

# University of Washington, Bothell Academic Personnel Procedures

## INDEX

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page No.</u></b>
<b>Procedure for Merit Decisions</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Procedural Safeguards for Promotion/Tenure and Merit-Based Salary Considerations</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Faculty Salary System: Policy and Procedures</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Assistant Professors, Reappointment Procedures</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Assistant Professor, Promotion Procedures</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Full Professor, Promotion Procedures (Corresponds to UW Handbook</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Calendar for Promotion and Tenure Review for Assistant Professors to Associate Professor with Tenure</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Calendar for Promotion Review for Associate Professors to Full Professor</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix A – Promotion materials to be forwarded to the Chancellor’s Office</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix B – Sample Letters</b>	<b>18</b>

# **University of Washington, Bothell**

## **Academic Personnel Procedures**

### **Procedures for Merit Decisions (Corresponds to UW Handbook Chapter 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. (Please see Merit Review Calendar, currently located in back of notebook.)

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, and 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. Faculty superior in rank reviews each faculty member.
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.) If the faculty member disagrees with the recommendation, he/she may respond in writing. Written records of personnel committee recommendations, written responses from faculty members, and 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.

## **Procedural Safeguards for Promotion/Tenure and Merit-Based Salary Considerations (Corresponds to UW Handbook Chapter 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 faculties 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 faculties 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 (See Academic Affairs: Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty Members).

If the faculty member and the program director disagree regarding the conference document, an ad hoc 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 part-time lecturers serving the campus for more than one quarter. To be eligible for a merit increase in salary the lecturer must submit documentation of his/her accomplishments (portfolio or dossier) for review by tenure track faculty (Assistant Professor rank and above).

## **Faculty Salary System: Policy and Procedures (Corresponds to UW Handbook Chapter 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. The Provost may determine unit adjustments with respect to a "market gap".
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: the Washington State Legislature initiates Cost of living increases for classified staff. Schedule pay raises other than cost of living may be found on the compensation Website, <http://www.washington.edu/admin/hr/ocpsp/compensation/>. Rules vary for union and non-union classified positions. See UW HRB manager for questions.

### **Other Faculty Appointments:**

#### **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.

## **Review of Assistant Professors and Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:**

An appointment at the rank of Assistant Professors 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 (Corresponds to UW Handbook Chapter 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). See section on postponements and extensions, page \_\_\_\_.

The UW Handbook places the responsibility for the decision regarding the second three-year appointment with the Dean. At UW Bothell the procedures for this 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 summarizing the candidate's accomplishments and his/her progress towards tenure and 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/program recommendation, the faculty vote (votes for, against, abstaining, absent; total number of eligible voters; and 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 including contributions to the program and campus, and the director's independent recommendation. (See Appendix A for sample letter.)
  - (b) Curriculum Vitae
  - (c) Copies of published work and manuscripts under review.
  - (d) Annual Reviews
  - (e) Evidence of teaching effectiveness including student evaluations of teaching (Standardized Educational Assessment forms) and collegial/peer evaluations of teaching.
  - (f) 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 (Corresponds to UW Handbook Chapter 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, external review letters, 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 meets 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. 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, the recorded vote (number eligible to vote, number voting, number voting yes, number voting no, number abstaining) and a synthesis of the candidates accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching and service including, comments and quotes from the reviewers as appropriate. 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. (See Appendix A for examples of promotion letters.) 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 A.)

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 (stopping the tenure clock) 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. Postponements do not stop the tenure clock. 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 Professor, Promotion Procedures (Corresponds to UW Handbook Chapter 24-54):**

For the promotion of Associate Professors to the rank of Full Professor the UW Bothell Faculty Council follows the processes described in the preceding paragraphs with the exception of the review. 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.

### **Other Faculty Appointments:**

#### **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:**

Part-time Lecturers and Artists in Residence are appointments for one-year or less. Full-time Lecturers and Artists in Residence are annual appointments not to exceed five years. Faculty senior in rank reviews continuing part-time and full-time appointment of Lecturers and Artists in Residence annually. Senior Lecturers, Principal Lecturers, and Senior Artists in Residence are appointed for a minimum of three years and a maximum of five years and are reviewed by faculty senior in rank in October of the final year of the contract. Multiple year contracts must be preceded by a search for eligible individuals to

fill the position. The Chancellor's office 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.

**Adjunct and Affiliate Appointments:**

Adjunct appointments are made to faculty who hold a primary appointment in another department. They are reviewed each year for renewal as adjunct faculty. Adjunct status does not confer governance or voting privileges or eligibility for tenure. Affiliate titles are awarded to individuals outside the university and to professional staff who make major contributions to the department. Affiliate appointments are reviewed on an annual basis for renewal.

## 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. Decision for non-mandatory review made by April 1.
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. The program director or designee provides a written summary of the report and the committee's recommendation 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 A 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.

*12/8/03*

## Calendar for Promotion Review for Associate Professors to Full Professor\*

January 15	Letter from Vice Chancellor's office to all faculty regarding promotion calendar. In most cases the decision to seek review is made by April 1.
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. The program director or designee provides a written summary of the report and the committee's recommendation to the candidate (without names and without vote counts).
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 meets and votes 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 A 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 professors, 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. Generally if materials for review are not completed by the end of Spring Quarter, promotion may be delayed.

*12/8/03*

## Appendix A

### **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	_____
Sample request letter to External Reviewer	_____
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	_____

## **Appendix B**

### **Sample Letters**

## Sample Letter to External Reviewer

[Date]

[Name and Address of External Reviewer]

Dear [Name of External Reviewer]

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for the consideration of [Name of Candidate] promotion from Associate to Full Professor. We look forward to receiving your evaluation of her scholarship. Enclosed you will find a large dossier of materials. You are invited to examine all of these materials if you wish, but for your review purposes you should find [Name of Candidate] curriculum vitae, a letter outlining her academic career, and evidence of her most significant scholarly work. We are also including portions of the University of Washington, Bothell Handbook that describe the mission of the campus and policies pertaining to promotion to full professor.

The intent of this external review process is to provide for a frank and open exchange of information about the candidate that will assist the review committee in reaching a well-founded recommendation that is both cognizant of the needs of our young and growing institution, and fair to the candidate. [Name of Candidate] review committee includes four scholars of [Name of Discipline], two from the UW Bothell [Program] and two from the UW Seattle [Program/College]. The committee chair is a faculty member in Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences at UW Bothell.

Scholarly teaching at the UW Bothell campus is highly valued, as is scholarship that is interdisciplinary or applied, as well as traditional research. (Note the relatively broad conception of scholarship in the enclosed UW Bothell Handbook excerpts, pp. 1-2, and pp. 12-13). Leadership in institution building is especially important on our young and growing campus. Within this broadly defined context, our specific request to you is that you provide us with information regarding; (a) how long and in what capacity you have known the candidate; (b) the significance, independence, influence, and promise of the candidate's scholarship, and degree of national and international recognition; and (c) a comparison of the candidate's accomplishments with successful scholars at a similar career stage in the same or related fields, and/or programs. We are not asking you to advise us specifically on whether the candidate should be promoted here at the University of Washington, Bothell, or elsewhere. As an external reviewer, we are asking you to focus primarily on the scholarly accomplishments of the candidate.

In order for the review committee to meet the schedule of the University of Washington, we would like to receive your evaluation by September 15, [year]. Please be advised that in the state of Washington, external reviews do become a permanent part of the candidate's file, subject to disclosure should a request be made pursuant to law. In the

event of disclosure, all names and other identifiers would be deleted. During the process itself, the candidate will not have access to the external letters of review.

Once again, please know that you have our deep appreciation for your assistance in this review. Your reply should be directed to [*Name of Individual*].

Sincerely,

[*Name and Title*]

[*List of Enclosures*]

## Sample Letter to External Reviewer

[Date]

[Name and Address of Reviewer]

Dear Professor:

Thank you very much for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for Professor [Name] in the Program in Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences of the University of Washington, Bothell. Professor [Name] is a candidate for promotion to full Professor. Enclosed you will find Professor [Name's] Curriculum vitae, a letter summarizing his teaching, research and service, as well as copies of his scholarly work. I am also forwarding a portion of the *University of Washington Branch Campuses Handbook of Policies*, which describes the mission of the Bothell campus and outlines the considerations for promotion to the next higher rank at the University of Washington.

The intention of our external review process is to provide for a frank and open exchange of pertinent information about the candidate that will assist the Review Committee in its efforts to reach a fair and equitable recommendation. We ask that your external evaluation provide us specific information regarding: (a) how long and in what capacity you have known the candidate; (b) the significance, independence, influence, and promise of the candidate's scholarship, and your assessment of the degree of national or international recognition the candidate has earned; and (c) a comparison of the candidate's accomplishments with leading scholars at a similar career state in the same or related fields. Your detailed response in each of these three areas will greatly assist us in our review of the candidate's scholarly accomplishments. We are not asking that you advise us as to whether or not the candidate should be promoted and tenured at the University of Washington, Bothell.

I should add a note of explanation about the relationship between our campus, which offers only upper-division and master's level degrees, and that of the Seattle campus. The UW Bothell campus was founded in 1990, along with a sister campus in Tacoma, to meet a need for increased enrollment in the state of Washington as a result of rapid expansion in population and a shortage of upper-division coursework in a state with a highly developed community college system. Although we fall under the provisions of the *Faculty Handbook of the Seattle campus*, tenure resides on our own campus. Because our faculty have heavy teaching loads and because they spend a great deal of time building a startup institution, we have unusual challenges that have to be considered during the process of promotion and tenure. Our solution, still evolving, is to expect that faculty produce scholarship at the same level of quality that one would find among faculty on the Seattle Campus, but at a reduced quantity. Because we are so small (though growing rapidly) and because we are an interdisciplinary program, we also require our faculty to teach well outside the boundaries of their normal disciplinary

training. The result is intellectually exciting and professionally rewarding, but is also more likely to produce scholarship that crosses conventional disciplinary boundaries. We ask that you bear these factors in mind when evaluating the enclosed dossier.

In order for the Review Committee to meet the schedule of the University of Washington, we would like to receive your evaluation by *[Date]*. Please be advised that in the state of Washington external reviews do become a permanent part of the candidate's file, subject to disclosure should a request be made pursuant to law. In the event of disclosure, all names and other identifiers would be deleted. During the process itself, the candidate will not have access to the external letters of review. Your reply should be addressed to Professor X as Chair of the Review Committee. Once again, please know that you have our deep appreciation for your assistance in this review.

Sincerely,

Program Director and Professor

*[List of Enclosures]*

## Sample Letter to External Reviewer

[Date]

[Name and Address of Reviewer]

Dear Professor,

Thank you very much for agreeing to assist us as an external reviewer for Professor [Name], in her application for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure at the University of Washington, Bothell. The following materials are enclosed: Assistant Professor [Name] curriculum vitae, her letter describing her accomplishments, copies of her publications and a sample syllabus from a course she teaches.

I am also enclosing a copy of the University of Washington, Bothell [program name] brochure, a copy of the MN program brochure, a description of the role of faculty in a developing institution, and guidelines for promotion of faculty members. These resources should enable you to more fully understand the mission of the institution and the criteria being used in this review process. Faculty at the University of Washington Bothell are actively involved in the process of developing new programs in a growing institution. It should also be clearly recognized that there is a strong emphasis on quality teaching as an essential trait of faculty in this institution. Teaching responsibilities and program development and the time required for both are often much more pressing than is the case at established traditional institutions. There are expectations for balancing traditional roles of teaching, scholarship and service in an integrated fashion per the Boyer model.

I request that you respond with a rather complete letter detailing your evaluation of the candidate. In composing your evaluation, it would be helpful if you would attend to the following questions:

1. How long and in what capacity have you known Assistant Professor [name]?
2. What is the significance, influence, contribution and promise of her scholarship?
2. How would you compare the quality of her accomplishments with faculty at a similar stage in their development at an institution similar to the University of Washington, Bothell?

With respect to the third point, please consider this candidate in the context of a developing professional program on a growing liberal arts campus. Note that our documents speak of “scholarship” rather than “research” and give scholarship a weight equal to that of teaching.

Faculty are encouraged to have an active scholarly life, which, among other responsibilities, includes academic presentations, and publications. Please be as explicit as you can in describing the comparative bases and criteria you are employing in arriving at your assessment.

Please be advised that in the State of Washington external reviews do become a permanent part of the candidate’s file and are subject to disclosure should a request be made pursuant to that law. In the event of disclosure, all names and other identifiers would be deleted. During the process itself, the candidate will not have access to the external letters of review.

Since the initial review committee must have its work complete quite early in the autumn quarter, I request to have your response by [Date]. Please include a copy of your curriculum vitae. A postage paid addressed envelope has been provided for the return of your letter and CV. Please shred the remaining review materials.

Once again, my deepest thanks for your willingness to participate in this most important process. If you have questions, please call me at .

Sincerely yours,

Director and Professor

Enclosures: Letter of Accomplishments  
Curriculum Vitae  
Manuscripts  
Syllabus  
BSN Program Brochure  
MN Program Brochure  
UWB Mission Statement  
UWB Nursing Program Vision Statement  
APT Criteria  
Return Mailer

## Sample Letter: Three-Year Reappointment Recommendation

[Date]

To: [ Name ], Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

From: [Name], Director [Name of Program]

Re: Third Year Reappointment Review for [Name of Candidate]

The Reappointment Review Committee consisting of [Names of Committee Members] met on May 12 to review the dossier of [Name of Candidate]. The committee voted unanimously to reappoint [Name of Candidate] to an additional three-year term and encourages her to continue in her progress towards promotion to Associate Professor with tenure at UW Bothell. I strongly concur with the committee recommendation.

[Name of Candidate] accomplishments in her first two years have been remarkable. I attribute her success to her extensive experience in the K-12 school system, her fine doctoral preparation at [Name of University], and the unusual clarity of thought that she brings to her work. [Name of Candidate] is keenly aware of her educational values and possesses the courage and the work ethic to help higher education meet its responsibilities to students and faculty. These are rare qualities in an assistant professor of only two years. However, [Name of Candidate] brings maturity that one would be more likely to find in a full professor. In future years, she will certainly be capable of playing a leadership role at UW Bothell, and I hope she will choose to do so.

[Candidate's Name] accompanying her dossier is characteristic of the thoughtful teacher that she is. The joy and satisfaction she derives from teaching are mirrored in the evaluations of students. They have great respect for her and recognize that she is completely committed to their intellectual growth and willing to "go the extra mile" that she expects of them. Follow-up conversations with graduates of our [Name of Program] confirm that what they learned through her courses has been invaluable in their classrooms. [Name of Candidate] has also taken a leadership role in the Masters program where her experience with the National Board Certification has enabled us to integrate portfolio preparation for that certification as a culminating project. She has also developed and taught two new courses that have been well received by our graduate students.

[Candidate's Name] research and scholarly work is closely intertwined with her teaching. She has a gift for helping practicing teachers give voice to their concerns about and insights into teaching children. Her publications reflect this gift. In 2001, [Candidate's Name] received the [Name of Award] for the outstanding research paper presented at the [Name of National Conference]. She has been well mentored by [Name of Individual] from [Name of University] and continues to do research and publish with her.

[*Candidate's Name*] is developing new projects with faculty at [*Name of University*] and is embarking on several single-author publications that will emanate from her continuing collaboration with classroom teachers. In addition, [*Candidate's Name*] has presented regularly at the annual meetings of the following organizations [*List of Organizations*].

[*Candidate's Name*] service to the University and to the [*Name of Program*] has been excellent. The skills she brings to her teaching are also evident in her student advising. Graduate students who have worked with her have developed and implemented significant Master's level projects. [*Name of Candidate*] has participated in numerous ad hoc committees at the Program level and has brought perspectives that have rejuvenated our thinking and inspired needed changes. She has maintained her connections with classroom teachers in the community and thus has contributed relevance to our short and long-term planning. [*Name of Candidate*] has been involved with the GFO and serves on the Faculty Affairs Committee. She has participated in the Teaching Circles. All of these attributes have made [*Name of Candidate*] the kind of colleague in whom UW Bothell can take great pride.

## Sample Letter: Promotion

[Date]

To: [Name], Vice Chancellor

From: [Name], Program Director

Re: Promotion with Tenure Recommendation, [Name]

In accordance with UW promotion and tenure procedures, the [Name of Program] has formulated a recommendation for promotion for Professor [Name] to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure. I am now pleased to forward that unanimously favorable recommendation (11 eligible to vote, 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining) and to add to it my own wholehearted concurrence.

Included with this memorandum please find: the dossier, external review letters from and [list the individuals and their University/Employment Association], the review committees letter of findings and corresponding summary to the candidate, and the summaries for the candidate from the program faculty and director's findings.

Rather than restate the above documents, I would simply like to underscore the strength of support all have registered for the promotion with tenure candidacy of Professor [Name]. His accomplishments to date across performance categories – teaching, scholarship, and service – yield emphatic support from both internal and external reviewers of the candidate's record.

As a teacher, Professor [Name] has demonstrated both commitment and, as evidenced by unsolicited student testimonials, successful outcomes. His research, too, earns consistent praise for its rigor and impact, rendering him 'one of only a few world experts in this area.' [Statement from External Reviewer] Whether as the principal investigator for a major tri-campus Tools for Transformation Grants or as the founder of a major Community Service Project, [Name] service is exemplary for its maturity of contribution. Furthermore, he has participated as an architect in kind with other faculty to build our new [name of program concentration] at UW Bothell. Such institution building is a rare demand even among tenured faculty on most campuses, but represents an even more striking accomplishment by an untenured faculty member. In all respects, Professor [Name] has excelled.

As his program director, I find [Name] an invaluable colleague whose achievements bring distinction to the UW and deepened promise to the future of UW Bothell. I regard him as utterly capable of assuming the responsibility of senior faculty status. I support Professor [Name] candidacy without reservation.

## Sample Letter: Promotion

[Date]

To: [Name], Vice Chancellor

From: [Name], Program Director

Re: Promotion Recommendation, [Name]

In accordance with UW Promotion and Tenure procedures, the [Name of Program] has formulated a recommendation on Professor [Name] application for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure. I am pleased to forward that unanimously favorable recommendation (11 eligible to vote, 11yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining) and to add to it my own wholehearted concurrence.

Included with this memorandum please find; the dossier, external review letters (*list individuals and their university/organization affiliation*) the review committee's letter of findings and corresponding summary to the candidate, and the summaries for the candidate on the program's and director's findings.

Rather than restate the above documents, I would simply like to underscore the strength of support all have registered for the promotion and tenure candidacy of Professor [Name]. His accomplishments to date across performance categories - teaching, scholarship, and service – yield emphatic support from both internal and external reviewers of the candidate's record.

In his teaching, Professor [Name] evinces his range of intellectual interests and his capacity for interdisciplinary synthesis of their interrelationships. His scholarly writing has garnered high praise and has found its dissemination in first-order venues. Professor [Name] has also established himself as an effective representative of UW Bothell at the National level on the following Organizations [*List Organizations*]. Furthermore, Professor [Name] has played a leadership role in framing our newest program option [*Name of Program Option*]. Such institution building is a rare demand even among tenured faculty on most campuses, but represents an even more striking accomplishment by an untenured faculty member. In short, Professor [Name] has flourished.

As his program director, I consider {Name} a valued peer whose presence at UW Bothell has enriched the campus environment, and maybe expected to continue doing so. I support Professor's [Name] candidacy without reservation.

## Sample Letter: Promotion

[Date]

To: [Name], Vice Chancellor

From: [Name], Program Director

Re: Promotion and Tenure Recommendation, [Name]

In accordance with the procedures laid out in Chapter 24 of the *UW Faculty Handbook*, the [Name of Program] has formulated a recommendation on Professor's application for promotion and tenure to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure. I am now pleased to forward the unanimously favorable recommendation (14 eligible to vote, 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining) and to add to it my own wholehearted concurrence.

With this memorandum please find: the dossier, external review letters [*list names of external reviewers and university/organization affiliation*], the Promotion and Tenure committee's letter of finding and corresponding summary to the candidate, and the summaries for the candidate on the program's and director's findings.

Rather than restate the above documents, allow me to underscore the strengths of this candidate in the traditional areas of scholarship, teaching, and service that have been supported by his colleagues within the University of Washington and beyond.

As a teacher, Professor [Name] can only be called outstanding by the range of courses he offers in [*identify specialty/field*]. His classes often close out first during registration and the student evaluations of his courses are consistently high [*identify range*]. He is a frequent and wonderful guest lecturer, giving generously of his time both on the UW Bothell and UW Seattle campuses. As a scholar beyond the classroom Professor [Name] has set the bar very high indeed. As his reviewers have noted, the research that now encompasses two books; [*identify by titles*], with a third manuscript [*identify title*] in preparation for [*identify publisher*] will be highly valuable for the academic community as well as the lay public. As for service to the institution, Professor [Name] has served as a valued member on [*Name UW Bothell Committees*]. He is a careful listener and contributes great insight to our tasks.

As the program director of [*Name of Program*], I find Professor [Name] an invaluable colleague, perhaps one of our best hires in [*Program Name*], and cannot praise him highly enough. I predict that his present achievements, grounded in years of disciplined research and creativity, will continue to accelerate over the next years. We are extremely fortunate to have among us a colleague of such stature. I support Professor [Name] candidacy without reservation.

## Sample Letter: Promotion

[Date]

To: [Name], Vice Chancellor

From: [Name], Professor and Director

Re: {Name}, Promotion and Tenure Recommendation

I am pleased to recommend the promotion of [Name] to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure at the University of Washington, Bothell. This recommendation is supported by the review committee (5-0) and the senior faculty of the [Name of Program with number eligible to vote] (3-0). I fully concur with the committee's statement that "*Professor [Name] superb record in integrating the scholarship of teaching, application and discovery give expression to the highest ideals of this interdisciplinary campus.*"

With this memorandum please find: the portfolio, external review letters from [*list external reviewers and university/organization affiliation*] the promotion and tenure committee's letter of findings and corresponding summary to the candidate, and the summaries for the candidate on the program's and director's findings.

Professor joined the University of Washington, Bothell as a new PhD graduate with a strong commitment to scholarship. Prior to her appointment at UW Bothell she had already published 6 manuscripts in referred journals, including the prestigious [Name Journals]. She has continued to build a solid program of scholarship in the area of [*name specialty/emphasis*] and has 4 published manuscripts (*name journals*). Among these publications is her dissertation study of [*name topic/title*].

As the recipient of the UW Bothell's Distinguished Teaching Award, Professor [name] teaching is consistently praised as being creative, innovative and thoughtfully responsive to student needs and variations in learning styles. Professor [Name] has brought her teaching expertise to students beyond [Name of Program], teaching in campus-wide interdisciplinary courses. The UW Bothell Mission states that the student faculty relationship is held to be paramount and [Name] clearly holds this to be true.

[Name] service commitments to the university and the wider community are also impressive and described by the review committee as being "*collaborative and generous in spirit*". She has chaired the [Name of UW Bothell committee] and provided the leadership in addressing the issue of [identify issue] on this campus. She is certified by the [*name of certifying organization*] as a [*specialist*] and is in a unique position to integrate her clinical and academic expertise into her scholarship.

Professor [*Name*] has done a remarkable job in demonstrating her balanced excellence in the scholarship of discovery, teaching, application and integration. These accomplishments form the basis for promotion within the [*Name*] of program. She has demonstrated her competencies as a productive scholar in the area of [*name of specialty/emphasis*] research, a master teacher, and an engaged citizen of this university and larger community. I believe that the [*Name of Program*] specifically and the UW Bothell campus in general are fortunate to have [*Name*] as a member of our faculty. I fully support this promotion and the granting of tenure without reservation.

## Sample Letter: Promotion

[Date]

To: [Name], Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

From: [Name], Professor and Director

Re: [Name], Promotion and Tenure Recommendation

I am pleased to recommend the promotion of [Name] to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure at the University of Washington, Bothell. This recommendation is supported by the [program name] review committee (5-0) and the senior faculty of the [name of program and number of eligible voting faculty] (3-0). I fully concur with the review committee's recognition of [Name] ability to successfully link the four domains of scholarship as articulated by the Boyer model; discovery, teaching, application and integration. It is truly this balanced notion of scholarship that is essential to the [name of the program] and consistent with the mission and values of the Bothell campus.

With this memorandum please find; the portfolio, external review letters [name of external reviewers and university/organizational affiliation], the promotion and tenure committee's letter of finding and corresponding summary to the candidate, and the summaries for the candidate on the program's and director's findings.

Professor [Name] has developed a program of funded research in [specialty/emphasis]. [Name of external reviewer] describes the outcomes of this research as the only definitive analysis currently available and thus information that will serve as a model for others deliberating on this issue. Professor has disseminated the results of this work through a variety of channels including referred publications, government reports, national meetings and invited presentations [include some titles of publications/presentations].

[Name] joined the UW Bothell Campus as an Assistant Professor and brought significant teaching and professional career experience to her this position. She has taught a variety of course offerings in the [Name of Program] as well as developing several interdisciplinary electives including [Name Courses]. Student course evaluations are consistently high and peer reviews of her teaching attest to her strength as a teacher.

[Name] has made substantial contributions to the university and community. She has been active with the General faculty Organization having served [list committees]. Her ongoing participation with the [list community organizations] contribute to UW Bothell connections with the broader community and benefit citizens at the local and state level.

Professor [Name] accomplishments over the last five years reflect an impressive integration of scholarship that is consistent with and highly valued by the overall mission

of UW Bothell. I fully expect her continued development as a scholar and we look forward to her growing presence and future accomplishments as part of the UW Bothell community.

## Sample: Promotion Letter<sup>1</sup>

[Date]

To: [Name], Vice Chancellor

From: [Name], Director and Professor

Re: Promotion and Tenure Recommendation, [Name]

In accordance with the procedures laid out in Chapter 24 of the *UW Faculty Handbook*, the [Name of Program] has formulated a recommendation on Professor's application for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure. I am now pleased to forward the unanimously favorable recommendation (14 eligible voting, 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining) and to add to it my own wholehearted concurrence.

With this memorandum please find: the dossier, external review letters [*list names of external reviewers and university/organization affiliation*], the Promotion and Tenure committee's letter of finding and corresponding summary to the candidate, and the summaries for the candidate on the program's and director's findings.

Rather than restate the above documents, allow me to underscore the strengths of this candidate in the traditional areas of scholarship, teaching, and service that have been supported by his/her colleagues within the University of Washington and beyond.

[*Insert Paragraphs<sup>2</sup> here summarizing candidate's accomplishments*]

As the program director of [Name of Program], I find Professor [Name] an invaluable colleague, perhaps one of our best hires in [Program Name], and cannot praise him/her highly enough. I predict that his/her present achievements, grounded in years of disciplined research and creativity, will continue to accelerate over the next years. We are extremely fortunate to have among us a colleague of such stature. I support Professor [Name] candidacy without reservation

---

<sup>1</sup> Examples of full text letters may be found in Section \_\_\_ of the Director's Handbook.

<sup>2</sup> Examples of paragraphs summarizing accomplishments may be found in Section \_\_\_ of the Director's Handbook

## Sample Paragraphs for Promotion Letters

### Example A:

As a teacher, Professor [Name] can only be called outstanding by the range of courses he offers in [identify specialty/field]. His classes often close out first during registration and the student evaluations of his courses are consistently high [identify range]. He is a frequent and wonderful guest lecturer, giving generously of his time both on the UW Bothell and UW Seattle campuses. As a scholar beyond the classroom, Professor [Name] has set the bar very high indeed. As his reviewers have noted, the research that now encompasses two books; [identify by titles], with a third manuscript [identify manuscript title] in preparation for [identify publisher] will be highly valuable for the academic community as well as a lay public. As for service to the institution, Professor [Name] has served as a valued member on [Name UW Bothell Committees]. He is a careful listener and contributes great insight to our tasks.

### Example B:

As a teacher, Professor [Name] has demonstrated both commitment and, as evidenced by unsolicited student testimonials, successful outcomes. His research, too, earns consistent praise for its rigor and impact, rendering him ‘one of only a few world experts in this area.’ [Statement from External Reviewer] Whether as the principal investigator for a major tri-campus Tools for Transformation Grant or as the founder of a major Community Service Project, [Name] service is exemplary for its maturity of contribution. Furthermore, he has participated as an architect in kind with other faculty to build our new [name of program concentration] at UW Bothell. Such institution building is a rare demand even among tenured faculty on most campuses, but represents an even more striking accomplishment by an untenured faculty member. In all respects, Professor [Name] has excelled.

### Example C:

In his teaching, Professor [Name] evinces a broad range of intellectual interests and an astonishing capacity for interdisciplinary synthesis of these interrelationships. His scholarly writing has garnered high praise and has found its dissemination in first-order venues [identify journals and publication outlets] Professor [Name] has also established himself as an effective representative of UW Bothell at the National level through his membership and participation in the following Organizations [List Organizations]. Furthermore, Professor [Name] has played a leadership role in framing our newest program option [Name of Program Option]. Such institution building is a rare demand even among tenured faculty on most campuses, but represents an even more striking accomplishment by an untenured faculty member. In short, Professor [Name] has flourished.

### Example D.

Professor [Name] has developed a program of funded research in [specialty/emphasis]. [Name of external reviewer] describes the outcomes of this research as the only definitive

analysis currently available and thus information that will serve as a model for others deliberating on this issue. Professor has disseminated the results of this work through a variety of channels including referred publications, government reports, national meetings and invited presentations [*Include some titles of publications/presentations and venues*].

[*Name*] joined the UW Bothell Campus as an Assistant Professor and brought significant teaching and professional career experience to her faculty position. She has taught a variety of course offerings in the [*Name of Program*] as well as developing several interdisciplinary electives including [*Name Courses*]. Student course evaluations are consistently high and peer reviews of her teaching attest to her strength as a teacher.

[*Name*] has made substantial contributions to the university and community. She has been active with the General faculty Organization having served [*list committees*]. Her ongoing participation with the [*list community organizations*] contribute to the UW Bothell connections with the broader community and benefit citizens at the local and state level.

#### **Example E.**

Professor [*Name*] joined the University of Washington, Bothell as a new PhD graduate with a strong commitment to scholarship. Prior to her appointment at UW Bothell she had already published 6 manuscripts in referred journals, including the prestigious [*name journals*]. She has continued to build a solid program of scholarship in the area of [*name specialty/emphasis*] and has 4 published manuscripts (*name journals*). Among these publications is her dissertation study, [*name topic/title*].

As the recipient of the UW Bothell's Distinguished Teaching Award, her teaching is consistently praised as being creative, innovative and thoughtfully responsive to student needs and variations in learning styles. Professor [*Name*] has brought her teaching expertise to students beyond [*Name of Program*], teaching in campus-wide interdisciplinary courses. The UW Bothell Mission states that the student faculty relationship is held to be paramount and [*Name*] clearly holds this to be true.

[*Name*] service commitments to the university and the wider community are also impressive and described by the review committee as being “*collaborative and generous in spirit*”. She has chaired the [*Name of UW Bothell committee*] and provided the leadership in addressing the issue of [*identify issue*] on this campus. She is certified by the Professional [*name of certifying organization*] as a [*specialist*] and is in a unique position to integrate her clinical and academic expertise into her scholarship.