

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA
Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC)
Agenda

Wednesday, March 7, 2012
 Mattress 352
 12:30 – 2:00 p.m.

1. Approval of February 22, 2012 meeting minutes.
2. Standing Committee Updates (*APC, APT, CC, FA, SBC*).
3. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures update
 - *UWT Handbook Appendix A changes (Yonn Dierwechter)*
 - *Proposed Class A Legislation – Diversity code revisions 24-32 & 24-54 (Zoe Barsness)*
4. Promoting Stronger Shared Governance at the Unit Level.
 - *Faculty Councils—membership and scope of activity/responsibility*
 - *Curriculum development and faculty review (e.g., course proposals, online courses).*
 - *Support for faculty development, teaching & research (e.g., proposals formerly eligible for Chancellor’s Endowment grants)*
 - *Budget consultation (SCPB Budget principles and recommendations)*
 - *Hiring processes*
 - *Service transparency and equity*
5. Reflection on February 24th, Faculty Discussion event (*Katie Baird*)
6. Other items
 - *Seeking faculty representative for Distinguished Service Committee.*
 - *Upcoming Faculty Assembly Sponsored Events*
 - *Other Announcements.*

Upcoming Executive Council Meetings	Faculty Assembly Meetings 2011-2012
• Thursday, March 29, 2012 MAT 352	• Friday, May 4, 2012 WPH
• Wednesday, April 11, 2012 MAT 352	• Friday, May 11, 2012 Longshoreman’s Hall [Tentative/Continuation Meeting]
• Thursday, April 26, 2012 MAT 352	
• Wednesday, May 9, 2012 MAT 352	
• Thursday, May 24, 2012 MAT 352	
Upcoming Events Faculty Assembly Sponsored Events	
• Faculty Discussion: The Challenge of Teaching Writing (Nicole Blair, Facilitator), 4:00 – 5:30pm, Friday, April 27 FACULTY RESOURCE CTR	
• Faculty Lecture & Discussion: Community Engagement (Marcy Stein), 5:00 – 7:00pm, Thursday, May 10, ROOM TBD	

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA
Faculty Assembly (FA) Executive Council (EC)
Wednesday, March 7, 2012
12:30 – 2:00 p.m.
Minutes

Attended: Zoe Barsness, Katie Baird, Donald Chinn, Linda Dawson, Yonn Dierwechter, Marjorie Dobratz, Ehsan Feroz, Charles Emlet, Diane Kinder, Nita McKinley, Beverly Naidus, Mark Pendras, Peter Selkin, Tracy Thompson, Larry Wear

Excused: Marcie Lazzari

Absent: Charles Williams

- 1. Approval of minutes from February 22, 2012**
 - Move to approve, seconded, and approved as amended
- 2. Standing Committee Updates (APC, APT, CC, FA, SBC)**

APC (N. McKinley)

A college level CLEP officer will be on campus to discuss the possibility of bringing CLEP to UW Tacoma. While there are still some language issues, D. Levy will be proposing that CLEP be available in the future.

There was a discussion of a physician's assistant satellite program being a part of UW Tacoma. There would be a BA program as well as a master's program. The desire is to have the faculty be UW Tacoma faculty. In Seattle they are housed under the UW medical program. There could be opportunities for nursing students to take classes from the master's program. Currently there are satellite programs in Alaska, Yakima, and Spokane.

Q: Is it possible that this would lead to having a pre-med program at UW Tacoma?

A: It's possible, and the program would originate out of IAS and Environmental Science.

A discussion ensued regarding the need for more clarity on the processes that course changes vs. proposals go through before going to the CC. Do course changes - especially including adding an online portion, or becoming a fully online class, go directly to the curriculum committee? K. Baird stated that it is assumed a course change has gone through a unit level review process and been approved by faculty before coming to the curriculum committee.

The decision was for the EC reps to investigate the initial steps in place at unit level for course changes. C. Carmean needs to be included in the discussion. Included in this investigation are intellectual property rights.

The discussion moved to understanding what the bigger plan is for online courses for UW Tacoma. The current understanding is faculty will not be required to teach online courses unless they choose to do so. Additionally, the understanding is that there is currently no plan for an online degree program.

N. McKinley brought a question from the VCAA up for discussion: Where does the faculty programmatically see UW Tacoma going in ten years? N. McKinley was asked to take this question back to APC and ask how UW Tacoma might grow using the current fiscal situation.

Discussion followed that this could be a topic for the May 4 Faculty Assembly general meeting:

- strategic viability
- pros/cons of growth
- source of resources

Additional discussion followed:

B. Naidus offered a case study in her efforts to create an arts program and the desire of former students and community to assist in both vision and monetarily. She sees a center for creativity and imagination on campus for all UW Tacoma programs as an interdisciplinary option.

CC (K. Baird)

Nothing to report.

FA (D. Chin)

- Continuing to collect interviews with faculty getting external funding
- More discussion regarding teaching evaluation effectiveness; working on a document outlining the issues.
- Day care report still in process

SBC (M. Lazari absent)

Z. Barsness stated that SBC is continuing to pull together data, and to incorporate such data into a meaningful format. The SBC is also drafting a message that will be distributed to the campus. This message will again

clarify the charge and activities of the committee and discuss the strategic issues related to growth.

APT: (Y. Dierwechter)

Y. Dierwechter reported:

- Committee hasn't met.
- There was a T&P get-together for associates in March, although there is no report of the activity at this point.
- Discussion transitioned into Agenda item 3 to discuss the proposed changes to the APT Procedures and Appendix A of the UWT Handbook and the procedures required by our bylaws to formally approve and adopt these changes.

3. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Procedures update:

Y. Dierwechter gave a brief history of the UWT Handbook Appendix A changes:

- Approximately 18 changes, some minor, some due to code language requirements
- These changes need to be brought before the full faculty for a vote, either at the upcoming Faculty Assembly meeting or electronically via catalyst. Prior to such a formal vote, representatives from EC need to work with their units and provide a context for the changes. If it passes, faculty going up for appointment, promotion and/or tenure in the 2012-2013 Academic year would be grandfathered; these faculty would have the option to follow the currently documented process (current set is antiquated, but has worked) and/or the process hoped to be approved this spring. Anyone applying for appointment, promotion and/or tenure following the 2012-2013 would be subject to the newly approved procedures.

Appendix A (revised version) and accompanying explanatory cover summary will be sent to EC members for comment and/or changes via email. The groundwork has been done, so this is only for substantive changes. All input on the explanatory summary should be sent to Y. Dierwechter by March 19. A final version of these changes will be proposed to EC for formal vote at our next meeting. EC members will then communicate reason for and substance of these changes to their respective faculty during the month of April in preparation for a full faculty vote in early May.

Z. Barsness reported on the Proposed Senate Class A Legislation regarding changes to Chapters 24-32 and 24-52 of the Faculty Code (criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure):

She indicated that the proposed legislation went to committee; several amendments to the language were made by the committee; the amended legislation came back to the floor of the senate where several additional minor amendments were made; it then passed almost unanimously. She indicated that the substance of the changes proposed in this legislation should it pass a full faculty vote will be good for our campus.

4. Promoting Stronger Shared Governance at the Unit Level

A discussion took place regarding the need to strengthen shared governance at the unit level by identifying practices that are working well (and sharing these across units), and identifying areas in which we are either deficient or might improve. Faculty need to be proactive, understand their roles and responsibilities in regards to shared governance at the unit level. If a unit faculty council exists, faculty in the unit should be aware of its current membership, procedures and activities. Some concern was expressed that currently unit level decisions are administratively driven and faculty are not fully aware of, and perhaps even insufficiently engaged in, executing their responsibilities in areas such as curriculum review, development of academic policy at the unit level, provision of advice in budget and hiring matters.

There is a gray area regarding becoming schools. The campus is essentially a school and the EC is a council for the school. There is a need for a sense of what legal code we are operating under. What is faculty role and responsibility at the unit level?

Domains that are the purview of the faculty:

- Curriculum
- Matriculation and Graduation requirements
- P & T criteria

Domains in which faculty are required by code to consult/provide advice

- Appointment, promotion, tenure
- Budget

Discussion ensued regarding some ambiguities regarding support for faculty development formerly eligible from the Chancellor's Endowment grants.

It was also noted that the reports about what each EC representative learns about such unit level procedures would be shared in time for further discussion at the April 11, 2012 executive council meeting.

5. Reflection on February 24th faculty discussion

K. Baird stated that there were twelve faculty in attendance, and a good contentious discussion regarding the reading on patriotism, facilitated by D. Morris.

6. Other items

Time ran out for discussion of other items

Adjourned 1:57 p.m.

Proposed Amendment to “Code Revisions to Chapters 24-31 and 24-32: Revisions related to appointment and promotion of faculty.”

Background: At the Jan. 26, 2012, Faculty Senate meeting, the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) proposed revisions to the Faculty Code adding explicit consideration of contributions related to diversity and equal opportunity in faculty appointment and promotion decisions. The original proposal can be read in the Senate minutes (http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/senate_minutes/11-12/senate_012612.pdf#page=27), and the slide presentation by members of the FCMA can be seen on the Senate blog (http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/blog/fcma_presentation.pdf).

Because the legislation in its original form engendered significant controversy, including a statement of opposition from the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) and a statement of support from the Faculty Council on Women in Academia (FCWA), the Senate voted to refer the matter to a special committee, including members of the FCMA, FCFA, and FCWA, to recommend a substitute motion that considered the views expressed in the Senate discussion. The Senate chair appointed a committee consisting of myself (chair), Michael Forman (IAS, UW Tacoma), Sarah Stroup (Classics), Stephanie Smallwood (History), Alexes Harris (Sociology, FCMA), Morayma Reyes (Pathology, FCMA), Lea Vaughn (Law, FCFA), Carol Landis (Biobehavioral Nursing and Health Systems, FCFA), and Ann Mescher (Mechanical Engineering, FCWA). The committee met three times, and between meetings continued our conversation on a GoPost discussion board.

The committee focused on three main objections to the original proposal:

- **Mandatory?** Although the intent of the new code provisions is clearly to allow but not require contributions to diversity and equal opportunity to be considered in appointment and promotion decisions, some were concerned that the proposed wording might nonetheless cause candidates and evaluators to treat such contributions as mandatory, a sort of “box that must be checked” in order to build a strong case. On the other hand, proponents of the code revisions were concerned that labeling these considerations as optional might be interpreted as giving departmental committees, deans, and college councils license to ignore them. We addressed these concerns by revising the wording to say clearly that a faculty member *may* present such contributions for evaluation, and if presented, they *must* be given recognition.
- **Placement?** Some senators had expressed concern that the placement of the new wording was inappropriate, because it seemed to address *procedures* for appointment and promotion in a section devoted to *qualifications* for appointment and promotion. The change in wording described above seemed to exacerbate this problem. We addressed this by moving the procedural sentences (“a faculty member may present... such contributions must be given recognition ...”) to Section 24-52, titled *Procedure for Promotions*.
- **Academic Freedom?** Some senators also expressed concern that the use of the word “promote” in “faculty contributions ... that promote diversity and equal opportunity” might be interpreted as imposing limitations on academic freedom, for example by suggesting that research that questions the value of diversity in the university should be devalued. We addressed this by changing the word “promote” to “address.”

Our amended proposal is attached. In this version, the added wording originally proposed by FCMA is underlined in black, our new strikeouts are in red, and our new additions are in turquoise. This version has been approved unanimously by our committee, including representatives from FCMA, FCFA, and FCWA, and we recommend that the Senate approve it.

In addition, because the original proposal contained no changes to Section 24-31 and we have not proposed any, and because we have proposed new changes to Section 24-54, the title of the legislation should probably be changed to **“Code Revisions to Chapters 24-32 and 24-54: Revisions related to appointment and promotion of faculty”**

Respectfully submitted,
John M. Lee (Mathematics)
Senator, College of Arts and Sciences

Code Revisions to Chapters 24-32 and 24-54: Revisions related to appointment and promotion of faculty

Faculty Code, Chapter 24

Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members

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. ~~In conjunction~~ accordance with the University's expressed commitment to excellence and equity, faculty contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that promote address diversity and equal opportunity may be included among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion outlined below. ~~are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the faculty member's qualifications. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities, efforts to advance equitable access to education, or public service that addresses the needs of diverse populations.~~

- 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. For each of these, contributions that address to the advancement of equitable access and diversity in education may can be included. 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 degree to which teaching strategies that encourage the educational advancement of students from all backgrounds and life experiences are utilized; 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. Included among these contributions are professional service activities that address the professional advancement of individuals from underrepresented groups from the faculty member's field.
- 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, including the faculty member's involvement in the recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students in an effort to promote diversity and equal opportunity. 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.

Section 13–31, April 16, 1956; S–A 58, May 16, 1978; S–A 64, May 29, 1981; S–A 71, February 5, 1985; S–A 75, April 6, 1987; S–A 86, December 8, 1992; S–A 99, July 9, 1999: all with Presidential approval.

Section 24–54 Procedure for Promotions

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee). At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.

- A. The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend the promotion. Research faculty shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-34 Subsection B shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department or undepartmentalized college or school who hold an eligible professorial appointment or an instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered. In this decision they shall take into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24–32, 24–33, 24–34, and 24–35 for the various academic ranks and titles. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of these qualifications and not upon length of service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans are directed to study the whole record of candidates' qualifications described in Section 24–32. A faculty member may present for evaluation contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity. If presented, such contributions must be given recognition in evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for promotion.

Submitted by:
Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs
January 9, 2012

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
January 9, 2012

Referred by Faculty Senate to Special Committee
January 26, 2012

NOTES ON PROPOSED REVISIONS TO APPENDIX A:

Based on an extensive effort by multiple faculty members over several years, the Faculty Assembly's Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee has amended portions of Appendix A in the UWT Handbook. Appendix A spells out important procedures that relate directly to promotion and tenure issues at UWT. According to our faculty bylaws, amendments to our Handbook constitute Class A legislation. As such, "The Executive Council will forward ... proposed amendments to the faculty as specified in Article VI." Changes were necessary to address legal concerns about current procedures as expressed by Academic Human Resources (AHR) and by Dr. Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty. These concerns nonetheless provided us with a great opportunity to strengthen the integrity of our APT procedures by offering more detailed and precise information to relevant actors. Members of the current APT committee voted unanimously on January 12, 2012 to adopt the proposed changes. We are requesting that members of the Executive Council do likewise.

The revised document includes 18 areas of change in total. The changes are [numbered] and underlined in the revised document that follows. Our current Appendix A is also included at the end of this document so that readers can compare the old with the new.

- Many of the changes are minor and thus self-evident; they provide clarity or greater emphasis of particular points, or simply update antiquated conditions; see for example [2], [4], [5], [14], [17].
- Other changes add more extensive language in order to provide both clarity and improved procedural direction to the various actors. See for example [1], [3], [10], [18].
- Change [6] provides more detail on the content of the candidate's file.
- Change [7] spells out what should be included in the candidate's curriculum vitae, including in particular more guidance on scholarly accomplishments.
- Change [8] places greater emphasis on the central importance of the narrative letter in communicating not only the overall record but especially the candidate's effectiveness in teaching and scholarship.
- Change [9] highlights more detailed information relating to the documentation of teaching effectiveness, including the requirement that applicants for promotion must have completed student and peer evaluations of their teaching within the previous 12 months.
- Change [11], [12] and [13] expand the language of our current handbook in order to redress insufficient guidelines relating to yearly activity reports and documentation of regular conferences with directors or dean. Specifically,

- [11] stipulates that yearly evaluations are not “optional,” as stated in the current Appendix A, but in fact are a required part of the candidate’s file.
- [12] includes more language and guidance from section 24-57 of the University Handbook regarding the purpose and role of yearly activity reports.
- [13] details the requirement that candidates for promotion must include documentation of a conference with her or his director or dean within the previous 12 months.
- Changes [14], [15] and [16] clarify procedures related to the section of and communication with external reviewers. Specifically,
 - [14] emphasizes that externals **not** be asked to assess whether the candidate should be promoted here or elsewhere.
 - [15] clarifies the roles of the committee chair and the director/dean in selecting the list of external examiners.
 - [16] clarifies the roles of the committee chair and the director/dean in communicating with the external examiners.

SEE BELOW

APPENDIX A

[changes underlined and numbered for purposes of discussion only; do NOT circulate this copy]

Promotion and Tenure: CAMPUS GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE PROVISIONS OF THE HANDBOOK OF POLICIES FOR UWT

Note: In cases where there is a discrepancy between these guidelines and the UW Faculty Code, the UW Faculty Code takes precedence.

This document outlines general guidelines for implementing the Handbook of Policies, University of Washington Tacoma, regarding promotion and tenure reviews and decisions. Additional guidelines may be required by individual programs. Included are procedures for external review of scholarship, as defined in Section 24-32 of the University Handbook.

Requesting a Review Committee:

At any time, professors of less than full rank may ask their program director to form a committee to help guide the candidate in preparing for the review for tenure and/or promotion. For an Assistant Professor to be promoted and granted tenure, a committee must be formed by the end of the fifth contract year. Associate Professors without tenure and Professors without tenure may request a review to change to a tenure track position at any point in their career; the review must take place during the promotion/tenure cycle and, if granted, the change to the tenure-track position is effective only at the beginning of the next academic year. [1]

In requesting that a review committee be formed, a candidate shall submit a brief letter to the candidate's program director or dean [2] summarizing the candidate's record in all areas of professional accomplishments (scholarship, teaching, and service) and identifying the fields and/or traditions to which their scholarship relates most closely. This letter is to be used as a resource in identifying potential members of the review committee and will be placed in the candidate's file.

Appointment, Composition and Function of the Review Committee:

The candidate and the program director will work collaboratively in selecting the members of the review committee. Members of the review committee may be chosen from all campuses of the University of Washington. At least two of the members of the committee must be members of the University of Washington Tacoma faculty. Each committee will have no fewer than three and no more than five members, all senior in rank to the candidate. The candidate and the program director must jointly endorse the composition of the review committee. The program director will appoint the committee and will inform the candidate in writing of the committee membership.

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 review committee will make sure that the candidate's file includes all items listed in the University of Washington Tacoma Promotion and Tenure Recommendation Checklist. [3] After all materials have been assembled and the external evaluation letters have been added to the candidate's file, the review committee will evaluate the candidate's file and vote. The committee chair in collaboration with the rest of the members of the review committee, will write a letter summarizing and evaluating the candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure. The letter will be submitted to eligible voting [4] faculty from the candidate's program and placed in the candidate's file. The full contents of the candidate's file will be made available to eligible voting [5] faculty (as defined in Section 24-54 A of the University Handbook) from the candidate's program. Throughout this process, candidates will have access to the file, excluding external evaluations, and will have the right to add comments to the material. The review committee does not have the authority to prevent a candidate from proceeding with the review process.

The Candidate's File:

The candidate's file must include a curriculum vitae or cumulative record, a narrative letter, documentation of teaching effectiveness, documentation of scholarship for review, yearly activity reports, documentation of regular conferences with the director or dean, and external review letters. Faculty who are being considered for promotion from the rank of Assistant to Associate should also include documentation from their third-year review. Please see the UWT Promotion and Tenure Recommendation Checklist for complete details. [6]

Curriculum Vitae or Cumulative Record

The candidate's vitae should contain a cumulative record of scholarship, teaching, and service. Precise contents will differ according to discipline. The following items should be included:

1. Education: list institutions, degrees granted, dates
2. Dissertation title
3. Employment
4. Research projects/grants/contracts: list funding agencies, dates, amounts of funding, and individual's role (PI, CO-PI, other)
6. Honors and awards
7. Service: university, professional, community
8. Curriculum development
9. Areas of teaching expertise
10. Scholarly accomplishments (if applicable, include: bibliography - including page numbers and length, types of publications, whether publication was peer-reviewed before acceptance, and whether candidate was the principal author). [7]

Narrative Letter

The narrative letter is an integrated discussion of an individual's scholarship, service, and teaching. The purpose of the narrative is to illuminate the contents of the cumulative record and the documentation of teaching effectiveness and scholarship. Research contributions should

demonstrate consistent scholarly progress after appointment as Assistant Professor when the candidate is seeking promotion to Associate Professor, or after appointment to Associate Professor when the candidate is seeking promotion to Professor. [8] The letter is addressed to the committee. It is the most important item included in an individual's file.

Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness

This documentation should include the following items:

- A list of all courses taught at the UW, with dates;
- A list of all graduate students supervised, each entry specifying student name, thesis/scholarly project topic, degree, dates, and the faculty member's committee role (chair or member)
- Peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness - Assistant Professors should be evaluated at least once a year; Associate Professors should be evaluated at least once every three years.
- Student course evaluations - all student teaching evaluations since date of last promotion should be included.

Evaluations should show a pattern of effective and competent teaching. Candidates who intend to apply for promotion and/or tenure must provide student and collegial evaluations of their teaching that have been conducted within 12 months of their application for promotion and/or tenure. [9] Candidates should include all student and peer teaching evaluations since their initial employment (for Assistant Professors) or last promotion (for Associate Professors).

Documentation of Scholarship For Review

Precise contents will differ according to the candidate's program/school. The candidate should consult their program/school's tenure and promotion guidelines. [10]

Yearly Activity Report, Third Year Reviews, and Documentation of Regular Conferences with the Director or Dean

The candidate must include yearly activity reports, documentation of his/her regular conference with the director or dean, and documentation of his/her third-year review. [11]

Yearly Activity Reports

Section 24-57 of the University Handbook states, "Yearly activity reports shall be used as a reference and as a course 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." Should the candidate need to update their yearly activity report and/or add additional materials to his/her file, the candidate shall follow the procedures outlined in Appendix C, Ch. 2, Sec.1A below. [12]

Documentation of Regular Conference with the Director or Dean

Candidates who intend to apply for promotion and/or tenure must include documentation of the regular conference with his/her director or dean within 12 months of their application for promotion and/or tenure. [13]

External Review Letters

Evaluation by external reviewers who are experts in the candidate's field(s) must be included in the file. Acceptable forms are reviews and/or letters from external reviewers who have evaluated the candidate's demonstrations of scholarship (as defined in Section 24-32 of the University Handbook). The external review is based on scholarship or artistic creativity; tenure and promotion depend on more than these factors. The external reviewer should **not** [14] be asked to assess whether the candidate should be promoted here or would be elsewhere.

The chair of the review committee will solicit from the candidate a list of names of scholars qualified to review the candidate's demonstration of scholarship. The review committee will select up to five names from this list and may substitute up to two others not named by the candidate. The external evaluators should be chosen by the program director or dean and faculty review committee. [15]

The review committee must solicit reviews from a minimum of three external reviewers. No more than one external reviewer may be from the candidate's doctoral committee, and no more than two may be from the candidate's degree-granting institution during the candidate's tenure. The external reviewers will be provided with relevant demonstrations of scholarship and a summary of the candidate's teaching and service record. All letters received from external reviewers will become part of the candidate's file but will not be made available to the candidate.

The committee chair will compose the solicitation letter in consultation with the program director or dean. The solicitation letter should be signed by, and should request return to, the program director or dean. [16]

The letter should state that the unit is considering the candidate for possible promotion and request the following information:

- How and for how long the referee has known the candidate
- The significance, independence, influence, and promise of the candidate's scholarship or creative work and the degree of national/international recognition
- A comparison of the candidate's accomplishments with leading scholars or artists at a similar career stage in the same or related fields

Each evaluator should be provided with the same representative set of the candidate's scholarly or artistic materials.

Voting on Promotion and Tenure:

Procedures for voting on promotion and tenure shall be as prescribed in Sections 24-54 and 25-41 of the *Faculty Code*. The program director or dean will write a letter to the VCAA summarizing the content of the decision leading up to the vote, the number and names of faculty participating in the discussion and vote, the number of eligible voting [17] faculty, and the number of positive and negative votes and abstentions. The program director or dean, who does not vote with the faculty, will write an independent letter of recommendation.

Upon receiving the recommendation from the program director, the VCAA will seek the advice of the Faculty Council on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure to make sure that current procedures have been followed and to ensure that the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service are similar in quality to that of current tenured faculty at the University of Washington Tacoma. The VCAA will forward his/her recommendation with concurrence from the Chancellor to the Provost who makes the decision on behalf of the President.

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 *Faculty Code* to appeal for redress. A faculty member whose tenure is denied may engage in the administrative and conciliatory proceedings described in Chapter 27, and may file a petition for review as provided in Section 25-64.

APPENDIX B

ORIGINAL INSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIVES AND ROLES FOR UWT, 1990

Role and Mission of the Tacoma and Bothell Campuses of the University The branch campuses of the University of Washington have been established for the purpose of providing needed educational services for the central Puget Sound region. Appropriately located in this major urban area, the branch campuses make bachelor's and master's degree programs accessible to people throughout a four-county region -- one campus serving primarily Snohomish and North King Counties, the other campus serving primarily Pierce, Kitsap and South King Counties. In accordance with the traditions of the University of Washington, the branch campuses are dedicated to the goals of providing educational programs that meet high academic standards and of fostering

student success in these programs. This requires that the members of the branch campus community should be of the highest quality and should maintain the highest standards in all phases of the branch campuses' work.

The academic programs of the branch campuses are designed to respond to the educational needs of a diverse population that includes employed commuting adults beyond the traditional college age. At the undergraduate level, the curriculum is comprised of upper division courses of study.

The branch campuses seek to build and maintain strong ties with regional industries, businesses, civic agencies and organizations, and educational institutions. They pay particular attention to cooperation with neighboring community colleges and baccalaureate colleges, in order to satisfy the higher education needs of the central Puget Sound region. In service to the people of central Puget Sound, the branch campuses are committed to serving the full range of ethnic, social, and economic groups that comprise the area's population.

APPROVED BY:
FACULTY SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
25 January 1990

APPENDIX C

CAMPUS RULES and POLICIES

CH. 2: APPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF THE FACULTY

Sec. 1: The Tenure and Promotion File

A) After the time a candidate's file for tenure and/or promotion is evaluated by the review committee, should the candidate wish to add material to the file, the candidate must:

1. inform the review committee and program director/dean regarding the addition to the file, if the departmental vote has not yet taken place
2. if the program vote has already taken place, the candidate must inform Academic Affairs about the addition to the file.

In both cases, the material must be clearly annotated including the letter(s) informing the review committee, program director/dean, and/or Academic Affairs regarding the addition to the file, and the date the material is added. All materials shall be placed in a separate folder and labeled as such, making it clear the material is an addendum.

There will be a log denoting the date and time the committee, director/dean, and/or Academic Affairs Office accepted the additional material. [18]

APPENDIX A (CURRENT VERSION)

From: http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/global/documents/faculty-assembly/uwt_handbook.pdf

Promotion and Tenure: CAMPUS GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE PROVISIONS OF THE HANDBOOK OF POLICIES FOR UWT

Note: In cases where there is a discrepancy between these guidelines and the UW Faculty Code, the UW Faculty Code takes precedence.

This document outlines general guidelines for implementing the Handbook of Policies, University of Washington, Tacoma, regarding promotion and tenure reviews and decisions. Additional guidelines may be required by individual programs. Included are procedures for external review of scholarship, as defined in **Section 24-32** of the University Handbook.

Requesting a Review Committee At any time, professors of less than full rank may ask that their program director form a committee to help guide the candidate in preparing for the review for tenure and/or promotion. For the purpose of tenure, a committee must be formed by the end of the fifth contract year.

In requesting that a review committee be formed, a candidate shall submit a brief letter to the candidate's program director summarizing the candidate's record in all areas of professional accomplishments (scholarship, teaching, and service) and identifying the fields and/or traditions to which their scholarship relates most closely. This letter is to be used as a resource in identifying potential members of the review committee and will be placed in the candidate's file. **Appointment, Composition and Function of the Review Committee** The candidate and the program director will work collaboratively in selecting the members of the review committee. Members of the review committee can be chosen from all campuses of the University of Washington. At least two of the members of the committee must be members of the University of Washington, Tacoma faculty. Each committee will have no fewer than three and no more than five members, all senior in rank to the candidate. The candidate and the program director must jointly endorse the composition of the review committee. The program director will appoint the committee and will inform the candidate in writing of the committee membership.

The review committee will advise the candidate, guide the candidate in applying for promotion and tenure, and assist in the assembling of appropriate documentation. After

all materials have been assembled and the external evaluation letters have been added to the candidate's file, the preliminary review committee will evaluate the candidate's file and vote. The committee chair in collaboration with the review committee, will write a letter summarizing and evaluating the candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure. The letter will be submitted to eligible faculty from the candidate's program and placed in the candidate's file. The full contents of the candidate's file will be made available to eligible faculty (as defined in **Section 24-54. A. of the University Handbook**) from the candidate's program. 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. The review committee does not have the authority to prevent a candidate from proceeding with the review process.

The Candidate's File: The candidate will submit a narrative letter, a curriculum vitae or cumulative record, documentation of teaching effectiveness, and documentation of scholarship for review in the promotion/tenure process.

Curriculum Vitae or Cumulative Record The candidate's vitae should contain a cumulative record of scholarship, teaching, and service. Precise contents will differ according to discipline. The following items should be included: Education: list institutions, degrees granted, dates Dissertation title Professional positions Research projects/grants/contracts: list funding agencies, dates, amounts of funding, individual's role (PI, CO-PI, other) Honors and awards Service: university, professional, community Curriculum development Areas of teaching expertise Scholarly accomplishments

Narrative Letter The narrative letter is an integrated discussion of an individual's scholarship, service, and teaching. The purpose of the narrative is to illuminate the contents of the cumulative record and the documentation of teaching effectiveness and scholarship. The letter is addressed to the committee. It is the primary item included in an individual's file.

Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness This documentation should include the following items: A list of all courses taught at the UW, with dates; A list of all graduate students supervised, each entry specifying student name, thesis/scholarly project topic, degree, dates, and the faculty member's committee role (chair or member) Evaluations: Evaluations should show a pattern of effective and competent teaching. Peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness Student course evaluations Documentation of Scholarship

Yearly Evaluations The inclusion of yearly evaluations is optional and is the sole decision of the candidate.

External Review Evaluation by external reviewers who are experts in the candidate's field(s) must be included in the file. Acceptable forms are reviews and/or letters from external reviewers who have evaluated the candidate's demonstrations of scholarship (as defined in **Section 24-32 of the University Handbook**).

The chair of the review committee will solicit from the candidate a list of names of scholars qualified to review the candidate's demonstration of scholarship. The review committee will select up to five names from this list and may substitute up to two others not named by the candidate. The review committee must solicit reviews from a minimum of three external reviewers. No more than one external reviewer may be from the candidate's doctoral committee, and no more than two may be from the candidate's degree-granting institution during the candidate's tenure. The external reviewers will be provided with relevant demonstrations of scholarship and a summary of the candidate's teaching and service record. All letters received from external reviewers will become part of the candidate's file but will not be made available to the candidate. The committee chair will compose the solicitation letter in consultation with the program director. The letter should be signed by the committee chair and should request reply to the committee chair. The external reviewer should not be asked to assess whether the candidate should be promoted here or would be elsewhere. The external review is based on scholarship or artistic creativity; tenure and promotion depend on more than these factors. The letter should indicate that the unit is considering the candidate for possible promotion and/or tenure and request the following information: (a) how and for how long the external reviewer has known the candidate; (b) significance, independence, influence, and promise of the candidate's scholarship or creative work; degree of national/international recognition; and (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. Voting on Promotion and Tenure Procedures for voting on promotion and tenure shall be as prescribed in **Sections 24-54 and 25-41 of the University Handbook**. The program director will write a letter to the dean summarizing the content of the decision leading up to the vote, the number and names of faculty participating in the discussion and vote, the number of eligible faculty, and the number of positive and negative votes and abstentions. The program director, who does not vote with the faculty, will write an independent letter of recommendation. Upon receiving the recommendation from the program director, the dean will seek the advice of the Faculty Council to make sure that current procedures have been followed and to ensure that the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service are similar in quality to that of current tenured faculty at the University of Washington, Tacoma. The dean will forward his/her recommendation to the provost who makes the decision on behalf of the president.

Principles and Recommendations for Crafting UW's 2012-13 Budget

Principle 1: Respond to budget changes strategically and transparently. Our students are among the state's most important resource and they are now paying the majority of the cost of their education. Our faculty provide the means for our students to succeed in their education and for the state to prosper. Responses to the current budget situation must consider and be apparent to these two critical constituencies. To accomplish strategic budget changes, we offer these recommendations:

Recommendations

1. *Aggressively continue the work of the goal-setting, strategic-planning and program-evaluation initiatives in progress. We also recommend that any further work on 2y2d, Organizational Effectiveness, and Program Evaluation be far more inclusive of non-administrative faculty and students than these committees have been to date.*
2. *SCPB recommends that the Provost use the same program-evaluation metrics that were developed last year to inform budget decisions this year.*
3. *Document and reinforce the requirement that deans seek the advice of their elected Faculty Councils during the development of strategic priorities for their academic units. Deans will confirm this consultation by including the attached statement signed by the chair of the Elected Faculty Council of the school or college.*
4. *Consider consolidations and reorganizations of units that preserve the University's ability to accomplish its missions effectively while resulting in significant reprogrammable funds.*
5. *Prioritize and possibly reduce the levels of service provided by non-academic units. The infrastructure that most directly supports teaching and learning quality, excellent scholarship (e.g., libraries), and essential student services (e.g., advising) should be protected first.*
6. *Preserve access to UW for low income students, while working to address the growing unmet need in middle income groups.*
7. *Create a pool of central bridge funds that allow disruptive changes in academic programs and student support to be managed thoughtfully.*
8. *As a short-term measure allow vacant state-funded faculty positions to remain open to meet the most urgent needs except where the integrity of programs that meet key strategic needs would be compromised without immediate faculty replacements.*

Principle 2: Value the faculty. Faculty drive the University's mission of instruction, research, and community service. Their confidence in high-level appreciation of and fair and competitive compensation for their work is essential if UW is to proceed to function collaboratively through the continuing period of budgetary unpredictability and retain its devoted faculty.

9. *Strive to fairly reward meritorious performance and to remain competitive among our peers; in order to remain competitive, we must at a minimum continue to produce comparative data on peer salaries (at the departmental level) centrally.*
10. *Promotion and tenure policies, including promotion raises, must be sustained at all faculty levels and we ask the Provost to reaffirm our commitment to established principles of promotion and compensation through active administrative participation on a joint faculty-administrative salary committee.*
11. *Faculty numbers may not keep pace with undergraduate enrollment, so student-faculty ratios and teaching loads are likely to increase. Encourage the use of TAs where they add instructional value and control the negative impacts of rising faculty teaching loads. It is important that we not lose TA positions in programs where these TA's provide a key part of the education services.*
12. *Recognize that moving to part-time rather than full-time instructional staff may negatively affect faculty and students.*

Principle 3: Sustain quality. The impact of the profound budget cuts over the past three years must have some impact on the quality of the education and research at the UW. In order to guard against decisions that may inadvertently further affect quality, we need affirmative efforts to sustain quality, one of which would be developing metrics that measure quality of education and research.

Principal 4: Consider differential program fees cautiously. The actual per-student cost of delivering instruction differs widely across programs as the budget supplements already recognize. The additional financial need caused by any new program fees should be completely covered. How the fees are phased in should be discussed extensively. The fees should be used for educational enhancement. The fees should recognize upper and lower division cost differences as well as those across majors. How differential program fees would work under Activity Based Budgeting should also be discussed extensively in SCPB.

Principle 5: Curtail (but continue) strategic investments. To remain a world-class institution of higher education it is vital that we continue to invest in the most urgent facets of our mission with vision and purpose at a rate consonant with financial reality.

13. Centrally funded strategic investments must continue. Nonetheless defer all but the most vital investments at least until the University's revenues stabilize.

Statement for Deans to have signed by their Elected Faculty Council Chairs:

I confirm that the elected college council, which I Chair, provided advice to our Dean in the development of the attached budget plan. Our college's process for developing strategic priorities was in accordance with the Faculty Code, Section 23-45, Subsection C, which states that "the elected faculty council or councils shall advise the Dean on matters involving academic policy, including priorities, resource, salary allocations, and budgets."

If this process was not followed, the Dean should provide a written explanation.