designee, 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 a written summary of the Subcommittee deliberation, if a Subcommittee was involved, to the Candidate, and solicits the Candidate's 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 a written summary of faculty deliberation and vote to the Candidate, and solicits the Candidate's 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 record (career dossier) is assembled.

3.5. Subcommittee 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 Subcommittee, if any, or the designated senior faculty member, if any, is determined within the Department.

1. Reviews Candidate on Self-assessment (Career Narrative) 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, Candidate may work with Chair to assist in soliciting written evaluations from teaching peer reviewers.
4. Review Committee 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.

3.6. 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.

3.7. CBE Elected Faculty Council Responsibilities

1. Reviews all Candidate materials for promotion and tenure cases.

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 the Department faculty action.

4. Prepares a confidential report that summarizes deliberation and vote and submits this memo to the Dean. The council may use the Form provided by the provost's office or write a narrative report. 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 eligible Elected Faculty Council members must be accounted for (the total number of yes, no, abstention and absent not voting must be equal to the number of eligible Elected Faculty Council Members). Voting council members must be superior in rank and should not have had a vote in the department review of the case.

3.8. CBE Dean Responsibilities

1. Reviews the complete record (career dossier), including the letters and reports, the Chair's memo, and the Elected Faculty 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 all cases, the Dean's recommendation is shared with the candidate, together with the Elected Faculty Council summary. If the recommendation is positive, the case is forwarded to the Provost without any response period for the candidate. If the recommendation is to deny Promotion or Promotion & Tenure, the candidate has a seven-day response period. The Dean must also provide the Chair with the letter and a 5-day response period.

The dean must also meet with the Candidate to discuss the case. 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; the materials are submitted to the provost via Interfolio for information purposes only.

6. Notifies Chair and Candidate of the final decision of the Provost and any further actions or outcomes of this decision.

3.9. UW Provost and President Responsibilities

1. Reviews the Promotion package forwarded by the CBE Dean's Office, including Dean's memo, Elected Faculty 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.

PART 4. Appendices

Appendix A. Key Dates and Deadlines

The *University of Washington Faculty Code* 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:

February: The CBE Dean's Office generates a list of faculty members who will be in their mandatory promotion year (Promotion & Tenure for Assistant Professors; Promotion for Research Assistant Professors) year in 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.

February and March: Department chairs poll faculty for non-mandatory cases for the following Academic Year.

April: Candidates begin the preparation of their key documents and develop a list of potential external evaluators. Candidates must submit their list to the Chair by the end of second week in April.

April - June: Chairs add additional external reviewers to the list and solicit willing reviewers based on availability of candidate materials by July 1, and the deadline for reviewer letters of September 10. Candidate must upload all materials for external review by the end of May. CBE administrators provide external reviewers access to the Interfolio case on July 1.

September: Candidate completes upload of additional dossier materials for internal review by September 10.

September - October: Departmental review by faculty with candidate response, and Chair summary and review with candidate response. Cases are forwarded via Interfolio to the CBE Administrator as soon as completed; all mandatory cases must be forwarded to the College Administrator by November 1, and non-mandatory by November 15.

November: The Elected Faculty Council reviews and recommends action on each case; forwarding to the Dean once complete. Mandatory cases are due by November 20; non-mandatory cases should normally be completed by the end of the quarter, but final cases can be forwarded by January 10.

December - January: Starting in late November, the Dean produces an independent analysis and recommendation for each candidate and transmits it to the candidate along with the EFC recommendation. The Dean meets with the candidate, and allows a 7-day response period. The Dean then finalizes their recommendation and forwards the cases to the Provost via Interfolio. Mandatory cases are due by December 15. Non-mandatory cases are due by February 1.

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.

Appendix B. Summary of Promotion and Tenure Documentation

Key documents included in the Promotion Package documented in the Candidate's case on the Interfolio RPT [digital platform](#) should include:

- Promotion and/or tenure recommendation checklist
- Pre-submission Workday Check
- Dean's letter
- Candidate's response to Dean communication(s)
- Elected Faculty 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.*

The candidate will also upload research and teaching evidence (complete career dossier) in the form of a portfolio.

Appendix C. 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 are beyond the scope of this document; but have been added as appendices for convenience. Chairs should ensure that these policies and administrative resources are clearly identified and available to the faculty.

This document 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.

C.1. University Resources

University of Washington Policy Directory
Faculty Code and Governance

Voting Membership in the Faculty ([Section 21-32](#))

Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members ([Sections 24-31 to 24-57](#))

Granting of Tenure ([Section 25-41](#))

C.2. UW Office of Academic Personnel & Faculty (APF)

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/>