

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
Appointment Tenure and Promotion (APT)
Tuesday, April 21, 2010
WCG 405
1:30- 2:30 p.m.

Attendance: Zoe Barsness, Chair; Yonn Dierwechter, Denise Drevdahl, Emily Ignacio

1. APT approved the minutes from April 6, 2010.
2. APT reviewed the UWT checklist, the UW Seattle HR list, UW Tacoma HR policy and procedure, and the Appendix A of the UWT Handbook to reconcile any differences and establish consistency for the faculty review process at UW Tacoma. These documents were provided to the APT members on Catalyst Shared Space. Denise Drevdahl made six suggestions for further research.¹

There are inconsistencies in the annual evaluations and within the review committees.

Further research: There are inconsistencies regarding external evaluations. APT will draft points regarding these inconsistencies in Appendix A of the UWT Handbook. A question was raised about whether the dean and chair are eligible to vote.

Action: APT will clarify with Human Resources (HR) and Marcia Killien the [UW Handbook, section 24-57, b. and c.](#) with the following questions: Are these two separate documents and is part “b” required on the UWT campus? Does HR trump the UWT Handbook approach? To whom are the external letters elected?

3. The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

¹ Please reference attachment A.

Attachment A: Denise's initial findings

1) UWT's VCAA checklist is pretty much the same one as found in UW HR web page, except that UWT has added a section on "Annual evaluations" as well as a couple of footnotes/reminders

2) re: annual evaluations: The UWT handbook states "The inclusion of yearly evaluations is optional and is the sole decision of the candidate." The annual review has been added to the UWT checklist as a requirement. However, this requirement isn't on the UW HR checklist. Chapter 24-57 states: yearly activity reports "shall be used as a reference and as a source of information for consideration of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. These forms shall be used as evidence for recommendations of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. Such information may be updated by a faculty member at any time during the academic year." (it seems that this "yearly activity report" is different from the "regular conference with faculty" [wording used in the UW Handbook; chapter 24-57]).

3) Outside letters of eval: the UW HR rules state "the evaluators should be chosen by the departmental chair/program director and faculty review committee."..."the solicitation letter should be signed by and should request return to the unit chair/program director." This does not match what is in UWT's handbook which talks about the review committee selecting and the letter being sent out and returned to the review committee chair.

4)UWT handbook states "Prior to the faculty's vote, candidates will have access to the file, excluding external evaluations, and will have the right to add comments to the material." this seems to go against our recommended policy of how materials can be added [policy developed last year].

5) The list in Appendix A of UWT handbook of required materials (on pg. 6) does not match the UWT chancellor's checklist (which does not completely match the UW HR list).

6) Finally, with respect to voting of directors with faculty. The UWT handbook Appendix A states "the program director, who does not vote with the faculty..." However, the UW HR document notes that the letter of recommendation from the chair should include: "the number of faculty eligible to vote (including if the chair is eligible)"...and "whether the chair's vote is included in the count of votes" ...I don't believe (or at least I couldn't find) the Handbook is explicit about the chair's voting or not.

So, there is it. Perhaps in some cases it's a question of how much latitude this campus has from UW HR guidelines. Perhaps a Sec. of the Faculty question(s)?