

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
May 14, 2019
11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Odegaard Undergraduate Library 320

Meeting Synopsis

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from April 30, 2019
 3. Subcommittee reports:
 - Gathering data on lecturers (Jack Lee)
 4. P&T in undepartmentalized colleges
 5. Teaching Professor track
 6. Good of the order
 7. Adjourn
-

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m.

2. Review of the minutes from April 30, 2019

The minutes from April 30 were approved as written.

3. Subcommittee reports:

- **Gathering data on lecturers (Jack Lee)**

Lee, the chair, spoke to Joe Janes, acting Faculty Senate Chair, about FCFA's questions drafted at the last meeting. The chair will share these with Janes before sending them to the Provost.

4. P&T in undepartmentalized colleges

The chair shared responses (questions sent from FCFA) from the EFCs at each of the undepartmentalized colleges/schools regarding their promotion and tenure processes (Exhibit 1).

A member suggested that the council should consider if these responses need further attention and then report back to the Senate. A member reiterated a question that has come up in previous meetings and in pushback from the undepartmentalized colleges/schools, "what problem are we trying to solve?" A member responded that there are issues of heterogeneity in the process and insufficient oversight. He further commented that inconsistency could be seen as unfair to individual candidates and could put the University at risk. Another member commented that the Provost is concerned with promotion, tenure and merit processes more broadly. This member suggested that the council should request to be included in the Provost's review (and that faculty members should be involved in the review). A member noted that even if the council proceeded with Class A legislation there may not be enough votes in the Faculty Senate.

Members continued to discuss promotion and tenure processes and whether they are problematic. A member commented that some might feel there is an issue, but it is unclear if the issue is based on substance or in appearance. The double voting within the undepartmentalized colleges/schools raises an appearance issue.

The chair will summarize the council's concerns in a letter to the Provost and share the draft letter at the next meeting.

5. Teaching Professor track

The chair shared a draft version of the code changes regarding the Teaching Professor track. The version shared was intended as an exercise, and not ready for wide distribution. Some members debated whether drafting code, at this stage, was necessary before having more discussions. The chair responded that the drafted code changes, at this point, would better inform the council's position and uncover potential barriers or areas that need more attention.

Members discussed voting rights. Last year part-time Senior and Principal Lecturers were given voting rights, but Lecturers were not. Changes to the code could give current part-time lecturers voting rights if they moved into the Assistant Teaching Professor title. The chair responded that competitively hired, full-time lecturers would move into the Assistant Teaching Professor title and not the part-time lecturers. If an Assistant Teaching Professor wants to negotiate a part-time deal with their department they may do that, and they should be able to retain their voting rights (as long as they are 50 percent or greater). Members expressed a need for greater clarification around part-time lecturers and hiring practices.

A member noted that the language in the Faculty Code describing qualifications for lecturers cannot be simply changed to describe Assistant Teaching Professors because it eliminates the qualifications for faculty members under a part-time lecturer title. Another member commented that Code changes need to pay attention to ranks and titles. The council may need to restructure this section of the Code rather than exchanging "Lecturers" for "Assistant Teaching Professors."

The chair will continue to refine the Code and develop talking points for this proposal.

6. Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Minutes by Lauren Hatchett, lehatch@uw.edu, council analyst

Present: **Faculty:** Jack Lee (chair), Steve Buck, Aaron Katz, Purnima Dhavan, Jacob Vigdor, Kamran Nemat, Tom Hazlet, Mary Pat Wenderoth, Lauren Montgomery, Dan Jacoby, Margaret Adam, Mícheál Vaughan
President's designee: Cheryl Cameron
Ex-officio reps: N/A

Guests: Mike Townsend

Absent:

Faculty: Joseph Janes, Dawn Lehman, James Gregory

Ex-officio reps: JoAnn Taricani, Padmaja Vrudhula, Bryan Crockett, Judith Henchy

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – Text from Tenure and Promotion Guidelines.pdf

May 13, 2019

Questions from FCFA Committee

1. **To what extent do the current procedures in your college or school satisfy the purposes of secondary review described below? (You need not include a detailed description of your P&T procedures, if they are clearly described in your unit's publicly available bylaws.)**
 - a. to protect the rights of individual candidates; in particular, if a candidate chooses to respond to the initial recommendation in accordance with [Section 24-54 B](#) of the faculty code, the second-level review is an opportunity for elected representatives of the faculty to weigh both the initial recommendation and the candidate's response.
 - b. to ensure that no individual or faction can have outside influence on promotion or tenure decisions.
 - c. to ensure that the standards of the college or school and of the university are upheld.

[In the following pages, we have shared the procedures for secondary review from each of our colleges or school.](#)

Information School

Based on multiple conversations and reviews of our processes with academic HR, we have been assured that our processes meet the UW requirements and satisfy the purposes of secondary review. All faculty above rank of the person under review participate in the initial recommendation and have full access to the promotion and/or tenure materials that were submitted as well as the external reviewer letters. We have an elected body of full professors who review the initial recommendation and the candidate's response and also has access to all materials.

College of Education

We believe our current process fully satisfies the purposes of secondary review. The College Advisory Council includes 5 full professors or research professors who are voted in by voting faculty for 2 year terms. They represent all areas of our college and would not constitute a faction or have outsized influence in any individual promotion decision. We have clear guidelines for each step of the process and the College Advisory Council reviews all material in making a recommendation about how the college has followed the tenure and promotion guidelines. The CAC has access to promotion files, faculty discussion and candidate responses.

Evans School

We believe our current process fully satisfies the purposes outlined above. The Evans School conducts two reviews of the promotion and tenure process. The first review is conducted by our elected Faculty Affairs committee, which reports to the Elected Faculty Council. This review ensures that the ad hoc Promotion and Tenure Committee report follows policy and guidelines as to procedural and substantive review and is conducted prior to the the report going to the faculty for a vote. Our second level review is done by the eligible voting faculty after the Dean has presented the results of the initial vote to the candidate and after the candidate has had an opportunity to respond. This provides for a second review of the candidate's case with any candidate response in hand,

May 13, 2019

ensures no one individual or faction can have outsize influence, and ensures that our collective school and university standards are being upheld.

School of Law

The recently approved process described in the appendix provides a faculty candidate with the opportunity to respond at every level-- first to the P&T Council's recommendation before it goes to the faculty, then after the faculty votes and the matter proceeds to the 3-member P&T Advisory Subcommittee of the EFC. Both bodies are elected by the faculty. The review following the faculty vote will be done by elected faculty members who took part in the faculty discussion will be ineligible to vote. With the involvement of two different elected bodies participating in the process, no one person or faction of the faculty will have an outsized role. In both cases, the bodies that recommend before the faculty vote and that review after the faculty vote are bound to follow the P&T standards as outlined in the School of Law's policies and the faculty code.

School of Social Work

We believe our current process fully satisfies the purposes outlined above. The School of Social Work conducts a secondary review by the elected faculty council that satisfies the purposes as described. The School of Social Work Faculty Council conducts two independent reviews.

Our first review calls for the Faculty Council (see: <https://ap.washington.edu/cms/wp-content/uploads/promotion-undepartmentalized.pdf> 24-54-B: Faculty Review) to conduct a procedural review of the report from the ad hoc review committee to determine if it meets the requirements of the University Handbook and the School of Social Work Policy Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion, and Continuation of Appointment. The FC either accepts the report or requests revisions. The process then continues with a review by the candidate and voting faculty, faculty discussion, and the vote. Faculty Council members vote on the case in accordance with their status.

At the second review, The Faculty Council conducts an independent, substantive review (see 24-54-C: Faculty Council Review). After the faculty vote, FC reviews "the case": this means they review the report and the faculty vote (both quantitative results and faculty comments). The faculty has access to other materials (such as external letters and the candidates materials). After discussion/deliberation, the elected Faculty Council members formally vote on whether or not to recommend promotion to the dean. This vote is recorded and reported in the Dean's report along with the full faculty vote.

- 2. If current procedures are not fully satisfying these purposes, what modifications or improvements would you suggest? Would revisions to the faculty code be required to implement these modifications or improvements?**

May 13, 2019

The EFCs and faculty of undepartmentalized units are confident that their procedures satisfy these purposes and do not at this time have modifications or improvements to suggest. As a result, we do not suggest any changes to the faculty code.

3. Are there other changes to the faculty code that would help to clarify, support, and enforce the intended purposes of the secondary review in undepartmentalized colleges?

We do not see any changes to the faculty code that are necessary to support the intended purposes of secondary review, which we feel are clearly understood by the schools.

May 13, 2019

**Procedures for Secondary Review of Promotion Cases in
Non-departmentalized Units**

Table of Contents

College of Education Procedures: College Advisory Council

STEP SIX: MEETING AND VOTE BY ELIGIBLE FACULTY

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

STEP EIGHT: DEAN'S REVIEW (excerpt as it pertains to CAC)

APPENDIX J: GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING THE CAC REPORT

**EXCERPT from Evans School of Public Policy & Governance Promotion and Tenure
Guidelines**

POLICY AND PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR TENURE, PROMOTION AND
CONTINUATION OF APPOINTMENT FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

VII. PROCEDURES: NOMINATION OF FACULTY FOR PROMOTION. TENURE AND
REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW [From FAC-FY-06-08-B (3-30-2007) RP]

VIII. APPOINTMENT OF REVIEW COMMITTEE

IX. EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

X. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW MATERIALS

XI. FUNCTION OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND [ELECTED] FACULTY AFFAIRS
COMMITTEE

XII. THE REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

XIII. REVIEW BY CANDIDATE

XIV. FACULTY VOTE

XV. ACTION BY THE DEAN

XVI. INFORMING THE CANDIDATE OF THE UNIVERSITY'S DECISION

**EXCERPT from the School of Law Policy & Governance Promotion and Tenure
Guidelines**

E. Subcommittee of the EC to serve as a P&T Advisory Review Committee pursuant to
Section 25.4.C of the Faculty Code:

A. Selection and Duties of a Promotion and Tenure Council

C. Procedure for Application for Contract Renewal, Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate or
Full Professor

D. Deliberation Procedures for the Promotion and Tenure Council and the Faculty

EXCERPT from the Information School

May 13, 2019

College of Education Procedures: College Advisory Council

These excerpts are drawn from our guide to promotion and tenure and is distributed by our standing committee on Faculty Development and Support (FDS).

STEP SIX: MEETING AND VOTE BY ELIGIBLE FACULTY

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

The meeting(s) will proceed as follows:

- i.) An FDS member who is a Full Professor with voting privileges will chair the meeting. The chair will conduct the meeting in a manner that will allow equal opportunity for the fair consideration of all candidates.
- ii.) The first part of the meeting shall consider Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturers, Senior Lecturers seeking promotion to Principal Lecturers, followed by Assistant Professors seeking tenure/promotion to the rank of Associate Professor whose review is mandatory. This discussion shall be followed by a consideration of Assistant Professors seeking tenure/promotion to the rank of Associate Professor whose review is not mandatory. All voting faculty in the College of Education holding the rank of Associate Professor or above are expected to attend this portion of the meeting.
- iii.) Each candidate will be discussed in turn. A member of the candidate's SPR will provide a summative statement of the SPR's overall recommendation. Following this statement, the chair will open the floor for questions and discussion. If necessary, the chair will ask a discussant to yield the floor to allow all concerned faculty an opportunity to speak. The chair may terminate the discussion of a candidate after a reasonable period in order to allow sufficient time for the discussion of remaining candidates.
- iv.) FDS members, or faculty members designated by the FDS Chair, will take notes summarizing the discussion of each candidate. Because the faculty's review is separate from the CAC's review, faculty members who take notes during the faculty meeting should not be members of the CAC. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions must be omitted from the written summary of the faculty discussion. Note-takers should consult **Appendix H: Guidelines for Summarizing Faculty Discussions Regarding Promotion or Tenure of Candidates.**

May 13, 2019

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

(B) At the conclusion of the meeting(s), the FDS Chair or his/her designee and the HR Manager distribute electronic ballots to all eligible voting faculty members. The voting period will take place over a period of one week and must conclude no later than November 27. All eligible voting faculty members are responsible for submitting their completed electronic ballots by 4:30 p.m. on the last day of the voting period.

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

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

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

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

The CAC is responsible for reviewing each candidate's file and for making a recommendation regarding promotion/tenure. While the CAC's recommendation considers the faculty's recommendation and vote, the CAC's recommendation is separate from that of the faculty and may differ from it. The CAC's review and recommendation goes to the Dean (see Step Eight). While the Dean considers the CAC's recommendation, the Dean's recommendation and the CAC's recommendation may differ. The Dean forwards the CAC's recommendation to the Provost. For more information about the responsibilities of the CAC, consult the "Promotion and Tenure Overview" provided by UW Academic Human Resources. Scroll to "Additional Resources" and click on "Promotion Review Process for Un-departmentalized Units" <http://ap.washington.edu/ahr/resources/tenure-promotion/>

The CAC shall be composed of 5 faculty members who are Full Professors in the College of Education and may include faculty in research positions. CAC members will serve a 2-year term, with at least two members overlapping with members who were elected the previous year.

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

May 13, 2019

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

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

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

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

(D) The CAC shares its written report and recommendation for each candidate with the Dean. For mandatory reviews, the Dean must receive the CAC report and recommendation by December 7. For non-mandatory reviews, the Dean must receive the CAC report and recommendation by January 7.

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

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

STEP EIGHT: DEAN'S REVIEW (excerpt as it pertains to CAC)

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

May 13, 2019

APPENDIX J: GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING THE CAC REPORT

College of Education Advisory Council (CAC) Report and Recommendation Regarding Promotion/Tenure

Date of CAC Meeting:

Names of CAC Members:

Candidate's Name:

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

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

Recommendation of the Subcommittee for Promotion and Tenure (SPR)

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

Associate Professor or Full Professor

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

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

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

Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer (selected categories as appropriate to rank and position description - See Appendix F)

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

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

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

Other categories:

Lecturer to Senior Lecturer: Extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline

May 13, 2019

Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer: Exemplary success in curriculum design and implementation, student mentoring and service, and leadership to the department, School/College, University, and the field

Summary of Notes from Faculty Discussion

Date of Faculty Meeting:

Faculty Discussion of Candidate's Scholarship:

Faculty Discussion of Candidate's Teaching + Advising:

Faculty Discussion of Candidate's Service:

Faculty Vote

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

CAC Recommendation (adapted to position description and rank)

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

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

May 13, 2019

EXCERPT from Evans School of Public Policy & Governance Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

POLICY AND PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR TENURE, PROMOTION AND CONTINUATION OF APPOINTMENT FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY¹

APPROVED SEPTEMBER 19, 2013

UPDATED MAY 28, 2014

UPDATED MAY 27, 2015

UPDATED OCTOBER 14, 2016

UPDATED MAY 24, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

II. OVERALL PERSONAL SELF-ASSESSMENT

III. TEACHING

IV. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

V. SERVICE

VI. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

VII. PROCEDURES: NOMINATION OF FACULTY FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

VIII. APPOINTMENT OF REVIEW COMMITTEE

IX. EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

X. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW MATERIALS

XI. FUNCTION OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

XII. THE REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

XIII. REVIEW BY CANDIDATE

XIV. FACULTY VOTE

XV. ACTION BY THE DEAN

XVI. INFORMING THE CANDIDATE OF THE UNIVERSITY'S DECISION

XVII. ALL TENURE TRACK FACULTY SHALL RECEIVE A COPY OF THESE GUIDELINES DURING THEIR FIRST QUARTER OF SERVICE IN THE EVANS SCHOOL: TIMETABLE

May 13, 2019

Please note that this document includes only sections VII – XVII covering procedures.

VII. PROCEDURES: NOMINATION OF FACULTY FOR PROMOTION. TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW [From FAC-FY-06-08-B (3-30-2007) RP]

A. Nominations for non-mandatory tenure and promotion may be made by a colleague, or faculty may nominate themselves. If a faculty member wishes to request an early review for tenure (i.e. before the fall of the sixth year at the University) or for promotion, he or she is advised to discuss with the Dean whether such a review is appropriate in view of the person's record.⁶ (There is no fixed date at which a review for promotion to full professor is mandatory. A review before the fall of the sixth year of service at the associate rank will be regarded as early.)

B. Faculty members who have been nominated for promotion or tenure and also those for whom mandatory tenure review is necessary shall be informed by the Dean's office by May 15, so they may proceed to prepare materials for review. At that time they will be directed to these guidelines.

C. Candidates for promotion and tenure may choose to withdraw their candidacy at any time during the review process, except those for whom review is mandatory.

D. Reappointment reviews for assistant professors normally occur in spring term of the second year of employment in the Evans School. Candidates for reappointment shall be informed by the Dean by January 31 in the year of the review to prepare materials for a spring term review, and will be directed to these guidelines at that time.

E. These guidelines shall uniformly apply to all tenure track faculty in the Evans School, including those with joint appointments where the primary appointment is in the Evans School.

For joint appointees whose primary appointment is not in the Evans School, minor modifications of these procedures may be arranged in consultation with the Dean and Faculty Affairs Committee. In all cases, however, the Evans School will prepare its own recommendation based on standards established herein, and have a faculty vote.

VIII. APPOINTMENT OF REVIEW COMMITTEE

A. By no later than May 15 (March 15 for reappointment), the Dean in consultation with the [elected] Faculty Affairs Committee shall appoint a Review Committee with a designated

May 13, 2019

chair for each faculty member considered for reappointment, promotion or tenure. Each Review Committee shall consist of three faculty members senior in rank to the candidate, at least two of whom will be Evans faculty. In most cases one member will be from outside the School or hold a joint appointment. If appointed, such a member may not serve as chair.

B. A candidate for promotion, tenure, or reappointment may specify in confidence to the Dean one member, senior in rank, who should not be appointed to her or his Review Committee.

C. It is the responsibility of faculty members to serve on Review Committees. However, a faculty member should decline such appointment if he or she has reason to believe that some personal consideration might interfere in reaching an unbiased recommendation.

D. If Review Committee membership must be changed after appointment, the Dean in consultation with the Faculty Affairs Committee shall select an appropriate alternate member. The candidate shall be informed of any change by the Dean.

E. After appointment of the Review Committees is completed, the Dean shall inform all the faculty of candidates to be reviewed and the membership of the Review Committees.

IX. EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

A. Candidates for reappointment will not undergo external scholarly review.

B. A candidate for tenure or promotion shall submit to the [elected] Faculty Affairs Committee a list of four or more persons who may be used as external reviewers and at her or his discretion up to three other names of persons who should not be used in this capacity. Both lists shall be submitted by June 1. A candidate who has publications in more than one major field of study may indicate which external reviewers are more appropriate evaluators of the work in each field. No more than one person on the first list may be a member of the University of Washington faculty, no more than one may be a joint author within the previous five years, and no more than one may be a member of the candidate's dissertation committee.

C. The [elected] Faculty Affairs Committee, in consultation with the Dean and Review Committee, selects two persons from the candidate's first list as well as two other persons, preferably not on this list.

D. The Dean chooses two additional external reviewers.

May 13, 2019

E. The [elected] Faculty Affairs Committee and Dean shall choose external reviewers who are recognized contributors with acknowledged competence in the scholarly fields of the candidate.

F. No more than one of the six reviewers may be a member of the University of Washington faculty and no more than two may have co-authored publications with the candidate or been a member of the candidate's dissertation committee. Candidates will not be told the names of the external reviewers. Prior to sending him or her the candidate's sample of scholarly work, the Dean shall inquire whether each external reviewer is willing to provide an assessment. If not, a substitute shall be named following the above procedures.

G. When letters are received from external reviewers they shall be treated in the following way:

1. The content of and names of writers of all letters from outside reviewers shall be confidential. No faculty should discuss the names of writers or content of letters with anyone other than members of the eligible voting faculty.

2. The letters shall be used by the Review Committee to inform its evaluation of the quality of the candidate's scholarship and service. The total content of the letters and identity and institutional affiliation of the writers of the letters will be provided to the full voting faculty when the Review Committee report is distributed.

X. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW MATERIALS

A. The collection and assembling of evidence pertinent to the teaching, research, and professional, community and university service criteria for promotion, tenure, and reappointment are the responsibilities of the candidate.

B. A representative sample of scholarly work chosen by the candidate for use by external reviewers must be submitted to the Dean's office no later than July 1. Candidates for promotion or tenure may, at their option, submit a 2-3 page statement to be sent out with their scholarly work to external reviewers. This statement would be a brief intellectual biography which explains the context and purpose of their research. Candidates may consult with the Dean about the size and content of the sample. Letters signed by the Dean will go out by July 15 requesting written evaluations from external reviewers on the candidate's scholarly work. Letters to external reviewers will provide information on the University of Washington's research criteria for promotion and tenure, a list of specific questions from the Dean to guide their evaluation, the sample of work. All written reports received from reviewers will be given to the Review Committee, along with the candidate's 2-3 page statement (if used). While efforts will be made to obtain all six external reviews, the review process will proceed regardless of the number received.

May 13, 2019

C. A candidate for promotion or tenure shall submit all other materials to the Dean's office no later than September 16. A candidate for reappointment shall submit all materials no later than April 1.

D. Candidates have access to and may review the electronic compilation of their review materials before the Review Committee begins its work.

E. The content of the external letters will, upon request, be summarized by the Dean for the candidate in a manner which protects the confidentiality of the reviewers.

XI. FUNCTION OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND [ELECTED] FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

A. The charge to each Review Committee is to evaluate the evidence about the candidate's work in relation to the criteria specified in the UW Policy Directory and Sections I-V above.

B. The Review Committee will carefully read and study the candidate's submitted materials. Its report will evaluate the quality and significance of this material. If the Review Committee does not have the expertise necessary to evaluate the quality of some of the materials submitted, its chair may secure the assistance of a member of the University faculty with acknowledged competence in the area of concern to appraise the material. If such action is taken, the candidate will be notified by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (see C).

C. The [elected] Faculty Affairs Committee oversees the review process. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs manages the logistics of the review process and serves as the central point of contact for communication among the candidate, the Review Committee and the Dean. The candidate and the Review Committee should not communicate directly about the review. The Review Committee, however, has sole responsibility for evaluating the candidate's record. The candidate may, with prior approval, provide updates during the review process through the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

XII. THE REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

A. The Review Committee shall prepare a written report that summarizes and evaluates the evidence for teaching, research (including the judgments of external reviewers), service, and collegial considerations and makes a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or reappointment.

B. The Review Committee will decide how to write the report. The chair will have the final responsibility for the report that is sent to the Faculty Affairs Committee. If the vote is not

May 13, 2019

unanimous, the dissenting member must provide an explanation for the dissent in the report. The identity of the dissenter will be kept confidential.

C. Because of the confidential nature of these reports, the Dean's administrative assistant may do the final editing for format and consistency, if requested by the Review Committee. She or he will also make the necessary copies (or create a web site restricted to faculty eligible to vote that includes the report). Any printed material shared by the Dean's office must be returned to the Dean's administrative assistant after being reviewed by the Faculty Affairs Committee and the faculty.

D. The Format of the Report: [full guidelines not included here since there are extensive guidelines for each section 1-7]

The report should consist of eight sections in the following order:

1. Identifying information
2. Introduction
3. Section on Research, Publication, and other Scholarly Activities
4. Section on Teaching
5. Section on Professional Community and University Service and Collegial Relationships
6. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations
7. Summaries of candidate's scholarly work
8. Copy of candidate's vita

E. The [elected] Faculty Affairs Committee reviews the report to determine if the report meets the requirements of the *UW Policy Directory*, follows the guidelines laid out in this document, and fairly and completely summarizes the record. If substantive changes in the report are required, the Chair of the Review Committee will take the report back to the Committee to make the necessary revisions.

F. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will deliver the final report to the candidate.

XIII. REVIEW BY CANDIDATE

The candidate will be given one week to review the report of the Review Committee. Candidates may request correction of factual errors. The candidate may prepare a statement for distribution at the same time the Committee's report is distributed to the faculty for vote. A statement is not necessary or expected except in those instances where the candidate feels the report is incorrect, incomplete, or unfair.

XIV. FACULTY VOTE

May 13, 2019

One week after the candidate receives the report, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs shall circulate it, and the candidate's response to the report if prepared, to the Dean and faculty designated by the *Faculty Code* as eligible to vote on the promotion and/or tenure of the candidate. If the candidate states that he or she will not be preparing a statement, the report may be distributed earlier. Faculty will be allowed at least one week to review the report and the candidate's materials. All candidate materials will be available to voting faculty. The Dean shall call a meeting of all faculty eligible to vote for discussion of the report and the candidate's record. A written ballot shall be taken following the discussion. Eligible faculty who are unable to attend the meeting may in exceptional circumstances submit a written ballot and/or written comments to the Dean after reading the report but must do so in advance of the meeting.

XV. ACTION BY THE DEAN

A. After the faculty discussion of the ad hoc Review Committee report and the results of the first faculty vote, the Dean or the Dean's designee shall write a summary of the faculty deliberations and vote. The Dean's summary shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality as determined in the *Faculty Code* 24-54B specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond to this summary in writing within seven calendar days.

B. After the candidate has reviewed the summary and chosen whether to provide a written response, the eligible members of the voting faculty shall review the case of the tenure or promotion decision including a candidate's response if written. (*Faculty Code* 24-54C) A second in-person vote among eligible members of the voting faculty will be held to make a final recommendation (as represented by the majority vote) on each case it reviews. For reasons of confidentiality specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted in the recommendation to the Dean.

C. If the recommendation of the eligible members of the voting faculty does not concur with the initial faculty recommendation or if the recommendation of the eligible members of the voting faculty is not favorable, the Dean shall assign a faculty member to provide reasons for the faculty position. A tie vote constitutes a recommendation consistent with the initial vote of the full faculty. A simple concurrence with a positive faculty vote can be submitted without reasons.

D. The candidate shall be given a copy of the eligible members of the voting faculty recommendation if it is negative or does not concur with the initial faculty vote.

E. On the basis of the entire record of the candidate, including any recommendation of the second faculty vote, the Dean shall decide the matter and prepare to submit a formal letter to the Provost on his or her decision.

May 13, 2019

F. Prior to issuing a decision or recommendation that is not favorable to the candidate, the Dean shall provide the candidate with her or his initial reasons for the decision. In such cases, the Dean or Dean's designee shall discuss the case with the candidate. The candidate may respond in writing to the Dean within seven calendar days of the discussion.

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

H. After the case is decided the Dean shall ensure the candidate is informed in writing in a timely way of the results of the case and, if the result is not favorable, the reasons for the outcome.

I. Reappointment decisions are reviewed and approved or reversed by the Dean, but are not forwarded to the Provost. If a faculty member requests a written statement of the reasons for non-renewal, the Dean shall supply such a written statement within 30 days. (Faculty Code, sec. 24-53)

XVI. INFORMING THE CANDIDATE OF THE UNIVERSITY'S DECISION

Faculty promotions must be approved by the Provost, the President, and the Board of Regents. The Dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the action of the Board of Regents.

XVII. ALL TENURE TRACK FACULTY SHALL RECEIVE A COPY OF THESE GUIDELINES DURING THEIR FIRST QUARTER OF SERVICE IN THE EVANS SCHOOL.

EXCERPT from the School of Law Policy & Governance Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The School of Law's Promotion and Tenure Policies have recently been amended to include the creation of a P&T Advisory Committee. This committee is a subcommittee of our Elected Faculty Council. The language establishing this subcommittee was added to our bylaws by a near unanimous vote of our faculty at our May 1st, 2019 faculty meeting. This language can be found below:

E. Subcommittee of the EC to serve as a P&T Advisory Review Committee pursuant to Section 25.4.C of the Faculty Code:

May 13, 2019

1. A P&T Advisory Review Committee, which will review all requests for promotion and tenure that have been reviewed and voted on by the eligible voting faculty, shall be elected from among the members of the Executive Council. This review shall constitute an independent review of the candidate's file as required by Section 25.4.C of the Faculty Code.
2. The P&T Advisory Review Committee will be composed of three members, two of whom will be Full Professors. These three members shall be selected by the elected membership of the EC. The third member of the advisory committee may hold any rank.
3. The P&T Advisory Review Committee shall make recommendations concerning the candidate and provide them to the Dean as well as the candidate.
4. The members of the P&T Advisory Review Committee may participate in the faculty discussion of candidates for promotion and tenure but such members will be considered ineligible to vote and their numbers will not be counted for purposes of determining the requisite majority.

In addition to this post-faculty-vote review, we also have an elected Promotion & Tenure Committee (P&T), which is separate from our Elected Faculty Council. This Committee assists candidates pre-tenure in annual progress reviews. Once a candidate seeks tenure or promotion, P&T reviews the candidate's complete file and makes a report and recommendation to the faculty in advance of the faculty vote and discussion, after first providing the candidate with a copy and opportunity to respond. The language describing this long-established process is taken from the Law School's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and is quoted below:

A. Selection and Duties of a Promotion and Tenure Council

1. Selection Process: Each year, the Faculty shall elect a Council of at least five tenured Faculty members, three of whom are full Professors, to serve on the Promotion and Tenure Council ("Council"). After consulting with faculty as to preferences for Council membership, the Dean shall propose the slate to the faculty each year for election and shall attempt to maintain continuity in the Council from year to year where possible given faculty members' sabbatical schedules and other duties.
2. Council's Pre-tenure responsibilities:
 - a. The Council will meet with each tenure-track faculty member at the end of each academic year to review the progress the candidate has made toward satisfying the law school's promotion and tenure criteria.
 - b. The Council will schedule class visits for Assistant Professors as detailed above in Item I.B.2.b.i. It shall schedule class visits for Lecturers on the same basis as for Assistant Professors. It shall schedule one class visit per year for Associate Professors and for Senior Lecturers. In addition, it shall conduct a class visit prior to recommending any promotion of a faculty member. Faculty Code 24-57.A. It is to be understood that beyond the minimum requirements of the Faculty Code, the collection of the foregoing

May 13, 2019

sources of information for evaluating teaching is aspirational, as further elaborated in Item I.B.2.b.iv.”

c. The Council, or a designee of the Council, will review each published work of a tenure-track candidate and provide a report to the candidate at the time of the article’s publication. If members of the Council do not have expertise in the candidate’s field, they will designate a member of the faculty to conduct the evaluation. This process is intended to provide the candidate with immediate feedback on the article to assist the faculty member in his or her scholarly development and progress toward tenure. It is not a substitute for the external review process required to obtain tenure.

[Section B. Timetable for Process Omitted]

C. Procedure for Application for Contract Renewal, Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate or Full Professor

1. Preparation of the Record for Law School Review

a. Contents of the record: The record upon which the faculty will make its recommendation on the application for promotion or tenure shall include the file prepared by the candidate, copies of student evaluations, and, in the case of applications for tenure or for promotion to professor, external peer review of the candidate’s scholarly writings.

b. Contents of the candidate’s file: The candidate shall submit a file for law school review that shall include the following: (1) self-assessment of the candidate’s qualifications for promotion; (2) reports of meeting with the Dean pursuant to FAC § 24-57; (3) a curriculum vitae that includes the candidate’s educational background, teaching and professional employment history, and professional accomplishments; (4) a brief statement by the candidate of pedagogical goals and methodology for each class currently taught; (5) reprints or other copies of scholarly writings submitted as evidence of professional growth; and (6) any other statements, exhibits, or materials that the candidate wishes to be considered by the law school faculty and dean in making their recommendation as to the application.

c. The Dean shall make the record available to faculty in a timely manner.

d. Student evaluations

1. The Dean shall make available for review student evaluations and student comments of all courses taught in the two years prior to application, or in the case of application for tenure, of all courses taught prior to application. The Dean shall also supply a numerical summary of the evaluations for each evaluated course.

May 13, 2019

2. In addition, the Council may seek input from the Student Bar Association and other pertinent student and alumni groups.

e. External peer review

1. The Associate Dean is responsible for selecting at least three external reviewers for each candidate. The Associate Dean should consult with the Council and the candidate regarding suitable reviewers. The goal in selecting reviewers shall be to obtain reviews from persons recognized as in the top-tier nationally in their respective field. While the candidate has the right to suggest reviewers, the candidate does not have the right to particular reviewers. The external reviewer should be sent the candidate's work in the case of assistant professors and a representative sample of work since obtaining tenure in the case of associate professors. External reviews may also include, at the candidate's request, professors from other academic departments within the University. External letters of review shall be kept confidential from the candidate, unless waived by the reviewer.

2. Peer reviewers will be asked to comment upon the quality of the scholarship reviewed, including an assessment of its originality and significance within the field, its intellectual context, and how it compares with other work within the field. Peer reviewers shall also be asked to disclose any personal or professional relationship with the candidate under review.

D. Deliberation Procedures for the Promotion and Tenure Council and the Faculty

1. Process for assessment: The Council will carefully review the record submitted for the application, and in the course of its evaluation, may request submission of additional information that may be helpful in reaching a fair assessment of the application.

2. Optional Meeting with the candidate: The Council may invite the candidate to meet with the committee prior to its recommendation, and in such cases shall inform the candidate in advance of any specific areas it intends to address in that meeting. A candidate may initiate a request to meet with the Council prior to its recommendation.

3. Council report: The Council shall prepare a written report of its analysis and recommendation. The report must assess the candidate's performance in the areas of scholarship, teaching and service. Candidates for tenure must be evaluated according to criteria in the Law School Promotion and Tenure Policy in effect at the time of hire. The Dean shall provide the candidate with a written copy of the Council's report and recommendation as required in Section 24-54 of the Faculty Code. The report should be accurate and meaningful so that the candidate is able to clearly understand the recommendation and its reasoning. Subject to the external reviewers' confidentiality noted above, the report must include a sufficient summary of external reviews to alert

May 13, 2019

the candidate to the existence of any negative reviews so that the candidate may respond.

4. Candidate's Option to Respond to the Council Report: The candidate has the option of responding in writing to the Council within seven calendar days, unless the Dean authorizes an extension of time for response.

5. Faculty Vote: The report and the candidate's response (if one exists) shall be provided to all members of the faculty who are superior in rank to the candidate no later than one week prior to the faculty meeting at which the candidate's application will be considered.

Given the recent faculty vote to establish the P&T Advisory Review Committee of the EFC, the Promotion & Tenure Guidelines are in the process of being amended to include this new step in the process.

EXCERPT from the Information School

Tenure and promotion policies and procedures are based on Chapter 24 of the University of Washington *Faculty Code*.

1. Tenure and promotion policies and procedures are based on Chapter 24 of the University of Washington Faculty Code.
2. Faculty members will be notified that they are eligible for tenure or promotion by March 1 of the academic year prior to the academic year in which the decision will be made (i.e., two years before the decision would take effect). Faculty eligible for non-mandatory promotion will notify the Dean of the intention to go up for promotion by March 15. Faculty scheduled for review should meet with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to confirm the process and establish a timetable.
3. The faculty member will write a Letter Writers document suggesting exactly 6 outside reviewers. This document contains (1) a description of the field or subfield of the candidate's work, (2) a list of names with emails, ranks, institution, link to website, area of work, rationale for inclusion, personal connection to candidate (e.g., never met, have interacted with, served on a panel with), and any other notes pertinent to the candidate's work or CV. Where appropriate the candidate may also optionally list what fields or reviewers should be excluded from the list, and why. The faculty member will submit the document to the Administrative Specialist for Faculty Affairs and Elected Faculty Council.

May 13, 2019

4. As detailed in the Promotion Committee Charge, the promotion committee will review the Letter Writers document and devise a separate list of at least 6 outside reviewers. The overall list of at least 12 reviewers with recommendations for top choices will then be submitted to the Dean, who will select and solicit the final Reviewers.
5. The faculty member will prepare a packet of materials representative of their work that will be sent to outside reviewers. This packet contains a written self-assessment of their work and a full and up-to-date CV. Where appropriate, example publications should be included.
6. Reviewers will be contacted to confirm that they are willing to serve. They will receive the packet of materials for review.
7. Teaching evaluations (including course evaluations and other formal review documents) will be compiled by iSchool Human Resources.
8. For decisions of promotion, tenure, and promotion and tenure, there will be a vote by the Faculty above rank after review and discussion by faculty. The Dean is a silent observer and note taker on the deliberations. Dean writes a formal report of the proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation with specific attributions omitted.
9. The Dean delivers the report to the candidate. The candidate has the option to respond in writing to the Dean within 7 calendar days.
10. The Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) reviews the case. If the recommendation decision is favorable and the recommendation does not conflict with the faculty vote, the FAC submits recommendation with reasons to the Dean. If the FAC's recommendation is not favorable or if the FAC recommendation conflicts with the faculty vote, the FAC, via Faculty Human Resources, submits recommendation with reasons to candidate and Dean with specific attributions omitted.
11. The Dean reviews the case. If the Dean's decision is favorable, the Dean transmits recommendation and candidate response (if any) to the candidate and the Provost. If the recommendation is not favorable, the Dean provides candidate with initial recommendation and reasons prior to issuance of decision. The Dean discusses the case with the candidate. Then, the candidate has option to respond in writing within 7 calendar days. After the Dean receives the response (if any), the Dean transmits the recommendation and candidate response (if any) to both the candidate and Provost. In the case where the promotion is not mandatory and not favorable, the Dean transmits decision and response (if any) to Provost for information purposes. In the case where the promotion is mandatory and not favorable, the Dean transmits decision and response (if any) to Provost.
12. The Provost reviews the case and informs the Dean of the decision. In all cases, the Dean informs the candidate of the result and, if not favorable, the reasons.

May 13, 2019

13. If the recommendation is favorable, the Provost will forward the recommendation to the President. If tenure or promotion is to be granted, it shall be conferred by the President acting for the Board of Regents.