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General Faculty Organization Bylaws

ARTICLE VI
CAMPUS COUNCIL ON PROMOTION, TENURE AND FACULTY AFFAIRS

Section 1. Responsibilities

A. Promotion and tenure: The Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs, as an elected council of the UW Bothell faculty, shall advise the Chief Academic Officer on cases involving promotion and tenure of the faculty in accordance with Sections 24-54C and 25-41B of the UW Handbook, and on appointments when consultation is needed. In formulating its advice on promotion and tenure, it is directed to study the whole record of candidates in accordance with the broad criteria established in the UW Handbook. It shall also be the responsibility of the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs to review and, if necessary, propose changes to policies and procedures related to campus-level implementation of University appointment, promotion, and tenure policy in accordance with Section 13-23A.5 and 13-31A.4 and A.5. of the UW Handbook. Proposed changes shall be referred to the GFO Executive Council, which shall determine whether to refer the proposed changes to the GFO for approval.

B. Faculty affairs: The Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs shall serve as deliberative and advisory body to the GFO Executive Council on all matters of policy relating to the interests of the faculty of UW Bothell, including salaries, professional leave, mentoring, professional development, and standards of academic performance. Within this area of jurisdiction, the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs

1. shall provide advice and information as requested by the GFO Chair and GFO Executive Council;
2. may on its own initiative prepare proposals or resolutions for submission to the GFO Executive Council;
3. may appoint such ad hoc committees as may be required for the effective pursuit of its work;
4. may request such information and assistance as may be required in the effective pursuit of its work;
5. shall submit to the GFO Chair any report for transmission to the GFO Executive Council.

Section 2. Membership

The membership of the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs shall consist of seven tenured voting faculty members. Each program not part of a school or college shall be entitled to at least one representative; should they be established by the Board of Regents, schools and colleges shall each be entitled to at least one representative. The Chancellor and academic Vice Chancellor are not eligible for membership. Deans of schools and colleges are not eligible for membership. Members will be elected for a term of two years and can be elected for a maximum of three consecutive terms, at which point a member cannot be re-elected for one full year. The chair will be elected by its members and will serve for one academic year (September 16 through June 15), unless re-elected. The term of all other members shall begin September 16 in the year of their election and end June 15 two years later.

Nominations and election of the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs shall be conducted annually in the Spring Quarter to replace members whose term expires with the current academic year. The first election shall be held Spring Quarter 2007 to replace the members of the current Faculty Council on Promotion and Tenure whose term expires June 15, 2007, and to elect an additional member to bring the total council membership to seven. Members whose term expires in 2008 shall have the option of continuing in the new Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs. Elections of four and three members shall be conducted in alternating years
to maintain the total membership at seven. Special elections may be held to fill seats vacated by faculty before the end of their terms.

No later than Fall Quarter 2009, the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs shall conduct a review of these procedures, practices, and policies and shall propose recommended changes to the GFO Executive Council.

For purposes of representation on the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs, there shall be two rounds of election:

1. First election: [campus-wide primary election]
   (a) The chair of the GFO shall distribute to all voting faculty members a secret ballot containing the names of all eligible UW Bothell professors.
   (b) Each voting faculty member votes for as many candidates as there are open positions.
   (c) Each voting faculty member shall only cast a maximum of one vote per candidate.
   (d) A designated staff representative of the GFO office will collect the ballots and count the first round tally, which shall not be released.

2. Second election: [campus-wide election using the slate of nominees from the first election]
   (a) The chair of the GFO shall distribute to all voting faculty members a second secret ballot containing the names of twice the number of eligible faculty as the number of open positions.
   (b) The names on the ballot will be drawn from those who received the highest number of votes in the first election and who have agreed to have their names placed on the second ballot.
   (c) Each voting faculty member may cast as many votes as the number of open positions.
   (d) Each voting faculty member shall only cast a maximum of one vote per candidate.
   (e) The election will be decided by plurality vote, consistent with the requirement that each program, school, and college have at least one representative. In case of a tie, there will be a run-off election.

Section 3. Members of the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs shall recuse themselves from promotion and tenure cases originating from within their own programs.
CCPTFA Policy on Conflict of Interest

Conflict of Interest, with respect to promotion and tenure, is a situation in which a faculty member has a relationship that impairs or might appear to impair an objective review of a case.

Relationships, which can give rise to conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflicts of interest include, among others, professional relationships created by joint publishing, grants, and research activities.

Members of the CCPTFA who judge themselves to have a conflict of interest are encouraged to recuse themselves and not participate in the consideration of that individual for promotion or tenure.

Recusal means not partaking in discussion or voting on the case.

2/13/12
University of Washington Policy Directory
Faculty Code and Governance:
http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCGTOC.html

Explanation of Materials Published in this Resource

The resource known as the *Faculty Code and Governance* includes the following parts:

- *The University Faculty*—This part establishes the authority of the University's faculty and its allocation of powers and duties.

- *Faculty Code*—This part provides for the organization and functioning of the University's faculty.

- *Senate By-Laws*—This part contains the rules governing procedures of the Faculty Senate.

- *Faculty Councils, Committees, and Representatives*—This part includes a delineation of rules and mandates pertaining to these groups and individual positions.
Faculty Code and Governance

Faculty Code

Chapter 24

Section 24–31  General Appointment Policy

The principal functions of a university are to preserve, to increase, and to transmit knowledge. Its chief instrument for performing these functions is its faculty, and its success in doing so depends largely on the quality of its faculty. The policy of this University should be to enlist and retain distinguished faculty members with outstanding qualifications.

*Section 13–31, April 16, 1956 with Presidential approval.*

Section 24–32  Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members

The University faculty is committed to the full range of academic responsibilities: scholarship and research, teaching, and service. Individual faculty will, in the ordinary course of their development, determine the weight of these various commitments, and adjust them from time to time during their careers, in response to their individual, professional development and the changing needs of their profession, of their programs, departments, schools and colleges, and the University. Such versatility and flexibility are hallmarks of respected institutions of higher education because they are conducive to establishing and maintaining the excellence of a university and to fulfilling the educational and social role of the institution.

A. Scholarship, the essence of effective teaching and research, is the obligation of all members of the faculty. The scholarship of faculty members may be judged by the character of their advanced degrees and by their contribution to knowledge in the form of publication and instruction; it is reflected not only in their reputation among other scholars and professionals but in the performance of their students.

B. The creative function of a university requires faculty devoted to inquiry and research, whose attainment may be in the realm of scholarly investigation, in constructive contributions in professional fields, or in the creative arts, such as musical composition, creative writing, or original design in engineering or architecture. While numbers (publications, grant dollars, students) provide some measure of such accomplishment, more important is the quality of the faculty member's published or other creative work.
Important elements in evaluating the scholarly ability and attainments of faculty members include the range and variety of their intellectual interests; the receipt of grants, awards, and fellowships; the professional and/or public impact of their work; and their success in directing productive work by advanced students and in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods. Other important elements of scholarly achievement include involvement in and contributions to interdisciplinary research and teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals; the judgment of professional colleagues; and membership on boards and committees.

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

D. Contributions to a profession through published discussion of methods or through public demonstration of an achieved skill should be recognized as furthering the University's educational function.

E. The University encourages faculty participation in public service. Such professional and scholarly service to schools, business and industry, and local, state, national, and international organizations is an integral part of the University's mission. Of similar importance to the University is faculty participation in University committee work and
other administrative tasks and clinical duties. Both types of service make an important contribution and should be included in the individual faculty profile.

F. Competence in professional service to the University and the public should be considered in judging a faculty member's qualifications, but except in unusual circumstances skill in instruction and research should be deemed of greater importance.

MEMORANDUM

February 3, 2014

TO: UW Bothell Faculty Colleagues

FROM: Susan Jeffords
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Calendar for Promotion and Tenure Process – AY 2014-2015

I am writing to commence the promotion and tenure review process for 2014-2015. Per the University Handbook, each member of the faculty below the rank of professor shall be considered annually for possible promotion. UW Bothell faculty eligible for promotion include the Assistant and Associate Professor, Lecturer and Senior Lecturer ranks. Reviews for Assistant Professors in their 6th year are mandatory, while "early" promotions to the Associate Professor level, recommendations to the Professor level, and recommendations to Senior and Principle Lecturer ranks are considered non-mandatory. The timelines for mandatory and non-mandatory reviews differ.

Attached you’ll find two timelines specific to UW Bothell, 1) timeline for mandatory reviews, and 2) timeline for non-mandatory reviews. These timelines serve as a general guide for UW Bothell’s process and to detail the actions taken at various stages in accordance with Chapter 24-54 of the University Handbook.

It is particularly important to note that the first step in either review process is to notify your program director of your desire to seek review. This notice must occur by March 28, 2014. UWB faculty members planning for either mandatory or non-mandatory review should carefully review the University policy and schedule of requirements as soon as possible and direct any questions to your school/program dean/director or Peggy Frazier, Director, Academic HR.

Attachments (2)
**Mandatory Review Portfolio Deadlines**: Candidates’ portfolio guidelines and submission dates to be provided by their respective schools. Schools’ portfolio review period to be completed in its entirety in time to submit the completed portfolio to the VCAA by or on November 1, 2015. The VCAA deadline, November 1, 2015, is a hard deadline. Other deadlines are approximate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadlines</th>
<th>Action / Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter Quarter 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13</td>
<td>Notification from Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) to deans regarding mandatory and non-mandatory promotion review process. Deans notify eligible faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Quarter 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31</td>
<td>Faculty member provides notification to dean of desire to be considered for promotion and tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Dean and candidate meet to discuss process and procedures including potential review subcommittee membership. Candidate provides dean 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 subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Dean selects review subcommittee of senior faculty, informs candidate of subcommittee members’ names, and schedules the first meeting. Initial draft of portfolio is completed and sent to subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>First meeting of the review subcommittee is held. The candidate may join the subcommittee for a portion of the meeting to receive feedback regarding the portfolio. The overall review process is discussed and timelines established. External reviewers are identified and a list of five individuals is sent to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29</td>
<td>Dean solicits participation of external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12</td>
<td>Dean sends letters and review materials to external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Quarter 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>Candidate finalizes portfolio and submits to dean. External reviews are completed and returned to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autumn Quarter 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 11</td>
<td>All final materials including the external review letters are sent to the candidate’s review subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5</td>
<td>The subcommittee’s review is completed and the subcommittee chair writes a report of the review to the dean. A written summary of the report and the subcommittee’s recommendation is provided by the dean to the candidate without names and specific attributions of external reviewers and vote counts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 12</td>
<td>The candidate acknowledges in writing within seven calendar days receipt of the report and may choose at that time to provide a written response to the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadlines</td>
<td>Action / Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20</td>
<td>A copy of the candidate’s acknowledgement and response is included with the candidate’s portfolio for review by school faculty senior in rank and eligible to vote before the school discussion and promotion vote occurs. The eligible faculty meet to consider the candidate’s review subcommittee’s recommendation and to vote. Following the school discussion and vote, the dean prepares a summary of the discussion and recommendation and provides this summary to the candidate without specific attributions and vote counts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27</td>
<td>The candidate acknowledges in writing within seven calendar days receipt of the report and may choose at that time to provide a written response to the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30</td>
<td>The dean writes an independent analysis and recommendation to the VCAA. The dean may, at its discretion, share its recommendations with the candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2</td>
<td>The dean forwards the portfolio containing originals of all required elements to the VCAA. The dean provides the VCAA with access to the candidate’s electronic file and in turn the VCAA provides access to the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure, and Faculty Affairs (Campus Council).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio’s due</td>
<td>The Campus Council reviews the materials and submits a written review and recommendation to the VCAA. If the review is unfavorable, or conflicts with the faculty vote, the Campus Council submits recommendation with reasons to candidate with specific attributions and votes omitted. The candidate may provide a response in writing within seven calendar days of receipt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the VCAA’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 23</td>
<td>The VCAA reviews the materials and consults with the Chancellor to determine a recommendation to the Provost. Prior to the issuance of a decision or recommendation by the VCAA that is not favorable the candidate shall be provided with the initial recommendation and reasons therefore. The VCAA or designee shall discuss the case with the candidate. The candidate acknowledges in writing the discussion and may provide a response in writing within seven calendar days of the discussion. If the VCAA recommendation is favorable or if the decision is mandatory the VCAA shall transmit recommendation and candidate’s response, if it exists, to the candidate and to the Provost. Specific attributions and vote counts will be omitted from recommendation to candidate. If the recommendation is not favorable and not mandatory, and the candidate has responded in writing, the VCAA shall transmit decision and response to the Provost for information purposes only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>The original hard copy of the portfolio is forwarded with the VCAA’s recommendation to the Provost’s Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter 2016</td>
<td>The Provost completes a review and forwards the final recommendation to the Board of Regents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter 2016</td>
<td>Letter from the President confirming tenure/promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Quarter 2016</td>
<td>Salary and title adjustments made effective for 12-month faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadlines</td>
<td>Action / Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Quarter 2016</strong></td>
<td>Salary and title adjustments made effective for 9-month faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference: Faculty Code, Chapter 24-54
Non-Mandatory Review and Early Review Portfolio Deadlines: Candidates’ portfolio guidelines and submission dates to be provided by their respective schools. Schools’ portfolio review period to be completed in its entirety in time to submit the completed portfolio to the VCAA by or on December 1, 2015. The VCAA deadline, December 1, 2015, is a hard deadline. Other deadlines are approximate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadlines</th>
<th>Action / Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter Quarter 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13</td>
<td>Notification from Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) to deans regarding mandatory and non-mandatory promotion review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Quarter 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31</td>
<td>Faculty member provides notification to dean of desire to be considered for promotion and tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Dean and candidate meet to discuss process and procedures including potential review subcommittee membership. Candidate provides dean 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 subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Dean selects review subcommittee of senior faculty, informs candidate of subcommittee members’ names, and schedules the first meeting. Initial draft of portfolio is completed and sent to subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>First meeting of the review subcommittee is held. The candidate may join the subcommittee for a portion of the meeting to receive feedback regarding the portfolio. The overall review process is discussed and timelines established. External reviewers are identified and a list of five individuals is sent to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29</td>
<td>Dean solicits participation of external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12</td>
<td>Dean sends letters and review materials to external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autumn Quarter 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16</td>
<td>External reviews are completed and returned to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5</td>
<td>Candidate’s portfolio is finalized and submitted to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 12</td>
<td>All final materials including the external review letters are sent to the candidate’s review subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 19</td>
<td>The subcommittee’s review is completed and the subcommittee chair writes a report of the review to the dean. A written summary of the report and the subcommittee’s recommendation is provided by the dean to the candidate without names and specific attributions of external reviewers and vote counts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26</td>
<td>The candidate acknowledges in writing within seven calendar days receipt of the report and may choose at that time to provide a written response to the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2</td>
<td>A copy of the candidate’s acknowledgement and response is included with the candidate’s portfolio for review by school faculty senior in rank and eligible to vote before the school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deadlines | Action / Process
---|---
discussion and promotion vote occurs. The eligible faculty meet to consider the candidate’s review subcommittee’s recommendation and to vote. Following the school discussion and vote, the dean prepares a summary of the discussion and recommendation and provides this summary to the candidate without specific attributions and vote counts.
November 14 | The candidate acknowledges in writing within seven calendar days receipt of the report and may choose at that time to provide a written response to the report.
November 26 | The dean writes an independent analysis and recommendation to the VCAA. The dean may, at its discretion, share its recommendations with the candidate.
December 1 (Portfolio’s due to the VCAA’s Office) | The dean forwards the portfolio containing originals of all required elements to the VCAA. The dean provides the VCAA with access to the candidate’s electronic file and in turn the VCAA provides access to the Campus Council.

**Winter Quarter 2016**

January 11 | The Campus Council reviews the materials and submits a written review and recommendation to the VCAA. If the review is unfavorable, or conflicts with the faculty vote, the Campus Council submits recommendation with reasons to candidate with specific attributions and votes omitted. The candidate may provide a response in writing within seven calendar days of receipt.

January 28 | The VCAA reviews the materials and consults with the Chancellor to determine a recommendation to the Provost. Prior to the issuance of a decision or recommendation by the VCAA that is not favorable the candidate shall be provided with the initial recommendation and reasons therefore. The VCAA or designee shall discuss the case with the candidate. The candidate acknowledges in writing the discussion and may provide a response in writing within seven calendar days of the discussion. If the VCAA recommendation is favorable or if the decision is mandatory the VCAA shall transmit recommendation and candidate’s response, if it exists, to the candidate and to the Provost. Specific attributions and vote counts will be omitted from recommendation to candidate. If the recommendation is not favorable and not mandatory, and the candidate has responded in writing, the VCAA shall transmit decision and response to the Provost for information purposes only.

February 1 | The original hard copy of the portfolio is forwarded with the VCAA’s recommendation to the Provost’s Office.

March 15 | The Provost completes reviews and forwards final recommendations to the Board of Regents.

**Spring Quarter 2016**

Spring Quarter | Letter from the President confirming tenure/promotion.

**Summer Quarter 2016**

July 1 | Salary and title adjustments made effective for 12-month faculty

**Fall Quarter 2016**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadlines</th>
<th>Action / Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 16</td>
<td>Salary and title adjustments made effective for 9-month faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reference: Faculty Code, Chapter 24-54*
CCPTFA Promotion and Tenure Review Process

Spring or Autumn Quarter
Orientation of new members to the CCPTFA

November 1st meeting of the CCPTFA – assignment of candidate’s files to Council members

Candidate Case Reviews

Meeting with VCAA
CCPTFA recommendation letters presented

CCPTFA meeting
Review of candidate’s letters
CCPTFA Dossier Review Process

Steps in the Review Process

1. When a dossier is ready for review, the Vice Chancellor’s Office will notify the chair of the CCPTFA of the location of the electronic file and the chair will notify the members of the CCPTFA. Notification will prompt the following actions:
   a. The dossier will be scheduled for review.
   b. Members of the CCPTFA who have a conflict of interest will notify the chair and recuse themselves as per the GFO Bylaws, Article 6, Section 3:
      Section 3. Members of the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs shall recuse themselves from promotion and tenure cases originating from within their own programs.
   c. Recusal means not partaking in discussions of or voting on the case.

2. At the first meeting when the file is discussed, members of the CCPTFA will be assigned specific files in their entirety. The CCPTFA member responsible for the in-depth review will identify:
   a. Questions and concerns,
   b. Areas of laudatory performance,
   Please note that, even though specific members will complete an in-depth review of the candidate’s dossier, voting members of the CCPTFA will also be responsible for reviewing the entire file.
   c. A full day meeting of the CCPTFA will be scheduled to conduct an in-depth review and discussion of the candidate’s dossier, identify questions, and meet with the candidate’s Program Director and if appropriate the P&T chair.
   d. The meeting with the Program Director and if appropriate with the P&T Chair will provide an opportunity for the CCPTFA to clarify questions that it has and explore possible concerns.

3. At the end of the meeting with the Program Director and if appropriate with the P&T Chair, if no additional actions are necessary:
   a. A member of the CCPTFA will be asked to draft the Council’s letter to the Vice Chancellor.
   b. The CCPTFA will discuss the case and vote

4. When the letter is drafted it will be circulated to members of the CCPTFA and if only minor corrections are necessary, the letter will be finalized. If there are concerns about the letter, the CCPTFA will meet to discuss and resolve the concerns.
   a. Once the letter is finalized a meeting will be scheduled with the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.
   b. Members of the CCPTFA will sign the letter and forward to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.
   c. The CCPTFA Chair will meet with the VCAA to discuss its recommendations.

Approved by the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs, February 16, 2012
Policies and Procedures
UWB Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs

Appendices A – G are current Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for University of Washington Bothell Programs and Schools.

Appendix H is the CCPTFA template for recommendation to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.
APPENDIX B
Guidelines for the School of Business

Criteria for Promotion/Tenure
Business Program
University of Washington Bothell
Accepted February 2007

The candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor must have a national reputation in his or her field. The candidate for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must show promise of attaining a national reputation. Letters from external reviewers are extremely important, as is the reputation of the reviewers. Any other evidence to indicate the quality of the research, such as the quality of journals in which publications appear, citations, awards, etc., is also valuable. A number of different types of scholarly contributions are valued (grants, book chapters, presentations, etc.), but there must be a base of publications in high-quality refereed journals.

Junior faculty members in Business are generally advised to concentrate more on discipline-based rather than on interdisciplinary research at the beginning of their careers. One reason is that a strong record of discipline-based research in the early stages of a career brings significant advantages to the faculty member. He or she has greater career mobility, can establish a national reputation more quickly, and has a greater likelihood that his or her interdisciplinary research will be taken seriously.

There must be evidence of effective teaching in the various courses the candidate teaches regularly (core, electives, MBA, etc.). This can be provided by student and peer evaluations, testimonial letters from students, teaching awards, etc. Particular attention is paid to the level of intellectual challenge of the courses. Regarding student evaluations, we follow the recommendations of the University’s Office of Educational Assessment (attached).

Service to the institution is particularly important at UWB because we are still in the process of building the institution. Service assignments are generally made by the Program Director with an eye toward keeping service from interfering too much with research and teaching, and balancing the assignments among faculty members. Assistant Professors generally carry a somewhat lighter service load than other faculty members. How well one performs in service assignments is an important criterion in performance evaluation.
This document outlines CSS guidelines for implementing Sections 24-32, 24-34, 24-54 and 24-57 of Volume 2, Chapter 24, of the *University of Washington Handbook* and the *UWB Calendar for Promotion Review* and *UWB Promotion/Tenure Documentation* documents attached to the UWB Chancellors Office yearly memorandum notifying faculty of their opportunity to stand for promotion. The focus of this document is detailing procedural information. It does not contain specific criteria for P&T. These are detailed in Sections 24-32 and 24-34 of the Handbook.

Chapter 24 of the Handbook outlines scholarly and professional qualifications of faculty members, specifically detailing the role of scholarship, teaching, and service to the institution. The CSS faculty recognize that all three roles are important and high-quality performance should be reflected in each candidate's portfolio. While the program seeks a balance of contributions, individual faculty may choose to emphasize certain roles more heavily than others.

An essential qualification for granting tenure or promotion is the ability to teach effectively. The candidate’s Dossier must include documentation of teaching effectiveness, as described in Chapter 24.

All members of the faculty must demonstrate scholarly ability and attainments. Results of these should be available for public scrutiny and be reviewed by academic peers or practitioners, and may include a mix of (a) basic scholarship — creation of new knowledge, (b) applied scholarship — application, transfer, and interpretation of knowledge to improve practice, and (c) instructional scholarship — enhancement of the educational value of instructional efforts of the institution or discipline.

In making promotion and tenure decisions, the CSS Program recognizes internal and extramural service.

In tenure decisions, the relative weight given to scholarship, teaching and service is specifically addressed in Section 24-34, “Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles.” This section states that “appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and research, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient.”

Candidates should keep in mind that the Footnote to Section 24-57 states that in the granting of tenure or promotion, consideration will be given to the way in which the candidate fits into the present and foreseeable future of the Program.

I. Requesting a Review Committee
   A. At any time, professors of junior rank may ask that the Program Director form a committee to help guide them in preparing for the review for tenure and/or promotion. At the latest, such a committee must be formed by the end of the fifth contract year.
B. In requesting that a review committee be formed, candidates are encouraged to write a letter summarizing and describing their record in all areas of professional accomplishment (including service) and identifying the fields or traditions to which their scholarship relates most closely. The Program Director will rely on this information in selecting the members of the review committee, and the letter itself will become part of the candidate's file. As indicated in the Handbook, Chapter 1, Section XIII, candidates may write additional letters for inclusion in their files at any time in order to update information in the original letter.

II. Composition and Function of the Review Committee

A. The Program Director, in consultation with the candidate, will appoint members for a review committee for each candidate. At least two of the members of the committee must be members of the candidate's own campus faculty (that is, Bothell or Tacoma). Each committee will have no fewer than three and no more than five members, all senior in rank to the candidate. The Program Director will select members from the Bothell campus faculties and/or from the Seattle faculty, drawing members from disciplines closely related to the discipline(s) of the candidate. A majority of members on the committee will be from the Bothell campus faculties. At the time this committee is formed, the Program Director will inform the candidate in writing of the committee membership. The Program Director does not have the power to prevent a candidate from proceeding with the review process.

B. The review committee will advise the candidate, guide the candidate in applying for promotion and tenure, and assist in the assembling of appropriate documentation. The items to be collected in the candidate's file include curriculum vita, personal statement, documentation of teaching effectiveness, letters from referees evaluating the candidate's scholarship and/or reviews of the candidate's creative work, copies of publications and other demonstrations of scholarship. The review committee does not have the power to prevent a candidate from proceeding with the review process.

C. After all materials have been assembled and the external evaluation letters have been added to the candidate's file, the committee will write a letter to the CSS Program Director for distribution to the CSS faculty, summarizing the candidate’s qualifications for promotion and/or tenure. The full contents of the candidate's dossier will be made available to all faculty eligible to vote at the candidate's home campus. Prior to the faculty's vote, candidates will have access to the dossier, excluding external evaluations, and will have the right to add comments or other material.

III. External Evaluation

A. Some form of evaluation by external experts in the candidate's field(s) must be included in the file. Acceptable forms are letters and/or reviews from outside evaluators who have reviewed the candidate's demonstrations of scholarship (as defined in the Bothell Campus Faculty Handbook, Chapter 1, Sections II.A., II.B., and II.C.).

B. The Chair of the review committee will solicit from the candidate a list of names of scholars qualified to review the candidate's demonstrations of scholarship. The review committee will solicit five letters. At least three of them will be from this list. No more than one referee may be from the candidate's PhD Committee or degree-granting institution. The referees will be provided with relevant demonstrations of scholarship and a summary of the candidate's teaching and service record. All letters received from referees will become part of the candidate's file.

C. The solicitation should be signed by and request reply to the Program Director. A copy of the text of the solicitation letter shall be provided to the candidate. It should not request support of a Program recommendation for promotion. Instead, it should indicate that the unit is considering the candidate.
for possible promotion and request the following information: (a) how and for how long the referee has known the candidate; (b) significance, independence, influence, and promise of candidate's scholarship or creative work; degree of national/international recognition; (c) comparison of the quality of the candidate's accomplishments with successful scholars or artists at a similar career stage in the same or related fields, or in similar programs. The evaluator should not be asked to assess whether the candidate should be promoted here or would be elsewhere. The outside evaluation is based on scholarship or artistic creativity; promotion depends on more than these factors.

IV. Voting on Promotion and Tenure
   A. The review committee will vote on the recommendation for promotion and tenure. The chair will write a letter to the Program Director reporting the deliberations leading up to the vote, the names of the committee members present to vote and the number of positive and negative votes and abstentions. Those tenured CSS faculty senior in rank to the candidate will then review the candidate’s file and vote. Both the report of the review committee and the CSS faculty will be forwarded by the Program Director to the Dean of the Bothell Campus.

   B. The recommendation of the Program Director is forwarded to the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor will seek the advice of the Faculty Council to ensure that correct procedures have been followed and to confirm that the candidate’s teaching and scholarship are similar in quality to that of current tenured faculty at the Bothell campus.

   C. The Chancellor will forward his/her recommendation to the Provost, who makes the decision on behalf of the President.

V. Disagreements on Procedures
   A. Candidates who believe that procedures relative to their review have not been properly adhered to, have the right to utilize established grievance procedures as set forth in the University of Washington Handbook to appeal for redress.

Approved by the CSS faculty on February 10, 2004.

Received by the Executive Council of the General Faculty Organization on February XX, 20
APPENDIX D
Guidelines for the School of Educational Studies

Branch Campus Promotion and Tenure for the Education Program:
Guidelines for Implementing the Provisions of the Handbook of Policies for UW Branch Campuses
(Note: Because of the administrative structure of Education Program, a separate promotion and tenure guidelines is necessary)

This document outlines guidelines for implementing the Handbook of Policies, University of Washington Bothell Campus, regarding promotion and tenure reviews and decisions. Included are procedures for external review of scholarship, as defined in the Handbook, Chapter 1, Sections II.A, IIB., and II.C.

This set of procedures is for a period of five years. At the end of that time, education faculty may evaluate how well the system is functioning and revise procedures.

I. Requesting a Review Committee

A. At any time, professors of junior rank may ask the Program Director to form a committee to help guide them in preparing for the review for tenure and/or promotion. At the latest, such a committee must be formed by the end of the fifth contract year.

B. The Program Director will consult with the Dean of the University of Washington, Bothell about members for their review committee for promotion. The Dean of the Bothell Campus will appoint the committee for the Program Director. The review committee will send its recommendation to the Dean of the Bothell Campus.

C. In requesting that a review committee be formed, candidates are encouraged to write a letter summarizing and describing their record in three areas of professional accomplishment: teaching, scholarship and service. The letter should also identify the fields or traditions to which their scholarship relates most closely. The Program Director will rely on this information and consult with the candidate in selecting the members of the review committee and appointing a Chair of the committee. The letter itself will become part of the candidate's file. As indicated in the Handbook, Chapter 1, XIII, B., candidates may write additional letters for inclusion in their files at any time in order to update information in the original letter.

II. Composition and Function of the Review Committee

A. The Program Director, in consultation with the candidate, will appoint members for a review committee for each candidate. The Program Director will select members from the Bothell or Tacoma campus faculties and/or from the Seattle faculty, drawing members from discipline areas that are the same as or are closely related to the discipline(s) of the candidate.
B. Each committee will have no fewer than three and no more than five members, all senior in rank to the candidate. Whenever possible, a majority of members on the committee will be from the Bothell and Tacoma education faculties. The majority of committee members must be education faculty.

C. When the committee is formed, the Program Director will inform the candidate in writing of the committee membership.

D. The Chair of the review committee will advise the candidate, guide the candidate in applying for promotion and tenure, and assist in the assembling of appropriate documentation. The items to be collected in the candidate's file include the candidate's letter to the Program Director, teaching evaluation materials from Bothell campus teaching, letters from outside reviewers evaluating the candidate's scholarship and/or reviews of the candidate's creative work, copies of demonstrations of scholarship, including all publications, and other dossier items listed in the guidelines for promotion and tenure review (see education program guidelines for a detailed description of scholarship). The review committee does not have the power to prevent a candidate from proceeding with the review process.

E. After all materials have been assembled and the external evaluation letters have been added to the candidate's file, the committee chair will write a letter to the review committee, summarizing the candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure. The full contents of the candidate's dossier will be made available to the review committee for review. Prior to the committee's vote, candidates will have access to the dossier, excluding external evaluations, and will have the right to add comments and/or other material.

III. External Evaluation

A. Some form of evaluation by external experts in the candidate's field(s) must be included in the file. Acceptable forms are letters and/or reviews from outside evaluators who have reviewed the candidate's demonstrations of scholarship (as defined in the Bothell and Tacoma Campus Faculty Handbook, Chapter 1, Sections II.A., II.B., and II.C. and in the Education Program Criteria document).

B. The chair of the review committee will solicit from the candidate a list of names of scholars qualified to review the candidate's demonstrations of scholarship. The review committee will select up to five names from this list or they may substitute up to two others not named by the candidate. No more than one referee may be from the candidate's Ph.D. committee, and no more than two may be from the candidate's degree-granting institution. The referees will be provided with relevant demonstrations of scholarship and a summary of the candidate's teaching and service record. All letters received from referees will become part of the candidate's file.

C. The solicitation to outside reviewers should be signed by and request reply to the Program Director and the Chair of the Tenure committee. A copy of the text of the solicitation letter shall be provided to the candidate. It should not request support of a Program recommendation for promotion. Instead, it should indicate that the unit is considering the candidate for possible promotion and request the following information: (a) how long and under what circumstances has the referee known the candidate; (b) significance, independence, influence, and promise of candidate's scholarship or creative work; degree of local/national/international recognition; (c) comparison of the quality of the candidate's accomplishments with successful scholars or artists at a similar career stage in the same or related fields, or in similar programs. The evaluator should not be asked to assess whether the candidate should be promoted here or would be elsewhere. The outside evaluation is based on scholarship or artistic creativity; promotion depends on more than these factors.
IV. Voting on Promotion and Tenure

A. The review committee will vote on the recommendation for promotion and tenure. The chair will write a letter to the Program Director reporting the deliberations leading up to the vote, the names of the committee members present to vote and the number of positive and negative votes and abstentions. Those tenured education faculty senior in rank to the candidate and who are not participating on the review committee will also review the candidate’s file and vote. Both the report of the review committee and the education faculty will be forwarded by the Program Director to the Dean of the Bothell Campus.

B. The recommendation of the Program Director is forwarded to the Dean of the Bothell Campus. The Dean of the Bothell Campus will seek the advice of the Faculty Council to make sure that correct procedures have been followed and to evaluate [sic] that the candidate’s teaching and scholarship are similar in quality to that of current tenured faculty at the Bothell and Tacoma campuses.

C. The Dean of the UWB Campus will forward his/her recommendation to the Provost, who makes the decision on behalf of the President.

V. Disagreements on Procedures

Candidates who believe that procedures relative to their review have not been properly adhered to, have the right to utilize established grievance procedures as set forth in the University of Washington Handbook to appeal for redress.

[These procedures were approved by the education faculty of the UW, Bothell, the Dean of the University of Washington, Bothell, the Provost of the University and the Bothell and Tacoma Campus Faculty Council on 4/5/99]
APPENDIX E
Guidelines for the School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
(To be provided at a later date)
APPENDIX F
Guidelines for the School of Nursing and Health Studies
(To be provided at a later date)
APPENDIX G
Guidelines for the School of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
(To be provided at a later date)
DATE

Dr. Susan Jeffords
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Washington, Bothell

Dear Vice Chancellor Jeffords:

Introduction
The Campus Council on Promotion and Tenure and Faculty Affairs (CCPTFA) met on (Insert Date) to review the application of Assistant Professor (Insert Name of Faculty Member and the Program Name) for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. All members of the CCPTFA were present.

Dr. (Insert Name of P&T Committee Chair) chairperson of (Insert Faculty Member’s Name) tenure and promotion committee, introduced the case and was available to answer questions. Dr. (Insert Name of Program Director) summarized the case and The CCPTFA thoroughly examined both the tenure review process and the merits of the application for tenure.

CCPTFA Recommendation
The CCPTFA voted (Insert ___Yes, ___No, ____ Abstaining) to recommend that (Insert Faculty Member’s Name) be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure. (If appropriate name faculty members who did not vote, because she/he had already participated in the vote of the Program’s senior faculty. This language can be used: “Following her/his interpretation of Chapter 24 of the University Handbook, she/he chose to register only one vote on this matter.) Chapter 24 of the University Handbook establishes “substantial success” in both teaching and research as a requirement for promotion to associate professor. In the view of the CCPTFA, Dr. (insert Faculty Member’s Name) teaching and research are both (Insert descriptive words) very strong and (meet/surpass) this standard. In addition, the quality of his/her service to his/her program, the University and the larger academic community (Insert descriptive words such as meet/surpass/ expectations - is exemplary).

Describe the Tenure Review Process
The review process was thorough, fair and in full accordance with the procedures prescribed in Chapter 24 of the University Handbook. The process included the following five steps. First, in (Insert Date) the tenure and promotion committee created a list of potential outside reviewers, including nominees provided by Dr (Insert Faculty Member’s Name). Second, Dr. (Insert Faculty Member’s Name) research was evaluated by (Insert names of outside reviewers) outside reviewers), all accomplished scholars from respected institutions, none of whom had any significant personal or professional connection to Dr. (Insert Faculty Member’s Name)
Their letters noted that Dr. (Insert Faculty Member’s Name) research was (Insert appropriate descriptors). Third, the tenure and promotion committee reviewed the complete dossier, evaluating the candidate's contributions in the areas of research, teaching and service. The committee voted (Insert vote – Yes, No, Abstaining) to recommend promotion and tenure to the Interdisciplinary Arts and Science faculty. Fourth, the tenured faculty of the (Insert Name of the Program) Program reviewed the dossier and the tenure and promotion committee’s recommendation. The faculty voted to (If appropriate insert adjective such as “strongly”) recommend promotion and tenure (Insert _____yes, ____no, ____ abstaining). Fifth, the Program Director, Dr (Insert Program Director’s Name) independently reviewed the dossier and (If appropriate insert adjective such as “strongly”) recommended promotion and tenure.

The Merits of the Application

Chapter 24 establishes “substantial success” in both teaching and research as a requirement for promotion to Associate Professor. The CCPTFA carefully evaluated Dr. _______'s record with respect to this standard.

Research.

Teaching.

Service.

The Challenges of the Application (Include this section as appropriate)

Summary Statement

In summary, we confirm that the review process was thorough and fair. We strongly recommend that Dr. (Insert Faculty Member’s Name) be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure.

Submitted by Campus Council on Promotion and Tenure and Faculty Affairs

Cherry A. McGee Banks, Chair (Education Program)
Sundar P.V. Balakrishnan, (Business)
Kate Noble, (Science & Technology)
Nancy Place, (Education)
Suzanne Sikma, (Nursing)
Kelvin Sung, (Computer Software Systems)
Elizabeth Thomas, (Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences)

cc: Peggy Frazier