



From Academic HR: "The Faculty Code Section 24-54B provides that candidates for promotion are to be responsible for assembling their own promotion record. Therefore, candidates are to be allowed to place in their promotion files any material that they feel should be considered."

Candidates should recognize; however, that they need to provide a balance that generates a readable/palatable file and should in all cases avoid the appearance of bloating the file. Therefore the College of the Environment has set some page limits and created guidelines to ensure all files focus on the essential information.

An added challenge is that the readership of the promotion file includes not only outside evaluators but also professionals who are not specialists in your particular area, including colleagues, administrators and college council members. Therefore, keep your personal statement accessible to a broader readership, and avoid technical terms and jargon.

Note that for promotions from associate to full professor, emphasis should be placed on the years since last promotion. You are not required to include all of your teaching evaluations, e.g., from before promotion, nor need you list every talk you ever presented. In all cases, keep repetition to a minimum.

2) CURRICULUM VITAE	
<i>Employment History</i>	Include post-doctoral positions and supervisors
<i>Research Grants/Contract</i>	In general, list only activities since your appointment or last promotion. For multi-PI and multi-institution grants, specify your role and the award amount of your part of the program. Do not list (or do specify the nature of) continuing institutional grants - e.g., continuing grants to UW from other agencies, for which you did not specifically compete.
<i>Graduate Students as primary supervisor or mentor</i>	This list should include students for whom you were chair or co-chair of the graduate committee; it may include others for whom you were a primary mentor. List name, degree awarded and date, subject of thesis/dissertation/research, (if known) current status of graduate; and (briefly) other accomplishments. Other students you have mentored will be included under "evidence of teaching effectiveness."
<i>Talks/Presentations</i>	In general, list only activities since last promotion. List presentations, including talks and posters, in three categories: (1) invited scholarly presentations, including invitations from other academic/research institutions, and keynote or plenary addresses; (2) presentations at (inter)national scholarly meetings, symposia, and workshops; and (3) notable presentations to a nonprofessional (or public) audience, including webcasts. Only include presentations for which you were the presenter (i.e., do not include abstracts for which you were a co-author). The purpose of this category is to show that you are participating in your professional community and making an impact, and in the case of invited talks, that you are recognized as an expert and a skilled presenter.
<i>Bibliography</i>	Submit as item 3 -- do not repeat items

3) BIBLIOGRAPHY	
A well-presented bibliography highlights your scholarship, accomplishments and productivity. Your bibliography should also emphasize your role in mentorship by specifically noting postdoctoral and student authors. Because multiple authorship is common, briefly (short phrases or a <i>percent effort</i>) describe your role in multi-authored. (e.g., "developed idea" "conducted analyses" "drafted paper").	
Use a consistent and standard bibliographic style that includes order of authorship, and full titles and publication names, as not all colleagues will recognize journal abbreviations. Indicate all mentored co-authors, including undergraduate and graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows. Separate publications into categories by type, including but not limited to: refereed journal articles, invited or special volume contributions, books, book chapters, technical reports.	
<i>Non-refereed materials reflecting scholarly and creative activities.</i>	<i>The dossier should explain the contextual significance of the work, and measures of its impact --see more under (4), personal statement. Examples of "non-refereed materials" may include books, urban plans, resource management plans, public policy documents and implementation, models with documented application, exhibitions and other communication products such as websites and other social media, curricular innovations implemented at broad scale, databases and other online research products, technical documents, and other applied works. Such works may qualify as scholarship on the basis of the faculty member's expertise, original intellectual contribution, recognition by professional communities, duration and depth of involvement, or the independence of professional judgment. The impact of such work can be briefly noted here; your personal statement should highlight your most important contributions.</i>

4) CANDIDATE'S LIST OF SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS & PERSONAL STATEMENT

The Faculty Code states that each candidate shall include a self-assessment of his or her qualifications for promotion in the file. From Academic HR: "The candidate should provide a promotion statement listing and describing his/her scholarly or creative contributions in the record that are likely to be of the most lasting significance. The majority of selected contributions should have been completed after appointment as Assistant Professor when recommending promotion to Associate Professor, or after appointment to Associate Professor when recommending promotion to Professor. The candidate should explain briefly why these contributions are most significant, describing the relationship between these pieces and his/her overall research agenda. The candidate is also expected to describe briefly his/her significant teaching and service contributions.]"

The personal statement is where a candidate highlights specific, significant accomplishments in the context of their scholarly and career goals. Details in other parts of the package should not be repeated, but rather should be referred to (e.g., citations). Typically, a statement will include an introduction as well as sections on research, teaching and service. Note that the faculty code highlights research mentorship as part of a research portfolio and also explicitly mentions that interdisciplinary research and contributions to diversity are to be valued. The CoEnv values external engagement and recommends candidates include a section on synergistic activities, interdisciplinary contributions and broad impacts.

Notes on documenting evidence of service impact and external engagement (abridged from SMEA recommendations)

Formal leadership roles in nationally or internationally recognized organizations, whether appointed or elected, and (usually) when in arenas related to a faculty member's area of expertise, are signals of broadly recognized eminence. Examples include chairmanships of National Research Council (NRC) committees, leadership positions in professional societies, advisory roles for state or federal agencies, and advisory or leadership roles with non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Leadership and impact through membership in *ad hoc* committees may also be achieved through a significant role in report writing. Professional consulting can also sometimes constitute high impact activity, for example when a faculty member has an on-going role in advising a public agency or private foundation on programs, policies, or future directions.

Evidence of effective leadership and high-impact public service and engagement can manifest itself and be recognized in a variety of ways. For example, a National Research Council report is an output, and policy change influenced by that report's findings or recommendations is an outcome. Some advisory roles of faculty may prove very influential for local organizations or start-ups in the NGO or private sectors, based on outcomes not readily discernible from the outside. Again, the best evidence of effectiveness will often be the testimonials of those inside the organizations receiving assistance from the faculty member. While some roles are readily recognized, others require evaluation by those closest to the work that has been done.

Suggestion/recommendation (by SMEA): Faculty seeking recognition in P&T consideration for service and external engagement should point whenever possible to tangible outputs and outcomes of their efforts. Outputs will frequently but not always take the form of reports. Sometimes the faculty member's role is not obvious from the report itself. Faculty candidates should therefore also supply names of recipients or observers of their efforts who can supply testimonials on their behalf, whether or not there are associated tangible products. Testimonials could then be sought from these individuals by departmental chairs or P&T committees and included in the candidate's file and potentially in materials sent to external peer reviewers. Those providing letter testimonials would be encouraged to describe the faculty member's role, to point to specific outputs and outcomes wherever possible, and to provide their own candid and confidential assessment of the significance of the contributions made. It is important to note that external reviewers are intentionally selected to be 'at arm's length' from the candidate so they may not be able to evaluate the influence of faculty on engagement processes. Hence, testimonials from those directly involved (and who may be well known to the candidates) may offer a critical addition to the candidate's file.

5) EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Courses taught at UW, dates, summary of evaluations *Sample below -- Suggested template for summary of teaching and teaching evaluations. List all courses taught, whether evaluated or not evaluated. Please list same courses taught more than once on successive lines.*

Sample Template

Summary of Teaching and Evaluations for Taylor Jones

Course Number	Qtr/Year	Short Title	# of Credits	Responsibility	# students	Student Ratings						Peer Evaluated
						Course as a Whole	Course Content	Instructors Contribution	Instructors Effectiveness	COMBINED	ADJUSTED COMBINED	
OSM234	AU2012	Intro to OSM Methods	3	100%	33	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.1	
OSM 234	AU2010	Intro to OSM Mehotds	3	100%	28	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.7	X
OSM 567	WI2012	OSM Field Trip	2	100%	12							
POE123	SP2011	Water in the Environment	4	50%	60	4.2	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.8	4.0	X

<i>Brief course summaries and candidates' contributions</i>	Do not repeat material covered in your personal statement
<i>Graduate students advised</i>	This list would include all committees on which you have served, without the details in your CV regarding specifically supervised students. <i>Recommended:</i> a table indicating name, degree and date, department/unit, your role (advisor, committee, reading committee, other); do include the basics of graduate students you advised, but put highlights of research mentorship in your CV and personal statement. Note that the faculty code includes graduate research supervision under research, not teaching.
<i>Undergraduate students advised/supervised</i>	Recommended: a Table
<i>Student assessment of teaching</i>	Do not send individual comments All student teaching evaluations since date of last promotion should be included; be sure that the course numbers are readable (sometimes punched out when filed by unit)
<i>Collegial assessment of teaching</i>	Each assessment should be no more than two pages. Some units use multi-page forms for assessments; such forms should be summarized, with details kept in the candidates' unit file.



It is the unit's (chair's, evaluation committee's) responsibility to educate College Council, the Dean's Office and the Provost's Office on the standards of scholarship and practice within the disciplines of that unit, and the means of evaluation/assessment within disciplines in that unit. The significance and impact of a candidate's dossier, within the context of their position, should be highlighted in a way comprehensible to a broad audience.

6) CHAIR/DIRECTOR'S LETTER

<i>Complete tally of departmental vote and basis for positive and negative votes</i>	The basis for votes typically comes from faculty meeting discussion. If there are negative votes, please explain reservations expressed at the meeting, or state that reasons were not expressed
<i>In cases of tenure-clock extension</i>	Include Chair's explicit consideration of granted extensions during review
<i>Description & evaluation of research, teaching, service</i>	If there is a separate committee report with details, these details need not be repeated. This is the place to describe unit standards. Either here or in the committee report, there should be a short summary and evaluation of outside letters.

7) DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

Currently this report is optional, although most units do have a committee that evaluates candidates and reports to the faculty before a discussion and vote. If such a report is produced, see Item 8 (that is, a redacted version goes to the candidate).

A typical committee report will make a recommendation for promotion and then justify that recommendation by summarizing and evaluating the candidate's contributions to research, teaching and service/engagement, emphasizing the impact of that work. The committee report typically would also summarize the letters from outside evaluators.

8) SUMMARIES & CANDIDATE'S RESPONSES

Note that names and other identifying materials are redacted from these reports.

Note that at least one of these pairs is required.

For a review committee report, see item 7.

The summary of department deliberations is typically written by the chair, summarizing the faculty meeting at which the dossier was discussed.

From academic HR: Summaries of Departmental Deliberations and Candidate's Responses.

Include the following items in the documentation (note that one item is required):

1. The committee report summary that was provided to the candidate (if a review committee report was produced)
2. The candidate's response to the report summary (an acknowledgment is required even if no response is made)
3. The summary of departmental deliberations that was provided to the candidate (required)
4. The candidate's response to the deliberations summary (an acknowledgment is required even if no response is made).

The summaries and responses are not required for promotions in the affiliate and clinical ranks.

10) EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

<i>3-5 Outside Letters</i>	Recommend at least four letters, from peer institutions.
<i>Qualifications (short summary) of referees</i>	<i>How chosen</i> (indicate cases where candidate was involved), <i>reasons for choice</i> (do not send referee CVs)
Chair/Director External Evaluation Solicitation Letter Template	<i>If [a] tenure clock extension(s) were requested, the Chair/Director letter to outside evaluators should include a statement that recognizes that the candidate received [a] tenure clock extension(s) by virtue of University of Washington and College of the Environment policy, and to explicitly take into account the granted extension(s) into their evaluation. Chair/Director External Evaluation Solicitation Letter Template can be found here.</i>
<i>Indication of what materials were provided to outside evaluators</i>	In practice, the full dossier provided by the candidate should go to external evaluators, including personal statement and evidence of teaching effectiveness, although the latter can be abbreviated.