COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

(Updated February 2025)

The procedures described below are designed to assist faculty to make informed recommendations concerning the award of promotion and/or tenure within the College of Education. The procedures are divided into eight steps and encompass reviews at the following four levels: (1) College of Education faculty; (2) the College of Education Advisory Council (CAC); (3) the Dean of the College of Education; and (4) the UW Provost. All steps and their procedures reflect the UW Faculty Code and policies of UW Academic Human Resources website and are reviewed periodically for that alignment.

See **Appendix A** for an outline of the four review stages.

STEP ONE:
MEMORANDUM OF INTENT

(A) The Chair of the Faculty Development and Support Committee (FDS) in consultation with the College of Education Human Resources (HR) Director distributes a Memorandum of Intent to the College of Education faculty. The Memorandum of Intent initiates the process for a faculty member to be considered for promotion and/or tenure. The FDS Chair must distribute the Memorandum of Intent by **February 1**. A sample **Memorandum of Intent** can be found in **Appendix B**.

To assist faculty with making decisions regarding putting their files forward for promotion and/or tenure, the follow guidelines have been excerpted from Chapter 24 of the UW Faculty Code:

Definitions and Criteria for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

<u>Tenure Rank Faculty</u>
Associate Professor. Appointment to the rank of **Associate Professor** requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and research, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient (Chapter 24-34A). Tenure-track Assistant Professors are a clock-managed rank that are required to undergo a mandatory review for promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure) in the last year of their second appointment term (normally the sixth year of a tenure-track appointment, but this may vary if the appointment is part-time, or if other adjustments to mandatory review dates have been approved). The promotion to Associate Professor and the granting of tenure are combined into one action for the departmental vote and recommendation.

Professor. Appointment to the rank of **Professor** requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching and in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition. (Chapter 24-34A)

<u>Non-tenure Rank Faculty</u>
Without tenure (WOT) Faculty. Faculty appointed **WOT** do not hold tenure because all or part of the faculty member's annual University-administered salary is derived from sources other than regularly appropriated state funds. Except for this distinction, WOT faculty members have the same rights, responsibilities, and obligations as tenure-track and tenured faculty members at those ranks. The description of their duties and qualifications for promotion and salary increases for reasons of merit are the same (Chapter 24-40).

Assistant Professors WOT are a clock-managed rank that must be reviewed for promotion in the last year of the second appointment term. Normally, that last year is the

sixth year of an appointment, but timing may vary if the appointment is part-time or if other adjustments to mandatory review dates have been approved.

Research Faculty. Appointment to positions with research titles including Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor or Research Professor requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis on research. Tenure is not acquired through service in research appointments (Chapter 24-34B).

Research Assistant Professors are a clock-managed rank that must be reviewed for promotion in the last year of the second appointment term. Normally, that last year is the sixth year of an appointment, but timing may vary if the appointment is part-time, or if other adjustments to mandatory review dates have been approved.

Teaching Faculty. Appointment to the rank of **Associate Teaching Professor** requires a record of substantial success in teaching and extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline as outlined in the UW Faculty Code (Chapter 24-34B). Promotion from Assistant to Associate Teaching Professor is a non-mandatory promotion. While an Assistant Teaching Professor may elect to go up for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor at any time, **the college generally would expect to see at least five years of service as an Assistant Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file.**

Appointment to the rank of **Teaching Professor** requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching and a record of excellence in instruction, service, and major contributions to their field as outlined in the UW Faculty Code (Chapter 24-34B): *exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field.* Promotion to Teaching Professor is a non-mandatory promotion. While an Associate Teaching Professor can elect to go up for promotion to Teaching Professor at any time, **the college generally would expect to see at least five years of service as an Associate Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file.**

For more information about these positions see:
https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/academic-titles-ranks/
http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html

(B) Eligible faculty of any rank, including non-tenured and tenured, who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure during the following academic year must return the Memorandum of Intent to the College HR Director by **February 15** via email. *The Memorandum of Intent must include the candidate's written signature or e-signature.*

(C) In the event that a faculty member who must be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure during the following academic year ("mandatory" review) does not sign and return a Memorandum of Intent by **February 15**, the FDS Chair will attempt to contact the individual to inform him/her that s/he must sign and return the Memorandum of Intent.

In this case, the College HR Director must receive the individual's Memorandum of Intent by **March 1**.

Should the absence of a faculty member during Winter Quarter make it impossible for him/her to sign and return the Memorandum of Intent by **March 1**, the deadline may be extended to **April 15**. In order to facilitate the review process, faculty members who are absent during winter quarter are encouraged to sign and return the Memorandum of Intent to the College HR Director as soon as possible.

STEP TWO:
FORMATION OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR PROMOTION REVIEW (SPR)

The Faculty Development and Support Committee (FDS) forms an SPR using the process below for each candidate with the following charge:
- Advises candidate on file including personal statement, CV, publications/artifacts to send to external reviewers, examples of teaching effectiveness, and contributions to service
- Solicits and reads letters from external reviewers
- Makes initial determination regarding whether or not candidate should move forward with promotion and/or tenure
- Assuming candidate moves forward, writes recommendation and report to "make the case" for candidate's promotion and/or tenure

(A) By **March 6**, the College HR Director informs the FDS Chair and the Chair of Faculty Council (FC)/the Faculty President of all candidates who wish to be considered for promotion and/or promotion and tenure during the academic year.

(B) A total of three faculty members will comprise each candidate's SPR nominated independently by each of the following: the candidate, the candidate's Area Chair; and the Faculty Council Chair (FC Chair) nominates one faculty member. Candidates should consult with their Area Chair to determine their nominee but the candidate's nominee is separate from the Area Chair's nominee.

Candidates, Area Chairs, and the FC Chair should not contact their nominees directly. Instead, they should submit their nominees to the FDS Chair; the FDS Chair will then contact each nominee to secure their written agreement to serve on the SPR per Step 2D below.

(C) All members of the SPR must be: a.) Voting members of the College of Education faculty; b.) Senior in rank to the candidate; and c.) Available to serve on the SPR during Spring Quarter when the SPR is formed and also during the following Fall Quarter when the candidate's file will be reviewed. In the event that a faculty member is not available to serve on the SPR during Spring Quarter, but will be available to serve on the SPR during the following Fall Quarter, the FDS Chair may invite an alternate faculty member to serve as a substitute during Spring Quarter. In the event that a faculty member is not available to serve on the SPR during Fall Quarter, but will be available to serve on the SPR during Spring Quarter, the FDS Chair may invite an alternate faculty member to serve as a substitute during Fall Quarter. The FDS Chair will make every effort to ensure that each candidate's SPR includes diverse perspectives from the College of Education faculty.

(D) The process for contacting nominees to serve on SPRs proceeds as follows. First, the FDS Chair contacts the candidate to request the name of the candidate's nominee. Upon receiving the name of the candidate's nominee, the FDS chair contacts the nominee to

secure their written agreement to serve on the candidate's SPR. The FDS chair then contacts the candidate's Area Chair to request the name of the Area Chair's nominee. Upon receiving the name of the Area Chair's nominee, the FDS Chair contacts the nominee to secure their written agreement to serve on the candidate's SPR. Finally, the FDS Chair contacts the FC Chair to request the name of the FC Chair's nominee. Upon receiving the name of the FC Chair's nominee, the FDS Chair contacts the nominee to secure their written agreement to serve on the candidate's SPR. The FDS Chair must receive written or email consent from each nominee. The FDS Chair transmits each faculty member's consent to the FC Chair.

(E) By the end of the first week of Spring Quarter, the FDS Chair sends a written or email memorandum to each candidate and to the three members of the candidate's SPR. This memorandum confirms the appointment of the candidate's SPR and informs candidates and SPR members of the SPR's charge and responsibilities.

STEP THREE:
PROMOTION AND TENURE ORIENTATION SESSIONS

During a March meeting of the general Faculty, the FDS Chair or his/her designee in consultation with the FC Chair, conducts a Promotion/Promotion and Tenure orientation session. While the orientation is intended for candidates and SPR members, all faculty members are strongly encouraged to attend.

In addition, prior to **April 15**, the Dean and an FDS Representative will conduct a meeting to orient the SPR members to the work of an SPR committee.

STEP FOUR:
SPR REVIEW PROCESS

(A) By **April 15**, the candidate submits a copy of his/her initial promotion/tenure file to all members of the SPR. To prepare this file, consult **Appendix C: Guidelines for Preparing Promotion/Tenure Files**. **Appendix H provides additional guidance for Teaching Professors.**

(B) By **April 15**, andidates are required to complete an External Reviewer Nomination form in Interfolio with at least three individuals for the SPR to consider asking to serve as external reviewers.

(C) By **April 21**, the FDS Chair directs the SPR member nominated by the FC Chair to convene the initial meeting of the SPR. The initial meeting does not include the candidate. The purpose of the initial meeting is to: a.) Select a Chair of the SPR; b.) Review the candidate's file, and identify strengths and weaknesses of the file; and c.) Confirm the timeline for all future SPR activities and meetings. The SPR Chair, selected during this meeting, will be responsible for convening all subsequent meetings of the SPR and for ensuring the timely completion of all necessary documents.

(D) By **April 30**, the SPR Chair convenes a meeting of the SPR. This meeting includes the candidate. During this meeting, the SPR ensures that the candidate's file contains (or will contain) all required elements. The SPR should communicate what they see as strengths and weaknesses of the file, and may also make suggestions for how the candidate could improve his/her file.

(E) By **May 15**, the SPR should secure 3-5 scholars at peer institutions who agree to serve as external reviewers who will evaluate the candidate's file. Candidates are required to complete an External Reviewer Nomination form in Interfolio with at least three individuals for the SPR to consider asking to serve as external reviewers. However, the final selection of external reviewers must be made by the SPR and the final list of external reviewers must *not* shared with the candidate.

Candidates for Associate Teaching Professor may have review letters that are external to the college but internal to UW. Candidates for Full Teaching Professor must all be external to UW.

The SPR must track all external reviewers in the [required External Reviewer Grid](#)– documenting there who participated as external reviewers and those who were nominated to submit a letter but declined or accepted and did not submit a letter. The SPR then must send the completed grid to the HR Director to upload to Interfolio as part of the candidate's case. The completed grid *must not* be shared with the candidate.

(F) By **June 15**, the SPR should work with the HR Director to send the candidate's file to each of the external reviewers in Interfolio. While it is appropriate for the SPR to make

individual contact directly with proposed external reviewers, transmission of the candidate file and receipt of the external letters must occur through Interfolio.

Consult **Appendix D: Guidelines for Soliciting External Review Letters.**

(G) By **September 30** of the academic year during which the candidate will be considered for tenure and/or promotion, the candidate must finish uploading all finalized documents to his/her file.

(H) By **October 11**, the SPR meets to discuss the external letters that it has received and consider its recommendation regarding the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion. This meeting does not include the candidate.

(I) By **October 15**, the SPR prepares a written report of the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion.

The SPR report should clearly state the SPR's recommendation concerning the award of tenure and/or promotion and should demonstrate that its recommendation is based on evidence from the candidate's overall record. In the event that SPR members are not able to reach a consensus recommendation, individual members may prepare separate reports.

The SPR report for all candidates except research faculty must include a summation of the candidate's scholarly productivity or scholarship, teaching effectiveness, and service activity. Each section of the report (scholarly productivity or scholarship, teaching effectiveness, and service activity) should be discussed clearly and separately.

For research faculty candidates, the written report should focus on the candidate's research.

The SPR report for candidates in teaching faculty appointments should include a summary of the candidate's position description including specific instructional responsibilities, curriculum development, expertise, leadership, program work, etc. as appropriate to the candidate's position and rank. Following, it should include a summation of the candidate's accomplishments and qualification for promotion relative to these criteria, with each section of the report clearly and separately identified.

SPR reports for candidates at all ranks should summarize the comments of external reviewers. The report should clearly explain how reviewers were selected, identify the reviewers' names and institutional affiliations, and describe each reviewer's qualifications to review the candidate's file.

For more information, consult **Appendix E: Guidelines for Preparing the SPR Report.**

(J) No later than 14 days before the general faculty review begins, the SPR meets with the candidate to discuss its recommendation.

No later than 8 days before the period of general faculty review begins, the SPR provides the candidate with a redacted version of its written report in Interfolio. To preserve confidentiality, the redacted report must delete all information concerning the identities of the external reviewers. This redacted report must be uploaded to Interfolio with the file name "Subcommittee Summary." The SPR chair will provide the file to the HR Director for uploading into Interfolio.

(K) Upon receiving the SPR's redacted report and recommendation, the candidate decides either to continue with the promotion/tenure process or to withdraw from further consideration. The candidate has 7 days to respond to the SPR report in Interfolio, if they wish. If the candidate decides to withdraw from further consideration at this point, they should communicate that in writing to the SPR chair and HR Director and the SPR's written report will not be presented to the faculty.

(L) If the candidate decides to remain under consideration, the SPR Chair/designee will work with the HR Director to confirm all required materials, documents and forms are in the candidate's file in Interfolio, including: a.) The full (non-redacted) SPR written report; b.) The redacted copy of the SPR written report; c.) The candidate's response to the redacted report if one was provided; d.) The completed External Reviewer Grid; and e.) All external reviewer letters. These materials must be in Interfolio no later than 1 day prior to the beginning of the general faculty review of files.

If the candidate does not wish to proceed, the candidate should notify the HR Director to close the file in Interfolio.

STEP FIVE:
GENERAL FACULTY REVIEW

No later than June 1 of the preceding academic year, the FDS Chair in consultation with the College HR Director establishes the dates when eligible faculty will review candidates' files. The review period lasts for at least two weeks. **It should begin between October 29 and November 6 and should end between November 12 and November 20**.

No later than the October general faculty meeting, the FDS Chair explains the procedures for reviewing promotion/tenure files and announces the dates when files will be available for review. The FDS Chair also announces the date of the fall faculty meeting to discuss candidates' files. (See Step Six below).

At least one day prior to the start of the general faculty review, the FDS Chair distributes a memo reminding all eligible faculty members above the rank of Assistant Professor of the dates and procedures for the general faculty review and the date of the meeting to discuss the candidates' files.

Files will be available for review in Interfolio by eligible faculty for a period of no less than two calendar weeks, ending no later than **November 20**.

STEP SIX:
MEETING AND VOTE BY ELIGIBLE FACULTY

(A) On the specified date, the FDS Chair convenes a meeting of all faculty members who are senior in academic rank to one or more candidates being considered for promotion and/or tenure. Faculty with instructional titles shall be considered by faculty who hold an appointment as associate professor or professor or an instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered (Chapter 24-54A). All eligible voting faculty members are expected to attend this meeting.

The discussion of candidates undergoing mandatory and non-mandatory review typically occurs during the same meeting. In the event that the number of candidates for promotion is so large as to make reasonable consideration within one session difficult, discussion may be scheduled over multiple sessions but the discussion of any single candidate must not extend beyond one meeting.

The meeting(s) for all candidates undergoing both mandatory and also non-mandatory review must be completed no later than November 20.

The meeting(s) will proceed as follows:

i.) An FDS member who is a Full Professor with voting privileges will chair the meeting. The chair will conduct the meeting in a manner that will allow equal opportunity for the fair consideration of all candidates.

ii.) The first part of the meeting shall consider Assistant Teaching Professors seeking promotion to Associate Teaching Professors. All voting faculty in the College of Education holding the rank of Associate Professor and Professor are expected to attend this portion of the meeting

Then, the meeting will consider Associate Teaching Professors seeking promotion to Teaching Professors. All voting faculty in the College of Education holding the rank of d Professor are expected to attend this portion of the meeting.

For a matrix further specifying who may attend different portions of this meeting, see: https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/actions/promotions-tenure/promotion-and-tenure-voting-matrix/

This discussion will be followed by Assistant Professors seeking tenure/promotion to the rank of Associate Professor whose review is mandatory. This discussion shall be followed by a consideration of Assistant Professors seeking tenure/promotion to the rank of Associate Professor whose review is not mandatory. All voting faculty in the College of Education holding the rank of Associate Professor or above are expected to attend this portion of the meeting.

iii.) Each candidate will be discussed in turn. A member of the candidate's SPR will provide a summative statement of the SPR's overall recommendation. Following this statement, the chair will open the floor for questions and discussion. If necessary, the chair will ask a discussant to yield the floor to allow all concerned faculty an opportunity to speak. The chair may terminate the discussion of a candidate after a reasonable period in order to allow sufficient time for the discussion of remaining candidates.

Following the discussion of Assistant Professors seeking promotion and/or tenure to the rank of Associate Professor, candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Full Professor shall be considered. Voting faculty in the College of Education holding the rank of Full Professor are expected to attend this portion of the meeting. The discussion shall proceed in the manner described in steps (i) through (iv) above.

iv.) FDS members, or faculty members designated by the FDS Chair, will take notes summarizing the discussion of each candidate. Because the faculty's review is separate from the CAC's review, faculty members who take notes during the faculty meeting should not be members of the CAC. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions must be omitted from the written summary of the faculty discussion. Note-takers should consult **Appendix F: Guidelines for Summarizing Faculty Discussions Regarding Promotion or Tenure of Candidates.**

(B) At the conclusion of the meeting(s), the FDS Chair or his/her designee and the HR Director distribute electronic ballots to all eligible voting faculty members. The voting period will take place over a period of one week and must conclude no later than **November 27**. All eligible voting faculty members are responsible for submitting their completed electronic ballots by 5:00 p.m. on the last day of the voting period.

(C) No later than 3 days after the conclusion of the faculty meeting, the FDS Chair or his/her designee will work with the HR Director to provide each candidate with a written summary of the faculty's discussion of his/her file in Interfolio.

(D) Candidates have the opportunity to respond in Interfolio to this summary within 7 calendar days of receiving it.

STEP SEVEN:
REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE ADVISORY COUNCIL (CAC)

The CAC is responsible for reviewing each candidate's file and for making a recommendation regarding promotion/tenure. While the CAC's recommendation considers the faculty's recommendation and vote, the CAC's recommendation is separate from that of the faculty and may differ from it. The CAC's review and recommendation goes to the Dean. While the Dean considers the CAC's recommendation, the Dean's recommendation and the CAC's recommendation may differ. The Dean forwards the CAC's recommendation to the Provost.

(A) The CAC shall be composed of 5 faculty members who are Full Professors in the College of Education and may include faculty in research or teaching positions if there are relevant files under review, per the COE bylaws: https://education.uw.edu/sites/default/files/mycoe/facstaff/faculty/Faculty%20Code%20revised%20November_20_2020.pdf.

CAC members will serve a 2-year term, with at least two members overlapping with members who were elected the previous year.

(B) The election of CAC members will proceed as follows:

i.) The FDS Chair and the FC Chair in consultation with the HR Director will prepare a list of all eligible Full Professors who are available to serve on the CAC. Based on this list, the FDS Chair and the FC Chair will prepare a slate of candidates. The FDS Chair will obtain the consent of each candidate who has been slated to serve on the CAC.

ii.) By May 20, the final slate of candidates will be presented to all College of Education faculty members who are eligible to vote on the slate (including eligible Research faculty). The FDS Chair and the HR Director will construct an electronic ballot, and an electronic vote will be conducted. The voting period will last for one week and must conclude by June 1.

(C) Within two weeks of the conclusion of the faculty vote on candidates' files in November, and no later than December 4, the CAC meets to review each candidate's file. A CAC member may recuse him/herself from discussing a candidate, if s/he served on the candidate's SPR.

(D) The CAC prepares a written report of each candidate's file. The report includes the candidate's vote tally. The CAC report must clearly state its recommendation for each candidate and the reasons for its recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions must be omitted from the CAC report.

Consult **Appendix G**: **Guidelines for Writing the CAC Report.**

(E) The CAC shares its written report and recommendation for each candidate with the Dean. For mandatory reviews, the Dean must receive the CAC report and recommendation by **December 7**. For non-mandatory reviews, the Dean must receive the CAC report and recommendation by **January 7**.

(F) The CAC shares its written report with candidates in Interfolio. This report must be uploaded to Interfolio with the file name SCC Committee Summary. The CAC can work with the HR Director to coordinate uploading this file and sharing it with the candidate. The CAC report for each candidate includes the candidate's vote tally. In the event that the recommendation of the CAC is not favorable or conflicts with the faculty vote, the UW Faculty Code stipulates that the CAC <u>must</u> provide a written copy of its report to the candidate per UW Faculty Code Chapter 24-54C.

(G) Chapter 24-54C of the UW Code provides no opportunity for candidates to respond to the CAC report.

STEP EIGHT:
DEAN'S REVIEW

(A) Upon receiving the CAC written report and recommendation for each candidate, the Dean writes his/her recommendation. In making his/her recommendation, the Dean will review all of the candidate's materials, including the external letters, the SPR report, the candidate's response to the redacted version of the SPR report, the written summaries from the faculty meeting, the candidate's response to summary of the faculty discussion, the faculty vote, and the CAC report/recommendation. For mandatory reviews, the Dean must submit the candidate's file and Dean's recommendation to the Provost by December 15. For non-mandatory reviews, the Dean must submit the candidate's file and Dean's recommendation to the Provost by **February 1**.

(B) Chapter 24-54D of the UW Faculty Code provides guidelines by which the Dean shall communicate his/her recommendation to candidates. The following summary of the code is adapted for our non-departmentalized unit from: https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/actions/promotions-tenure/part-2-recommendations-and-candidates-opportunity-for-response/

After receiving the CAC report, the Dean prepares their initial recommendation or decision and transmits a summary to the candidate with their rationale in Interfolio. The candidate will have 7 calendar days to respond in Interfolio.

If the Dean's initial recommendation or decision is favorable, then the case is transmitted directly to the Provost. There is no specific opportunity for candidate response.

If the dean's initial recommendation or decision is not favorable, then the dean, or designee, must discuss the recommendation/decision with the candidate, documenting any specific requests for additional information or clarification. The candidate may respond in writing to the dean within 7 calendar days of the discussion. If the dean revises their recommendation after considering the candidate's written response, a copy shall be shared with the candidate.

In non-mandatory promotion cases, the Dean has the authority to render a negative final decision. In all other circumstances, the Dean's recommendation is advisory to the Provost and the entire file shall be transmitted to the Provost for their review. Should a candidate submit a written response to a negative, non-mandatory decision by the dean, then the file shall be transmitted to the Provost for information purposes only.

(C) Upon receiving a recommendation from the Dean, the Provost shall formulate an initial decision. If this decision is positive, then the candidate will receive a congratulatory letter by the date listed on the Promotion and Tenure Notification Date page.

If the initial decision of the Provost is negative, the Provost shall formalize a written summary of the decision and reasons therefor and share it with the candidate and Dean.

The Dean may respond in writing, with a copy to the candidate, within 5 calendar days, and the candidate may respond in writing within 7 calendar days. The Provost shall review any responses submitted and make a final decision. The Dean shall ensure that the candidate is informed in writing of the result and, if the result is not favorable, of the reasons therefore.

APPENDICES AND LINKS

Appendix A: Promotion and Tenure: Four Stages of Review

Appendix B: Sample Memorandum of Intent

Appendix C: Guidelines for Preparing Promotion/Tenure Files

Appendix D: Guidelines for Soliciting External Review Letters

Appendix E: Guidelines for Preparing the SPR Written Report

Appendix F: Guidelines for Summarizing Faculty Discussions Regarding Promotion/Tenure of Candidates

Appendix G: Guidelines for Preparing the CAC Report

Appendix H: Promotion Guidelines for Teaching Faculty

Link to Chapter 24 of the UW Faculty Code
http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCGTOC.html

Link to "Promotion and Tenure Overview" from UW Academic Human Resources
https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/actions/promotions-tenure/

APPENDIX A: PROMOTION AND TENURE: FOUR STAGES OF REVIEW

STAGE 1: COE FACULTY

A. SPR (Sub-committee for Promotion Review) (Spring-Fall)
- Advises candidate on file including personal statement, CV, publications/artifacts to send to external reviewers, examples of teaching effectiveness, and contributions to service
- Solicits and reads letters from external reviewers
- Makes initial determination regarding whether or not candidate should move forward with promotion and/or tenure
- Assuming candidate moves forward, writes recommendation and report to "make the case" for candidate's promotion and/or tenure

B. COE faculty senior in rank to candidate (Fall)
- Review candidate's file
- Attend and participate in meeting to discuss candidate's file
- Vote to support or deny candidate's promotion and/or tenure

STAGE 2: COLLEGE ADVISORY COUNCIL (CAC) (December)

- Reviews faculty recommendation, including faculty vote + notes from faculty meeting. Also reviews candidate's complete file (including external review letters, SPR's recommendation, candidate's response to SPR letter and candidate's response to faculty meeting notes)
- Writes recommendation to support or not support candidate's promotion and/or tenure

STAGE 3: COE DEAN (December)

- Reviews candidate's file, faculty vote, and CAC recommendation/report.
- Writes letter to Provost to support or not support candidate's promotion and/or tenure.

STAGE 4: UW PROVOST/PRESIDENT (Winter/Spring of the following year)

APPENDIX B: SAMPLE MEMORANDUM OF INTENT

February 1, 20XX

TO: College Faculty

FROM: Chair of the Faculty Development and Support Committee (FDS)

RE: Promotion and Tenure Notification of Intent

Any eligible professorial Assistant or Associate Professor faculty, including tenure-track, WOT, teaching or research wishing to be considered for Tenure and/or Promotion during Autumn Quarter 20XX must inform the College Human Resources (HR) Director of his/her intent by signing at the bottom of this memorandum. Signatures may be submitted electronically.

Return this memorandum with your signature to the College HR Director (Bernadette Dwyer) no later than February 15, 20XX.

All faculty members who are declaring their intent to be considered for promotion and/or tenure are expected to review the UW and COE documents regarding promotion and tenure. The most recent version of these documents can be found on the COE website: https://education.uw.edu/my-coe/facstaff/fac-promo

PLEASE RETURN TO: Bernadette Dwyer, dwyer@uw.edu February 15, 20XX

....

Yes, I wish to be considered for Promotion/Tenure during Autumn Quarter 20XX.

Signature_____ Date_____

Name (please print)

_____

APPENDIX C: GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROMOTION/TENURE FILES

OVERVIEW

Your file consists of evidence and documentation, which you and your Subcommittee for Promotion (SPR) will use to justify your case for promotion/tenure. For tenure-track and without-tenure (WOT) faculty members, evidence should focus on your cumulative record across the areas of research, teaching, and service. For research faculty members, evidence should focus on your cumulative record of research; evidence of teaching and service also may be included, depending on the individual case. For teaching faculty members, evidence should focus on your cumulative record of instructional excellence, scholarship, experience, and other responsibilities associated with your job description. **See Appendix H for additional information for teaching faculty.**

You are responsible for assembling most of the information for your file and uploading it into Interfolio. The HR Director will provide you access to Interfolio.

REQUIRED ELEMENTS

The College of Education requires that your file include the following elements. You may also find it useful to review the Academic HR website for further guidance on assembling your file: **https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/actions/promotions-tenure/assembly-of-record/**

Excepted where noted below, you are responsible for uploading evidence of each of the following into Interfolio by May 1 to be ready for external reviewers. You may continue to add or update your Interfolio file up until your file is forwarded to COE faculty fo review in the fall. Check the instructions below for specific formatting requirements.

1. Personal statement
You prepare a personal statement, 4-6 pages in length, supporting your candidacy for promotion/tenure. Your statement should focus on the major arguments for your promotion/tenure and should discuss evidence across the areas of research, teaching, scholarship, and service, as appropriate to your position. Research faculty members should emphasize their cumulative record of research; teaching and service may be included, depending on the individual case. Teaching faculty should emphasize their cumulative record of instructional excellence; research may be included, depending on the individual case.

Ask your SPR for feedback on your personal statement. You can expect to write several drafts of your statement before it is ready to be placed in your file.

2. Current curriculum vitae (CV)

Your CV should list current and past academic positions, your educational history, scholarly products, teaching/advising, service, and relevant experience. Lists of professional experiences and publications should be noted in descending order from the most to the least recent experience or publication. When referencing organizations, associations, journals, and periodicals, provide full names.

Ask your SPR to read through your CV for formatting suggestions and clarity.

3. Four-six exemplary publications

Publications should represent the breadth and quality of your scholarship. Your SPR can help you choose the publications to include in your file.

Teaching Faculty:"Scholarship is an obligation of all faculty members" (UW Faculty Code Section 24-32 A)." Teaching faculty may demonstrate their scholarship in a variety of ways (Section 24-32), including but not limited to: introduction of new knowledge or methods into course content; creation or use of innovative pedagogical methods; development of new courses, curricula, or course materials; participation in professional conferences; evidence of student performance; receipt of grants or awards; contributions to interdisciplinary teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations; or significant outreach to professionals at other educational institutions. While you can demonstrate your scholarship through peer reviewed journal publications, those publications are not required.

4. Evidence of teaching and advising effectiveness

Such evidence includes all the following:
- Student Evaluations: Include copies of summary sheets from the University's Instructional Assessment System (IAS). UW Faculty Code 24-57 requires that all faculty members must have at least one course evaluated by students every year during which they have teaching responsibilities. Arrange the student evaluations in reverse chronological order (most recent evaluation first) and upload to Interfolio as one PDF with the name Student Teaching Evals.

- Written peer evaluation(s) of teaching: Peer evaluations of your teaching are required annually for Assistant Professors and at least once every three years for Associate and Full Professors. **Associate Professors and Teaching faculty** must have a peer evaluation of teaching for the year immediately prior to the year they wish to be considered for promotion. Arrange the peer evaluations in reverse chronological order (most recent evaluation first) and upload to Interfolio as one PDF with the name Peer Teaching Evals.

  Peer evaluations may address one or more of the following: written observation of teaching, assessment of teaching materials such as syllabi or lesson plans, assessment of student evaluations or other evidence of student learning, etc.

- Summary of student advising (as appropriate to the rank)
  a. Number of Doctoral committees (chair):
  b. Number of Doctoral committees (committee member):
  c. Total number of students awarded the Doctoral degree:
  d. Number of Masters students (chair):
  e. Number of Masters students (committee member, if relevant):
     f. Total number of students awarded the Masters degree:
     g. Number of undergraduate advisees (if relevant):

- Additional evidence of teaching (if appropriate/desired): Evidence may include additional written evaluations by peers (beyond the required number), course syllabi, evidence of student achievement or publications, undergraduate and/or on-line courses that you developed, etc. For faculty at teaching faculty ranks, this may include evidence associated with instruction, professional development, curriculum/program design, mentorship, leadership within and outside the COE.

5. Evidence of service
Your CV and personal statement must include sections devoted to your professional service. For example, in your CV you can create a list of organizations and associations with which you have been affiliated with dates of office, special positions, and/or special assignments. When discussing your service, please refer to your work within the following arenas as appropriate:

- College - committees, administration, special projects, etc. (Examples: Faculty Council; Diversity Committee; program development; etc.)
- University – committees; administrative work; special projects; etc. (Examples: Faculty Senate; Royalty Research Fund Committee, etc.)
- Professional organizations – membership; offices held; program planning; committees; etc. For each organization, specify whether it is local, regional, national or international. (Example: American Educational Research Association, Chairperson, Section H, national; Editorial Board for *Science Education* (journal), regional, etc.)
- Community – committees; offices held; consultations; etc. (Examples: State Superintendent of Public Instruction Office, Consultant, Curriculum Writing Committee; Seattle Public Schools, Bilingual Training Program Review Committee, etc.)

6. In consultation with your SPR, you may choose to include additional evidence in your file. Additional evidence can include:
- Scholarly products beyond the 4-6 required publications described in #3 above (additional peer-reviewed articles, books, and/or chapters; measures that you developed; etc.)
- Works accepted for publication but not yet in print

- Documents related to internally and externally funded projects
- Policy reports/briefs
- Professional presentations (list topic, name, place)
- Curriculum materials
- Program materials/designs
- Leadership documents
- Documents from community partners/collaborators
- Editorials that you wrote
- Evidence of service

7. Letters from external reviewers
In Interfolio, you will enter at least three nominees to serve as external reviewers. Your SPR will then solicit 3-5 letters from external reviewers which may or may not include your nominees. For reasons of confidentiality, you will not see these letters or learn the names of your reviewers. Your SPR will upload the external review letters to your file.

8. SPR Report + Recommendation
The SPR Report summarizes your qualifications for promotion/tenure, includes comments from your external reviewers, and states your SPR's recommendation regarding your case. Your SPR will write two versions of its report.

One version includes information that identifies your external reviewers. Your SPR will present this version of its report to the faculty and also will upload it to your file. You do not see this version of your SPR's report.

Your SPR also prepares a second redacted version of its report, which omits all information that could identify your external reviewers. The redacted version of the SPR report will not be included in your file. However, you will see and may respond to the redacted version of your SPR's report in Interfolio. See #9 below.

9. Candidate's Response to redacted SPR Report + Recommendation
According to the UW Faculty Code, you may respond in Interfolio to the redacted version of your SPR's report within 7 days of receiving it.

10. Candidate's Response to Summary Discussion from the fall Faculty Meeting
FDS (and/or FDS designees) writes notes from the faculty discussion of your file and shares those notes with you in Interfolio where you may also respond to the notes. Per UW Faculty Code, you have 7 days upon receiving the notes to offer a response.

11. Report of the College Advisory Committee (CAC) uploaded into Interfolio. You may review the CAC report there but you do not have an opportunity to respond.

APPENDIX D: GUIDELINES FOR SOLICITING EXTERNAL REVIEW LETTERS

The information in this Appendix is taken from a document supplied by Academic HR entitled, "Promotion and Tenure Overview." For a copy of this document, click here:
http://ap.washington.edu/ahr/resources/tenure-promotion/

The SPR will request external letters from 3-5 scholars at peer institutions who will evaluate the candidate's scholarship and scholarly reputation. In the case of candidates promoting to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor, it may be appropriate to solicit letters from experts who are external to the College of Education but who are within the UW community, as long as the reviewer is qualified and can provide an "arm's length" assessment of the candidate's qualifications for the rank. **Candidates promoting to the rank of Full Teaching Professor MUST have all external review letters be external to UW.**

Before sending a formal request in Interfolio, the SPR Chair or his/her designee will contact the reviewer by email or phone to explain the nature of the candidate's position (tenure-track; non-tenure instructional) and the review, and the timeline for the reviewer to complete his/her evaluation. The formal request for evaluation must be made by letter and must be signed by the SPR Chair. The HR Director will send candidate materials to the external reviewer through Interfolio with a copy of the SPR Chair's solicitation letter. Note: The names of external reviewers and their letters are not shared with candidates.

The letters must provide information specified by Academic HR and include the text in the sample templates available here:

https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/actions/promotions-tenure/letter-of-solicitation/

APPENDIX E: GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING THE SPR WRITTEN REPORT

General Information

The purpose of the SPR written report is to summarize the candidate's qualifications and to state the SPR's recommendation as to whether the candidate should be promoted and/or granted tenure.

The SPR prepares **two** versions of its report. Both versions will be added to the candidate's file. The full version of the report must provide specific information about external reviewers. The other version of the report will be shared with the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, this version of the report must be redacted to omit all information that might reveal the identities of external reviewers.

In the event that a consensus among the SPR is not reached, individual members may prepare separate reports.

The report must be finalized by October 15 of the academic year in which the candidate's file is being considered for promotion and/or tenure. The SPR provides the candidate with a redacted version of its written report in Interfolio no later than 8 days before the general faculty review.

Guidelines for Recommendation

When making its recommendation, the SPR should keep in mind the following stipulations from the UW Faculty Code:

Assistant to Associate Professor, tenure-track or WOT: "Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in teaching and/or research. For tenured, tenure-eligible, or WOT appointments, both of these shall be required, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient. (Chapter 24-34A.2)

Associate to Full Professor, tenure-track or WOT: "Appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and/or accomplishments in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition. For tenured, tenure-eligible, or WOT appointments, both of these shall be required." (Chapter 24- 34A.3)

Note: WOT Faculty: "WOT faculty members have the same rights, responsibilities, and obligations as tenure-track and tenured faculty members at those ranks. The description of their duties and qualifications for promotion and salary increases for reasons of merit are the same." (Chapter 24-40B)

<u>Research Faculty</u>: Appointment to a rank "with a *research* title requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon research." (Chapter 24-34B.5)

<u>Teaching Faculty:</u> Appointment as a teaching faculty requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon teaching. (Chapter 24-34B.3)

<u>Assistant Teaching Professor to Associate Teaching Professor:</u> "Appointment with the title of associate teaching professor requires extensive training, competence, and experience in the discipline." (Chapter 24-34B.3b)

<u>Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor:</u> "Appointment with the title of teaching professor requires a record of excellence in instruction, which may be demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field." (Chapter 23-34B.3c)

Substance of the Report

For candidates on tenure-track and WOT appointments, the written report must include a summation of the candidate's scholarly productivity, teaching effectiveness, and service activity. Each section of the report (scholarly productivity, teaching effectiveness, and service activity) should be <u>clearly</u> and <u>separately </u>identified. For research faculty candidates, the written report should focus on the candidate's research. For teaching faculty candidates, the written report should focus on the candidate's instructional excellence.

Effective reports include evidence that clearly demonstrates the candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure and justifies the SPR's recommendation.

Summary of Evidence of Scholarly Productivity and/or Scholarship:
The SPR letter should state the name and institutional affiliation of each external reviewer, describe the reviewer's qualifications, and explain why the SPR chose the reviewer to evaluate the candidate's scholarship. Quotations from external letters typically provide the most compelling evidence of a candidate's scholarship, scholarly achievements and productivity. The redacted letter that is shared with candidates must omit all information that could reveal the identities of the external reviewers.

Success in obtaining external funding and in serving as principal investigators for grants and contracts is an important source of evidence for research faculty. Grant production also is an important evidentiary source for many (but not necessarily all) tenure-track candidates. Teaching faculty may serve as principal investigators and engage in external research, but are not required to do so.

Summary of Evidence of Productivity: Associate and Teaching Professors
The SPR letter should state the name and institutional affiliation of each external reviewer, describe the reviewer's qualifications, and explain why the SPR chose the reviewer to evaluate the candidate for promotion. Quotations from external letters typically provide the most compelling evidence of a candidate's achievements. The redacted letter that is shared with candidates must omit all information that could reveal the identities of the external reviewers.

SPR letters may highlight and explain the candidate's samples of curriculum development, course design, policy briefs, etc.

Summary of Evidence of Teaching: Tenure-track, WOT, and Teaching Faculty
Evidence of a candidate's teaching ability can include (but is not limited to) letters from peer-reviewers in the College of Education, teaching evaluations from students, work with advisees, syllabi, leadership in creating and/or sustaining new programs, success in developing attractive on-line courses, comments from student advisees, and work with the UW Center for Teaching and Learning. For the Teaching faculty ranks, evidence may be associated with professional development, curriculum/program design, mentorship, leadership within and outside the College of Education)

Summary of Evidence of Service: All ranks
Evidence of service can include (but is not limited to) the candidate's contributions to the College and the University. It also can include leadership in professional organizations and conferences and editorial service to professional journals. Service to the public at the local, state, national, and international levels is a compelling source of evidence for many College of Education faculty members.

Summary of Additional Evidence associated with Associate and Teaching Professors
Associate Teaching Professor is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline (Chapter 24-34B.3). While an Assistant Teaching Professor may elect to go up for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor at any time, we generally would expect to see at least five years of service as an Assistant Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file. Assistant Teaching Professor candidates who wish to be considered for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor will need to address these areas as outlined in the UW Faculty Code: *extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline.*

Teaching Professor is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in instruction is demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field (Chapter 24-34B.3). While an Associate Teaching Professor can elect to go up for promotion to Teaching Professor at any time, we generally expect to see at least five years of service as an Associate Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file. Associate Teaching Professor candidates who wish to be considered for promotion to Teaching Professor will need to address these areas as

outlined in the UW Faculty Code: *exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field evidence of contributions inside and outside of the COE/UW.*

APPENDIX F: GUIDELINES FOR SUMMARIZING FACULTY DISCUSSIONS REGARDING PROMOTION/TENURE OF CANDIDATES

College of Education, University of Washington
Notes from Faculty Meeting Regarding Promotion and/or Tenure

Members of FDS or designees appointed by the FDS Chair will take notes summarizing the discussion of each candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions must be omitted from the written summary.

Date of Meeting:

Candidate Name:
Name of Scribe/Note-taker:

Recommendation of the SPR:

Discussion of faculty members in attendance:

Strengths

Questions

Concerns

Counterarguments

APPENDIX G: GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING THE CAC REPORT

**College of Education Advisory Council (CAC)
Report and Recommendation Regarding Promotion/Tenure**

Date of CAC Meeting:

Names of CAC Members:

Candidate's Name:

For Tenure-Track, WOT, and Research Candidates: Brief description of candidate's research (1-2 sentences)

For Teaching Faculty Candidates: Brief description of candidate's responsibilities (1-2 sentences)

Recommendation of the Subcommittee for Promotion and Tenure (SPR)
SPR's overall recommendation: Dr. ____'s Subcommittee for Promotion Review "strongly and unanimously recommends that Dr. ____ be promoted to Associate Professor/Professor with tenure……… Associate Teaching Professor/Teaching Professor"

 Associate Professor or Full Professor
 Candidate's Scholarship: "Drawing on the assessments of five external reviewers, the SPR concludes that Dr. _____'s scholarship…"

 Candidate's Teaching + Advising: "As a teacher and advisor, Dr. _____ has excelled…."

 Candidate's Service: "Dr. _____ also has an outstanding record of service…"

Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor (selected categories as appropriate to rank and position description - See Appendix F)
 Candidate's Teaching + Advising: "As a teacher and advisor, Dr. _____ has excelled…."

 Candidate's Service: "Dr. _____ also has an outstanding record of service…"

 Candidate's Scholarship: "Drawing on the assessments of five external reviewers, the SPR concludes that Dr. _____'s scholarship…"

 Other categories:
 Assistant to Associate Teaching Professor: Extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline

Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor: Exemplary success in curriculum design and implementation, student mentoring and service, and leadership to the department, School/College, University, and the field

Summary of Notes from Faculty Discussion
Date of Faculty Meeting:
Faculty Discussion of Candidate's Scholarship:
Faculty Discussion of Candidate's Teaching + Advising:
Faculty Discussion of Candidate's Service:

Faculty Vote
Include number of professors by rank who were eligible to vote, number of professors who voted to support promotion/tenure, number of professors who voted against promotion/tenure, number of professors who abstained, number of professors who did not vote.

CAC Recommendation (adapted to position description and rank)
<u>Example</u>: "Dr. _____ has demonstrated an exceptionally strong record of teaching, scholarship, and service. External letters provide irrefutable support for promotion and tenure. Dr. _____'s SPR unanimously endorses her promotion and tenure. Dr. _____ received (percentage) of positive votes from the faculty. Based on this evidence, the Council unanimously recommends that Dr. ___ be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure."

<u>Note</u>: Because the CAC's recommendation is independent from the faculty's recommendation and also from the Dean's recommendation, it is possible that the CAC's recommendation may differ from that of the Dean and/or the faculty.

Appendix H: Promotion Guidelines for Teaching Faculty

All faculty at the University of Washington are expected to engage in teaching, scholarship and service. The promotion process offers an opportunity for individuals to demonstrate their contributions and impact in these areas as applicable to the role served. The following promotion criteria/guidelines have been developed to support teaching faculty candidates, review committee members and faculty when preparing for, reviewing and analyzing teaching faculty professorial rank promotion files.

Assistant Teaching Professor to Associate Teaching Professor
Appointment to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor requires a record of substantial success in teaching and extensive training, competence, and experience in the discipline (Section 24-34). Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor is a non-mandatory promotion. While an Assistant Teaching Professor may elect to go up for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor at any time, **we generally would expect to see at least five years of service as an Assistant Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file.**

Assistant Teaching Professor candidates who wish to be considered for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor will need to address these areas as outlined in the UW Faculty Code: extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline, and scholarship. Questions for candidates and their committees to consider in order to demonstrate this evidence are provided below. It is not expected that every candidate's file will include answers to each and every question.

- What are the particular knowledge and skills you possess in content or pedagogy and how do you leverage this knowledge and skills within your special instructional role?
- How do you influence teaching and learning within and outside the COE? How do you engage with your peers to improve teaching and learning? If applicable, what conference presentations have you delivered or led? What has been the impact of your peer engagement and/or conference presentations?
- How have your teaching and/or service contributions improved the educational experiences of COE students?
- What special competencies or experiences do you bring from your discipline? This may include work that you engaged in prior to joining the university. How have you utilized these experiences to deepen exploration of content or pedagogy within a program, area or college?

Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor
Appointment to the rank of Teaching Professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching and excellence in instruction as demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field. Promotion to Teaching Professor is a non-mandatory promotion. While an Associate Teaching Professor can elect to go up for promotion to Teaching Professor at any time, **we generally expect to see at least five years of service as an Associate Teaching Professor in a successful promotion file.**

Evidence of exemplary success may take many forms and the candidate will need to demonstrate evidence of contributions inside and outside of the COE/UW that show excellence in instruction as demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field (Section 24-34). Candidates will work with their committees to identify how their work has impacted students, the community and/or the field and address these areas in the personal statement/self-assessment letter and artifacts submitted for review.

While Associate Teaching Professors have many different roles in the COE that vary in their responsibilities, each person going up for Teaching Professor would address these areas as outlined in the UW Faculty Code: excellence in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership. Questions for candidates and their committees to consider in order to demonstrate exemplary success are provided below. It is not expected that every candidate's file will include each and every question.

- What evidence do you have to support excellence in instruction? What honors or awards have you received from within the college, university or field?
- What has been your exemplary impact on learning through teaching and preparing College of Education undergraduate and/or graduate students?
- What successes have you achieved in curriculum design and implementation?
- What innovative and effective pedagogies do you employ in your classes? How have you shared your knowledge of teaching and learning with other members of the college, university or other colleagues?
- What additional or exemplary service have you provided to the college or university beyond COE expectations? How have you been involved in mentoring or supporting peers within the COE or outside of the COE? What have been tangible outputs or outcomes from the service you have delivered?
- What exemplary student mentoring do you provide? If you prepare candidates for special roles, what percent of graduates are serving in those roles? Where are your graduates serving? Who are your graduates serving? What evidence might you have that your graduates have a positive impact through their roles?
  - If you are a program lead or director, what goals had you set for the program and how have you met or exceeded program goals? How have you influenced program design and development? How have your contributions improved program outputs or outcomes?
  - What has been your impact on the field? What organizations have you participated in or led and what have been tangible outputs or outcomes from this work

- What community/district/state/national partnerships have you nurtured or led? What tangible outputs or outcomes have come from this work?
- If applicable, what research have you led or supported and how has that work been disseminated to the field? (websites, podcasts, conference papers, publications, etc.)

Teaching faculty scholarship
"Scholarship is an obligation of all faculty members" (UW Faculty Code Section 24-32 A)."

Teaching faculty may demonstrate their scholarship in a variety of ways (Section 24-32), including but not limited to: introduction of new knowledge or methods into course content; creation or use of innovative pedagogical methods; development of new courses, curricula, or course materials; participation in professional conferences; evidence of student performance; receipt of grants or awards; contributions to interdisciplinary teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations; or significant outreach to professionals at other educational institutions. While they may choose to do so through publication, **such publication shall not be required.**

For more information on Non-Tenure Professorial Teaching Faculty Rank Roles:
https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/academic-titles-ranks/professorial/
http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#2434