November 14, 2003, 11:00 am, Room 211B

Present: Frank Cioch, Colin Danby, Patricia Kelley, Andrea Kovalesky, Sandeep Krishnamurthy, Jane Van Galen, Barbara Van Sant and Linda Watts

Guest: Anne Loustau

Draft Documents, Review/Promotion/Tenure

The EC began a discussion of the draft documents relating to review, promotion and tenure guidelines and timelines prepared by Anne Loustau, for use within the context of an academic director’s handbook. Anne has been charged with preparing these items to ensure our compliance with, and facilitate our implementation of, Chapter 24. She has conducted this work in consultation with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the academic program directors. She seeks our comments, as faculty leaders, at this point in the process. The EC reviewed the Draft of 6/30/03 on Promotion (24-54) and Reappointment (24-41) Procedures. The extension and postponement of the review process for promotion came under discussion by the EC. One area of concern voiced was in regard to the attitude or overall philosophy that is reflected upon a candidate who requests either an extension or a postponement of their tenure review.

Frank Cioch expressed that the reasoning at UWS within units participating in ADVANCE (a targeted faculty retention initiative for women in science and technology, sponsored by NSG) toward extending the review is one of support and encouragement in respect to a candidate’s pursuit of tenure. A forward looking attitude toward the faculty member maximizes the likelihood of success if that candidate can suffer no adverse effect from utilizing an extension to pursue further research, publication or visit another institution to further their scholarship. This embracing position can create an environment that encourages success of faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion. The same is true for a candidate that is seeking a postponement to the review, for personal matters. It should not be viewed in a negative light by the department reviewing the promotion and/or tenure. The extension and postponement should be used as a means to stop the clock of the review and allow the candidate the time to prove to the review committee that they can succeed. It is understood that an extension may be officially requested at any point in time within the 5 year review and is a decision between the faculty member and the director of their program. The review committee can grant a postponement at the point of decision. Anne will check with Steve Olswang on whether a postponement must have the review committee’s approval or if the decision can be made between the candidate and director only.

A recommendation was brought forward by the EC to add a preamble to the Promotion and Reappointment Procedures that will express the culture of scholarship at UWB in relation to promotion and tenure. Frank Cioch will draft key phrases for a preamble that will convey the attitude of UWB to faculty on the philosophy of tenure here, what is needed to succeed. Two points should be clarified in the approach to promotion and tenure:

1. Develop a way to realize mentoring of pre-tenure faculty
2. Analyze how review committees are charged to review cases

In reviewing the draft, a concern was notated that the letter submitted to the Program Director recommending third-year review should be extensive and substantive. Another issue that was discussed
was multiple voting by faculty. It was clarified that faculty would not vote more than once; members serving on the review committee would cast only one vote.

Anne Loustau will bring all the concerns of the EC to the program directors. Questions about the candidate's annual review and merit decisions by the program being linked to the promotion and tenure came up for discussion. Merit decisions have 2 parts:

1. Contributions to the faculty member's progress
2. Contributions to the program and institution

A system of review for statements on promotion and reappointment procedures is needed periodically, every two years or so. The EC will complete their review of the draft document and submit comments, concerns or ideas to Linda Watts to convey to Anne Loustau.

Other Business

Linda reported the affirmative outcome of the vote to forward the MACS pre-proposal to Academic Council's consideration.

Linda asked the EC for confirmation on an important item distributed electronically in October: The draft of the Transfer System Agreement between Cascadia Community College and the University of Washington, Bothell - EC confirms agreement, will send any comments to Linda.

Linda informed the EC on the HECB's Master Plan and asked for the EC members to review.

EC Minutes for October 6, 2003 and October 20, 2003 were unanimously approved.

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant

Draft 6/30/03 Promotion (24-54) and Reappointment (24-41) Procedures: Assistant Professors. Appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor requires a tenure decision by the end of the sixth year. Within this six-year time frame, two mandatory reviews occur. The first review occurs during the spring of the second year of the appointment and a decision is made to renew or not renew to a second three-year term. The second review occurs during the fifth year of the appointment and requires a decision for promotion as well as tenure. Assistant Professors, Reappointment Procedures (24-41): The first appointment for Assistant Professors is for three years. During the Spring of the second year of this first three-year appointment, a comprehensive review of the Assistant Professor's performance and potential for future contributions is conducted and a decision is made regarding a second three-year appointment. The review encompasses documentation of the faculty members accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship and service. This review may be postponed for one year. If the decision is to not renew for a second three-year term, the appointment is terminated at the end of the following year (the third year of the initial appointment or the fourth year of the
appointment in the case of a one-year postponement). The UW Handbook places the responsibility for the decision regarding the second three-year appointment with the Dean. At UW Bothell the procedures for the second three-year review are as follows: 1. The Assistant Professor receives a letter from the Vice-Chancellor informing him/her of the upcoming review. 2. The Program Director and the Assistant Professor meet to discuss the formation of the review committee, the content of the portfolio/dossier to be provided to the committee and the procedures to be followed. 3. The Program Director appoints a committee of at least three tenured faculty and charges them with the responsibility of conducting the review and providing advice regarding the reappointment. 4. The Assistant Professor provides the review committee with a portfolio/dossier including a current CV; a letter summarizing progress towards his/her scholarship, teaching and service goals; teaching evaluations (standardized review forms as well as peer reviews of teaching), evidence of scholarly productivity (manuscripts published and/or submitted) and prior annual reviews. 5. The committee reviews the above materials and writes a letter to the Program Director recommending renewal or non-renewal. 6. Tenured Program Faculty meets and votes for renewal or non-renewal. 7. The Program Director forwards the following materials to the Vice-Chancellor: (a) Letter from the director including: the department recommendation, the faculty vote (votes for, against, abstaining, absent; total number of eligible voters; whether the chair's vote is included), reasons for the faculty decision along with a statement of the candidates progress towards promotion/tenure in the areas of scholarship, teaching and service along with contributions to the program and campus, and the director's independent recommendation (b) Curriculum Vitae (c) Annual Reviews (d) Evidence of teaching effectiveness including student evaluations of teaching (Standardized Educational Assessment forms) and collegial/peer evaluations of teaching. (e) Report from the secondary program/department if a faculty member holds a joint appointment. 8. The Vice-Chancellor consults with the Chancellor and a letter is sent to the Assistant Professor informing him/her of the decision (within 30 days of receipt of the recommendation). This letter is copied to the Program Director and to UW Seattle Academic Personnel. If the review recommends a second-three year reappointment, the letter to the faculty member contains the mandate for a tenure decision at the time of the next review. Assistant Professor, Promotion Procedures (24-54): During Winter Quarter of the fifth year of the appointment, the Assistant Professor receives a letter from the Vice-Chancellor (Appendix A) informing him/her of the upcoming mandatory promotion and tenure review. The faculty member and the program director meet to discuss the process, responsibilities, and the schedule of activities and decisions. The program director then appoints a committee of three to five senior faculty to conduct the review. A letter is sent to the Chancellor's Office, listing the members of the review committee. During Spring Quarter the faculty member submits a portfolio/dossier which includes a letter synthesizing his/her accomplishments, a Curriculum Vitae, records of teaching evaluations from students as well as collegial reviews, syllabi of courses taught, published manuscripts, and other supportive material. The review committee meets. The Assistant Professor may attend the initial portion of this meeting to receive feedback regarding the format and content of the portfolio materials and to provide the names of individuals who may serve as outside/external reviewers. The committee discusses the process and procedures, determines workload and establishes timelines. The committee makes the final determination of individuals who will be asked to serve as external reviewers for the candidate (without the candidate present) and forwards these names to the Program
Director. External Reviews: Five external reviews are requested with the expectation that there will be a minimum of four individuals providing reviews. The reviewers should include individuals identified by the candidate as well as individuals suggested independent of the candidate's recommendations. At least one-half (three) of these reviewers should not have substantial personal connections or have worked collaboratively with the individual being reviewed. The Program Director contacts the reviewers to request their services and sends a letter along with selected portfolio materials to each reviewer. The same materials are sent to each reviewer with the primary focus of the review on scholarly and/or artistic achievements. The solicitation letter (see sample in Appendix A) to the external reviewer should contain statements to the effect that the program/unit is considering the candidate for possible promotion, a brief description of the UW Bothell Campus, and the role of the program in the context of the campus mission. The letter should request the following from the reviewer: 1. How and for how long the referee has known the candidate; 2. The significance, independence, influence, and promise of the candidate's scholarship or creative work (particularly that done since coming to UW Bothell) and the degree of national/international recognition; 3. A comparison of the candidate's accomplishments with scholars or artists at a similar career stage in the same or related fields. The evaluator should not be asked to assess whether the candidate should be promoted, although they may choose to volunteer their opinion on this matter. The letter to the reviewer should also include the expected date for the return of the reviewer's comments and a statement regarding Washington state disclosure law. Committee and Program Actions The final portfolio/dossier along with letters from external reviewers are made available to the review committee by mid September. The committee meets and makes their decision regarding promotion and tenure. A letter reflecting their review and recommendation (the number of votes for, against, or abstaining) is submitted to the Program Director. The Program Director provides a synthesis of the recommendation (without names or votes) to the candidate. The candidate has seven days to respond if he/she desires. The candidate's portfolio/dossier, the letter from the committee, and the response from the candidate's response, if any, are made available to the senior faculty in the program. The senior faculty meet and vote (the number of votes for, against, or abstaining are recorded) regarding the promotion and tenure of the candidate. Faculty members who have served on the initial review committee may abstain from voting as they have already voted. (This opportunity for faculty to vote more than once on a promotion/tenure decision is an issue currently under discussion.) The Program Director provides a written summary of the recommendation (without names and may be with or without the vote count) to the candidate. The candidate has seven days to respond in writing. The Program Director writes a letter with his/her recommendation including the program's recommendation, and the recorded votes. A statement describing the qualifications of the external reviewers along with their CV's, their relationships (if any) with the candidate, the manner in which they were chosen and the reasons for these choices are included in the Program Director's letter. The faculty portfolio/dossier, letter from the committee, letter from the Program Director and external review letters, along with the candidate's responses, if any, are forwarded to the Vice-Chancellor. One sample of the solicitation letter is included in the packet. (See checklist of materials to be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor in Appendix B.) The UW Bothell Faculty Council reviews the materials and votes on the candidate's promotion and tenure. This information is forwarded to the Vice-Chancellor who reviews the record of the candidate and makes his/her recommendation to the Chancellor. The
Chancellor reviews the record, makes his/her recommendation and if the decision is to promote with tenure, the portfolio with the recommending letters and the external review letters are forwarded to the UW Provost. Extensions and Postponements: The counting of years towards tenure may be adjusted in two ways. First, the mandatory renewal and promotion/tenure dates may be extended by one year if the faculty member takes a leave of absence that is both (1) more than 50% time and (2) six months or more in length during an academic year. Second, a faculty member who becomes a parent may apply for a waiver of one year in the count toward renewal and promotion/tenure, with a possible extension of a second year. Applications for extensions are discussed with the program director and forwarded to the Chancellor’s office. A letter indicating the granting of the extension is sent to UW Academic Personnel. A one-year postponement, delaying either of the mandatory reviews (the review for reappointment to a second-three year term or the review for promotion with tenure) may be requested. This decision for postponement may originate from the Program Director, from the review committee, or from the Chancellor’s office. A decision for postponement should not extend the term of a non-tenured appointment beyond seven years. A letter indicating the postponement is sent to UW Academic Personnel. No additional materials (portfolio/dossier) are required by UW Academic Personnel. Full Professors: For the promotion of Associate Professors to the rank of Full Professor the processes described in the preceding paragraphs are followed with the exception of the review by the UW Bothell Faculty Council. The committee of Full Professors provides a review of the candidate’s materials and advises the Program Director regarding the promotion of the candidate. Since it is not a mandatory review, promotion to the rank of Full Professor allows for variability in the time-line permitted. The review process for promotion from Associate to the rank of Full Professor may be initiated by the faculty member when he/she considers it appropriate or he/she may be encouraged to seek promotion by the Full Professors of the Program or by the Campus Committee of Full Professors. Research Faculty: Research faculty meet the qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for rank with a primary emphasis on research. Research faculty are reviewed for reappointment and promotion according to the same procedures as described in the prior sections. Tenure is not awarded with academic rank and the continuation of the appointment is dependent on funding. Lecturers and Artists in Residence: Fulltime Lecturers and Artists in Residence are appointed for one-year terms. The Director must notify the individual at least six months (three months in the case of a first year appointment) whether or not the appointment is to be renewed. Part-time Lecturers and Artists in Residence are for one-year or less. Senior Lecturers and Artists in Residence are appointed for a minimum of three years and a maximum of five years. Appendix B Promotion materials to be forwarded to the Chancellor's Office Program Director's recommendation letter ___ Review committee report and recommendation ___ Program Director's (or his/her designee's) summaries to candidate of deliberations of program faculty, campus council and committee of full professors (in the case of promotion to Full Professors rank) ___ Record of each vote (program vote, council vote, etc) including number of faculty eligible to vote, number of faculty in favor, number of faculty against, number of faculty abstaining number of faculty absent whether the director's vote is included ___ Candidate responses, if any, to the above deliberations ___ . External Review Letters (original copies) along with CV's ___ Three copies of the Candidate Portfolio/Dossier including: Candidate’s personal statement presenting his/her academic accomplishments in teaching, research and service ___ Candidate’s CV with bibliography
___ Course syllabi ___ Evidence of teaching effectiveness (list of classes taught, peer review letters, and student evaluations) ___ Published manuscripts, monographs, grants submitted and other relevant examples of scholarship and research ___ Prior annual reviews ___ Procedures for Merit Decisions (24-55) Chapter 24, covering Appointment, Promotion and Tenure as well as procedures for salary increases based on Merit, was voted on and approved by the faculty at all three UW campuses in 1999. The following section serves as a guide to Merit Policies and our implementation of these at UW Bothell. A consistent expectation throughout this chapter is that written documentation of review meetings and recommendations is kept in the program office; and, the faculty member being reviewed (if he or she disagrees with the recommendations) has the option of responding in writing, within a specified number of days. 1. The performance of all faculty (including full time lecturers and senior lecturers) is reviewed annually for merit salary increases to be determined by performance for the year, cumulative career accomplishments, salary history and market gap. 2. Program personnel committees, comprised of tenured faculty, serve as peer review bodies and provide recommendations for salary increase decisions. Each faculty member is reviewed by faculty superior in rank. 3. Program directors, with the advice from personnel committees, provide recommendations regarding salary increases to the Vice-Chancellor. (See the attached grid for a detailed timeline of activities leading to the submission of these recommendations.) Written records of personnel committee recommendations as well as program director recommendations are kept on file in the program office. 4. The Vice-Chancellor forwards his/her recommendations to the Chancellor who in turn submits these salary recommendations to the UW Provost. 5. If a faculty member receives a "no merit" recommendation for two consecutive annual reviews, the program director, in consultation with the faculty member, appoints an ad hoc committee of faculty, superior (or equal in rank for full professors). The committee meets with the faculty member in question and provides a written report of their recommendations, either for improving performance or rectifying the salary decision. The faculty member has 21 days to respond to this report. Written documentation of these deliberations is kept in the program office. 4/28/03 Procedural Safeguards for Promotion/Tenure and Merit-Based Salary Considerations (24-57) This is a section that serves as a bridge between the section on merit review and the section on appointment, promotion and tenure. It assures that faculty will be informed of the expectations of their program, that they will keep a record of their annual accomplishments, and that they will meet regularly with the program director (or his/her designee). There is also a paragraph on teaching effectiveness, which was created in the 1980’s, to guarantee the annual review of teaching for each faculty member. However, teaching effectiveness is not the only criteria to be considered with regards to productivity; and, there is a section in the promotion and tenure guidelines, which defines the responsibilities of faculty more broadly, in terms of teaching, scholarship and service. 1. All programs establish goals/objectives in the first year of each biennium and review these in year two of each biennium. These goals/objectives serve as a base for the annual report written by each faculty member and for the meeting with the program director (or his/her designee). 2. Expectations of faculty and program directors include: a. Teaching Effectiveness. All faculty are required to have at least one course evaluated each year by students (either using the university standardized teaching assessment form or an alternative approach acceptable to the program). At UW Bothell most faculty have courses evaluated each quarter. b. Peer Review. All faculty are required to have their teaching
reviewed by colleagues - annually for assistant professors and every three years for associate and full professors. The methods used for peer review are determined by the program and may include classroom visitations by a colleague and/or the review of instructional materials. c. Yearly Activity Report. All faculty prepare a report of activities and accomplishments for the year (January 1 through December 31). These reports are submitted to the program director and serve as a basis for decisions regarding merit and progress towards promotion and tenure. d. Annual Conference. The program director (or his/her designee) conducts an annual conference with each assistant professor, full-time lecturer and senior lecturer. The purpose of these meetings is to discuss career goals, progress towards promotion and tenure for tenure line faculty, and expectations of the faculty member in terms of contributions to the goals/work of the program for the coming year(s). At UW Bothell faculty senior in rank review faculty junior in rank as a means of providing advice to the program director. The conference with the chair or his/her designee is required every two years for Associate Professors and every three years for Full Professors. These conferences are to be conducted separately from the merit review conference and written documentation of these meetings is to be kept in the program office. The faculty member has 10 days to respond in writing to the record of the meeting. A detailed description of the responsibilities of a faculty member may be found in Section 24-57 Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit-Based Salary, and Tenure Considerations, 24-32, Scholarly and Professional Responsibilities of Faculty Members, and 24-33, A Statement of Principle: Academic Freedom and Responsibility. If the faculty member and the program director disagree regarding the conference document, an adhoc committee of three senior faculty (one to be selected by the program director, one to be selected by the faculty member and a third to be selected by the committee) is appointed for the purposes of review and resolution of the disagreement. This committee may also be chosen from the University Conciliation Board. The committee reviews all documents, interviews the faculty member and the program director and conveys their decision, as well as any agreements between the faculty member and director, in a written report to the faculty member and to the program director. This letter is filed in the faculty member's personnel file. e. Although there is no requirement for merit or annual review of part-time lecturers, at UW Bothell we encourage an evaluative conference with respect to performance feedback and career goals for lecturers serving the campus over time. 4/28/03 Faculty Salary System: Policy and Procedures (24-70) There are three pages in the Handbook with recommendations from faculty to administrators regarding salary policy and procedures. This section ends with a caveat from the University stating that these policies can only be honored if the state provides new money to cover the increases. The essentials to be aware of are as follows: 1. All faculty judged meritorious receive a minimum of a 2% increase. 2. Extra merit is to be awarded on the basis of the individual's contributions to the Program/Campus/University. 3. Those faculty who are promoted receive a minimum of a 7.5% salary increase. 4. Unit adjustments with respect to a "market gap" may be determined by the Provost. 5. Response to outside offers of appointment (competitive offers) may come from the Provost in consultation with unit faculty. Chapter 24 requires that every two years faculty in each department/program are to adopt a policy spelling out the level of faculty involvement when a unit responds to competitive offers. Professional and Classified Staff Salary System All Professional and Classified Staff are reviewed annually to provide feedback regarding the employee's progress toward achieving program
goals and objectives, recognition of individual accomplishments and opportunities for growth, and evaluative comments from faculty, students, clients, and peers. 1. Professional Staff: Salary increases may be authorized as a General Salary Increase or may be related to job growth or retention or recognition adjustments. See http://www.washington.edu/admin/hr/pol.proc/prostaff/ for specific details. 2. Classified Staff: Cost of living increases for classified staff are initiated by the Washington State Legislature. Schedule pay raises other than cost of living may be found on the compensation Website, http://www.washington.edu/admin/hr/ocsp/ccompensat/. Rules vary for union and non-union classified positions. See UW HRB manager for questions. Lecturers and Artists in Residence Fulltime Lecturers and Artists in Residence are appointed for one-year terms. The Director must notify the individual at least six months (three months in the case of a first year appointment) whether or not the appointment is to be renewed. Part-time Lecturers and Artists in Residence are for one-year or less. Senior Lecturers and Artists in Residence are appointed for a minimum of three years and a maximum of five years. 4/28/03 Timing Merit Decisions January Personnel committee comprised of senior faculty established. February All faculty members in the program prepare their Yearly Activity Report (reviewing their past year's objectives and their accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service). The Yearly Activity Report should include a CV and a list of the past year's objectives. March Program director provides the personnel committee with salary data and market comparisons (http://www.washington.edu/admin/factbook/OisAcrobat/OisPDF.html#anchor1) for each faculty member for the purpose of identifying salary inequities. Personnel committees meet and review Yearly Activity Reports submitted by faculty and assess contributions to the program and degree of merit (extra merit, merit, no merit). Members of the personnel committee excuse themselves while their performance is reviewed. The personnel committee writes a letter recommending action(s) to the director (with justification for the recommendation). The personnel committee also reviews salary information and makes recommendations regarding salary inequities and disparities. April The program director may meet with the personnel committee to receive merit reviews, and salary recommendations. Using advice from the personnel committee, the director, or his/her designee prepares letters assessing each faculty's yearly activities. Faculty members may meet with the director or his/her designee to discuss the report. June Every two years, each program faculty determines whether they will respond to outside competitive offers for their faculty. If they choose to respond to the offer and the salaries of faculty with competitive offers are increased, the amount of merit money available to the program faculty for merit distribution may be decreased by a corresponding amount. June Directors submit to the Vice Chancellor a summary letter containing names, ratings, and recommended salary increases. Recommended increases should be based on merit and market factors. The letter should also indicate the type and kind of consultation provided in the review process. Copies of the review letters (personnel committee and program director) are retained in the program office along with copies of faculty goals and objectives. June The Vice Chancellor, with Chancellor's concurrence, prepares letters to faculty indicating the merit/market increase recommended and submits merit/market increase recommendations to Provost's Office. June Although not part of the faculty review process, the performance of professional and classified staff is reviewed on an annual basis. Recommendations regarding salary increases are submitted to the Vice Chancellor. See the following sites for details of staff reviews:

In the first year of the biennium, program faculty and director review and update program vision, objectives, and strategic plan. In the second year of the biennium, the director distributes a copy of the vision, objectives, and plan to all program faculty members for review and, if necessary, revision. January The program director prepares and distributes to all program faculty members the service, teaching/curricular, and research activities needed to carry out the program goals and objectives for the next year. Winter Quarter Faculty submit objectives for the upcoming year based on the program's projected list of needed activities/duties and the program's goals and objectives. Spring Quarter The program director reviews all objectives submitted by faculty to determine their overall coherence and fit with the program's needs given the program's vision, objectives, and goals. Spring Quarter The Chair of the personnel committee, Full Professors and Associate Professors (or a subcommittee thereof) meet about Assistant Professors to review progress toward tenure and promotion. Full time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are also reviewed for progress towards career goals and contributions to the program. Fulls follow program procedures to review themselves (every three years). Winter, Spring or Autumn Quarter The program director (or his/her designees) meets with faculty to discuss the faculty member's goals and objectives and the findings from the Spring quarter review regarding progress toward tenure and promotion. 4/28/03 Draft 10/01/03 UW BOTHELL, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES Calendar for Promotion and Tenure Review for Assistant Professors to Associate Professor with Tenure Timeline* Action January 15 Letter from Vice-Chancellor's office to all faculty regarding mandatory and non-mandatory promotion review calendar. Spring Quarter, April 1 In mandatory cases faculty member must acknowledge awareness of upcoming review for promotion and tenure. In non-mandatory cases faculty member must notify program director of desire to be considered for promotion and tenure by this date. Spring Quarter, April 15 Program director and faculty member meet to discuss process and procedures including potential committee membership. Faculty candidate provides program director with a list of three to five qualified external reviewers (faculty from outside the University of Washington campus system) who may be selected to referee their materials and write letters to the review committee. Spring Quarter, May 1 Program director selects review committee of senior faculty, informs candidate of committee member's names, and schedules the first meeting. Initial draft of portfolio/dossier is sent to committee. Spring Quarter, May 15 First meeting of the committee is held. The candidate may join the committee for a portion of the meeting to receive feedback regarding the portfolio/dossier. The overall process is discussed and workload and timelines established. External reviewers are identified and a list of five individuals is sent to the program director. Spring Quarter, May 30 Program director solicits services of external reviewers. Spring Quarter, June 15 Letters and review materials sent to external reviewers Summer Quarter Candidate's portfolio/dossier is finalized. September 1 External reviews are completed and returned to the program director. Autumn Quarter, September 15 All final materials including the external review letters are sent to the committee for review. Autumn Quarter, October 7 The committee's review is completed and the committee chair writes a report of the review to the program
director. A written summary of the report and the committee’s recommendation is provided by the program director or designee to the candidate (without names and without vote counts). Autumn Quarter, October 15 The candidate may, if he or she chooses, respond in writing to that report within seven calendar days. Autumn Quarter, October 30 A copy of the candidate’s response, if any, is included with the candidate’s portfolio for review by faculty eligible to vote before the program discussion and promotion vote occurs. The eligible faculty meet to consider the committee’s recommendation and to vote. Following the program discussion and vote, the program director or designee prepares a summary of the discussion and recommendation and provides this summary to the candidate (without names and may be without vote counts). Autumn Quarter, November 7 The candidate may choose to respond in writing to the report within seven calendar days. Autumn Quarter, November 10 The program director writes a letter and an independent recommendation to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The following items are forwarded to the office of the Vice-Chancellor; the total portfolio/dossier of the candidate; the letters from the external reviewers; the review committee's recommendations; the candidate's response (if any) to the committee; the outcome of the faculty vote; the faculty summary; the candidate's response (if any) to the faculty; and records of votes. (See Appendix B for an itemized list of materials to be forwarded.) Autumn Quarter, November 10 The Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs forwards candidate's materials to and seeks advice from the UW Bothell Faculty Council. Autumn Quarter, November 15 The Faculty Council reviews the materials, meets and votes. Autumn Quarter, November 30 The Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs reviews the total record of the candidate, the outcome of the faculty vote, the program director's recommendation, the faculty council recommendations, and the candidate's responses, if any. The Vice-Chancellor consults with the Chancellor to construct their recommendation to the Provost. Autumn Quarter, December 1 All materials, including the letters from external reviewers, with a letter from the Chancellor are forwarded to the UW Provost's Office. Winter Quarter The Provost completes his/her review and forwards the final recommendation to the President. Spring Quarter Letter from the President confirming tenure/promotion. July 1 Salary and title adjustments made effective for 12-month faculty September 16 Salary and title adjustments made effective for 9-month faculty. *Specific dates are approximations allowing for weekends and holidays. Draft 10/01/03 UW BOTHELL, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES Calendar for Promotion Review for Associate Professors to Full Professor* January 15 Letter from Vice-Chancellor’s office to all faculty regarding promotion calendar. Spring Quarter, April 1 Faculty member notifies program director of desire to be considered for promotion. Spring Quarter, April 15 Program director and faculty member meet to discuss process and procedures including potential committee membership. Faculty candidate provides program director with a list of three to five qualified external reviewers (faculty from outside the University of Washington campus system) who may be selected to referee their materials and write letters to the review committee. Spring Quarter, May 1 Program director selects review committee of senior faculty, informs candidate of committee member's names and schedules the first meeting. Initial draft of portfolio/dossier is completed and sent to committee. Spring Quarter, May 15 First meeting of the committee is held. The candidate may join the committee for a portion of the meeting to receive feedback regarding the portfolio/dossier. The overall review process is discussed and workload and timelines established. External reviewers are identified and a list of five individuals is sent to the program director. Spring Quarter, May
30 Program director solicits services of external reviewers. Spring Quarter, June 15 Letters and review materials sent to external reviewers. Summer Quarter Candidate's portfolio/dossier is finalized. September 1 External reviews are completed and returned to the program director. Early Autumn Quarter, September 15 All final materials including the external review letters are sent to the committee for review. Autumn Quarter, October 15 The committee's review is completed and the committee chair writes a report of the review to the program director. A written summary of the report and the committee's recommendation is provided by the program director or designee to the candidate (without names and without vote counts). Autumn Quarter, October 22 The candidate may, if he or she chooses, respond in writing to that report within seven calendar days. Autumn Quarter, November 7 A copy of the candidate's response, if any is included with the candidate's portfolio for review by the UW Bothell committee of Full Professors. The committee of Full Professors meet and vote on the promotion. Following the vote, the program director or designee prepares a summary of the discussion and recommendation and provides this summary to the candidate (without names and may be without vote counts). Autumn Quarter, November 15 The candidate may choose to respond in writing to the report within seven calendar days. Autumn Quarter, November 30 The program director writes a letter and an independent recommendation to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The following items are forwarded to the office of the Vice Chancellor; the total portfolio/dossier of the candidate; the letters from the external reviewers; the review committee's recommendations; the candidate's response (if any) to the committee; the outcome discussion and vote of the Full Professors; and the candidate's response, if any. (See Appendix B for an itemized list of materials to be forwarded.) Autumn Quarter, December 7 The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs reviews the total record of the candidate; the committee, full professor's, and program director's recommendations; and the candidate's responses, if any. The Vice Chancellor consults with the Chancellor to construct their recommendation to the Provost. Autumn Quarter, December 1 All materials, including the letters from external reviewers, with a letter from the Chancellor are forwarded to the UW Provost's Office. Winter Quarter The Provost completes his/her review and forwards the final recommendation to the President. Spring Quarter Letter from the President confirming promotion. July 1 Salary and title adjustments made effective for 12-month faculty. September 16 Salary and title adjustments made effective for 9-month faculty. * In special circumstances the calendar for promotion from associate to full professor may vary. D R A F T Transfer System Agreement Cascadia Community College and the University of Washington, Bothell Introduction: This agreement details institutional responsibility assumed by Cascadia Community College and the University of Washington, Bothell in support of an efficient student transfer system between the collocated institutions. The University of Washington, Bothell (UWB) and Cascadia Community College (CCC) enter into this mutual agreement in order to facilitate student success in higher education at the baccalaureate level. CCC and UWB are committed to the creation and maintenance of a program for successful student transfer that will serve as a model of excellence for the State of Washington. Purpose and Goals: 1. Provide effective and efficient transition for graduates from CCC to UWB by clearly articulating the curricular requirements of the first two years of college and course prerequisites for UWB programs of study; 2. Increase student transfer rates by providing students with a four-year curricular plan based on an approved sequential learning schedule; 3. Increase student knowledge about prerequisite and required classes necessary for upper division program enrollment; 4. Increase
curricular efficiency, thereby achieving greater cost effectiveness for students; and 5. Increase graduation rates and decrease time to degree at both institutions. The Agreement: In order to promote successful student transfer from Cascadia Community College to the University of Washington, Bothell and to increase coordination between the two institutions particularly in the areas of student recruitment, advising, and admissions, the institutions agree to the following: 1. On an annual basis, create and maintain a clearly articulated Academic Transfer Program Guide to degrees that serve as a pathway to achieving a baccalaureate degree from UWB. 2. Distribute the Academic Transfer Program Guide to degrees to appropriate CCC contacts prior to the beginning of each academic year. The guides will include admission requirements, application deadlines, and policies related to admission for each of the UWB degree programs; 3. Jointly insure timely notification of program or admission requirement changes, as well as information about changes to admissions policies, deadlines, and curriculum. 4. Coordinate quarterly joint meetings of advising staff members from both institutions. 5. Offer joint student transfer information sessions on a regular basis; 6. Provide information regarding admissions requirements on the websites of both institutions and encourage high school counselors and other advisors to link to these sites; 7. Provide an annual report to CCC on application, admission, and enrollment of students transferring from CCC to UWB; 8. Provide an annual report on the academic performance of CCC Graduates enrolled in UWB programs; and 9. Review this agreement in February of each year or earlier if the need arises.