Checklist for Promotion / Tenure Recommendation

University of Washington **College of Engineering**

- ☐ Documentation listed below should be prepared as 3 copies and a PDF.
- ☐ One copy should be reserved by the department and should NOT be filed in the faculty member's personnel file.
- ☐ Please observe the following preparation guidelines for these documents.
  - Consecutively number all pages in the upper right-hand corner.
  - Please do not use *multiple* staples, paper clips, or binder clips within the copies.
  - Double-sided copies are encouraged.
  - It is not necessary to 3-hole punch the dossier.
  - 3 copies are forwarded to the Dean's Office (ATTN: Human Resources), 371 Loew Hall.
  - A PDF should be forwarded to avt@uw.edu
  - NOTE: If the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Council determines that the submitted documentation is insufficient, the Chair may be asked to supply additional information.

● ● ● ●

Candidate:_____ Department:_____
Joint Appt: _____ Adjunct Appt:_____

Recommendation For: _____

0. Table of Contents	☐ Include a Table of Contents at the front of the dossier. ☐ Table of Contents should be divided into the sections described below. ☐ Each page of the entire case should be numbered consecutively in the upper right-hand corner.
1. Chair's Letter of Recommendation:	☐ Timeline of the candidate's faculty position (e.g. date of appointment, extensions of the tenure time table, whether the promotion is mandatory) ☐ Complete tally of departmental vote (total eligible; affirmative, negative, absent, abstaining votes) ☐ Basis or reasoning for affirmative and negative votes, if known ☐ Nature and content of faculty discussion in promotion and tenure meetings, and a clear statement about the department's criteria for tenure and promotion ☐ Chair's independent assessment of candidate and his/her role in the present and future development of the academic unit ☐ Description and evaluation of research, teaching, service to the College, University or State ☐ Statement of the candidate's special competence, together with an analysis of external evaluator's comments relating to the candidate's standing, reputation, and scholarly achievements. There is no need for long sections of direct quoting from the letters; rather, a summary of how the reviewer's comments were interpreted by the faculty and chair is of most value ☐ Description of the candidate's role in the development of the department curriculum at the undergraduate and graduate level and his/her place in its future development (optional for research faculty) ☐ Description of the program of research the candidate is following and plans for the future ☐ Comment on the quality of the journals and conference proceedings in which the candidate has published. The most respected journals or conferences in the candidate's field should be specifically mentioned ☐ For candidates working in multiple research areas, indicate which publication venues pertain to which areas of research ☐ If the Chair believes that the documentation required on the candidate's teaching record

	does not fully reflect the contributions of the candidate, the chair may include comments from graduate and undergraduate students to support the candidate's teaching record ☐ Summary of changes if previous recommendation was denied or postponed, with respect to the above items ☐ Any comments from the discussion of the candidate that could have led to a "no" or "abstain" vote
2. Chair's Report of Faculty Deliberation and Candidate Response	☐ The Chair's summary of faculty deliberation, be sure to include the date of the deliberation ☐ The candidate's response – It can be a short paragraph acknowledging receipt and acceptance of the report. (An email exchange will suffice).
3. Concurrence of adjunct appointment and/or joint appointment(s) *The parent department initiating the recommendation for tenure and/or promotion is responsible for ensuring that this (these) letter(s) are included in the candidate's dossier.*	☐ A letter from the Chair(s) of any adjunct-appointing department(s) ☐ If a faculty vote is required by the adjunct-appointing departments, this must be included in the Chair's letter ☐ A letter from the Chair(s) of any joint-appointing department(s), including faculty vote, is required.
4. Department Review Committee Report and Candidate Response	☐ Departmental review committee report ☐ The Candidates response
5. General Biographical Information	☐ Section 5.1: Basic data: • Full Name • Department Affiliations • Telephone number, email, and (office) mail address • Other personal biographical information the candidate wishes to offer ☐ Section 5.2: Educational history (institution, degree conferred, year) and Ph.D. dissertation title ☐ Section 5.3: Employment (institutions, positions, years) ☐ Section 5.4: Awards and Honors ☐ Section 5.5: Affiliations (e.g. adjunct appointments, etc.)
6. Publications	☐ In-print publications listed in reverse chronological order (most recent first) in each main division listed below ☐ Inclusive page numbers for each entry in print ☐ Publications not yet in print may be included at the end of each category, but these must be clearly labeled with a status of "In Press (accepted)," or "Submitted." ☐ Section 6.1: Refereed archival journal publications ☐ Section 6.2: Conference proceedings and other non-journal articles • Non-journal-refereed publications (e.g., conference proceedings) • Non-journal abstract refereed publications (e.g., conference proceedings) ☐ Section 6.3: Books and editing • Books written • Parts of books (chapters in edited books) • Books edited • Journal issues edited ☐ Section 6.4: Miscellaneous • Patents submitted and/or awarded • Abstracts, letters, non-refereed papers • Other (web sites, software, etc.)

7. Other Scholarly Activity	☐ Section 7.1: Invited Lectures and seminars. Include: • Location (e.g. institution) • Title of Seminar / lecture • Date (Year and Month) ☐ Section 7.2: Conference presentations. Include: • Conference Title • Title of Presentation • Presenter (for multiple-authored papers) • Date (Year and Month) ☐ Section 7.3: Professional Society Memberships (give dates of membership) ☐ Section 7.4: Other (e.g., work as a referee, including journal titles and approximate number of articles refereed)
8. Graduate Students *Information can be presented in tabular form; horizontal (landscape) format is acceptable.*	☐ Section 8.1: Chaired Doctoral Degrees (indicate if the department does not offer a doctoral degree, and co-chaired if applicable). Include: • Student name • Dissertation title (optional) • Current Employer (if known) • Year of Completion ☐ Section 8.2: Chaired Masters Degrees (indicate co-chaired if applicable). Include: • Student name • Scope of supervision (e.g., thesis, project or coursework only). • Thesis / paper title, if applicable (optional) • Year of completion ☐ Section 8.3: Other significant student supervision. Include: • Student name • Scope of supervision (e.g., thesis, project or coursework only). • Thesis / paper title if applicable (optional) • Year of completion
9. Research Activities *Information can be presented in tabular form; horizontal (landscape) format is acceptable.*	☐ Section 9.1: Sponsored Research. Include: • Funding agency • Project Title • Dollar Amount, indicating the total award, any University matching funds, and any significant fractions which were subcontracted to other institutions. The default assumption is that the funding is allocated equally across all co-PIs. Please indicate if that is not the case. • A list of PIs and Co-PIs and the level of the candidate's activity (primary, secondary, joint, etc.) • Funding status (funded, not funded, or pending) • Start and Finish Dates ☐ Section 9.2: Unsponsored Research. Include: • Title • Start and Finish dates • Reason for undertaking (e.g., publications, future funding, public importance)

10. Documentation of teaching effectiveness

For those who were evaluated in accordance with the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 24, sections 2457.A, results of peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness must also be submitted. Documentation of teaching effectiveness comprises at least four measures: student, peer, self, and expert professional evaluation. Self evaluation of teaching is part of the candidate's self-advocacy statement, and should appear in Section 12.

- ☐ Section 10.1: List of all undergraduate and graduate courses. Include:
  - Course number / identification
  - Title
  - Year and quarter taught
  - Number of credit hours
  - Student enrollment
  - Indication of whether student evaluations were given (yes or no)
- ☐ Section 10.2: Summary of student teaching evaluations. Include:
  - Course number/identification
  - Year and quarter taught
  - Number of students responding versus enrollment, e.g. 20/50
  - Adjusted median rating of course as a whole (item 1)
  - Adjusted median rating of instructor (item 3)
  - Adjusted median rating of instructor's contribution to course (item 4)
  - Adjusted median rating of combined items (1-4)
  - Any graphs indicating trends (optional, but often helpful)
  - The raw student evaluation forms themselves. However, the data from these forms should be distilled and summarized into tables or graphs to create a single-page summary as per the above
  - Only include student evaluations for the candidate; if there are none, do not substitute some other evaluation, such as for the course as a whole or another instructor for the course
  - It is not necessary to include the detailed student comments
- ☐ Section 10.3: Supervision of undergraduate independent study (design projects and research). List total number of students and credit hours per year. A detailed breakdown by student is not required.
- ☐ Section 10.4: Peer evaluation of teaching and a description of the department policy and procedures for any peer evaluation of teaching. Peer evaluations of teaching are most valuable when they address the intellectual depth of the material and the educational standards held by the instructor, as opposed to more social aspects such as student comfort
- ☐ Section 10.5: List of other teaching experience (short courses, workshops, and other educational programs)
- ☐ Section 10.6: Any other supporting documents on teaching development and effectiveness, e.g. evaluations by expert professionals such as CIDR (optional)

11. Service	☐ Section 11.1: Departmental service (committees, etc.) ☐ Section 11.2: College service (committees, etc.) ☐ Section 11.3: University service (committees, etc.) ☐ Section 11.4: Professional society and other service (committee memberships, positions and offices held, conference organization, journal editorship, etc.) ☐ Section 11.5: Community service (volunteer or consulting work, etc.) ☐ Section 11.6: National or governmental service (agency review panels, etc.) ☐ Section 11.7: All other service
12. Self Advocacy Statement *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 candidate's self-advocacy statement should meet the following criteria: ☐ 5 pages or less ☐ Include separate statement on teaching with discussion of: • Goals • Direction • Impact ☐ Include separate statement on research with discussion of • Goals • Direction • Impact ☐ Include separate statement on service activities with discussion of • Goals • Direction • Impact ☐ Candidate should also assess her/his own performance, how s/he has responded to performance recommendations from mentors, and a frank assessment of the quality of mentorship provided to her/him by the department. ☐ Reference to three most influential publications written to date, with a short statement (by the candidate) explaining the impact and importance of each of these publications. (Copies in Section 18)
13. Other supporting information	☐ Offers of positions elsewhere ☐ Acceptance letters for publications not yet in print ☐ Letters of approval for proposals not yet funded ☐ Any other information (that does not fall into the above categories) supporting the candidate
14. Summary of external reviewers	☐ Description of the procedure used to select reviewers ☐ The motivation for the choice of each reviewer, i.e. what particular area of the candidate's research or career was the reviewer selected to reveal? The reviewers should provide a full coverage of the candidate's research areas, and it should be made clear who is an expert in which area. ☐ Candidate's role in selection of reviewers ☐ Relationship of each reviewer to the candidate ☐ Summary of the qualifications of each reviewer, and, in particular, a justification in terms of reputation and technical expertise as to why the reviewer was chosen. Do not include the reviewer CV. ☐ Documentation of any conversations with reviewers

15. Letters of external reviewers	☐ Overall minimum of 5 letters must be included in dossier ☐ 4 "CLASS A" Letters (minimum) required for promotions ☐ 3 "CLASS A" Letters (minimum) required for new appointments ☐ Class B letters provide supplementary information, and are not required in the dossier. B letters do not meet all four criteria below. Class B letters might include those from, for example, close collaborators when it is unclear who has been responsible for the research, funding agency program directors, or society officers. As with "A" letters, a justification for their inclusion should appear in section 14. ☐ No more than 3 class B letters should be included in the dossier. If upon receipt of an A letter, it is clear that there is a tie between the letter writer and the candidate that disqualifies the letter as an "A," there can be an extra "B" letter. ☐ Reviews should be highly detailed and point to specific accomplishments of the candidate. Letters of a general nature are given less weight. ☐ "CLASS A" Letters meet the following four criteria: • Author is a recognized leader in the candidate's specialty field • Author is currently active in this field • Author is independent, having no mutual career interdependencies with the candidate • Author is independently selected by the department's review committee from a list of letter writers that includes those suggested by the department's review committee and those suggested by the candidate ☐ When bringing a candidate through the promotion and tenure process a second time, departments should obtain letters from the same set of reviewers who were asked the first time, or provide a justification for the change. Additional letters can be obtained, again with a reason as to why the addition is warranted.
16. Solicitation letter sent to external reviewers	☐ Copy of the cover letter sent to external reviewers
17. Department review criteria	☐ Narrative explanation of department review criteria
18. Candidate's 3 most significant publications	☐ Photocopies are acceptable ☐ These may be chosen by the candidate ☐ Should be the same 3 publications referenced in Section 12