

COLLEGE OF THE ENVIRONMENT **PROMOTION & TENURE GUIDELINES - Candidate Responsibilities** Additional information to assist in preparing a promotion package

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 also recognize it is necessary to balance detail with a readable and digestible file. The College of the Environment has therefore set page limits and guidelines to ensure promotion dossiers focus on the essential information.

The readership of the promotion file includes not only outside evaluators, but also professionals with a wide range of expertise, including colleagues, administrators, and college council members. Personal statements should therefore be accessible to a broader readership and avoid overly technical terms or jargon.

For promotions from associate to full professor, emphasis should be placed on the years since last promotion. Keep repetition to a minimum.

PERSONAL DETAILS	
<i>Employment History</i>	Include post-doctoral positions and supervisors
<i>Education History</i>	Include all undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral education
<i>Awards and Offices</i>	List all honors, awards, offices, invited named lectures, and professorships received.

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 describe your role in multi-authored works (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. 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>	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 based on the faculty member's expertise, original intellectual contribution, recognition by relevant 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.

RESEARCH GRANTS AND CONTRACTS
List all funded grants and contracts you served as PI, Co-PI, or senior personnel, identifying the funding source and whether the grants/contracts were competitive, non-competitive, and/or continuing. Specify (1) your role, (2) total award amount, (3) award amount to UW, and (4) award amount to your research group. Provide itemized sums for career total, since joining UW, and since your last promotion if applicable.

PRESENTATIONS

List activities before and after your 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 national and international scholarly meetings, symposia, and workshops; and (3) notable presentations to a nonprofessional (or public) audience, including webcasts. Indicate presentations for which you were the presenter or primary mentor of the presenter.

MENTORING	
<i>Post-doctoral scholars mentored</i>	List all postdocs you have mentored. <i>Recommended:</i> a table indicating name, date, department/unit, your mentoring role, and their current position if applicable. Note that the faculty code categorizes post-doctoral research supervision as research, not teaching.
<i>Graduate students advised</i>	List all graduate student committees on which you have served. <i>Recommended:</i> a table indicating name, degree and date, department/unit, your role (committee chair/co-chair, committee member, reading committee, GSR, other). For graduate students where you were the primary mentor (i.e., chair/co-chair) include details related to their research, accomplishments (e.g., awards, fellowships, career milestones), and your mentorship. Note that the faculty code categorizes graduate research supervision as research, not teaching.
<i>Undergraduate students advised/supervised</i>	<i>Recommended:</i> a table indicating name, degree and date, department/unit, your role (e.g., capstone advisor, Mary Gates scholar, other).

EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS																																																																										
<i>Courses taught at UW, dates, summary of evaluations</i>	<i>Sample below -- Suggested template for summary of teaching and teaching evaluations. List all courses taught, whether evaluated or not evaluated. Please list courses taught more than once on successive lines.</i>																																																																									
<p><i>Sample Template</i></p> <p>Summary of Teaching and Evaluations for Taylor Jones</p> <hr/> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Course Number</th> <th rowspan="2">Qtr/Year</th> <th rowspan="2">Short Title</th> <th rowspan="2"># of Credits</th> <th rowspan="2">Responsibility</th> <th rowspan="2"># students</th> <th colspan="7">Student Ratings</th> <th rowspan="2">Peer Evaluated</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Course as a Whole</th> <th>Course Content</th> <th>Instructors Contribution</th> <th>Instructors Effectiveness</th> <th>COMBINED</th> <th>ADJUSTED COMBINED</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>OSM234</td> <td>AU2023</td> <td>Intro to OSM Methods</td> <td>3</td> <td>100%</td> <td>33</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>3.9</td> <td>4.1</td> <td>4.2</td> <td>4.2</td> <td>4.1</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>OSM 234</td> <td>AU2022</td> <td>Intro to OSM Methods</td> <td>3</td> <td>100%</td> <td>28</td> <td>3.8</td> <td>3.7</td> <td>3.7</td> <td>3.5</td> <td>3.6</td> <td>3.7</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OSM 567</td> <td>WI2022</td> <td>OSM Field Trip</td> <td>2</td> <td>100%</td> <td>12</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>POE123</td> <td>SP2021</td> <td>Water in the Environment</td> <td>4</td> <td>50%</td> <td>60</td> <td>4.2</td> <td>4.1</td> <td>4.1</td> <td>3.9</td> <td>3.8</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>X</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		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	AU2023	Intro to OSM Methods	3	100%	33	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.1		OSM 234	AU2022	Intro to OSM Methods	3	100%	28	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.7	X	OSM 567	WI2022	OSM Field Trip	2	100%	12								POE123	SP2021	Water in the Environment	4	50%	60	4.2	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.8	4.0	X
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	AU2023	Intro to OSM Methods	3	100%	33	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.1																																																															
OSM 234	AU2022	Intro to OSM Methods	3	100%	28	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.7	X																																																														
OSM 567	WI2022	OSM Field Trip	2	100%	12																																																																					
POE123	SP2021	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>Student assessment of teaching</i>	All student teaching evaluations, including student comments, since date of last promotion should be included; be sure that the course numbers are readable.																																																																									
<i>Collegial assessment of teaching</i>	Each assessment should be no more than two pages. Multi-page forms for assessments should be summarized to no more than two pages.																																																																									

UNIVERSITY AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

University	List department/school, college, and university committees that you have served on highlighting your contributions. Includes dates of service.
Professional	List professional service activities and dates of service. Examples include editorial boards, offices in professional societies, and grant proposal review.

CANDIDATE'S SELF-ASSESSMENT

The Faculty Code states that each candidate shall include a self-assessment of their qualifications for promotion in the file. Candidates are referred to [Faculty Code Section 24-32](#) and [Executive Order 45](#), which outline pertinent scholarship and professional qualifications of particular importance at the University of Washington. From [Academic HR](#): "In the self-assessment, the candidate should reflect on the significance, independence, influence, and promise of completed and in-progress scholarship and/or creative work. The focus should be on achievements in rank or title at the University of Washington, but it is important to place those achievements in context with how it fits into a larger body of work or program. Candidates holding ranks or titles with a primary emphasis in research or teaching should particularly reflect upon accomplishments and experiences that are consistent with their rank or title. All candidates should outline contributions to the profession, the University, and public service."

The narrative self-assessment is where a candidate highlights specific, significant accomplishments in the context of their scholarly and career goals and is typically on the order of 5-8 pages. 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. Candidates involved in community-engaged scholarship should describe the degree of engagement with the community, the resulting impacts, and products including non-refereed materials. Candidates may also include an additional section on broader impacts, including outreach, and contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion.



COLLEGE OF THE ENVIRONMENT
PROMOTION & TENURE GUIDELINES - School/Department
Responsibilities

Additional information to assist in preparing a promotion package

It is the school/departmental responsibility to articulate for the College Council, the Dean's Office and the Provost's Office the standards of scholarship and practice within that unit and the means of evaluation/assessment therein. The significance and impact of a candidate's dossier within the context of their position and the goals of the unit should be highlighted in a way that is easily comprehensible to a broad audience.

CHAIR/DIRECTOR'S LETTER	
<i>Complete tally of departmental vote</i>	Include total faculty votes in favor, opposed, abstain, and absent; these must sum to the total number of faculty eligible to vote. State whether the chair/director vote is included in the total number of votes.
<i>Description of research, teaching, and service activities.</i>	Describe the expected allocation of effort among research, teaching, and service given the candidate's position and rank. There should also be a short summary and evaluation of outside letters including specific recommendations regarding promotion/tenure. If there is a separate committee report, these details need not be repeated.
<i>Summary of departmental deliberation & evaluation</i>	Describe the school/department expectations of faculty of a given rank including how faculty should contribute to the overall mission and values of the unit, college, and university. Include a summary of the faculty discussion that frames how the candidate's record was evaluated in the context of these expectations and the Faculty Code, specifically noting areas of excellence and weakness. If negative votes were cast, please explain the reservations expressed at the meeting or state that reasons were not expressed. Votes to abstain or not voting (absent) act the same as a vote to oppose, and therefore should also be contextualized in the letter to the extent possible.
<i>In cases of deviations from expected tenure-clock</i>	Describe the circumstance and how it was considered during review.

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

Currently this report is optional, although most schools/departments have either ad-hoc or standing committees to evaluate candidates and reports to the faculty. If such a report is produced, 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 and how it meets the expectations of the school/department. The committee report typically summarizes the letters from outside evaluators including specific recommendations regarding promotion/tenure.

SUMMARIES & CANDIDATE'S RESPONSES

Include the following items in the documentation with names and other identifying information redacted. Candidate notifications must include documentation that the candidate was given a minimum of 7 calendar days to respond to BOTH the subcommittee AND faculty summary reports.

- 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 deliberation 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.*

EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS	
<i>Number and qualifications of external evaluators</i>	A minimum of three external evaluation letters from faculty of higher rank at peer institutions are required. All three should be at arm's length without a conflicted relationship (see below for definition of a conflict). However, it is strongly recommended that at least four unconflicted letters are obtained. An additional letter from a conflicted or from a non-faculty reviewer may in some cases be included in the dossier when the reviewer offers unique and relevant insights about the candidate. Provide a description of qualifications and rationale for why each evaluator was chosen to review the promotion case. Also indicate which individuals were suggested by the candidate. Indicate if a reviewer is not at arm's length from the candidate and why the letter was included.
<i>Conflict of interest</i>	A conflicted relationship here includes but is not limited to personal/family/business relationships, graduate and postdoc advisors, graduate and postdoc advisees, collaborators/co-investigators within 48 months, co-authors within 48 months, and co-editor within 48 months. For large collaborations (e.g., 10 or more researchers), only the researchers with whom the candidate collaborated are considered as a conflicted relationship.
<i>Chair/Director external evaluation solicitation</i>	Director External Evaluation Solicitation Letter Template can be found here .
<i>Materials provided to outside evaluators</i>	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. The solicitation letter should explicitly state what was included in the package sent to the evaluator.
<i>Chair/Director statement of external reviewer's qualifications</i>	Chair/Director statement should describe the qualifications of the external reviewers, their relationship (if any) with the candidate, the manner the external reviewers were chosen, and the reason for their choices.
<i>In cases of tenure-clock extension or acceleration</i>	If [a] tenure clock extension(s) or acceleration were requested, the Chair/Director letter to outside evaluators should include a statement that the change in the tenure clock duration meets University of Washington and College of the Environment policy. Regardless of the duration of the evaluation period, the reviewer should evaluate the case on the totality of the dossier.