



# **School of Dentistry Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Manual**

**Updated by School of Dentistry APT Committee, July 2023**

**Approved by School of Dentistry Faculty Council, January 2024**

## Table of Contents

Section I. Introduction .....	5
Section II. Appointments and Titles Used in the School of Dentistry .....	6
A. General Comments: .....	6
B. Appointments within the Professorial Track: .....	6
C. Promotion Clock: .....	6
D. Part-Time: .....	7
E. Assistant Professor: .....	8
F. Associate Professor: .....	9
G. Professor: .....	9
H. Professorial Tenure/Tenure-track .....	9
I. Without Tenure By Reason of Funding (WOT) Appointment .....	10
J. Research Appointments .....	11
K. Teaching Appointments .....	13
L. Acting Appointments .....	15
M. Clinician-Teacher Pathway .....	16
Preamble: .....	16
Clinical Assistant Professor – Dental Pathway: .....	17
Clinical Associate Professor – Dental Pathway: .....	18
Clinical Professor –Dental Pathway: .....	19
N. Clinical Salaried Appointments .....	20
Evaluation Criteria for Appointments and Promotions: .....	20
Criteria Typically Considered for Appointment and Promotion .....	20
Appointment Considerations .....	21
O. Affiliate Appointments .....	23
P. Adjunct Appointments .....	25
Q. Visiting Appointments .....	26
R. Joint Appointments .....	27
S. Emeritus Appointments: .....	28
T. Re-employed Retirees: .....	28
U. Non-Professorial Instructional and Related Titles: .....	29
SECTION III - Changing Professorial Tracks .....	30
Track Change Options and Associated Requirements .....	31
SECTION IV – Working after Retirement .....	32

SECTION V - Earning Advanced Degrees: Exclusion of Faculty .....	34
SECTION VI - Procedures for Initial Appointment of Faculty.....	35
A. Appointments that require competitive searches AND Office of Academic Personnel approval on the hiring plan: .....	35
B. Search and hire overview for positions that require competitive searches.....	35
C. Appointments that DO NOT require competitive searches but require Office of Academic Personnel approval on the hiring plan:.....	36
D. Appointments that DO NOT require competitive searches and DO NOT require Office of Academic Personnel approval on the hiring plan:.....	37
E. For non-competitive searches, follow these steps: .....	37
F. Appointment Procedures for Joint and Adjunct Ranks:.....	38
SECTION VII - School of Dentistry <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee Reappointment Policy .....	39
SECTION VIII - Voting Faculty .....	40
SECTION IX - Membership in the Graduate Faculty .....	41
SECTION X - Promotion and/or Tenure .....	42
A. Evidence for Promotion and/or Tenure Consideration.....	42
B. Award of Tenure.....	43
C. Eligibility for Tenure .....	44
D. Procedure for Tenure Award.....	45
E. Evidence Which may be Submitted to Demonstrate Qualifications for Appointment, Promotion, and/or Tenure: .....	45
Scholarship: .....	45
Teaching: .....	46
Administration and/or University Service:.....	47
Professional and Community Service: .....	48
Personal Qualities:.....	48
SECTION XI - Promotion Time Schedule .....	50
SECTION XII - Promotion Policies and Procedures.....	51
A. Titles subject to mandatory promotion (tenure eligible) and reviewed by the APT Committee:.....	51
B. Titles subject to mandatory promotion (non-tenure eligible) and reviewed by the APT Committee:.....	51
C. Titles not subject to mandatory promotion and reviewed by the APT Committee.....	52
D. Titles not subject to promotion consideration (non-tenure eligible) and not reviewed by the APT Committee:.....	52

5. Part-time Faculty:	52
6. Clock waiver:	52
7. Informal Review:	53
8. Peer Teaching Evaluation Review Committee:	53
9. Candidate's Responsibilities:	54
10. Candidate's Letter:	55
11. Optional Sub-committee Review:	56
12. SOD Ad Hoc Promotion Committee:	57
13. Voting:	57
14. Department Chair:	57
15. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee:	58
16. Dean's Recommendation:	59
17. Office of Academic Personnel Review:	59
APPENDICES	60
Prologue	60
Appendix 1: Checklist for Recruitment of Professorial Tracks	61
Appendix 2: Sample Models for Structuring Faculty Search Committees	62
Appendix 3: Writing the Job Advertisement	64
Appendix 4: SOD HR Faculty Sample Job Posting Template	66
Appendix 5: Posting the Job Ad	68
Appendix 6: Best Practices for Faculty Searches	69
Appendix 7: Job Offer Template	74
Appendix 8: Chair Letter to the Dean	78
Appendix 9: Sample PTERC Evaluation Report	79
Appendix 10: Curriculum Vitae Sample	81
Appendix 11: Faculty Teaching Portfolio	90
Appendix 12: School of Dentistry Peer Evaluation Forms	94
Appendix 13: Candidate's Checklist for Promotion/Tenure Packet	103
Appendix 14: Candidate's Letter to Chair	105
Appendix 15: School of Dentistry <i>Ad Hoc</i> Review Committee Policy	106
Appendix 16-1: Department Chair's Checklist for Promotion/Tenure Packet	107
Appendix 16-2: Chair's Letter of Solicitation Template	111
Appendix 16-3: Chairperson's Letter of Recommendation	112

Appendix 17: Administrator’s Checklist for Promotion/Tenure Packet .....114

Appendix 18: Procedural Guide for the Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and  
Tenure.....116

Appendix 19: Guidelines Governing Membership on the APT Committee .....120

Appendix 20: Supplemental Information.....121

## **Section I. Introduction**

The following information is presented to acquaint faculty members, department chairs, and administrators with academic appointments, promotions, and associated procedures that apply to the School of Dentistry at the University of Washington. These guidelines describe the academic ranks and criteria for appointment or promotion; privileges and obligations of each academic rank; and the functions of faculty, departmental administration, the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee, the Dean, the Provost, and the University's Board of Regents as related to appointments and promotions. The administrative procedures (forms, deadlines, etc.) also are described.

Appointment, promotion and tenure at the University of Washington follow the UW Policy Directory which includes Faculty Code and Governance. The intent of this Manual is to clarify how these policies might apply at the School of Dentistry. In the case of any discrepancy between this Manual and UW Policy Directory, the UW Policy Directory takes precedence.

## **Section II. Appointments and Titles Used in the School of Dentistry**

### **A. General Comments:**

The appointments and titles used in the School of Dentistry are generally the same as those employed in the other Schools and Colleges of the University of Washington.

The School of Dentistry has the following types of appointments:

1. Professorial Track (see Section B below)
2. Acting
3. Clinician-Teacher
4. Clinical
5. Other

There are different titles for each type of appointment that convey ranks; qualifications; expectations; appointment duration; clock-managed ranks; tenure eligibility; funding support; and voting eligibility, among others.

Some titles require competitive searches and APT Committee review for appointment and promotion.

### **B. Appointments within the Professorial Track:**

- Assistant Professor Tenure Track
- Associate Professor
- Professor
- Associate Professor Tenure Track
- Professor Tenure Track
- Assistant Professor WOT
- Associate Professor WOT
- Professor WOT
- Research Assistant Professor
- Research Associate Professor
- Research Professor
- Assistant Teaching Professor
- Associate Teaching Professor
- Teaching Professor

### **C. Promotion Clock:**

Positions subject to mandatory promotion consideration are:

- Assistant Professor Tenure Track
- Assistant Professor WOT
- Associate Professor Tenure Track
- Professor Tenure Track
- Research Assistant Professor
- Clinical Assistant Professor-Dental Pathway

The promotion clock begins July 1 of the same academic year for faculty appointed any time between July 1 through December 31. The promotion clock begins July 1 of the next academic year for faculty hired between January 1 and June 30. For example, if the hire date

is October 1, 2022, the promotion clock will begin July 1, 2022. If the hire date is February 1, 2023, the promotion clock will begin July 1, 2023.

#### **D. Part-Time:**

(UW Policy Directory, [Faculty Code: Chapter 24, Section 24-45](#). Appointment of Part-Time Professors)

The University may appoint faculty to professorial ranks (see [Section 24-34](#), Subsections A.2 through A.3 and Subsection B.3 through B.5) on less than a full-time basis. The percentage of appointment at the time of hire shall be documented by the Department Chair (or Dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) and clearly communicated in writing to the faculty member.

The first appointment of a part-time assistant professor who is eligible for tenure, without tenure by reason of funding, a research assistant professor, or a clinical assistant professor-dental pathway, at 50 percent or greater full-time equivalency, shall be for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. In Spring Quarter of the second year of appointment, the Dean of the assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:

1. The appointment is to be renewed;
2. The appointment is not to be renewed beyond the three-year period, in which case the assistant professor will be notified that the appointment ceases at the end of the third year; or
3. The decision concerning reappointment is postponed to the following year, in which case the assistant professor will be notified that the three-year appointment is extended to include a fourth year.

Should the decision on the faculty result in a postponement, during Spring Quarter of the third year, the Dean shall decide whether:

1. The appointment is to be renewed for a further period, consistent with the below paragraph; or
2. The appointment is not to be renewed in which case the assistant professor shall be notified that the appointment ceases at the end of the fourth year.

Should the initial appointment of a part-time assistant professor be renewed, the following renewal periods pertain to the second appointment:

1. For part-time assistant professors who hold appointments of 90-percent time and above, the second appointment period shall be for three years.
2. For part-time assistant professors who hold appointments between 70 percent and 89 percent, the second appointment shall be for four years.
3. For part-time assistant professors who hold appointments between 60 percent and 69 percent, the second appointment shall be for five years.
4. For part-time assistant professors who hold appointments between 50 percent and 59 percent, the second appointment shall be for six years.



In all cases, a mandatory review for promotion and tenure (or in the case of WOT faculty, for promotion and continuous appointment) must occur no later than the end of the last year of appointment, see 1 to 4 above.

At any time during the appointment, the faculty member may change his or her percentage of appointment with the written agreement of the Dean. In the event of a change, the time for mandatory review shall be stated in the agreement consistent with [Section 24-45](#), Subsection D above.

#### **E. Assistant Professor:**

UW Faculty Code [Chapter 24, Section 24-34 A.1](#):

Appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor requires a demonstration of teaching and research ability:

- Successful completion of a post-professional degree program relevant to the appointment with completion of a thesis or paper prepared for publication; or
- Successful completion of clinical specialty training in an officially certified program; or
- Professional experience in the area of the proposed appointment, for example, medical or dental practice, part-time teaching, postdoctoral training with documented evidence of capability within criteria for appointment or promotion discussed in [Section X.A.](#)
- One or more years at the rank of Acting Instructor with documented evidence of capability within the criteria for appointment or promotion discussed in [Section X.A.](#)

Appointment at the Assistant Professor rank is for a maximum of six (6) years and the appointment is divided into two (2) three-year terms. A decision on re-appointment at the end of the first term must be made in Spring Quarter of the second year of the appointment. The voting faculty members of superior rank in the department must make a recommendation to the Dean on renewal, non-renewal, or postponement. If postponement is the decision made by the Dean, then another review must occur in Spring Quarter of the third year (first term) to reach a decision on renewal or non-renewal. Refer to Faculty Code [Chapter 24 Section 24-41 A.](#)

Time spent as Acting Instructor or Acting Assistant Professor does not count toward that six (6) years. Time spent as an Instructor or Assistant Professor at another institution does not count against the maximum of six (6) years permitted in these ranks at the University of Washington.

No definite number of years' experience is required at the Assistant Professor rank. It is unlikely that promotion would be considered with less than four (4) to five (5) years at the Assistant Professor level. Consideration must be made at the sixth year of appointment as an Assistant Professor. If a faculty member is considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor **in advance** of the sixth year and is denied the promotion, they are still eligible for reconsideration the next year.

## F. Associate Professor:

Faculty Code [Chapter 24, Section 24-34 A.2](#): 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.

Individuals appointed to this rank shall have served at the Assistant Professor level except for very unusual circumstances, as for example when they are recruited from foreign countries, the military, private practice, or allied fields. In these latter cases, credentials must be unique and compelling.

There shall be documentation of capabilities in the areas of criteria for promotion described in this Manual and the Faculty Code, as well as evidence of continuing development during the period of service at the rank of Associate Professor. National recognition can be demonstrated, for example, by letters of assessment from nationally recognized professional organizations, appointments to an office or a major responsibility in important organizations, appointments to committees or boards of national significance.

## G. Professor:

Faculty Code [Chapter 24, Section 24-34 A.3](#): 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 recognition. See additional criteria in [Faculty Code 24-57](#), and [Executive Order 45](#). Individuals appointed to this rank shall have served at the Associate Professor level except in unusual circumstances as noted under Associate Professor above. No definite number of years of experience is required at the Associate Professor rank to be considered for the rank of Professor. It is unlikely, however, that promotion would be considered with less than five (5) years at the Associate Professor level.

## H. Professorial Tenure/Tenure-track

### [PROFESSORIAL – TENURE \(eligible for or has tenure\)](#)<sup>1</sup>

Rank	Term	Promotion Eligible	Mandatory Promotion	Tenure Eligible	Competitive Recruitment	APT Review for appointment / promotion	Board of Regents Approval	Emeritus Eligible <sup>5</sup>	UW Voting Rights <sup>6</sup>	SOD Voting Rights
Assistant Professor <sup>2,3</sup>	3 + 3 years	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Associate Professor	Continuous	Y	N	Tenured	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Associate Prof. Tenure Track <sup>4</sup>	3 + 3 years	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Professor	Continuous	N/A	N/A	Tenured	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Professor Tenure Track <sup>4</sup>	3 + 3 years	N/A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y

<sup>1</sup> All professorial ranks must be at least 50% FTE.

<sup>2</sup> Upon renewal of the initial 3-year term of a part-time assistant professor, the second term varies according to percentage of appointment: 90%-100%: 3 years; 70%-89%: 4 years; 60%-69%: 5 years; 50%-59%: 6 years. [Faculty Code §24-45 D](#)

<sup>3</sup> The first appointment or the reappointment of an assistant professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Although neither appointment period shall extend beyond the academic year in which a decision on tenure is required, the year in which a negative tenure decision is made must be followed by a terminal year of appointment. If the assistant professor is reappointed, the period of reappointment must include a tenure decision. Assistant professors holding positions funded by other than state funds shall be treated in the same way except that the appointment may be to a position without tenure by reason of funding as provided in [Subsection D. Faculty Code §24-41 A](#)

<sup>4</sup> Tenure-track duration is limited to not more than two consecutive appointments, each of three years' duration. Tenure review must be conducted no later than the second year of the second three-year appointment (i.e., fifth year). In the case where tenure is not granted in the mandatory fifth year, the sixth year will be the terminal year of appointment (Note: promotion is not mandatory). Part-time appointments do not extend the tenure review period, [Faculty Code §25-32 \(D\)](#).

**Rationale for tenure-track:** A small number of faculty are appointed to the tenure-track at the rank of associate or full professor, but without awarding tenure at the time of appointment, as provided for in the [Faculty Code §25-32](#). This type of appointment is used, for example, to hire faculty from other universities who are near a tenure decision, and also to hire persons from industry or other non-academic settings who are at a mature stage in their careers but may not have a demonstrated record of academic teaching or research funding similar to that of the typical tenured associate or full professor. The number of these “without tenure” appointments has been small, no more than five at any time out of the two thousand tenure track/tenure faculty on campus. This number is unlikely to grow, as faculty and industry people who are at a more junior stage of their careers receive tenure-track assistant professor offers, and senior faculty who are tenured and more senior industry or non-academic people will in general not accept an offer that is “without tenure”. This type of “without tenure” appointment differs from the appointment that is without tenure due to reason of funding (WOT) in which the person is not eligible for tenure.

<sup>5</sup> Generally, emeritus status criteria include having at least 10 years of service as a faculty member and holding the rank of professor or associate professor. Appointment requires an affirmative vote of the department faculty, dean concurrence and provost approval.

<sup>6</sup> Not eligible to vote when on sabbatical leave or leave without pay of more than 50%.

## **I. Without Tenure By Reason of Funding (WOT) Appointment**

The issue of the proper classification of faculty actively involved in a portion of the instructional program needs to be considered. Faculty in the regular professorial ranks but designated as “without tenure by reason of funding (WOT)”, are expected to be integrated into the instructional program. WOT faculty hold continuing appointments at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks and are voting members of the faculty, both within the department and the University as a whole. WOT faculty are supported primarily from grant and contract funds, except when their time is supported from state budgets for instructional purposes. The fact that soft money-supported faculty are involved in teaching does not necessarily mean that they are to be classified as WOT rather than research. The factor that is critical to differentiating the WOT and research faculty categories is the expectation for WOT faculty to participate in departmental teaching and service functions on a regular and continuing basis. It remains a departmental faculty decision whether to appoint individuals primarily supported by soft money as either research or regular WOT faculty. Department Chairpersons must remember that WOT faculty are expected to assume a teaching load that is comparable to any regular faculty member and that excellence in teaching is an important consideration in promotion and merit pay raises.

## PROFESSORIAL – WOT (Without Tenure by Reason of Funding)<sup>1</sup>

Rank	Term	Promotion Eligible	Mandatory Promotion	Tenure Eligible	Competitive Recruitment	APT Review for appointment / promotion	Board of Regents Approval	Emeritus Eligible <sup>6</sup>	UW Voting Rights <sup>7</sup>	SOD Voting Rights
Assistant Professor WOT <sup>2,3,4</sup>	3 + 3 years	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Associate Professor WOT <sup>4,5</sup>	Continuous	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Professor WOT <sup>4,5</sup>	Continuous	N/A	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

<sup>1</sup> All professorial ranks must be at least 50% FTE.

<sup>2</sup> Upon renewal of the initial 3-year term of a part-time assistant professor, the second term varies according to percentage of appointment: 90%-100%: 3 years; 70%-89%: 4 years; 60%-69%: 5 years; 50%-59%: 6 years. [Faculty Code §24-45 D](#)

<sup>3</sup> The first appointment or the reappointment of an assistant professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Although neither appointment period shall extend beyond the academic year in which a decision on tenure is required, the year in which a negative tenure decision is made must be followed by a terminal year of appointment. If the assistant professor is reappointed, the period of reappointment must include a tenure decision. Assistant professors holding positions funded by other than state funds shall be treated in the same way except that the appointment may be to a position without tenure by reason of funding as provided in [Subsection D. Faculty Code §24-41 A](#)

<sup>4</sup> Faculty without tenure by reason of funding (WOT) do not hold tenure because all or part of his or her annual University-administered salary is derived from sources other than regularly appropriated state funds. [Faculty Code §24-40 B](#) Termination of funding is defined as failure, for a continuous period of more than 12 months, to obtain funding sufficient to provide at least 50% of the faculty member's base annual salary. The University is not obligated to provide replacement funding during lapses of a faculty member's external support. [Faculty Code §24-41 J](#)

<sup>5</sup> A professor or associate professor without tenure by reason of funding (WOT) is qualified for tenure by virtue of rank. Such a faculty member holds his or her appointment on a continuing basis. [Faculty Code §24-40 A](#)

<sup>6</sup> Generally, emeritus status criteria include having at least 10 years of service as a faculty member and holding the rank of professor or associate professor. Appointment requires an affirmative vote of the department faculty, dean concurrence and provost approval.

<sup>7</sup> Not eligible to vote when on sabbatical leave or leave without pay of more than 50%.

### **J. Research Appointments**

The distinguishing characteristic of the research ranks is that the faculty member is to be engaged primarily in research activity with less emphasis on teaching. (UW Policy Directory, Faculty Code, [Chapter 24, Section 24-35](#)). Appointment or promotion to any of the research ranks requires qualifications, except for the amount of teaching, generally corresponding to those described for the regular academic ranks.

Research faculty may participate in the regular instructional program but are not required to do so, except as required by their funding source. Thus, teaching, in any form (clinical,

graduate student supervision, or lecturing in the classroom), is not mandatory for research faculty, though it is to be encouraged.

**Research Faculty Funding:** All research faculty appointments are subject to continuation based on the existence of funding. "Termination of funding" is the "failure, for a continuous period of more than twelve (12) months, to obtain funding sufficient to provide at least 50% of the faculty member's base annual salary." (Faculty Code [Chapter 24-41 K](#)). Thus, if a faculty member loses all or a portion of their funding, the appointment cannot end involuntarily for lack of funding during its term until the average of funding over twelve (12) months falls below 50%. The loss of funding from external sources does not obligate the University to replace the salary lost in any way, nor is the University required to dedicate laboratory space for faculty without research funding support. The provision does require faculty appointments to continue until the 50% average annual support test is fulfilled, thereby enabling faculty with funding fluctuations or deficiencies to continue to generate research proposals through the University system.

## PROFESSORIAL – RESEARCH<sup>1</sup>

Rank	Term	Promotion Eligible	Mandatory Promotion	Tenure Eligible	Competitive Recruitment	APT Review for appointment / promotion	Board of Regents Approval	Emeritus Eligible <sup>6</sup>	UW Voting Rights <sup>7</sup>	SOD Voting Rights
Research Assistant Professor <sup>2</sup>	3 + 3 years <sup>3</sup>	Y	Y <sup>4</sup>	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Research Associate Professor	1 - 5 years <sup>5</sup>	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Research Professor	1 - 5 years <sup>5</sup>	N/A	N/A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

<sup>1</sup> All professorial ranks must be at least 50% FTE.

<sup>2</sup> Upon renewal of the initial 3-year term of a part-time assistant professor, the second term varies according to percentage of appointment: 90%-100%: 3 years; 70%-89%: 4 years; 60%-69%: 5 years; 50%-59%: 6 years. [Faculty Code §24-45 D](#)

<sup>3</sup> The first appointment or the reappointment of a research assistant professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Research assistant professors may not be reappointed more than once, except that a research assistant professor who does not receive promotion in rank must receive a terminal year of appointment. During the second year of the initial appointment, the dean of the school shall decide whether to renew the appointment; not renew the appointment, in which case, the appointment will cease at the end of the third year; or postpone the appointment to the following year. [Faculty Code §24-41 G 1, 2](#)

Appointment of a research assistant professor who is supported by other than state-appropriated funds are subject to termination, should the supporting agency fail to continue the funding for the appointment, provided that the assistant professor is advised in writing prior to commencement of their appointment that such appointment is at all times subject to the continued availability of grant or contract funds. (Faculty Code [Chapter 24-41 E](#))

<sup>4</sup>No later than the third year of a second appointment, the dean of the school shall decide if the research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor, associate professor WOT, or associate professor with

tenure; if the appointment is to cease at the end of the following year; or postponed to the following year. Should the decision be postponed, the dean shall decide whether the research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor, associate professor WOT, or associate professor with tenure; or the appointment is to cease, in which case the basic appointment is extended by one year. [Faculty Code §24-41 G 3, 4](#)

<sup>5</sup>May be renewed indefinitely.

<sup>6</sup>Generally, emeritus status criteria include having at least 10 years of service as a faculty member and holding the rank of professor or associate professor. Appointment requires an affirmative vote of the department faculty, dean concurrence and provost approval.

<sup>7</sup>Research faculty may vote on all personnel matters, except for matters relating to promotion to and/or tenure to Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer, Associate Professor, Professor, Associate Professor WOT, Professor WOT, Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor. [Faculty Code §21-32 C](#). Not eligible to vote when on sabbatical leave or leave without pay of more than 50%.

## **K. Teaching Appointments**

In Spring 2020, UW's voting-eligible faculty approved [legislation](#) proposing the establishment of a professorial track focusing primarily on teaching. The Faculty Senate then approved [companion legislation](#) that described how the new track should be implemented.

[Faculty Code Chapter 24, Section 24-34 B.3](#): Appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor with a teaching title requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon teaching. Such an appointment requires completion of professional training appropriate to the teaching, scholarship, and service requirements of the position. Appropriate degree requirements shall be determined for each position by the college, school, or campus making the appointment. Tenure is not acquired under teaching appointments.

Teaching professor, associate teaching professor, and assistant teaching professor appointments are term appointments for periods not to exceed the limits specified in [Section 24-41 C](#). The question of their renewal shall be considered by the voting faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal of the appointment of a teaching professor. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-53.

Teaching professors, associate teaching professors, and assistant teaching professors are eligible for appointment to the graduate faculty and are eligible to act as principal investigators for grants and contracts.

1. Appointment with the title of assistant teaching professor requires a demonstration of teaching ability that evidences promise of a successful teaching career.
2. Appointment with the title of associate teaching professor requires extensive training, competence, and experience in the discipline.
3. 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.

Individuals appointed in this track may demonstrate their scholarship and research in a variety of ways (Faculty Code Chapter 24, [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.

## [PROFESSORIAL – TEACHING](#)<sup>1,2</sup>

Rank	Term	Promotion Eligible	Mandatory Promotion	Tenure Eligible	Competitive Recruitment	APT Review for appointment / promotion	Board of Regents Approval	Emeritus Eligible	UW Voting Rights <sup>6</sup>	SOD Voting Rights
Assistant Teaching Professor	1-5 years	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Associate Teaching Professor	1-7 years <sup>3</sup>	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y <sup>5</sup>	Y	Y
Teaching Professor	1-10 years <sup>4</sup>	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y <sup>5</sup>	Y	Y

<sup>1</sup> All professorial ranks must be at least 50% FTE.

<sup>2</sup>In Spring 2020, UW’s voting-eligible faculty approved [legislation](#) proposing the establishment of a professorial track focusing primarily on teaching. The Faculty Senate then approved [companion legislation](#) that described how the new track should be implemented. Effective September 16, 2020, Principal Lecturer and Adjunct Principal Lecturer converted to Teaching Professor; Senior Lecturer Full-Time, Senior Lecturer Part-Time, and Adjunct Senior Lecturer converted to Associate Teaching Professor; and Lecturer Full-Time and Adjunct Lecturer converted to Assistant Teaching Professor.

<sup>3</sup>Appointment as an associate teaching professor shall be for a period not to exceed seven years. The normal appointment period shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost

<sup>4</sup>Appointment as teaching professor shall be for a period not to exceed ten years. The normal appointment period shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

<sup>5</sup>Generally, emeritus status criteria include having at least 10 years of service as a faculty member and holding the rank of professor or associate professor. Appointment requires an affirmative vote of the department faculty, dean concurrence and provost approval.

<sup>6</sup>Teaching faculty may vote on all personnel matters except promotion and tenure of Associate Professor; Associate Professor WOT; Research Associate Professor; Professor; Professor WOT; and Research Professor. [Faculty Code §21-32 D](#). Not eligible to vote when on sabbatical leave or leave without pay of more than 50%.

## L. Acting Appointments

Rank	Term	Promotion Eligible	Mandatory Promotion	Tenure Eligible	Competitive Recruitment	APT Review for appointment/promotion	Emeritus Eligible	UW Voting Rights	SOD Voting Rights
Acting Instructor	Annual; limited to 4 years in any one acting title; 6 years total combined titles	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Acting Assistant Professor - temporary	Annual; limited to 4 years in any one acting title; 6 years total combined titles	N	N	N	Yes, only if transition to assistant professor title	N	N	N	N
Acting Assistant Professor - pending PhD	Up to 2 years	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Acting Associate Professor	Annual; limited to 4 years in any one acting title; 6 years total combined titles	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Acting Professor	Annual; limited to 4 years in any one acting title; 6 years total combined titles	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

### [ACTING](#)<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> All ranks must be at least 50% FTE. Acting appointments typically address 1 of 3 important needs: temporary instruction requiring someone with significant professorial training, e.g., PhD; a temporary bridge for professorial faculty who have not yet completed regular appointment requirements; or a temporary transition period between postdoctoral training and mentoring, and entry into the professorial ranks. [Faculty Code Section 24-34.B.14](#).



## M. Clinician-Teacher Pathway

### **Preamble:**

It is essential to the teaching mission of the School of Dentistry that a number of faculty be highly skilled clinicians and teachers with recognized expertise in diverse clinical areas. However, it is well recognized that time and/or interest for research among such expert clinicians may be limited. Prior to the development of this pathway, academic regulations did not favor retention or allow promotion of valuable clinician-teachers without an accompanying record of significant research activity. Without such a research record, the only method by which these valued colleagues could maintain their University affiliation was to serve six years as an Assistant Professor and then to accept an annual appointment as Lecturer. Thus, the description and use of the previously available titles did not give adequate recognition to the contributions and stature of clinician-teacher faculty and did not allow for promotion in rank. Therefore, the Clinician-Teacher Pathway was established to overcome this deficiency by providing a renewable term up to five-years, with a minimum of 3 years (with exceptions to be reviewed by the dean). The intention is for retaining, recognizing and promoting faculty who have made unique, enduring and invaluable contributions to the School of Dentistry's clinical dental education programs.

That being said, the School of Dentistry is steering in the direction of recruiting in the teaching track for positions that emphasize teaching more and scholarship less. Individuals appointed in this track may demonstrate their scholarship and research in a variety of ways (Faculty Code Chapter 24, [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.

Persons recruited and engaged primarily to perform teaching and clinical care may be eligible for appointment to a clinician-teaching rank. While this is a promotion ladder series, faculty in the Clinician-Teacher ranks are not eligible for the award of tenure (Faculty Code [Section 25-32](#) for details): appointments are for specific periods of time. Appointments and promotion criteria and procedures parallel those for research titles. Faculty appointed to a clinician-teaching rank are not voting members of the University Faculty (Faculty Code [Section 21-32](#)) but they have limited voting rights within the School of Dentistry (*Bylaws of the Faculty*, [Article II, Section 2](#)). Information in this section is meant to be clarifying and does not supersede the Faculty Code.

The distinguishing characteristic of the clinical-teaching ranks is that the appointee is to be engaged primarily in teaching and clinical care with less emphasis on scholarship. This provides an opportunity for clinicians committed to clinical care and teaching to successfully pursue an academic career as a member of the faculty of the University of Washington School of Dentistry.

In addition to teaching and clinical practice, faculty are expected to contribute to the mission and function of the school by demonstrating a scholarly approach to teaching and clinical activities and providing service. Service activities may include, but are not limited to, participation in UWSOD committees, other health center or university committees, and professional organizations. With respect to scholarly activities, a broader definition, compared to the tenure and research tracks, should be applied. As such, scholarly contributions may be demonstrated by activities such as those listed below:

1. Development of teaching materials, including manuals, web-based instructional material, and novel approaches in education and delivery of care.
2. Developing and teaching continuing education courses
3. Invited presentations and presentations at scholarly meetings
4. Published case-reports and literature reviews
5. Serving as a reviewer for journals and textbooks
6. Authoring or editing textbooks and chapters
7. Mentoring students and junior faculty
8. Participation in research projects
9. Journal publications
10. Board Certification in field of specialty
11. Participation in grant writing

PTERC evaluations are mandatory for those in the clinical ranks, as these provide peer review of teaching, which is a primary responsibility for this track.

Appointment or promotion to the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor – Dental Pathway or above is reviewed by the APT committee, the Dean, the Provost, and the Board of Regents.

#### **Clinical Assistant Professor – Dental Pathway:**

This title is the initial level of appointment for faculty entering the Clinician-Teacher track. National searches and credentials equivalent to other professorial tracks are required.

Appointment to the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor requires a demonstration of teaching and clinical ability beyond that ordinarily required of a Lecturer:

- Successful completion of a post-professional degree program relevant to the appointment with completion of a thesis or paper prepared for publication; or
- Successful completion of clinical specialty training in an officially certified program; or
- Professional experience in the area of the proposed appointment, for example, medical or dental practice, part-time teaching, postdoctoral training with documented evidence of ....capability within the criteria for appointment or promotion discussed in [Section II.E](#).

Clinical Assistant Professor appointments are to follow an appointment track identical to Assistant Professors; that is, the initial appointment is normally to be for three (3) years, a thorough renewal review is to be conducted during Spring Quarter of the second year of the initial three-year appointment, and if renewal is awarded, a mandatory review for promotion or must be made in the sixth year of appointment.

Appointment at the Clinical Assistant Professor rank is for a maximum of six (6) years. Time spent as a Lecturer does not count toward that six (6) years. Normally, the appointment is divided into two (2) three-year terms. A decision on re-appointment at the end of the first term must be made by Spring Quarter of the second year of the appointment. The voting faculty members of superior rank and title in the department must make a recommendation to the Dean on renewal, non-renewal, or postponement. If postponement is the decision made by the Dean, then another review must occur in Spring Quarter of the third year (first term) to reach a decision on renewal or non-renewal.

Under extenuating circumstances, it may be possible for the faculty member to seek an extension of one year prior to mandatory review for promotion. The decision to postpone a mandatory review of the candidate's credentials until the seventh year of the appointment can only be made in the sixth year. The material presented on behalf of the candidate parallels that of a formal review without the letters of assessment. The same deadlines are in effect. Should promotion be denied in the sixth (mandatory) year, reconsideration in the seventh or terminal year will not be allowed.

No minimum number of years of experience are required at the Clinical Assistant Professor rank for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor. It is unlikely that promotion would be considered with less than four (4) to five (5) years at the Clinical Assistant Professor level. Consideration **must** be made at the sixth year of appointment as Clinical Assistant Professor. If a faculty member is considered for promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor in advance of the sixth year and the outcome is not favorable, they are still eligible for reconsideration the next year.

Postponement is an option when a faculty member's promotion record requires further development that could be achieved during a year of postponement. The decision to postpone a mandatory review of the candidate's credentials until the seventh year of the appointment can only be made in the sixth year. The material presented on behalf of the candidate parallels that of a formal review. The same deadlines are in effect. Should promotion be denied in the postponed (mandatory) year, reconsideration in the final or terminal year will not be allowed.

#### **Clinical Associate Professor – Dental Pathway:**

Appointment to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor requires documented evidence of continued clinical competence and productivity as a clinician, high ranking as a teacher, scholarly achievement, and regional recognition as a clinician, teacher, or dental educator. Individuals appointed to this rank shall have served at the Clinical Assistant Professor level except in very unusual circumstances, for example, when they are recruited from foreign institutions, other academic institutions, the military, private practice, or allied fields. In these latter cases, credentials must be unique and compelling.

Appointments are for a limited term and a period of up to five (5) years must be specified at the time the appointment or promotion is recommended. Renewal decisions must occur in the Autumn Quarter of the last year of the appointment period.

It is unlikely that promotion would be considered with less than five (5) years at the Clinical Associate Professor level. There shall be documentation of capabilities in the areas of criteria for promotion described in the Faculty Code and these guidelines, as well as

evidence of continuing development during the period of service at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor.

**Clinical Professor –Dental Pathway:**

Appointment to the rank of Clinical Professor requires continued accomplishments in teaching and *scholarship* (see section C above) as evaluated in terms of national recognition and the criteria in the Faculty Code [Sections 24-34](#) and [24-57](#), and [Executive Order 45](#). National recognition can be demonstrated, for example, by letters of assessment from nationally recognized professional organizations, appointments to an office or a major responsibility in important organizations, appointments to committees or boards of national significance. Individuals appointed to this rank shall have served at the Clinical Associate Professor level except in unusual circumstances as noted under Clinical Associate Professor (number 2 above). No definite number of years’ experience is required at the Clinical Associate Professor rank.

Appointments are for a limited term and a period of up to 5 years must be specified at the time appointment or promotion is recommended. Renewal decisions must occur in the Autumn Quarter of the last year of the appointment period.

**CLINICAL DENTAL PATHWAY<sup>1</sup>.**

Rank	Term	Promotion Eligible	Mandatory Promotion	Tenure Eligible	Competitive Recruitment	APT Review for appointment / promotion	Board of Regents Review	Emeritus Eligible <sup>3</sup>	UW Voting Rights	SOD Voting Rights <sup>4</sup>
Clinical Assistant Professor	3 + 3 years	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Clinical Associate Professor	1 - 5 years <sup>2</sup>	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Clinical Professor	1 - 5 years <sup>2</sup>	N/A	N/A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y

<sup>1</sup> The distinguishing characteristic of the clinical –teaching ranks is that the appointee is to be engaged primarily in teaching and clinical care with less emphasis on scholarship; see [SOD APT Manual, Section V C](#). With the introduction of the teaching professorial track in 2020, the school has moved away from hiring faculty into the dental pathway. The teaching emphasis in the dental pathway track aligns with the teaching track and the latter affords UW voting rights, which is not the case with dental pathway.

<sup>2</sup>Minimum of 3years (with exceptions to be reviewed by the dean). May be renewed indefinitely.

<sup>3</sup>Generally, emeritus status criteria include having at least 10 years of service as a faculty member and holding the rank of professor or associate professor. Appointment requires an affirmative vote of the department faculty, dean concurrence and provost approval.

<sup>4</sup>For purposes of School of Dentistry issues, except as restricted by UW Policy Directory, [Faculty Code §21-32 B](#), Clinical Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant professors with 50% appointment or greater, shall have voting privileges ( [Bylaws of the Faculty, Article II, Section 2](#)).

## **N. Clinical Salaried Appointments**

Titles for clinical salaried positions are:

- Clinical Instructor-Salaried
- Clinical Assistant Professor-Salaried
- Clinical Associate Professor-Salaried
- Clinical Professor-Salaried.

Clinical-salaried appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department in which they are held. [Faculty Code 24-34 B.11](#).

Appointments and promotions are carried out at the departmental level and do not require open searches or APT Committee review. After departmental review, the Dean then evaluates the appointment / promotion materials to determine whether the candidate merits the proposed appointment/promotion.

### **Evaluation Criteria for Appointments and Promotions:**

- *Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members*

In accord with the University's expressed commitment to excellence and equity, any contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity shall be included and considered among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion, Faculty Code [Section 24-32](#)

### **Criteria Typically Considered for Appointment and Promotion**

NOTE: Emphasis placed on each category will be dependent on the nature of the candidate's specified job responsibilities.

- Clinical Competence

The evaluation of clinical competence should be based on an assessment of clinical skills, general dental knowledge, knowledge specific to a sub-specialty area of expertise, humanistic qualities, interpersonal skills, and professional behavior. The evaluation could also include an assessment of effective leadership and management of a major clinical program.

The evaluation process should incorporate peer review and be performed in ways that are appropriate to the individual's specialty. Board certification in a specialty field may be considered in the evaluation process but is by itself not sufficient evidence of clinical competence.

The department chair will evaluate clinical productivity in accordance with performance expectations agreed upon at the time of appointment to the faculty or altered during subsequent annual review.

- Teaching

The evaluation of teaching skills and role as a dental educator should be based on a review of the quality of the teaching interactions with students and practicing dentists, including formal student course evaluations and peer teaching evaluations. Innovative teaching techniques, teaching materials, instructional resources, or educational programs developed should also be considered. The evaluation could also include an assessment of effective leadership and management of a major educational program.

- Scholarship

Annually appointed clinical faculty would typically not be engaged in scholarly activity to the same degree as faculty with multi-year appointments. Nevertheless, scholarly contributions are encouraged and are of value when considering issues related to appointment, promotion and merit evaluations. Scholarly contributions may focus on clinical dentistry, health services or applied clinical research, dental education, or other relevant fields.

Scholarly contributions may be demonstrated by activities such as those listed below:

1. Development of teaching materials, including manuals, web-based instructional material, and novel approaches in education and delivery of care.
2. Developing and teaching continuing education courses
3. Invited presentations and presentations at scholarly meetings
4. Published case-reports and literature reviews
5. Serving as a reviewer for journals and textbooks
6. Authoring or editing textbooks and chapters
7. Mentoring students and junior faculty
8. Participation in research projects
9. Journal publications
10. Board Certification in field of specialty
11. Participation in grant writing

- Service

Service activities may include, but are not limited to participation in UWSOD committees, departmental committees, other health center or University committees, and professional organizations.

## **Appointment Considerations**

### *Distinction among ranks*

**Appointment to the rank of Clinical Instructor – Salaried** requires completion of professional training. This title is used when the individual appointed is fulfilling a temporary, clinical, or instructional need, or is in a temporary transition period between post-doctoral training and mentoring and entry into the professorial ranks.

**Appointment to the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor - Salaried** requires a demonstration of teaching and clinical ability beyond that ordinarily required of a Clinical Instructor-Salaried.

- Successful completion of a post-professional degree program relevant to the appointment with completion of a thesis or paper prepared for publication; or
- Successful completion of clinical specialty training in an officially certified program; or
- Professional experience in the area of the proposed appointment, for example, medical or dental practice, part-time teaching, postdoctoral training; or,
- One or more years at the rank of Lecturer or Clinical Instructor-salaried, with documented evidence of capability within the criteria for appointment or promotion.

**Appointment to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor-Salaried** requires documented evidence of continued clinical competence and productivity as a clinician, high ranking as a teacher, a scholarly approach that includes critical thinking and incorporation of evidence-based practices, and regional recognition as a clinician, teacher, or dental educator. Individuals appointed to this rank shall have served at the Clinical Assistant Professor level except in very unusual circumstances, as for example when they are recruited from foreign institutions, other academic institutions, the military, private practice, or allied fields. In these latter cases, credentials must be unique and compelling. No definite number of years' experience is required at the Clinical Assistant Professor rank although other promotable pathways often consider promotion after 5 or 6 years at this rank to provide adequate time to evaluate the faculty member's accomplishments and growth in the position.

**Appointment to the rank of Clinical Professor-Salaried** requires continued accomplishments in teaching and clinic as evaluated in terms of national or enhanced regional recognition. Individuals appointed to this rank shall have served at the Clinical Associate Professor level except in unusual circumstances as noted under Clinical Associate Professor. No definite number of years' experience is required at the Clinical Associate Professor rank but it is common to consider promotion after 5 or 6 years at this rank to provide adequate time to evaluate the faculty member's accomplishments and growth in the position.

[CLINICAL \(ANNUAL\)](#)<sup>1</sup>

Term: Annual; indefinite reappointments

Rank	Promotion Eligible <sup>4</sup>	Mandatory Promotion	Tenure Eligible	Competitive Recruitment	APT Review for appointment / promotion	Board of Regents Review	Emeritus Eligible	UW Voting Rights	SOD Voting Rights <sup>6</sup>
<i>Clinical Salaried</i> <sup>2</sup> Must hold 50% FTE or more for 6 months or more									
Clinical Instructor	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Clinical Assistant Professor	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Clinical Associate Professor	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y <sup>5</sup>	N	Y
Clinical Professor	N/A	N	N	N	N	N	Y <sup>5</sup>	N	Y
<i>Clinical Non-Salaried</i> <sup>3</sup>									
Clinical Instructor	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Clinical Assistant Professor	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Clinical Associate Professor	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Clinical Professor	N/A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

<sup>1</sup> A *clinical* appointment in the appropriate rank or title is usually made to a person who holds a primary appointment with an outside agency or non-academic unit of the University, or who is in private practice. Clinical faculty make substantial contributions to University programs through their expertise, interest, and motivation to work with the faculty in preparing and assisting with the instruction of students in practicum settings. Clinical appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or under departmentalized college or school) in which they are held. [Faculty Code §24-34 B10](#)

<sup>2</sup> Clinical Salaried appointments may be full-time or part-time (minimum 50% appointment)

<sup>3</sup> Clinical Non-Salaried appointments are unpaid; however, may receive salary on a temporary basis (below 50%) which cannot result in being benefits-eligible

<sup>4</sup> Each year, departments may review affiliate and clinical faculty for promotion consideration. Requires faculty vote, Chair recommendation to the Dean, who will make their recommendation to the Provost.

<sup>5</sup> Emeritus status may be granted to Clinical Associate Professor Salaried and Clinical Professor Salaried. Criteria include having at least 10 years of service as a faculty member and holding the rank of professor or associate professor. Appointment requires an affirmative vote of the department faculty, dean concurrence and provost approval.

<sup>6</sup> For purposes of School of Dentistry issues, except as restricted by UW Policy Directory, [Faculty Code §21-32 B](#), Clinical Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant professors with 50% appointment or greater, shall have voting privileges (*Bylaws of the Faculty*, [Article II, Section 2](#)).

## O. Affiliate Appointments

(UW Policy Directory, Faculty Code: Chapter 24, [Section 24-34](#)).

An affiliate title requires qualifications comparable to those required for appointment to the corresponding rank of other titles. It recognizes the professional contributions of the individual whose principal employment responsibilities lie outside the colleges or schools of the University, with a non-academic unit of the University, or who is in private practice. Affiliate appointments are not intended for regular UW compensation or to be benefits eligible.

Affiliate faculty make substantial contributions to University programs through their expertise, interest, and motivation to work with the faculty in preparing and assisting with the instruction of students in practicum settings.

Affiliate appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department in which they are held. Those voting faculty members of superior rank in the involved department are eligible to vote on the promotion of affiliate faculty. Affiliate appointments and promotions are not reviewed by the APT Committee.

- a. Affiliate Instructor:** For the rank of Affiliate Instructor, a candidate must possess a dental degree or credentials appropriate to the duties performed. In addition, the appointee would be an active participant in departmental work such as assisting



regular teaching faculty in the clinical aspects of course instruction. This is the most commonly used initial appointment level.

- b. Affiliate Assistant Professor:** Requires training or experience, plus regular or exceptional contributions, as above. Such regular contribution should have been sustained for at least three (3) years. This is the typical entry level for individuals with a graduate degree and less than three (3) years' experience. The usual time in rank as Affiliate Assistant Professor is three (3) to seven (7) years.
- c. Affiliate Associate Professor:** Requires above qualifications and is reserved for those who continue to make regular, exceptional contributions to the departmental activities over a **prolonged period of time**. Scholarly contributions to literature will be considered but are not required. Participation in outside activities such as study clubs, dental societies, and continuing dental education, will also be considered. Usual time in rank as an Affiliate Associate Professor is five (5) to fifteen (15) years.
- d. Affiliate Professor:** Requires outstanding, mature scholarship, as evidenced by accomplishments in clinical teaching, related professional activities (e.g., mentor of a study club, CDE teaching, leadership in local, state, or national dental societies, etc.), and the consideration of scholarly contribution to literature. This appointment should be based on national recognition in his or her area of specialization and requires exceptional contributions to teaching and related professional and scholarly activities within the department over a long period of time.

Promotions in these ranks require the following:

- A current curriculum vitae of the candidate.
- Documentation from the faculty which fully describes and assesses the candidate's teaching and, if any, research involvement.
- A letter from the Department Chair detailing the faculty vote, the contribution of the candidate to the departmental program, and an explanation of why promotion in rank is justified. Years of service alone do not justify promotion.

### [AFFILIATE FACULTY](#)<sup>1</sup>

Term: Annual; indefinite reappointments

Rank	Promotion Eligible <sup>2</sup>	Mandatory Promotion	Tenure Eligible	Competitive Recruitment	APT Review for appointment / promotion <sup>3</sup>	Board of Regents Review	Emeritus Eligible	UW Voting Rights	SOD Voting Rights
Affiliate Instructor	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Affiliate Assistant Professor	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Affiliate Associate Professor	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Affiliate Professor	N/A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
---------------------	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

<sup>1</sup> An *affiliate* appointment requires qualifications comparable to those required for appointment to the corresponding rank or title. It recognizes the professional contribution of an individual whose principal employment responsibilities lie outside the colleges or schools of the University. Affiliate appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or under departmentalized college or school) in which they are held. [Faculty Code §24-34 B7](#)

<sup>2</sup> Each year, departments may review affiliate and clinical faculty (annual appointments) for promotion consideration. Requires faculty vote, Chair recommendation to the Dean, who will make their recommendation to the Provost.

## P. Adjunct Appointments

Rank	Promotion Eligible	Mandatory Promotion	Tenure Eligible	Competitive Recruitment	APT Review for appointment/promotion	Board of Regents Review	Emeritus Eligible	UW Voting Rights	SOD Voting Rights
Adjunct Assistant Professor	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Adjunct Associate Professor	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Adjunct Professor	N/A	N	N/A	N	N	N	N	N	N
Adjunct Research Assistant Professor	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Adjunct Research Associate Professor	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Adjunct Research Professor	N/A	N	N/A	N	N	N	N	N	N
Adjunct Teaching Assistant Professor	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Adjunct Associate Teaching Professor	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Adjunct Teaching Professor	N/A	N	N/A	N	N	N	N	N	N

Adjunct Clinical Assistant Professor	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Adjunct Clinical Associate Professor	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Adjunct Clinical Professor	N/A	N	N/A	N	N	N	N	N	N

**ADJUNCT FACULTY** <sup>1</sup>

Term: Annual; indefinite reappointments

<sup>1</sup>An *adjunct* appointment is made only to a faculty member (including one in a research professorial rank) already holding a primary appointment in another department. This appointment recognizes the contributions of a member of the faculty to a secondary department. Adjunct appointments do not confer governance or voting privileges or eligibility for tenure in the secondary department. These appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the secondary department. [Faculty Code §24-34 B8](#)

**Q. Visiting Appointments**

**VISITING FACULTY** <sup>1</sup>

Term: Determined at the local level; cannot exceed one year

Rank	Reappointment <sup>2</sup>	Promotion Eligible	Mandatory Promotion	Tenure Eligible	Competitive Recruitment	APT Review for appointment/promotion	Board of Regents Review	Emeritus Eligible	UW Voting Rights	SOD Voting Rights
Visiting Lecturer <sup>3</sup>	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Visiting Scholar <sup>4</sup>	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Visiting Scientist <sup>5</sup>	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Visiting Assistant Professor <sup>6</sup>	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Visiting Associate Professor <sup>6</sup>	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Visiting Professor <sup>6</sup>	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N

<sup>1</sup>Visiting titles include both faculty and academic staff appointments and represent temporary relationships with the UW.

<sup>2</sup>Reappointment term is determined at the local level and cannot exceed one year. Limited to 2 consecutive years in any visiting title; subsequent appointment is possible after a reasonable period of return to primary employment/home institution.

<sup>3</sup>Visiting Lecturer may hold a non-professorial position at another institution of higher education and/or may otherwise be qualified for this special instructional role. If serving as an instructor of record for a for-credit course, start and end dates should align with academic year or quarter. May be full-time or part-time (minimum 50% appointment). Education and experience are determined at the local level and commensurate with assigned responsibilities. May receive regular pay that meets [University minimum](#). See [UW Faculty Code Section 24-34 B.15](#)

<sup>4</sup>Visiting Scholar is an honorary, non-faculty academic staff title awarded to persons who hold professorial (including research titles) positions at other institutions of higher education and who are visiting but not employed by the University during their stay. Individuals with this title may not serve as instructor of record, may not hold another UW appointment concurrently, and are not eligible for UW salary. [UW Faculty Code Section 24-34 B.16](#)

<sup>5</sup>Visiting Scientist is an academic staff, typically a non-academic expert or professional in a field who collaborates with or serve an academic department and temporarily engage in independent (non-mentored) research, observation, and/or consultation with colleagues. Individuals in this non-faculty title may not teach or be an instructor of record for any course; must not otherwise meet eligibility criteria for appointment as a postdoctoral scholar; and may not be a student enrolled at any institution and/or performing the duties of a professional staff research scientist. May be terminated with 30 days' notice, with or without cause. Must be full-time. Must hold at least a master's degree. Must either be paid 100% directly from a non-UW source (PDR, i.e., Paid Direct), or be 100% UW-funded. If on a UW compensation plan, must meet [University minimum](#).

<sup>6</sup>Visiting professorial appointments are salaried faculty appointments that require a primary professorial position at another institution of higher education. If serving as an instructor of record for a for-credit course, start and end dates should align with academic year or quarter. All ranks require qualifications consistent with those outlined in [Faculty Code Section 24-34 A](#). Full-time or part-time (minimum 50% appointment). Education and experience: completion of professional training, in many cases marked by a PhD. If on a UW compensation plan, must meet [University minimum](#).

## R. Joint Appointments

Joint appointments recognize a faculty member's long-term commitment to, and participation in, two or more departments. A joint appointment may be discontinued only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. One department shall be designated the primary department and the others secondary, and this designation can be changed only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. Personnel determinations (salaries, promotions, leave, etc.) originate with the primary department, but may be proposed by the secondary department(s), and all actions must have the concurrence of the secondary department(s). A faculty member who has the privilege of participation in governance and voting in the primary department may arrange with the secondary department(s) either to participate or not to participate in governance and voting in the secondary department(s). This agreement must be in writing and will be used for determining the quorum for faculty votes. The agreement can be revised with the concurrence of the faculty member and the department involved. See [Faculty Code §24-34 B9](#).

Joint appointments are allowed for the following ranks:

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Research Professor
- Research Associate Professor
- Research Assistant Professor
- Teaching Professor

- Associate Teaching Professor
- Assistant Teaching Professor

A dental pathway faculty member may hold a joint appointment only in another SOD department.

### S. Emeritus Appointments:

Emeritus appointments are lifelong designations that recognize achievements of those with meritorious records. It is recommended by departmental action and concurrence by the dean and provost. The normal criteria for appointment with the emeritus title are: retiring from a tenured, WOT, research, teaching, clinical dental pathway, or clinical-salaried track at the rank of professor or associate professor; has held a UW faculty appointment for at least 10 years prior to retirement; requesting emeritus status within one year of retirement; has been found to be meritorious in each of the 5 years leading up to retirement and has an overall record of meritorious performance; and has had no misconduct issues requiring review and/or resolution in the 5 years leading up to retirement. [Faculty Code §24-34 B 13](#)

#### [Emeritus Faculty](#)<sup>1</sup>

Rank/Track	Reappointment	Promotion Eligible	Tenure Eligible	Competitive Recruitment	APT Review for appointment / promotion	Board of Regents Review	UW Voting Rights <sup>1</sup>	SOD Voting Rights <sup>1</sup>
Professor with tenure Associate Professor with tenure	N/A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Professor WOT Associate Professor WOT	N/A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Research Professor Associate Research Professor	N/A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Teaching Professor Associate Teaching Professor	N/A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Clinical Professor, Dental Pathway Clinical Associate Professor, Dental Pathway	N/A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Clinical Professor-Salaried Clinical Associate Professor-Salaried	N/A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

<sup>1</sup>Emeritus faculty may vote if they are in paid status during the quarter when voting action occurs

### T. Re-employed Retirees:

Faculty who retire but who do not hold emeritus status, may partially re-employ after retirement using the following titles/ranks in the table below:

<b>Title/Rank Prior to Retirement</b>	<b>Title/Rank Upon Re-employment</b>
Professor Professor WOT Research Professor Teaching Professor	Professor, Retired
Associate Professor Associate Professor WOT Research Associate Professor Associate Teaching Professor	Associate Professor, Retired
All other academic titles eligible for retirement	Retiree-Academic

Unless a faculty retiree maintains a [vested right to re-employ](#), re-employment is at the discretion of the dean/chancellor who will take into consideration—among other things—the needs of the University and availability of funding.

**U. Non-Professorial Instructional and Related Titles:**  
(e.g., Lecturer; Professor of Practice): [please click on link](#).

## **SECTION III - Changing Professorial Tracks**

There are a variety of reasons why faculty members in professorial tracks may wish to change tracks. Professorial tracks include\*:

- Tenure (eligible for or has tenure)
- Without Tenure By Reason of Funding (WOT)
- Research
- Teaching

It is expected that a faculty member approved to change tracks will enter the new track at the equivalent rank. For example, an Associate Professor WOT changing to the Research track would come in as a Research Associate Professor.

If a faculty member in a clock-managed rank changes tracks, the timeline for mandatory promotion and/or tenure review does not change as a result of changing tracks. In other words, the new track typically inherits the previously established clock. For example, a Research Assistant Professor with a 6-year mandatory promotion clock who changes to Assistant Professor WOT after 4 years will have 2 years remaining on their mandatory promotion clock. Please note that a track change does not preclude the faculty member from requesting a clock extension as allowed for by policy (e.g., change in FTE, [Promotion and Tenure Extension](#)).

If the faculty member moves from a clock-managed track into the teaching track, which is not clock-managed, the faculty member will no longer have a mandatory promotion clock. Conversely, if a faculty member moves from the teaching track into a clock-managed track, they will start at the beginning of the standard probationary period for the new track.

A faculty member who has been appointed as a clock-managed assistant professor and has exhausted the full probationary period (i.e., the equivalent of two 3-year appointments) is not eligible to hold the assistant professor rank in the same or a different clock-managed professorial track at the University. In limited circumstances and prior to a pending promotion or tenure decision, a faculty member in the final year of a clock-managed professorial appointment may be allowed to move into the teaching track.

## Track Change Options and Associated Requirements

Currently in...	Changing to...	Required Documentations and Approvals
<b>Tenure track</b> <b>WOT track</b>	Research track Teaching track	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required approvals: chair/director/campus dean, dean/chancellor, Academic HR</li> <li>• Letter from faculty member requesting track change and resigning from current appointment</li> <li>• New appointment letter</li> <li>• Chair/director/campus dean letter</li> <li>• Faculty vote</li> </ul>
<b>Tenure track</b>	WOT track	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required approvals: chair/director/campus dean, dean/chancellor, Academic HR</li> <li>• Letter from faculty member requesting track change and resign current appointment contingent on being offered new appointment</li> <li>• New appointment letter</li> <li>• Chair/director/campus dean letter</li> <li>• Faculty vote</li> </ul>
<b>WOT track</b>	Tenure track	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required approvals: chair/director/campus dean, dean/chancellor, Academic HR, Vice Provost</li> <li>• Approval on hiring plan</li> <li>• If track change does not involve award of tenure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Letter from faculty member requesting track change and resigning current appointment, contingent on being offered new appointment</li> <li>○ New appointment letter</li> <li>○ Chair/director/campus dean letter</li> <li>○ Faculty vote</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If track change involves the award of tenure, follow procedures as outlined on the <a href="#">Faculty Promotion and Tenure page</a></li> </ul>
<b>Research track</b>	Tenure track WOT track Teaching track	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required approvals: chair/director/campus dean, dean/chancellor, Academic HR, Vice Provost</li> <li>• Approval on hiring plan</li> <li>• Competitive recruitment required</li> <li>• Offer letter acknowledges that the new appointment supersedes current appointment</li> </ul>
<b>Teaching track</b>	Tenure track WOT track Research track	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required approvals: chair/director/campus dean, dean/chancellor, Academic HR, Vice Provost</li> <li>• Approval on hiring plan</li> <li>• Competitive recruitment required</li> <li>• Offer letter acknowledges that the new appointment supersedes current appointment</li> </ul>



## **SECTION IV – Working after Retirement**

Consistent with Washington State law, the University of Washington (UW) permits retired faculty members to reemploy at the UW up to a maximum of 40%. The UW bases the 40% limit on the faculty member's appointment and academic year base salary at the time of retirement. Forty percent represents the maximum amount of annual compensation a retiree can receive from all funding sources and compensation plans. Reemployed retired faculty members are subject to all applicable UW policies and procedures.

The faculty partial reemployment policy serves the dual purpose of providing transitional support to retiring faculty members while at the same time maintaining a corpus of experienced and committed faculty members who able to continue to support the UW's instructional and research mission.

### **Vested Right**

By policy, the UW has vested in tenured faculty members the right, beginning at age 62, to be reemployed up to the maximum of 40% of their tenure-backed salary (for example, a full-time faculty member with 80% tenure would be eligible to be rehired at 32%) for instructional and/or research purposes for 5 years immediately following their retirement. The vested right applies to only the tenure-backed portion of a faculty member's salary at the time of retirement.

When a faculty member with a vested right to reemploy retires prior to the end of an academic year, i.e., June 30 separation/termination date for 12-month appointments, the academic year in which retirement occurs counts as the first year of the 5-year vested right. In such cases, the retiree is eligible to reemploy up to 40% of the time remaining in that academic year. A faculty member does not need to elect reemployment in every year of the 5-year reemployment period; however, skipping a year does not extend the 5-year period. Faculty must notify their chair/director/campus dean/dean by December 1 of the academic year preceding the academic year they elect to be reemployed. This notification ensures that they can be planned into the curriculum.

When a retiree's reemployment is funded from state or tuition funds, the assigned duties must be classroom teaching unless the reemploying unit agrees to other instructional assignments. Decisions about teaching load and their equivalent percentages of support are made at the local level, taking into account traditional teaching loads within the particular unit. Arrangements for instructional, research, or other designated duties of reemployed faculty members are made at the discretion of the appointing unit. Program and curricula needs take precedent when making assignments. While efforts are made to accommodate reemployment assignments specifically requested by retirees, they cannot be guaranteed. Nonetheless, by vesting the reemployment commitment in retired tenured faculty members, the University commits to honor, in some scheduled way, the total reemployment opportunity for each year. The retiree has the discretion whether to accept the offered reemployment opportunity.

Reemployed faculty members are expected to maintain excellence in instructional, research and other designated duties and the University retains the right to discontinue reemployment on evidence of failure to meet those expectations. In addition, reemployment can be voided if the reemploying program is eliminated, or in the event of a financial emergency.

### **Other Reemployment Options**

Faculty members who retire from professorial appointments in the following tracks: without tenure by reason of funding; research; or teaching, may be reemployed after retirement for instructional, research, or service at the discretion of the appointing unit, using funds appropriately designated and available for the assigned duties.

#### Compensation During Reemployment

Reemployed retired faculty members are not eligible for merit-based salary increases. Base salary may only be adjusted when across the board salary increases for all faculty members are authorized by the president. A retired faculty member's reemployment compensation threshold of 40% is based on the appointment percent and base salary at the time of retirement.

#### Related References:

[Academic HR Working after Retirement](#)

[Working After Retirement FAQ](#)

[Emeritus Appointments and Re-employed Retirees](#)

[Leaving the UW](#)

## **SECTION V - Earning Advanced Degrees: Exclusion of Faculty**

Ordinarily, no member of the faculty with the rank of assistant professor or above shall be granted any advanced degree at the University. However, with prior approval of their chair, dean and the provost, such degrees (outside the faculty member's department) may be granted. This regulation shall not be applied to any member of the military services officially assigned to campus. ([Faculty Code Chapter 52](#))

## **SECTION VI - Procedures for Initial Appointment of Faculty**

### **A. Appointments that require competitive searches AND Office of Academic Personnel approval on the hiring plan:**

- Assistant Professor tenure-track
- Assistant Professor Without Tenure by Reason of Funding (WOT)
- Research Assistant Professor
- Assistant Teaching Professor
- Clinical Assistant Professor, Dental Pathway
- Associate Professor tenure/tenure-track
- Associate Professor Without Tenure by Reason of Funding (WOT)
- Research Associate Professor
- Associate Teaching Professor
- Clinical Associate Professor, Dental Pathway
- Professor tenure/tenure track
- Professor Without Tenure by Reason of Funding (WOT)
- Research Professor
- Teaching Professor
- Clinical Professor, Dental Pathway

UW sponsors full-time, UW-salaried employees in competitively recruited faculty titles for permanent residence. Eligible ranks and tracks include assistant professor, associate professor, and professor (tenured, tenure track, WOT, research, teaching, and clinical dental pathway).

In order to be eligible for UW sponsorship, appointments must include some teaching responsibilities, whether through classroom teaching, laboratory instruction, or mentorship. Affiliate, acting, and emeritus titles are not eligible for sponsorship; nor are temporary titles such as Postdoctoral Scholar or Acting Instructor.

References:

[AHR Permanent Residence Sponsorship](#)

[SOD Hiring Procedures Handbook/Job Posting and Outreach #4](#)

### **B. Search and hire overview for positions that require competitive searches**

The following are general steps involved in hiring faculty. You may also view the [Hiring Process Flow Chart](#) for competitive searches for a high-level overview of the process.

#### **Step 1**

Verify if the title being recruited requires approval from the Provost, see [Requesting a faculty position](#) in the SOD Faculty Hiring Procedures Handbook. It is expected that the department chair seeks input from the Associate Dean for Faculty to determine the appropriate title, rank and track for positions that require competitive searches.

## Step 2

If applicable, form your search committee once the position is approved by the Office of Academic Personnel (OAP), see [Assembling a Search Committee](#) in the SOD Faculty Hiring Procedures Handbook.

## Step 3

Draft job posting (search committee). Post job in Interfolio (UW faculty recruitment tool). See [Job Posting and Outreach](#) and [Overview of Interfolio Administrator Role](#) in the SOD Faculty Hiring Procedures Handbook.

## Step 4

Review applications; conduct interviews; identify final candidate. It is expected that the department chair consults with the APT Committee chair (provide the candidate's CV and job posting for the position) on the qualifications of the proposed candidate before conducting department faculty vote and making the job offer. See [Evaluating, selecting job applicants and scheduling interviews](#) and [Making the job offer](#) in the SOD Faculty Hiring Procedures Handbook.

## Step 5

For positions that require a competitive search, compile appointment packet. APT Committee reviews proposed appointment and makes their recommendation to the dean; see [Appointment, Promotion and Tenure \(APT\) Committee](#) in the SOD Faculty Hiring Procedures Handbook. Dean reviews the committee's recommendation and makes recommendation to the provost.

## Step 6

The Dean's Office submits appointment packet, including the dean's recommendation to Academic HR via Workday.

## Step 7

Chairpersons should allow sufficient lead time for the recruitment and review process. For academic appointments requiring Board of Regents approval ([see Academic Personnel Appointments Requiring Board of Regents Approval](#)), the appointment packet must be sent to central Academic HR via Workday at least 3 weeks prior to the Board of Regents meeting; see [Due Dates Calendar](#)). All appointments are not final until approved by the Board of Regents. *The Board of Regents will generally not approve appointments on a retroactive basis.* Once approved by the Board of Regents, Academic HR will send written confirmation of appointment to the faculty member with a copy to the SOD Academic HR Manager, who will forward a copy of the letter to the department chair and administrator.

### **C. Appointments that DO NOT require competitive searches but require Office of Academic Personnel approval on the hiring plan:**

- Clinical Instructor-Salaried
- Clinical Assistant Professor-Salaried
- Clinical Associate Professor-Salaried
- Clinical Professor-Salaried

- Acting Instructor
- Acting Assistant Professor
- Acting Associate Professor
- Acting Professor
- Visiting Assistant Professor
- Visiting Associate Professor
- Visiting Professor
- Visiting Scientist
- Visiting Scholar

**D. Appointments that DO NOT require competitive searches and DO NOT require Office of Academic Personnel approval on the hiring plan:**

- Affiliate Instructor
- Affiliate Assistant Professor
- Affiliate Associate Professor
- Affiliate Professor
- Clinical Instructor Non-Salaried
- Clinical Assistant Professor Non-Salaried
- Clinical Associate Professor Non-Salaried
- Clinical Professor Non-Salaried
- Emeritus faculty

**E. For non-competitive searches, follow these steps:**

**Step 1**

Department drafts offer letter, see offer letter templates on SOD Faculty HR/[Forms & Templates webpage](#).

**Step 2**

Department sends draft offer letter to the Dean's Office for review and approval. See [Making the job offer](#) in the SOD Faculty Hiring Procedures Handbook.

**Step 3**

Department conducts faculty vote and report in chair's letter of recommendation to the dean.

**Step 4**

Department collates appointment packet, see UW Academic HR webpage, [Academic Titles and Ranks](#); select title and rank; Hiring Packet Required Documents.

**Step 5**

Department opens [RequestManager ticket](#) and uploads appointment packet.

**Step 6**

Dean's office enters appointment in Workday for Academic HR approval.

**Additional information on appointments:**

Procedures for New Appointments; Faculty Code Chapter 24, [Section 24-52 Academic HR Academic Titles and Ranks](#)

**F. Appointment Procedures for Joint and Adjunct Ranks:**

Joint and adjunct appointments require the same review by the Dean as regular appointments; however, appointments to these titles do not require review by the APT Committee. To initiate appointment, letters of concurrence are needed from the faculty member's Chairperson/Dean of the primary unit. For joint appointments, a decision by the Chairperson and the faculty member regarding designation of primary and secondary departments shall be made and documented following discussion by faculty member and chairs of both departments. The documentation of parent department needs to be sent to the Office of the Dean for inclusion in faculty member's personal file. Joint appointments will require the faculty vote of both departments.

## **SECTION VII - School of Dentistry Ad Hoc Committee** **Reappointment Policy**

When departments lack three eligible voting faculty, an *ad hoc* review committee shall be formed to review and vote on matters related to reappointment. This policy establishes the process for the creation of such a committee in the School of Dentistry.

1. The Chair shall appoint up to three School of Dentistry faculty members who are superior in rank (except faculty at rank of professor) to the person being considered for reappointment. These faculty, in addition to the members of the department's faculty that are superior in rank (except faculty at rank of professor) to the person being considered for reappointment will serve on an *ad hoc* review committee that has no fewer than three faculty members.
2. When the Chair of the department is the person being considered for reappointment, the Dean, in consultation with the Associate Dean for Faculty, shall appoint a Review Chair from another department who is superior in rank (except faculty at rank of professor), to serve as Review Chair. The Review Chair, shall appoint an *ad hoc* review committee of three School of Dentistry faculty members who are superior in rank to the Chair (except faculty at rank of professor) being considered for reappointment, and who may be members of the same department.
3. The *ad hoc* review committee serves as the voting eligible faculty members for the reappointment under consideration. The *ad hoc* review committee shall review all materials and make a recommendation to the Chair (in the case of #1), or Review Chair (in the case of #2), who shall make their recommendation to the Dean.



## **SECTION VIII - Voting Faculty**

The voting members of the faculty of the School of Dentistry are those holding the rank of:

Professor

Research Professor\*

Teaching Professor\*\*

Associate Professor

Research Associate Professor\*

Associate Teaching Professor\*\*

Assistant Professor

Research Assistant Professor\*

Assistant Teaching Professor\*\*

Lecturer, full-time

Retired Assistant Professor, Research Assistant Professor, Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Professor, Research Associate Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Professor, Research Professor, or Teaching Professor during the quarter they are serving on a part-time basis

\*Research faculty may vote on all personnel matters as described in the Faculty Code except those matters relating to the promotion and/or tenure of faculty to the following ranks: Associate Teaching Professor; Teaching Professor; Associate Professor; Professor; Associate Professor WOT; Professor WOT.

\*\* Professorial teaching faculty may vote on all personnel matters as described in the Faculty Code except those matters relating to the promotion to and/or tenure of faculty to the following ranks: Associate Professor Professor; Associate Professor WOT; Professor WOT; Research Associate Professor; Research Professor.

Faculty Code Chapter 21, [Section 21-32](#).

Academic HR [Voting Guidelines](#)

## **SECTION IX - Membership in the Graduate Faculty**

The Graduate Faculty consists of those members of the University faculty who have been designated by the Dean of the Graduate School as actively participating in graduate education. New Graduate Faculty members are nominated to general membership by a quorum majority vote of Graduate Faculty from the academic unit where the faculty hold the primary faculty appointment. The nominated faculty are subsequently appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School ([Faculty Code Section 23-42](#)). In cases where the faculty member's primary academic unit does not offer a graduate degree or graduate certificate, the faculty member may be nominated to the Graduate Faculty by a graduate degree-offering or graduate certificate-offering unit where that faculty member holds an adjunct appointment.

Graduate Faculty members who substantively engage in doctoral education must also have a specific "doctoral endorsement." A doctoral endorsement is required to chair a doctoral supervisory committee or to serve as a Graduate School Representative (GSR) to doctoral supervisory committees.

Additional information:

[Policy 4.1: Membership in the Graduate Faculty and Doctoral Endorsement](#)

[Faculty Titles and Ranks Eligible for Graduate Faculty Status](#)

Faculty Code [Chapter 23; section 23-42 and 23-44](#)

[Policy 4.2: Supervisory Committee for Graduate Students](#)

## **SECTION X - Promotion and/or Tenure**

### **A. Evidence for Promotion and/or Tenure Consideration**

General Considerations (Modified from Faculty Code: Chapter 24, [Section 24-32](#)): Scholarship, the essence of effective teaching and research, is the obligation of all members of the faculty. The scholarship of faculty members may be judged by the character of their advanced degrees and by their contribution to knowledge in the form of publication and instruction; it is reflected not only in their reputation among other scholars and professionals but in the performance of their students, both elementary and advanced. The UW Policy Directory, Faculty Code requires evidence of "substantial success in both teaching and research" for appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Associate Professor and "national recognition" for the rank of Professor. Consistent with the University's expressed commitment to excellence and equity, any contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity shall be included and considered among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion, Faculty Code [Chapter 24-32](#).

The creative function of a university requires faculty devoted to inquiry and research, whose attainment may be in the realm of scholarly investigation or in constructive contributions in professional fields. Some elements in evaluating the scholarly ability and attainments of faculty members include the quality of their published and other creative work; the range and variety of their intellectual interests; the receipt of grants, awards, and fellowships; their success in directing productive work by advanced students and in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods; their participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals; the judgment of professional colleagues; and membership on boards and committees.

In addition, the university aims to promote and recognize interdisciplinary research (IR). The National Academies defines IR as, "*a mode of research by teams or individuals that integrates information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, and or theories from two or more disciplines or bodies of specialized knowledge to advance fundamental understanding or to solve problems whose solutions are beyond the scope of a single discipline or area of research practice.*" The UW recognizes original research contributions in peer-reviewed publications as well as integrative and applied forms of scholarship that involve cross-cutting collaborations with business and community partners, including translational research, commercialization activities, and patents. IR often requires significantly more faculty time and effort. The evaluation of a candidate's research productivity will, therefore, encompass not only an individual's contribution to research but also assess the extent to which the individual worked beyond the bounds of a specific discipline and engaged in collaboration and cross-disciplinary activities.

Consistent with the statement above, faculty at the School of Dentistry are encouraged to engage in interdisciplinary collaborations within the UW and with external institutions. Unlike the traditional principal investigator role, interdisciplinary research efforts entail lending specialized knowledge to other disciplines with the aim to promote basic understanding or address complex subject matters that are beyond the scope of any one area of expertise. The evaluation of a candidate's research productivity need not be limited to an individual's area of research, but special recognition must be given to their collaborations

with cross disciplinary activities. Their interdisciplinary research effort shall be recognized by the school when faculty members are considered for appointment, promotion, and tenure.

The educational function of a university requires faculty who can teach effectively. Instruction must be judged according to its essential purposes and conditions which they impose. Some elements in assessing effective teaching include the ability to organize and conduct a course appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter, the consistency with which the teaching brings to the classroom the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline; the ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments; the extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate within the course to enable students to articulate the ideas they are exploring; the availability of the teacher to the student beyond classroom environment; and the regularity with which the teacher examines or re-examines the organization and readings for a course and explores new approaches to effective educational methods. The assessment of teaching effectiveness should include qualified student opinion, the informed judgment of colleagues, and, where possible, measures of student performance. **Each faculty member shall have at least one (1) course evaluated by students in any academic year during which the faculty member teaches one or more courses. Collegial (peer) evaluations shall be conducted "every year" for assistant professors; and tenure-track associate and full professors; and "at least every 3 years" for tenured Associate Professors and Professors** (UW Policy Directory, Faculty Code, [Section 24-57](#)). With respect to merit pay, annual student and peer evaluations are essential.

Contributions to a profession through published discussion of methods or through public demonstration of an achieved skill should be recognized as furthering the University's educational function. The scope of the University's activities makes it necessary for some members of the faculty to engage in many activities outside the fields of teaching and research. Competence in professional service to the University and the public should be considered in judging such a faculty member's qualifications. This may include participation in university committee work and other administrative tasks, clinical duties, special training programs, continuing education and community service. The internal services as well as extramural professional services to school, to industry, and to local, state, national and international organizations.

Quality and extent of service to the University and the public should be considered in judging a faculty member's qualifications, but except in unusual circumstances, skill in instruction and research should be deemed of greater importance.

Additional information on Documentation of Qualifications and Recommendations for Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Increases can be found in [Executive Order No. 45](#).

## **B. Award of Tenure - Introduction**

1. Faculty Code [Chapter 25-31](#) Tenure is the right of a faculty member to hold their position without discriminatory reduction of salary, and not to suffer loss of such position, or discriminatory reduction of salary, except for the reasons and in the manner provided in the Faculty Code [Chapter 25-51](#).
2. Tenure should be granted to faculty members of such scholarly and professional character and qualifications that the University, so far as its resources permit, can

justifiably undertake to employ them for the rest of their academic careers. Such a policy requires that the granting of tenure be considered carefully. It should be a specific act, even more significant than promotion in academic rank, which is exercised only after careful consideration of the candidate's scholarly and professional character and qualifications. [Chapter 25-41A](#).

3. Unless the faculty member is disqualified under any other provision of this section, a full-time member of the faculty has tenure if:
  - The faculty member is a professor or associate professor; or
  - The faculty member has held full-time rank as assistant professor in the University for seven or more years and has not had the term of appointment extended by the Provost or received notice terminating the appointment.
4. A part-time assistant professor appointed pursuant to Chapter 24, [Section 24-45](#), accumulates eligibility for tenure.
5. A faculty member with tenure may resign a portion of their appointment with the agreement of their department chair, dean, and the President, while retaining tenure in their part-time appointment. If their tenure value is not 100%, the tenured portion will be reduced proportionately. For example, if a 100% tenured appointment is reduced to 75% time, then the faculty member must resign 25% of their tenure; if reduced to 50% time, they must resign from 50% of tenure. The reduction in tenure cannot be reinstated.

### **C. Eligibility for Tenure**

1. The appointment of an assistant professor on tenure-track consists of two 3-year terms. During the second year of the initial term, the appointment must be considered for renewal, consistent with the provisions of Chapter 24, [Section 24-41.A](#). If the assistant professor is reappointed, the second 3-year term must include a tenure decision, followed by a terminal year in the event that tenure is not granted.
2. Appointments to the rank of Associate or full Professor Tenure-Track are limited to no more than two consecutive 3-year terms. During the second year of the initial term, the appointment must be considered for renewal, consistent with the provisions of Chapter 24, [Section 24-41.A](#) for assistant professors. If the associate or professor is reappointed, the second 3-year term must include a tenure decision and terminal year in the event that tenure is not granted. To meet this expectation, the tenure review must be conducted no later than the second year of the second 3-year term; postponement of the tenure decision is not an option. In the case where tenure is not granted in the mandatory fifth year, the sixth year will be the terminal year of appointment. The part-time reappointment periods provided for assistant professors in Chapter 24, [Section 24-45.D](#) do not apply to Associate or full Professor Tenure-Track.
3. For titles that are not eligible for tenure, please see Faculty Code [Chapter 25 32-C](#).
4. In the case of appointments of Associate or Professors either initially appointed or promoted to these ranks but specified to be Without Tenure Due to Funding (WOT), such appointments *may be eligible for tenure review* if state funds become available. The faculty member will follow the promotion and tenure process. Such faculty shall follow

the same promotion procedures as outlined in the Faculty Code, except that a denial of tenure shall not of itself lead to termination of appointment. See Faculty Code [Chapter 25-41 C](#).

#### **D. Procedure for Tenure Award**

The general procedure for recommendation of tenure is described in Faculty Code [Section 25-41](#) and Faculty Code [Section 24-54](#). Tenure recommendations ordinarily accompany the promotion of persons in tenure-eligible titles, from the rank of Assistant Professor tenure-track to Associate Professor, or from Professor tenure-track to Professor with tenure. For an Associate Professor tenure-track who is awarded tenure, normally, the promotion title would be Associate Professor; the individual would seek a promotion in rank to Professor in a separate promotion cycle.

Because the consideration of tenure is a decision that is special unto itself, the letter of recommendation from the Chairperson is most significant. This letter should follow the guidelines described earlier in relation to promotion. If a previous recommendation for promotion has been considered in the past, a summary of the changes in the nominee's status shall be included.

#### **E. Evidence Which may be Submitted to Demonstrate Qualifications for Appointment, Promotion, and/or Tenure:**

Evidence should be provided in the areas of scholarship, teaching, administration and/or school service, community service, personal qualities and the way in which the candidate will fit into the present or foreseeable future of the department. Interdisciplinary research should also be recognized when assessing record of scholarly activities. Among criteria used as the basis for appointment or promotion, performance in teaching and research (or other scholarly activity) will carry the greatest weight. Performance in other areas used as criteria for promotion, i.e., administration, service, etc. will be considered but will carry less weight than the overall record in teaching and research.

##### **Scholarship:**

Scholarship is the diligent and systematic inquiry into a subject to discover, organize or revise theories or facts. Objective evidence of scholarship includes the following:

- a. *Publications:* Significant research is usually published and therefore, it is available for evaluation. The quality of publications is far more important than quantity. Considerations in judging quality include the opinion of experts in the relevant field, reputation of the journal in which the paper appears and whether or not the journal is juried. Research and publication are considered in their broadest sense, i.e., library research of significant quality is as acceptable as laboratory or clinical research. Papers, monographs, book chapters and other manuscripts which have not been published but are considered to be of high quality can be submitted for review. Contributions to theory are as valued as contributions to fact. Textbooks and other books which the candidate has authored, co-authored or to which they have contributed may provide evidence of considerable scholarly activity.
- b. *Support for research:* The awarding of a grant for the purpose of conducting original research provides evidence of scholarly capabilities. Grant applications which have been approved but remain unfunded, or which have been seen as meritorious, but do

- not fit in with funding program requirements may be submitted for committee evaluation. The evaluation of a candidate's research productivity encompasses not only an individual's contribution to research but also assess the extent to which the individual worked beyond the bounds of a specific discipline and engaged in collaboration and cross-disciplinary activities.
- c. *Scholarship for teaching professorial track:* May be demonstrated in a number 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 professional at other education institutions; or significant outreach to professionals at other educational institutions. While they may choose to do so through publication, such publication shall not be required. ([Faculty Code Section 24-34 B.4](#)).
  - d. *Presentations before scholarly meetings and conferences:* A paper presented at such a conference can be submitted for evaluation. Documentation of lectures, seminars, and programs given for study groups or at other institutions may also be considered by the committee.
  - e. *Academic training:* Scholarly pursuit beyond the level Ph.D., D.D.S., D.M.D. or D.H. will be evaluated. This may include additional degrees, certificates awarded, courses of study in progress or completed, or postdoctoral training.
  - f. *Election to editorial boards of major journals:* Evidence indicating a commitment to the editing of major professional journals may be submitted as evidence of one's stature within a discipline.
  - g. *Training of graduate and professional students in scholarly methods:* Evidence which demonstrates that graduate and professional students have been successfully trained in scholarly methods may be submitted for evaluation. Examples of such evidence include student's papers accepted for publication, papers presented at scholarly conferences, awards won by students that were based on the scholarly training, etc.

### **Teaching:**

For a faculty member to be an effective teacher, they must be capable of organizing and presenting their materials in a logical, comprehensive manner. In evaluation of teaching activity and capability, evidence of constructive activity to improve instruction will be given more weight than maintenance of instruction status quo, even when instruction is effective.

Objective evidence which can be considered includes the following, which should be assembled in a **Teaching Portfolio**, [Appendix 11](#).

- a. *Student performance:* What students learn is the ultimate criterion in effectiveness of instruction. Proper evaluation of this accomplishment requires that course objectives, copies of pertinent examinations, teaching materials, and records of class performance be submitted.

- b. *Systematic and standardized student evaluation of instruction:* **It is the responsibility of the department chairperson and faculty to see that systematic and standardized student evaluation of instruction is carried out annually, on at least one course, with particular attention to the year prior to the tenure or promotion recommendation.** Student evaluations of instruction obtained via standardized University or School forms and procedures -- for example, University Educational Assessment Center forms and procedures -- shall carry significantly greater weight than non-standardized evaluations designed by the candidate or others, although the latter may be submitted. The results of standardized evaluations will significantly influence APT decisions when the candidate is consistently judged by students to be at either extreme of the distribution of instructional effectiveness. The results of all formal standardized course evaluations conducted must be submitted to the APT Committee, including evaluations of postdoctoral, predoctoral, didactic, clinical, and laboratory instruction. The results of student evaluation of instruction shall be transmitted to the Committee.
- c. *Instructional material collected or devised:* Teaching aids such as slides, syllabi, teaching modules, audio and video tapes, motion pictures, computer programs, and other material can be evaluated for organization, accuracy, and effectiveness in meeting specific objectives.
- d. *Course responsibilities:* Detailed documentation of clinical and didactic teaching responsibilities of a candidate must be provided by the chairperson or, when the candidate is a chairperson, by the Dean. The documentation should present a clear picture of the relative magnitude of teaching efforts of the candidate.
- e. *University of Washington-sponsored Continuing Education:* Detailed documentation of teaching effectiveness is required as indicated above for didactic, preclinical laboratory or clinical instruction. Course activity submitted without documentation will be considered under Professional and Community Service.
- f. *Systematic appraisal of instruction by other faculty members:* **Collegial evaluation of teaching is required - every year for assistant professors; and tenure-track associate and full professors; and "at least every 3 years" for tenured Associate Professors and Professors (UW Faculty Code, [Section 24-57](#)) and for the year leading up to promotion and/or tenure review.**

A Peer Teaching Evaluation Review Committee (PTERC) must be formed to evaluate the candidate's teaching. See [Section XII No. 11](#).

### **Administration and/or University Service:**

The extent of participation, competence demonstrated, and productivity in committee and administrative activity will be considered.

Examples of this type of service include:

- Administration of a department, segment of a department or a specific course within a department.



- Administration of a clinic or other aspects of patient management.
- Direction of special departmental or interdepartmental training or research program.
- Service as class advisor.
- Service on School or University governing and advisory bodies.
- Chairperson or member of School and University committees.
- Representation of the School, University, or profession on outside agencies.
- Chairperson of course committee(s).

Objective evidence of a candidate's contribution to the activities of these services could include letters submitted by the administrative superior of the candidate. For instance, a letter from a committee chair for a committee member, a letter from the departmental chairperson for someone administering an aspect of a departmental program, a letter from the Dean for someone administering a school-wide program, etc. In addition, a candidate may submit other evidence of committee or service activity, such as reports, documents, studies, etc., that they have prepared as evidence of a positive contribution to the service activity.

The Dean should direct chairs of various committees to issue annual reports regarding the committee's activities and accomplishments, and department chairs should be encouraged to secure letters documenting a candidate's contribution and productivity or lack thereof. These should be submitted to the APT Committee.

### **Professional and Community Service:**

Involvement and competence in community service provides an indication of a faculty member's interest and devotion to the community in which they reside. Examples of community service include the following:

- a. Consultantship to hospitals, community colleges, high schools and other universities.
- b. Participation in national, state, or local dental society or other professional organizations.
- c. Member of advisory committees of various educational and other institutions.
- d. Organization and participation in community dental health education projects.
- e. Presentation of continuing dental education courses, other than those sponsored by the University of Washington.
- f. Contributions to cultural or other activities that assist the University and the community.
- g. Professional service outside the University.

Objective evidence concerning the candidate's qualitative and quantitative contributions to these activities should be provided. This evidence may be of the type previously described under Administration and/or University Service.

### **Personal Qualities:**

A Statement of Principle: Academic Freedom and Responsibility (Faculty Code, Chapter 24, [Section 24-33](#))

Personal qualities are considered in order to ensure a positive and inclusive learning environment that respects the dignity of others, acknowledges their right to express differing opinions, and fosters and defends intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and free expression on and off the campus.

## **SECTION XI - Promotion Time Schedule**

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair. At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted (Faculty Code, [Chapter 24, Section 24-54](#)).

**Winter Quarter:** Dean's Office sends individual notices to department chairs and their faculty members who are due for mandatory promotions reviews in the fall about deadline for submitting promotion materials to the Dean's Office. The Dean's Office will also send a courtesy notice to the department(s) where the faculty member has a joint appointment(s).

Between January and September of the promotion review year, the faculty member collates promotion materials (note: it is ultimately the faculty member's responsibility for their own promotion portfolio, not their administrative staff). Activities during this period include the department chair soliciting external letters of evaluations.

**September 25:** Due date for mandatory promotion materials submission. Portfolio must be submitted electronically via One Drive, see Administrator's Promotion Checklist, [Appendix 17](#).

**\*November 15:** Due date for early/non-mandatory promotion materials submission (tenure/tenure-track, WOT, research, teaching, dental pathway). Portfolio must be submitted electronically via One Drive. Dean's Office notifies department chairs in June.

\*This is SOD deadline which may be modified by the Academic HR Manager, depending on the number of early/non-mandatory promotion requests received each year).

**February 1:** Due date for annual appointment promotions (clinical-salaried; clinical non-salaried; affiliate). Materials must be submitted electronically. Dean's Office notifies department chairs in June.

## **SECTION XII - Promotion Policies and Procedures**

(Faculty Code [Section 24-34](#); [Section 24-54 B](#); [Chapter 24 Section 24-57](#))

1. All procedures regarding promotion, merit-based salary, and tenure considerations outlined in the relevant sections of the Faculty Code must be followed. Open communication among faculty, and between faculty and administration, must be maintained in order to ensure informed decision making, to protect the rights of the individual and to aid the faculty in the development of their professional and scholarly careers.
2. Each faculty member must be allowed to pursue those areas of inquiry which are of personal scholarly interest; at the same time, however, each faculty member must be informed of the expectations a department holds for them and of the manner in which their activities contribute to the current and future goals of the department, school, college, and University. In order to enable the faculty member to establish priorities in the overall effort of professional career development and to fulfill the University's obligations of fair appraisal and continual monitoring of faculty development, the following procedural safeguards shall be adopted in each department, school, or college.
3. The department shall consider each faculty member below the rank of Professor for promotion each year. The chair's annual conference with faculty members is instrumental in this process. During the conference, the chair and faculty member assess the faculty member's readiness for promotion consideration (not an option for faculty on a mandatory promotion clock). The annual conference is a good venue to check that the faculty member has obtained required student and peer evaluations. The chair must discuss readiness for promotion with the faculty member who is subject to mandatory promotion from the first year that the promotion clock begins.

Where a candidate has a joint appointment, the candidate shares their promotion packet with the secondary unit. The chair from the primary unit will ensure that there are votes from both units. The primary unit is responsible for collating the information from the reviews for all units, and for submitting a unified record to the Dean's Office. Where the candidate has an adjunct appointment, the chair from the primary appointment will obtain concurrence from the chair in the adjunct unit.

### **4. A) Titles subject to mandatory promotion (tenure eligible) and reviewed by the APT Committee**

- Assistant Professor tenure-track
- Associate Professor tenure-track
- Professor tenure-track

### **B) Titles subject to mandatory promotion (non-tenure eligible) and reviewed by the APT Committee:**

- Assistant Professor WOT
- Research Assistant Professor
- Clinical Assistant Professor Dental Pathway

**C) Titles not subject to mandatory promotion and reviewed by the APT Committee:**

- Associate Professor tenured
- Associate Professor WOT
- Research Associate Professor
- Clinical Associate Professor Dental Pathway
- Assistant Teaching Professor
- Associate Teaching Professor

**D) Titles not subject to promotion consideration (non-tenure eligible) and not reviewed by the APT Committee:**

- Clinical Instructor-Salaried
- Clinical Assistant Professor-Salaried
- Clinical Associate Professor-Salaried
- Clinical Instructor-Non-Salaried
- Clinical Assistant Professor-Non-Salaried
- Clinical Associate Professor-Non-Salaried
- Affiliate Instructor
- Affiliate Assistant Professor
- Affiliate Associate Professor

**5. Part-time Faculty**

For assistant professors in clock-managed ranks, the length of the second appointment term varies according to FTE percent, Faculty Code [Section 24-45 D](#):

- 90%-100%: 3 years
- 70%-89%: 4 years
- 60%-69%: 5 years
- 50%-59%: 6 years

**6. Clock waiver**

a. Clock waiver may be permitted for the following reasons:

- Birth or adoption of a child
- A serious personal health condition
- Providing care for a family member with a serious health condition
- Caring for a newly placed foster child
- Other extenuating circumstances outside the control of the faculty member that have substantially limited the faculty member from having the full benefit of the probationary period (e.g., a faculty member who performs field research but is unable to go to the field)

b. Generally, if the faculty member works less than 50% for six months or more, the year will be waived and will not count toward promotion and/or tenure clock. See [Promotion and Tenure Clock Waivers](#).

## 7. **Informal Review**

Faculty in a tenure track may request **informal review** of their credentials and records by the APT Committee twelve (12) months or more prior to recommendation by the Chairperson for formal consideration for promotion and/or tenure. The purpose of the informal review, which is entirely voluntary and can be exercised only once, is to provide guidance to the faculty member concerned relative to perceived strengths and deficiencies at such time that corrective action can be successfully undertaken. Requests for informal review are generally initiated by the individual concerned rather than by the Chair or the Dean. Material submitted and the review process used parallels formal consideration for promotion and/or tenure with the exception that letters of recommendation and Peer Teaching Evaluation Review Committee (PTERC) report are not needed. Materials for review should be submitted to the Dean's office by May 1<sup>st</sup> (internal School deadline). Informal reviews will be conducted once annually during the month of June. A written report will be provided to the faculty member reviewed or to the Chair or Dean. Reports of informal reviews will not be made available to the APT Committee at the time of formal consideration for promotion and/or tenure, and the recommendations and judgments expressed in informal review reports will in no way commit the APT Committee to any future course of action upon a formal promotion request.

## 8. **Peer Teaching Evaluation Review Committee**

The Peer Teaching Evaluation Review Committee (PTERC) will evaluate the applicant's teaching and will forward a written evaluation of their findings to the applicant's Department Chair, who will include it in the candidate's promotion packet. This evaluation will be confidential to the APT Committee and will assist the Committee in preparing its recommendation to the Dean. Research-track candidates may participate in instruction but are not required except insofar as required by their funding source.

The PTERC will consist of three (3) UW faculty members at the rank of Associate or Full Professor. At least one faculty member must be from the Department in which the faculty member seeking promotion has their primary appointment, and that faculty member will chair the PTERC. (APT Committee members may serve on PTERC; however, they should not chair the PTERC). At least one faculty member must have their primary appointment outside of the applicant's primary Department. The Department Chair, in consultation with the candidate, will select faculty members to complete peer teaching evaluations. Care must be taken in selecting Associate and Full Professors whose time availability is compatible with the faculty member's teaching schedule. In addition, the peer evaluators must be capable of making informed and objective evaluations in one or more of the four (4) possible teaching settings (lecture, small group seminar, clinical, and laboratory).

The actual selection of the three PTERC members will be made by the Department Chair, in consultation with the candidate from the eligible pool of peer evaluators. Each PTERC member must have completed peer evaluation forms on a minimum of two (2) teaching sessions (e.g., lecture, seminar, lab, clinic) given by the faculty member seeking promotion since their previous appointment or promotion. The assortment of teaching sessions that are peer evaluated should reflect the candidate's teaching responsibilities. Additional faculty members may evaluate single teaching sessions and these evaluations should be included in the teaching portfolio, however, these faculty do not qualify to be

members of the PTERC. Therefore, a minimum of three (3) faculty members must observe two (2) teaching sessions each before that faculty member can qualify for evaluation for promotion. **Progress toward achieving the requisite peer evaluations to form a PTERC will be monitored yearly during the annual faculty review.**

For faculty subject to mandatory promotion, the Department Chair should officially inform the peer evaluators of their appointment to the specific PTERC in the faculty member's first year of appointment (**Note:** this is also recommended for all early career faculty members even if they are not on a promotion clock as the PTERC reports may have helpful suggestions to improve their teaching skills). The candidate should provide the PTERC with additional information to adequately evaluate their teaching (e.g., syllabus, audiovisual materials).

*By August 1* (or October 1 for non-mandatory promotion) in the year promotion is considered, the PTERC will convene to discuss peer teaching evaluations. The PTERC should meet with the candidate to provide feedback to enhance the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

*By August 15* (or October 15 for non-mandatory promotion), in the year promotion is considered, the PTERC must submit their report to the Department Chair.

The Peer Teaching Evaluation Review Committee (PTERC) evaluation report must contain the following information:

- a. The names and departmental affiliations of the members of the PTERC.
- b. A composite summary statement of the Peer Evaluation Review Forms that have been completed. Comments should reflect the candidate's performance in the relevant teaching categories (i.e., lecture, small group, clinical teaching, laboratory teaching).
- c. Degree of improvement noted over the evaluation period.
- d. Evaluation of Supporting Material
  - i. Assessment of teaching syllabi, classroom handouts and other appropriate teaching materials, e.g., videotapes, computer assisted instruction, etc.: Are any of the materials used at other schools? Is the material up to date?
  - ii. Quality of Exams and Quizzes: Are the questions relevant to the course objectives?
- e. Student Performance in classes taught by the candidate.

A summary statement of the overall assessment by the PTERC regarding the quality of the candidate's teaching. See PTERC Report template, [Appendix 9](#).

## 9. Candidate's Responsibilities

The candidate is responsible for assembling most of the promotion materials which consists of the following:

- i. Candidate's Letter (Self-Assessment)
  - ii. Candidate CV should follow the sample format provided in [Appendix 10](#)
  - iii. ....\*Faculty Teaching Portfolio, see [Appendix 11](#)
  - iv. ....\*Teaching summary
  - v. ....\*Peer evaluations, see [Appendix 12](#)
    - Yearly:
      - Assistant professor tenure-track; WOT; teaching
      - Associate professor tenure-track, professor tenure-track
    - Once every three years:
      - associate professor with tenure

Regardless of rank, peer evaluations must be included in the year prior to consideration for promotion

- vi. \*Student evaluations (at least one course taught in an academic year). Evaluations must include both quantitative and qualitative course ratings and qualitative comments from summary reports.
- vii. ....Grant summary
- viii. ....Publications summary
- ix. ....Administration and Service summary
- x. Supplemental materials - please be selective. Only submit materials if they are substantive and will be helpful in evaluating a candidate's record (e.g., course syllabi; teaching materials)

*\*Does not apply to research faculty unless they participate in regular instruction.*

See Candidate's Promotion Checklist, [Appendix 13](#)

The candidate's portfolio should be assembled according to the Administrator's Promotion Checklist, see [Appendix 17](#). The Administrator must include the checklist and forward the promotion packet electronically to the Academic HR Manager in the Office of the Dean, no later than the deadline dates outlined in Section XI.

## 10. Candidate's Letter

(See template, [Appendix 14](#))

In April of the year the candidate is considered for promotion, the candidate should prepare a well-written self-assessment of academic accomplishments as well as future plans and career trajectory to include statement that incorporates diversity, equity and inclusion in teaching, scholarship and service activities. See Faculty Code [Chapter 24-32](#) and [Executive Order 45](#).

- a. The candidate should submit a letter addressed to the Departmental Chairperson, commenting on the publications listed in the C.V. First, the candidate should identify any publications felt to be especially important or to have "landmark" status in the field. The candidate should succinctly explain why the publication is important and place it in context with how it fits into a larger body of work or program. Letters of assessment should address and confirm the extraordinary nature of the noted publications.



- b. The candidate’s letter should address multi-authored publications listed in the C.V. Specifically, for those publications where the candidate was not the first author, the letter should identify the role played by the candidate in completing the published work. It is especially important to identify first authors who might be graduate students, residents, or technicians whose work was directed by the candidate.
- c. If a significant amount of effort is directed at interdisciplinary collaborative research, including mentoring trainees, publications, community engagement, and research grants, it is important to communicate the overall goals of the project, why it is critical that achieving the goals requires an interdisciplinary team, and your role in the project.
- d. Publications based on work done prior to arriving at this dental school should be distinguished from publications based on work at the UW School of Dentistry. This will give the Committee insight into the candidate’s level of independence, and the consistency of their research and publication activity.
- e. Candidates in the research, WOT or teaching tracks with primary emphasis in research or teaching, should reflect on accomplishments and experiences that are consistent with their track and rank.
- f. Teaching professorial track: expound on teaching. Do not omit scholarship or service. Scholarly activities include, but are not limited to, authoring/co-authoring textbooks or book chapters; authoring open-source resources for students and/or faculty to support teaching and learning; restructuring curriculum; participating on task forces on education in area of specialty; and presenting at professional conferences.
- g. Regardless of track, consistent with the UW’s expressed commitment to excellence and equity, contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity should be included and highlighted in the promotion materials.
- h. The faculty are reminded that 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 recognition** and other criteria listed in the UW Policy Directory, Faculty Code Chapters 24 and 25. Items constituting evidence of national recognition are included on that page and should be referred to by all candidates for promotion to full professor. These candidates should provide specific and detailed evidence of national recognition in their letters.
- i. All candidates should describe contributions to the profession, the University, and public service.

## 11. **Optional Sub-committee Review**

For departments where an initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion is produced by a subcommittee of the faculty senior in rank, the report shall be written. Such a subcommittee must consist of at least three eligible

voting faculty members, and may include faculty drawn from other departments, schools, colleges, or campuses who have appropriate expertise. Members of the subcommittee shall be given the opportunity to review the candidate's record, including external letters.

The department chair shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, all names shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The chair or dean shall forward the candidate's response, if any, together with the committee's report to the voting faculty.

## 12. SOD Ad Hoc Promotion Committee

If there are fewer than three eligible voting members in the department, a subcommittee shall be formed as described above, and it shall include any eligible voting members in the candidate's department who are available to serve. The subcommittee shall be used in lieu of a vote by the department. When the department chair is the person considered for promotion and/or tenure, the Dean, in consultation with the Associate Dean for Faculty, will appointment a review chair from another department. For additional information, see SOD Ad Hoc Promotion Committee, [Appendix 15](#).

## 13. Voting

The voting faculty of the candidate's department superior in rank to the candidate shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record and to vote on the promotion question. Voting faculty members superior in rank shall vote:

- a. to approve the promotion;
- b. to disapprove promotion;
- c. to postpone for reconsideration.

Personnel actions are effective only if passed by a majority vote of eligible voting members in the unit. A vote of less than or exactly 50% of those eligible to vote does not represent a majority. For both mandatory and non-mandatory promotions, the candidate has the right to submit their portfolio to the APT Committee and the Dean despite a negative decision by the involved department.

## 14. Department Chair

The department chair shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, all names shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days.

The Chair's letter of recommendation is particularly important. The letter needs to offer the chair's independent assessment of the candidate and the candidate's role in the present and future development of the academic unit. The recommendation should ideally provide insight in the departmental discussion. It must include a vote count and must specify if the votes include the chair's vote (chairs may choose to abstain from voting since they are making their recommendation to the dean). In so far as possible, the chair should explain the basis of negative votes.

- a. Describe and present a critical evaluation of teaching, research, and service to the department, School, University or the State as covered in the statement of major University functions, Faculty Code, Chapter 24, [Section 24-32](#).
- b. Describe and evaluate special competencies which the nominee has developed, together with copies of the letters or other evidence to be used by the school in judging standing, reputation and scholarly achievements.
- c. Present a complete and precise description of the departmental or school curriculum at the undergraduate, professional, or graduate/postgraduate level, as well as the anticipated place in future developments.
- d. Describe the program of research or creativity the nominee is following and plans for the future.
- e. Report the departmental vote on the recommendation (number eligible to vote, number voting, number of affirmative votes)
- f. Comment on the quality of the nominee's teaching portfolio

If the candidate holds a multi-year term, please specify appointment length (clinical dental pathway: 1-5 years, normally, minimum of 3 years; research track: 1-5 years; associate teaching professor: 1-7 years; teaching professor: 1-10 years. For associate teaching professor and teaching professor, the normal appointment period shall be for a minimum of 3 years)

See [Appendix 16-1](#): Department Chair's Promotion Checklist; [Appendix 16-2](#): Chair Letter of Solicitation template; [Appendix 16-3](#): Chair Letter to Dean.

If the recommendation is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, or if the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote, the chair shall transmit all documents produced in this promotion process to the dean, with the chair's independent analysis and recommendation.

Departmental recommendation to postpone mandatory review for one academic year must be supported by the dean and provost. If the provost approves the postponement, the dean must inform the candidate of the outcome and reasons therefor. It is recommended that a postponement plan and expectations be outlined.

The review conducted in the year following a postponement is considered a postponed mandatory review and the promotion outcomes are limited to approval or denial. The postponed mandatory review requires the initiation of a new review process supported by an updated promotion record (e.g., CV, self-assessment, teaching evaluations) and new external review letters. Recommendations from the chair must address the candidate's progress since the postponement decision.

## **15. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee**

The APT Committee is a standing committee, elected by eligible faculty members at the School, and reports to the School's Faculty Council. Its responsibilities is to: 1) establish guidelines governing appointment, promotion, and tenure consistent with the University

Faculty Code; 2) review candidates and advise the Dean regarding proposed appointments, promotions, and the award of tenure. See [Appendix 19](#).

Upon receipt of the materials, the APT Committee will make its recommendation to the Dean. If the recommendation of the committee is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the committee recommendation, with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. [Faculty Code Chapter 24-54 C](#).

The Dean will take the Committee's recommendation into consideration when evaluating the faculty member's candidacy for promotion.

#### **16. Dean's Recommendation**

After receiving the recommendation from the APT Committee, the Dean shall decide on the matter. If the Dean's recommendation is favorable, the promotion packet will be forwarded to the Provost. The Dean will inform concerned Chairpersons and candidates of the Dean's recommendations to the Provost. If the promotion is mandatory and not favorable, the Dean provides the candidate with their initial recommendation and reasons prior to issuing a decision and meets with the candidate. The candidate may respond in writing within 7 calendar days. If the final recommendation is not favorable, the Dean transmits their recommendation and candidate's response, if any, to the candidate and the Provost.

If the promotion is not mandatory and not favorable, the Dean provides the candidate with their initial recommendation and reasons prior to issuing a decision and meets with the candidate. The candidate may respond in writing within 7 calendar days. If the final recommendation is not favorable, and the candidate has not submitted a written response, the Dean informs the candidate regarding the Dean's final decision and reasons and copies the department chair. If the candidate provided a written response, the Dean transmits their decision and candidate's response and promotion materials to the Provost for informational purposes and copies the department chair on their decision.

#### **17. Office of Academic Personnel Review**

The Office of Academic Personnel (OAP) reviews promotions in winter and early spring. OAP will notify the Dean of preliminary approvals and the Dean will notify the concerned Chairpersons and candidates. Upon approval from the Board of Regents, OAP will send written confirmations to candidates, with copies to the Dean's Office. Promotions become effective on July 1, at the beginning of the academic year following the review period.

# **APPENDICES**

## **Prologue**

Appendices 2-8 are abstracts from the UW Handbook of Best Practices for Faculty Searches and Online Toolkit, and School of Dentistry Faculty Hiring Procedures Handbook. For the full text, please click on the web links below. Also, please visit the SOD Human Resources/Faculty website for resources on policies and procedures as well as forms and template.

### **UW Handbook of Best Practices for Faculty Searches**

<https://www.washington.edu/diversity/faculty-advancement/handbook/>

### **UW Handbook of Best Practices for Faculty Searches Online Toolkit**

<https://www.washington.edu/diversity/faculty-advancement/handbook/toolkit/>

### **School of Dentistry Faculty Hiring Procedures Handbook**

<https://uwnetid.sharepoint.com/sites/sod/human-resources/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2Fsod%2Fhuman%2Dresources%2FShared%20Documents%2FFaculty%20Policies%20and%20Procedures%2FFaculty%20Hiring%20Procedures%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2Fsod%2Fhuman%2Dresources%2FShared%20Documents%2FFaculty%20Policies%20and%20Procedures>

### **School of Dentistry Human Resources Faculty Webpage**

<https://uwnetid.sharepoint.com/sites/sod/human-resources/SitePages/Faculty.aspx?csf=1&e=ZRAtyr&cid=1a4bbfc3-e52e-4d0a-80ed-bca8127d9e52>

## Appendix 1

### Checklist for Recruitment of Professorial Tracks

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Permission to recruit (submit hiring plan to AHR Manager, Dean's Office)	✓	✓	✓
National search: advertisement approved via UW Interfolio system (automatically posted in UW academic jobs page, once approved)	✓	✓	✓
Post online at The Chronicle of Higher Education and/or professional journal	✓	✓	✓
Job offer letter, signed (requires informal dean's approval; draft to be reviewed by AHR Manager, Dean's Office)	✓	✓	✓
Department chair recommendation letter to the dean	✓	✓	✓
3 letters of recommendation (minimum)	✓	✓	✓
Curriculum vitae	✓	✓	✓
The Chronical of Higher Education online ad or professional journal ad (pdf copy of ad on website, including URL web address)	✓	✓	✓
Sexual misconduct declaration (waived for internal candidates with no break in UW employment)	✓	✓	✓
Background check request to dean's office (waived for internal candidates with no break in UW employment)	✓	✓	✓
WA state dental license, if applicable	✓	✓	✓

Refer to [SOD Faculty Hiring Procedures Handbook](#) for details

## Appendix 2

### [Sample Models for Structuring Faculty Search Committees](#)

(Please click on hyperlink above to assure you are viewing the most recent version)

There are multiple models for structuring effective search committees: what is possible and practical will depend on the size of your unit, how your subfields typically interact, how many searches you conduct in a given hiring season, and your overall unit culture and climate.

Keep in mind that how you structure search committees signals what your unit values—e.g., subfield autonomy, faculty seniority, and the discretion of the chair or director, on the one hand, or, on the other, broad unit consensus and issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion—but also how your unit distributes and enacts power. Who gets to provide significant input during the hiring process? Who gets to ask questions? And who makes decisions?

Below are a few sample structures to consider, each of which can be modified to meet the needs of particular units and disciplines, and/or specific faculty searches.

#### **A. Basic structure that engages the expertise of specialists in the subfield of the search:**

1. Senior specialist in subfield serves as committee chair
2. Second senior specialist in subfield from within the unit
3. Junior specialist in subfield from within the unit

Advantages: focused and efficient; subfield exercises high level of autonomy

Disadvantages: isolated from the larger unit; limited perspectives; subfield may have trouble building broad consensus for its choices

#### **B. More elaborate structure that engages broader expertise across the unit:**

1. Senior specialist in subfield serves as committee chair
2. Junior specialist in subfield from within the unit
3. Senior specialist in different subfield from within the unit
4. Graduate student representative from within the unit
5. Member of unit leadership team serves ex officio; participates but does not vote

Advantages: balance of senior and junior perspectives; multiple subfields have buy-in; broader investment should build consensus across the unit

Disadvantages: more difficult to schedule meetings; potential for disagreement about goals and expectations for the new hire

#### **C. More elaborate structure that engages expertise both within and outside the unit:**

1. Senior specialist in subfield serves as committee chair
2. Junior specialist in related subfield from within the unit
3. Senior or junior specialist in different subfield from within the unit
4. Senior specialist in related field from outside the unit
5. Graduate student representative from within the unit

6. Member of unit leadership team serves ex officio; participates but does not vote

Advantages: multiple perspectives; multiple subfields have buy-in; broader investment should build consensus across the unit; potential to build networks within and outside the unit for the new hire

Disadvantages: more difficult to schedule meetings; potential for disagreement about goals and expectations for the new hire

**D. More elaborate structure that emphasizes equity and inclusion:**

1. Senior colleague outside the subfield serves as committee chair; participates but does not vote
2. Senior specialist in subfield from within the unit
3. Junior specialist in subfield from within the unit
4. Specialist in different subfield from within the unit
5. Specialist in related field from outside the unit
6. Graduate student representative from within the unit
7. Member of diversity committee from within the unit

Advantages: committee chair focuses on search process but does not advocate for specific outcome; member of diversity committee is charged with making sure applicants from underrepresented backgrounds are considered fully and fairly; multiple perspectives; multiple subfields have buy-in; broader investment should build consensus across the unit; potential to build networks within and outside the unit for the new hire

Disadvantages: more difficult to schedule meetings; potential for disagreement about goals and expectations for the new hire; senior specialists in subfield may feel disempowered



## Appendix 3

### [Writing the Job Advertisement](#)

(Please click on hyperlink above to assure you are viewing the most recent version)

#### **Position Description:**

1. Describe the specific position. This can be done in expansive terms that include a commitment to diversity and inclusion.
2. It is useful to describe the unit. This, too, can be done in expansive terms that include a description of the unit as a place that values diversity and diversity-related work on multiple levels—e.g., in the curriculum, in pedagogy, in outreach to students and/or communities, in research.
3. It can be useful to also describe the university. Here is an opportunity to introduce potential applicants to UW’s broader commitments to diversity, equity, and inclusion, including its efforts to respond to the needs of dual career couples.
4. Depending on the position, it can be especially helpful to describe potential allies across campus. This might include interdisciplinary research centers, outreach programs, and so forth. It might also include related searches in other units—i.e., an unofficial cluster hire.

#### **Qualifications:**

- State the minimum qualifications for the position. A bulleted list, rather than a sentence or paragraph, can work well.
- Depending on the nature of the position, the unit may need to include an explicit statement of the minimum degree required (e.g., “Ph.D. or foreign equivalent”).
- The unit may also need to include an explicit statement indicating that “All University of Washington faculty engage in teaching, research, and service.” If in doubt, check with the unit’s Academic HR specialist.
- State any preferred qualifications for the position (e.g., years of relevant experience, demonstrated commitment to particular kinds of research or pedagogy, demonstrated commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion, etc.). Here, too, a bulleted list, rather than a sentence or paragraph, can work well.

#### **Instructions:**

5. Describe the materials you want applicants to submit for review. Depending on the specific field or subfield, as well as the academic rank of the position, typical materials include: a letter of interest; a full C.V.; a dissertation or thesis abstract; a sample of scholarship or creative activity; a statement of teaching philosophy and/or evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., a specified number of student or peer evaluations of teaching); a specified number of references or a specified number of names and contact information for potential references.
6. Committees may also want to request or invite an explicit statement that describes the applicant’s experiences with and commitments to diversity.
7. For positions that are primarily administrative, such as a department chair or college dean, it may be appropriate for committees to request a statement of administrative experience and/or a vision statement for the specific role.
8. List a priority deadline—the date when you will begin to read and assess applications. This date should be at least 30 days after initial posting.

**Highlight:**

The University of Washington, as both a state government institution and a public university, meets the federal requirement of a “public service organization” as defined by the [Public Service Loan Forgiveness \(PSLF\) Program](#).

## Appendix 4

### SOD HR [Faculty Sample Job Posting Template](#)

(Please click on hyperlink above to assure you are viewing the most recent version and see comments on web version)

\*Highlighted phrases below are required language.

The University of Washington (UW) School of Dentistry is ranked among the top 10 dental schools in the United States. The UW is an internationally ranked public university, serving diverse students, faculty, and staff, and is committed to educating and working in a multicultural environment. The institution engages in teaching, research, and service [required UW language]. The University of Washington, as both a state government institution and a public university, meets the federal requirement of a “public service organization” as defined by the [Public Service Loan Forgiveness \(PSLF\) Program](#).

The UW School of Dentistry is a 12-month service school [required UW language]. The Department of \_\_\_\_\_ is seeking a full-time faculty member for an [insert title] appointment. [Add brief description about the program/department and its standing in the region/country]. The Department of \_\_\_\_\_ is committed to building a diverse, equitable and inclusive learning environment. Candidates are encouraged to demonstrate their ability to innovate and create teaching/research/service models that incorporate diversity, equity, and inclusion. We invite a broad range of scholars with diverse perspectives to join us. The ideal candidate will be board certified by the American Board of \_\_\_\_\_, or board eligible. They must also be able to demonstrate contributions to diversity and equity in teaching, research, scholarship, and service. The successful candidate must have strong interpersonal skills and an excellent record of collaboration with colleagues.

#### **Qualifications**

The successful candidate must have [Insert qualifications].

#### **Salary and Benefits**

[Required UW language]The base salary range for this position will be [insert amount per month], commensurate with experience and qualifications, or as mandated by a U.S. Department of Labor prevailing wage determination.

Other compensation (if applicable) associated with this position may include [insert other compensation].

[Required UW language]A summary of benefits associated with this title/rank can be found at <https://hr.uw.edu/benefits/benefits-orientation/benefit-summary-pdfs/>

#### **Application Instructions**

Applications, including a letter of interest, C.V., diversity statement (past and planned contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion), and list of three references (name, work title, affiliated institution, phone number and email address), should be addressed to the attention of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_, [insert title], Department of \_\_\_\_\_, University of Washington School of Dentistry.

[Required UW language]University of Washington is an affirmative action and equal opportunity employer. All qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, pregnancy, genetic information, gender identity or expression, age, disability, or protected veteran status.

[Required UW language]The University of Washington is committed to building diversity among its faculty, librarian, staff, and student communities, and articulates that commitment in the UW Diversity Blueprint (<http://www.washington.edu/diversity/diversity-blueprint/>). Additionally, the University's Faculty Code recognizes faculty efforts in research, teaching and/or service that address diversity and equal opportunity as important contributions to a faculty member's academic profile and responsibilities (<https://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#2432>).

## Appendix 5

### [Posting the Job Ad](#)

(Please click on hyperlink above to assure you are viewing the most recent version)

Circulating ads in traditional scholarly publications remains useful but can result in a relatively homogenous pool of applicants. To enlarge the applicant pool, consider posting ads in a variety of publications and on the listservs, websites, or social media sites of relevant professional organizations. This should not only help enlarge the potential pool of applicants, but also help convey the unit's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. It is useful to maintain a comprehensive record of where ads have been posted.

Note: Depending on the nature of the faculty or administrative position, the unit may be required to post its ad in a print publication with an international audience, such as the Chronicle of Higher Education. A review by the unit's Academic HR specialist is required before any posting.

### **Networking**

Once the job ad is posted, preliminary "scouting" should become active "networking." Members of the search committee, along with other members of the unit, should personally contact colleagues at UW and other institutions to seek nominations for potential applicants. Consider using the following means of active networking:

- Send announcements and request nominations from departments at institutions that serve large numbers of Latina/Latino, African American, Native American, and other historically underrepresented populations. Your campus allies will be able to help you locate such institutions.
- Send announcements to diversity-related sections of regional, national, or international organizations within the discipline.
- Take advantage of social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn) to attract a broader pool of applicants by distributing the ad through a committee member's, unit's, or academic organization's account, or by reaching out to prospective applicants directly through their accounts.
- Consider inviting applications from junior colleagues who may be currently under-placed and thriving at less well-ranked institutions.
- Ask current faculty, graduate students, post-docs, and alumni to help market open positions by taking copies of job ads to academic conferences and meetings.
- Ask all members of the unit to contact their colleagues at other institutions to inquire about promising graduate students, post-docs, or junior faculty from underrepresented groups.
- Have the chair, director, or dean personally contact qualified nominated applicants, especially those from underrepresented groups.

## Appendix 6

### [Best Practices for Faculty Searches: Assessment 4](#)

(Please click on hyperlink above to assure you are viewing the most recent version)

Two key components help ensure fair and effective assessment of job applicants:

1. a clear and consistent assessment rubric (i.e., the criteria by which committees evaluate applicants' qualifications), and
2. a clear and consistent assessment plan (i.e., the process by which committees evaluate applicants and make selections).

#### **Creating and Implementing an Assessment Rubric**

An assessment rubric ensures that all applicants are subject to the same evaluation criteria, and that members of search committees apply selection criteria consistently. Moreover, assessment criteria should reflect statements made in the job advertisement.

Ideally, the entire unit should participate in the creation of an assessment rubric to ensure that the unit's values are reflected in the assessment criteria. Minimally, the search committee should be assisted by unit leadership and the unit's diversity committee. An assessment rubric requires the committee and the unit to define selection criteria up front, preferably while writing the job ad but always before the committee begins reviewing applications.

An assessment rubric also helps the committee and the unit clearly rank its selection criteria in terms of unit priorities—including the unit's commitments to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Some questions to consider:

- What are the goals for this hire in terms of research, teaching, service, and outreach?
- How is a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion a factor in each goal?
- How does the unit rank these goals in terms of first and second priorities?
- What types of evidence will demonstrate achievement or future potential in each area?
- Does the job ad request materials appropriate to the assessment criteria?

Committees should consider how many distinct criteria will be useful in their assessment, and they should consider what kind of scale to employ. Interfolio allows evaluators to use a "star" rating system; evaluators can assign between one and five "stars" for each criterion. Some typical scales include:

- A simple choice of "High," "Medium," and "Low" rankings (using only the first three "stars" in Interfolio).
- A more elaborate choice of "Excellent," "Good," "Neutral," "Deficient," and "Unable to judge" rankings (using all five "stars" in Interfolio).

A range of sample assessment rubrics are available in the [Toolkit](#).

#### **Open Rank Searches**

If the unit is running an "open rank" search (i.e., "assistant or associate," "associate or full," or open to all three ranks), the committee should consider creating more than one assessment rubric,

since different levels of achievement may be expected from applicants at different stages of their careers (e.g., in terms of research productivity, leadership, or national service).

### **Using the Assessment Rubric as a Tool for Discussion**

Committees may be tempted to use the assessment rubric as they might use a rubric designed for grading coursework or reviewing grant proposals: to rank applications based on total scores. It is important to stress, however, that the assessment rubric is a tool to help maintain consistency and fairness in the review process, that is, to minimize bias either in favor of or against particular applicants. The rubric is not a substitute for active committee deliberations.

Committee members should come to meetings prepared to discuss the relative merits of specific applicants, and the review process should allow committee members opportunities to discuss any applications they find have merit, regardless of assigned scores or rankings.

### **Creating and Implementing an Assessment Plan to Work Against Bias**

Before any applications are reviewed, the committee should have agreed upon an explicit plan for how it will conduct its business in a fair and consistent manner. Some questions to ask:

- When will the committee begin reading and assessing applications? As applications come in? Or after the priority deadline?
- Should all committee members read and assess the same materials at the same stage of the search process?
- How will committee members define and then handle potential conflicts of interest, such as a prior relationship with an applicant or with an applicant's adviser? This issue can be especially challenging if the pool includes internal applicants.
- By what process will the committee come to a decision about its short list? Will members vote, for example, or work to achieve consensus?
- At what point in the process will the committee review or request references?
  
- Will the committee conduct preliminary interviews? If so, will these be on site at a conference, over the phone, by Skype, or by some other electronic means?
- By what process will the committee create its list of finalists to invite to campus?
- How will the committee organize campus visits?
- By what process will the committee make its final assessments and recommendations?
- How will the committee communicate with applicants and with the larger unit at each stage of the process?

**“Early Bird” Bias:** Beware of overvaluing applications that arrive early in the process, or simply giving them more attention. It can be helpful to wait until the priority deadline before reading any applications, and to organize applications by some method other than order of arrival.

**“Moving Target” Syndrome:** Beware of changing the requirements for the position as the search proceeds in order to include or exclude particular applicants. The terms of the job ad and the criteria of the assessment rubric should be consistently applied. It may be helpful to designate a point during the process to evaluate the usefulness of the assessment criteria and the consistency of their application. How well are the criteria and the process working?

**“Known Quantity” Bias:** Internal applicants—whether current graduate students, recent graduates, post-docs, lecturers, or part-time instructors—can be both disadvantaged and advantaged during the hiring process. It is important to openly discuss the challenge of maintaining fairness, collegiality, and confidentiality when internal applicants are part of the pool.

**Implicit Bias:** All of us are affected by unconscious bias, the stereotypes and preconceptions about social groups stored in our brains that can influence our behavior toward members of those groups, both positively and negatively, without our conscious knowledge.

One well-documented example is our tendency to feel more comfortable with those we perceive as “just like us” (so-called in-group favoritism), and numerous studies show that in situations of evaluation, members of dominant groups are typically rated more highly than others, even when credentials are identical. This occurs regardless of the evaluator’s background—male or female, majority population or racial minority.

“Positive bias” often manifests as favoritism; “negative bias,” on the other hand, often manifests not as overt hostility but rather as a kind of neglect, as an absence of care, assistance, or attention.

It is therefore crucial to consider the potential impact that implicit bias may have on the evaluation process.

Some factors that can trigger implicit bias against particular applicants, whether or not they meet advertised selection criteria:

- Non-traditional career paths.
- Non-traditional research interests or methodologies.
- Degrees from less historically prestigious institutions.
- Prior work experience at less prestigious or lower-ranked institutions.
- Do not appear to “fit” the unit’s existing profile (e.g., in terms of gender, age, background, interests, and so forth).

Some factors that can trigger implicit bias in favor of particular applicants, whether or not they meet advertised selection criteria:

- Traditional career paths.
- Traditional research interests and methodologies.
- Degrees from historically prestigious institutions.
- Prior work experience at prestigious or highly ranked institutions.
- Appear to “fit” the unit’s existing profile (e.g., in terms of gender, age, background, interests, and so forth). This is sometimes referred to as “cloning”—replicating the current unit profile in new hires.

Implicit bias is more likely to affect our decision making when we are tired, in a hurry, feeling overworked or distracted, or uncertain of exactly what we should do—in other words, under the typical conditions of serving on a search committee. Research shows that bias can be contagious; we are more likely to feel, express, or enact bias after witnessing it in others.



Attention to implicit bias can help committees to acknowledge the value of applicants who are less obviously “like us” and thus to consider their possible positive contributions to the unit. It can also encourage committees to openly discuss how members define concepts like “merit,” “quality,” and “excellence.” Does the committee assume that these and related concepts have singular definitions? Does the committee assume that definitions for these concepts are the same for all members?

Resources and case studies about implicit bias are available in the [Toolkit](#).

In sum, it is important to consider:

- At which stage(s) of the assessment process will you apply the assessment rubric?
- How will you ensure that agreed upon criteria are applied consistently for all applicants—including internal applicants—at all appropriate stages of the assessment process?
- How will you work to minimize the potential impact of implicit bias?

### **[Best Practices for Faculty Searches: Assessment 4](#)**

#### **Preliminary Interviews**

In many fields it is conventional practice to conduct preliminary interviews with a “long” short list—perhaps 8 to 10, or up to as many as 15 candidates—before determining which 2 to 4 to bring to campus as finalists. To help make interviews consistent, fair, and effective:

- Avoid offering “courtesy” interviews to internal or other applicants who do not meet stated criteria.
- Conduct all interviews in the same format and under similar conditions—whether in person, over the phone, or over Skype—including interviews with internal candidates.
- Have the same committee members present for all interviews.
- Ask the same set of standard questions, in the same order.
- Ask questions about diversity, equity, and inclusion of every candidate.
- Make sure all interview questions comply with federal and state hiring laws and university policies. (These are available on the EOAA website.)

A guide to “fair” and “unfair” inquiries, sample interview questions that highlight issues of diversity and inclusion, and a guide to interviewing candidates with disabilities are available in the [Toolkit](#).

#### **On-campus Interviews**

The on-campus interview is a component of the assessment process, but it is also the beginning of the recruitment process, and thus it should involve not only the search committee but also the larger unit, the college or school, and your campus and community allies.

#### **Hosting the Campus Visit**

The campus visit allows finalists to showcase their professional and scholarly pursuits; it is also an opportunity for the unit to make finalists feel welcomed in a new community.

In addition to the traditional job talk, research seminar, and/or teaching demonstration; meetings with the chair or director, other department leaders, and graduate students; meals with

colleagues; a meeting with the appropriate dean or chancellor; and a tour of the campus, elements of a campus visit should include:

- Providing finalists a detailed itinerary, as far in advance as possible. To ensure equitable treatment, all itineraries should be similar, including those for internal candidates.
- Introducing finalists to relevant faculty, staff, students, and administrators within and outside the unit with whom they might share research, teaching, service, and/or outreach interests. How can you help finalists imagine local professional networks?
- Asking finalists if they would like to visit relevant research centers, facilities, or other campus resources, and/or to meet with a human resources or benefits officer. It is best to create a list of resources finalists can review before they travel to campus. A sample list of campus resources is available in the [Toolkit](#).
- Providing venues for finalists to ask questions they might not feel comfortable asking members of the unit (e.g., about partner hiring, family or medical leave, stopping the tenure clock, disability accommodations, resources for childcare or eldercare, unit or campus climate toward women and minorities). The meeting with a dean can be an opportunity for these kinds of questions if it is clear they can be asked in confidence.
- Maintaining clear and open communication with finalists. It is important to be honest about expectations, as well as about issues of funding, space, or other resources.
- Explaining the unit's and the university's expectations about teaching, research, service, and the promotion and tenure process.
- Introducing finalists to relevant college and campus resources for their success.

### **Campus Visits and Internal Candidates**

If the list of finalists includes internal candidates, it is important to:

- Ensure that the itineraries for their campus visits are as similar as possible to those of external candidates.
- Be intentional about maintaining fairness, collegiality, and confidentiality.
- Inform internal candidates about the campus visit process.
- Encourage internal candidates not to attend public events, such as job talks or open meetings, involving the other finalists.

A best practice is to host internal finalists first in order to avoid any potential perception that internal finalists have an advantage from having seen firsthand or heard about the other finalists' visits.

# Appendix 7

## [Job Offer Template](#)

(Please click on hyperlink above to assure you are viewing the most recent version)

Date

Dr. [NAME]

[ADDRESS]

Dear Dr. [LAST NAME]:

It is a pleasure to inform you that the Department of [DEPT. NAME] has recommended your appointment at the rank of [FACULTY TITLE/RANK], effective [date][State end date for teaching track. (Assistant Teaching Professor: 1-5 years; Associate Teaching Professor: 1-7 years (minimum 3 years); Teaching Professor: 1-10 years (minimum 3 years). The end date must be June 30)]. This recommendation has been forwarded with your credentials to the Dean of the School of Dentistry, who has authorized me to inform you of the terms of the offer. This appointment is subject to review by the School's Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee. In addition, this appointment will only become effective upon the approval of the University of Washington Board of Regents. If your appointment is confirmed, you will receive a formal notice of appointment from the Office of Academic Personnel.

The proposed base salary is \$\_\_\_ per month; \$\_\_\_\_\_ per year, on a 12-month basis, at 100% full-time equivalency. The base salary will be reviewed for merit eligibility in [YEAR], and annually thereafter, as authorized by the Washington State Legislature and the University of Washington President, [Faculty Code Section 24-55](#). In addition, you will receive an administrative supplement of \$\_\_\_ per year (\$\_\_\_ per month) for your responsibilities as \_\_\_\_\_ until duties associated with the role are discontinued; or at the discretion of the dean, the associated administrative supplement can be terminated at any time.

You will receive a lump sum moving allowance of [AMOUNT] with your first paycheck following your appointment start date. The lump sum payment is intended to be used to cover your personal moving costs. Appropriate taxes will be withheld from the payment amount, and the payment and withholding will be reported on your W-2 statement; see [UW Moving Expenses policy](#). If you have questions about the tax implications, you should consult a tax professional for advice.

Additionally, this offer includes a relocation incentive payment in the amount of \$\_\_\_\_. Acceptance of this offer confirms your understanding that the full amount of the relocation incentive payment must be repaid to the University, if within one year of the date of your appointment you voluntarily terminate University employment, or if you engage in behavior that makes termination of employment necessary. In addition, acceptance of this offer may have tax consequences for you, and necessary payroll deductions will be taken from the relocation incentive payment. If you have questions about the tax implications of the relocation incentive payment, you may wish to consult a tax professional for advice.

The initial appointment of a [*for Assistant Professor tenure track; Assistant Professor WOT; and Research Assistant Professor*] is three years. Renewal for a second three-year term will be considered by the department during Spring Quarter of the second year; if renewed, a mandatory review for promotion must be conducted in the sixth year of appointment (unless recommended earlier). [*For Research Assistant Professor*]: Upon promotion, appointments of this type are reviewed for renewal for a period of one to 5 years, with indefinite reappointments.

[*For Teaching Professorial track*]: Your initial appointment is for [ ] years[must match duration in the 1st paragraph]. Continuation of your appointment is contingent on review by eligible voting faculty in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_, as well as the availability of funding and departmental needs.

The essential functions and responsibilities of this position include the following:

- ....

- ....
- ...
- ...
- ...

At the discretion of the chair, your responsibilities and effort assigned to each area may change over time to best serve the needs of the Department and School.

[We invite you to participate in the UW Dentistry Campus Dental Center faculty practice (limited to one day per week, total 52 days per year). Faculty practice compensation is supplemental to your base salary and will be dependent on net revenue generation.]

Faculty members at the University of Washington enjoy an excellent benefits package including medical and dental coverage, retirement plan, voluntary investment program, and tuition exemption for coursework; please see [UW Benefits Summary](#) for more information. Additional information for new faculty can be found on the [Academic Human Resources - Getting Settled](#) webpage.

As a new faculty member, you may participate in the Faculty Fellows Program which is a one-week paid orientation program that takes place each year before Autumn Quarter begins. You will receive an invitation from the UW Center for Teaching and Learning. For information on teaching resources, please visit the Center's [website](#).

Once you have obtained access to University computing systems you will be expected to complete information in our Workday payroll system, such as Affirmative Action data and W-4 withholding. If you need assistance with Workday, contact the [Integrated Service Center \(ISC\)](#).

You must have a current license to practice dentistry in the State of Washington to carry out your clinical teaching responsibilities. This can either be your individual license or by obtaining a faculty license through the School and the Washington State Dental Quality Assurance Commission (DQAC). Our department administrator, [NAME] is available to assist you with this process. Additionally, you have an affirmative obligation to inform your department chair if you are faced with the following actions including, but not limited to, enforcement action against you, sanctions, or disbarment from practicing dentistry in Washington State, or any other state or country, or suspended dental license or related licensure.

You must complete the School of Dentistry's Relias online training modules and you will be notified of these trainings periodically via your UW email address. If you have any questions about these trainings, please contact your department administrator. Non-compliance with these training modules has serious implications for the school. Failure to complete these trainings in a timely manner may result in non-renewal of your appointment at the time of your reappointment review, if applicable.

*[If candidate is a current employee, i.e., no break in service, criminal background check and sexual misconduct disclosure are waived.]*

"A-Check America" is the consumer reporting agency vendor that conducts background checks for the University. You will receive an email message from A-Check that explains how to log in to their secure site and provide the information that is needed to complete the background check process. This will include, among other things, your birth date, your social security number, and any other names by which you have been known. Please complete, sign, and return the enclosed Criminal Conviction and Civil Finding History Questionnaire with your letter of concurrence. This offer is contingent upon an acceptable outcome regarding the criminal background check.

State law requires that the University of Washington obtain a Disclosure of Sexual Misconduct declaration signed by the candidate, as well as conduct a reference check concerning any sexual misconduct at current or past Washington state postsecondary educational institutions and ask the candidate whether they have been the subject of any substantiated findings of sexual misconduct by an association with which they have, or have had, a professional relationship. The declaration requires candidates to disclose any substantiated findings of sexual misconduct, to authorize current and past employers and relevant associations to disclose to the UW any sexual misconduct currently being investigated and/or committed by the candidate, and to release current and past employers and relevant associations from any liability. If the results of the disclosure or reference check are unacceptable, the offer will not be extended.

Vaccination saves lives, slows disease spread in the event of an epidemic. To this end, the School of Dentistry continues to require COVID-19 vaccine for all its staff, faculty, and students. A declination process is available for staff and faculty if they so wish. Medical exemptions of vaccination requirements are considered for faculty, staff, and students following the appropriate guidelines.

If you accept our offer, please examine the sections of the Faculty Code that pertain to the responsibilities and expectations of all faculty. Particular attention should be paid to the rules of appointment and reappointment contained in Faculty Code [Chapter 24](#).

Please note that a condition of this appointment is that you resign any faculty appointment or other employment that you may be holding elsewhere by the effective date of your University of Washington appointment.

Before your appointment recommendation can be acted upon formally, we must receive your response by [DATE]. If you accept the job offer, please provide your concurrence with the proposed terms of appointment by signing below and returning the offer letter to my office.

We are excited that you are considering joining us in the Department of [ ] at the School of Dentistry. We believe you will find your experience at the University satisfying and rewarding should you choose to accept our offer of [RANK]. We look forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

[NAME]  
[TITLE]  
[DEPARTMENT NAME]

#### ENCLOSURES:

Criminal Conviction and Civil Finding History Self-Disclosure Questionnaire

#### REFERENCES

UW Benefits  
<https://hr.uw.edu/benefits/>

UW Benefits Summary  
<https://hr.uw.edu/benefits/benefits-orientation/>

UW Moving Expenses  
<https://finance.uw.edu/ps/how-pay/moving-expenses>

Academic HR – Getting Settled  
<https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/working/getting-settled/>

Center for Teaching and Learning  
<https://teaching.washington.edu/>

Faculty Code, Section 24, Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members  
<http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html>

Faculty Code, Section 25-32, Criteria for Tenure  
<http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH25.html#2532>

Faculty Code, Section 24-55, Procedures for Salary Increases Based Upon Merit  
<http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#2455>

Faculty Code, Section 21-32, Voting Membership in the Faculty  
<http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH21.html#2132>

Integrated Service Center  
<http://isc.uw.edu/>

**CONCURRENCE:**

I accept your conditions for the “[FACULTY TITLE/RANK]” appointment at the University of Washington School of Dentistry, Department of [DEPT. NAME]. I agree to adhere to all the rules and regulations of this appointment, as they currently exist or as they may be amended from time to time.

---

[NAME]

---

Date

## Appendix 8

### [Chair letter to the Dean](#)

(Please click on hyperlink above to assure you are viewing the most recent version)

Re: [Candidate's Name]

Dear Dean \_\_\_\_\_,

I am pleased to recommend Dr. [Candidate's Name] for an appointment as an [Appointment Title] in the [Department Name], effective [Date]. The proposed terms of the appointment include a monthly full-time salary of \$\_\_\_\_\_ (\$\_\_\_\_\_ per month, pro-rated at \_\_\_\_\_% full-time equivalency).

[Degree credentials/Experience]

Dr. [Candidate's last name] will be [List General Responsibilities].

Results from eligible voting faculty from the department are as follows:

Voting Eligible:

Affirmative:

Negative:

Abstain:

Absent:

I support the appointment of Dr. [Candidate's Name] as [Appointment Title] in the [Department Name].

Sincerely,

[Department Chair]

# Appendix 9

## Sample PTERC Evaluation Report

Date: April 1, 20\_\_

To: Dr. \_\_\_\_\_, Chair  
Department of Restorative Dentistry

From: PTERC for Dr. John Smith  
Dr. \_\_\_\_\_, Department of \_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. \_\_\_\_\_, Department of \_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. \_\_\_\_\_, Restorative Dentistry and Chair of the PTERC

RE: PTERC REPORT FOR DR. JOHN SMITH

The above listed members of the Peer Teaching Evaluation Review Committee (PTERC) have met and reviewed the teaching performance of Dr. John Smith. Each of the three committee members had attended a minimum of two teaching sessions and had completed peer evaluation forms. The committee members had collectively completed eight evaluations. An additional three evaluations were completed by two other faculty. Copies of all eleven peer evaluations should be included in Dr. Smith's teaching portfolio.

A composite summary of Dr. Smith's Peer evaluation results are listed below:

RESD 528, 529 -- (3,3) A, W (highest score = 5)

Intro to Restorative Dentistry

4 Lectures -- Ave. Rating 4.7

4 Pre-clinical Lab -- Ave. Rating 4.5

RESD 534 -- 1 S

Restorative Dentistry

1 Lecture -- Ave. Rating 4.9

RESD 630 -- (2,2,2) A, W, Sp

1 Clinical -- Ave. Rating 4.0

RESD 586 -- (2) Sp

1 Small Group -- Ave. Rating 4.9

### DEGREE OF IMPROVEMENT

A definite improvement was noted in Dr. Smith's teaching performance over the time that the PTERC members had been making peer evaluations.

The most dramatic improvement was noted in the RESD 528 and 529 courses. Initially, the projects assigned by Dr. Smith were overwhelming to the majority of the class. All students were forced to spend a substantial amount of outside time to complete the projects, and as a result of student evaluations, Dr. Smith made major changes in the course. He reduced the number and complexity of the laboratory projects and improved his methods of classroom instruction which included a major syllabus modification. The PTERC noted that during this past academic year, Dr. Smith appears more relaxed and in command of the teaching environment. It was obvious to the committee members that the students and Dr. Smith were enjoying the course.

The least improvement was noted with Dr. Smith's clinical teaching in third year restorative. While clinical instruction is not the major responsibility for Dr. Smith, he needs to provide more critical feedback to the students during and after each clinical session. He also needs to give positive feedback as well as negative.

### EVALUATION OF SUPPORTING MATERIALS



1. *Assessment of Teaching Syllabi and Additional Items:* As noted previously, based on student critique, Dr. Smith completed a major revision of the syllabus for RESD 528 and 529. The members of this PTERC feel it is exceptionally well done. Dr. Smith was invited to present excerpts of the Syllabus and related teaching aids at a seminar conducted at the A.A.D.S. annual meeting at New Orleans. Dr. Smith has learned that 5 dental schools have adopted the ideas he presented, and 2 schools have requested the opportunity to purchase copies of the syllabus to distribute to their students.

Dr. Smith has developed 4 videotapes that he uses in teaching basic skills being taught in RESD 528 and 529. Eight dental schools have purchased copies of these tapes and are using them in their comparable courses.

2. *Quality of Exams and Quizzes:* While the exams were initially criticized by the second-year class in RESD 528 and 529, Dr. Smith has made dramatic improvements. Initially, the student critiques indicated that the questions were vague and tended to be "tricky." Dr. Smith currently tests students on material from his syllabus and lectures. The students currently rate the exams as being challenging but very fair. They particularly appreciate having the keys to the quizzes and exams being posted immediately.

The members of the PTERC feel the exams are very well constructed. In addition, the methods of testing utilized in the pre-clinical laboratory are very effective. The student evaluations have indicated that they feel the laboratory exams test their abilities fairly. They appreciate the willingness of Dr. Smith to provide remedial assistance to anyone needing it.

3. *Student Performance:* The students, in general, are able to master the skills being taught, which has resulted in a high class performance. The grades given for RESD 528 range from 1.8 to 4.0 with a median of 3.2. The grades for RESD 529 range from 2.0 to 4.0 with a median of 3.3. Since Dr. Smith established an effective remedial component to these two courses, the overall class performance has improved.

## **SUMMARY**

In summary, the PTERC members feel Dr. Smith is a very effective teacher, especially in the second-year pre-clinical courses which constitute his major teaching responsibility. He has been judged by his peers at the University of Washington and other dental schools to be a very effective and innovative teacher. His students appreciate his willingness to help them and to make the pre-clinical lab a friendly setting to work in. In addition, they feel he is a very talented and effective teacher.

In reviewing Dr. Smith's teaching performance over the past five years, this PTERC feels he has worked very hard to improve his teaching performance. To be judged by both his peers and his students as an outstanding teacher is a just reward for his hard work.

# Appendix 10

## Curriculum Vitae Sample

JOHN – or JANE - DOE

### Education

Oregon State University	1973-1977	B.S.	June 1977
University of Hawaii	1977-1981	D.D.S.	June 1981
University of Hawaii	1987-1989	M.S.D.	Stomatology, 1989

### Private Practice

Portland, Oregon	August 1981-July 1987	(General Dentistry)
------------------	-----------------------	---------------------

### Faculty Appointments

Institution	Department	Rank	Years	%Time
University of Washington	Stomatology	Assistant Professor	1989-present	100

### Hospital Appointments

Harborview Medical Center	Attending Staff	1989 - present
University Hospital	Consulting Staff	1989 - present
Children's Hospital	Consulting Staff	1989 present

### Memberships and Offices

Seattle-King County District Dental Society, Washington State Dental Association, American Dental Association, American Stomatology Society, Delta Sigma Dental Fraternity, Omicron Kappa Upsilon (1981), Secretary Treasurer (1991-1992), President, (1992-1993)

### Dental License

Washington, Oregon, and Hawaii

### Dental School Honors

Outstanding Instructor, Class of 1990  
Most Outstanding Dental Instructor, Class of 1991

### Professional Honors

Omicron Kappa Upsilon, 1981

### Current Research Projects

1. Craniofacial Anomaly Syndromes
2. Oral Infection and Retention of Surgical Implants
3. Application of Biotechnology to Caries Detection
4. Treatment and management of Patients with Complete Laryngectomy

### Research Grants

### ***Awarded***

1. **Grant Title:** Orthodontic Treatment and Craniofacial Growth and Development.  
Principal Investigator: J.J.Doe  
Granting Agency: BRSG  
Grant Period: 1991-1992  
Total Direct Costs: \$6,197.00  
Role: Co-Principal Investigator  
Percent Effort: 20%
2. **Grant Title:** Craniofacial Anomaly Syndromes.  
Principal Investigator: R. Mine, DDS, MSD  
Granting Agency: Children's Hospital Research Fund, Seattle, WA.  
Grant Period: 1992-1995  
Role: Co-Principal Investigator  
Percent effort: 20%, all years  
Total Direct Costs: \$232,000
3. **Grant Title:** Oral Infection and Retention of Surgical Implants  
Principal Investigator: R. Jasper, DDS, PhD  
Granting Agency: Nobel Pharma  
Grant Period: 1993-1994  
Total Direct Costs: \$11,000  
Role: Investigator  
Percent effort: 10%

### **Under Current Review**

1. **Grant Title:** Application of Biotechnology to Caries Detection.  
Principal Investigator: J.J.Doe  
Granting Agency: NIDR  
Grant Period: 1994-1998  
Total Direct Costs: \$387,000.00  
Role: Principal Investigator  
Percent Effort: 50% 01 Year, 30% subsequent years

### **Publications (including In Press)**

1. Delvinator, E. and Doe, J.J.: Genetic parameters in the Mindelbunk-Tojo syndrome. Amer. J. Gum. Gen., 3415-420, 1987.
2. Doe, J.J. and Smith, E.F.: Hypertrichosis, scrotal ears, Kaposi's sarcoma and hyperparathyroidism - An autosomal recessive disease. Arch. Int. Med., 34:561-567, 1989.
3. Doe, J.J.: Simplified repairs and alterations or removable partial dentures and conversion of an existing removable partial denture to an immediate denture. Dental Clinics of North America. July 1990.
4. Doe, J.J., and Phips, A.C.: Hypertelorism, phimosis and thrombophlebitis of the pterygoid plexus - Case Report. Brit. J. Plast. Surg., 23:231-242, 1991.
5. Kames, K.B. and Doe, J.J.: Bifid uvula, congenital dislocation on the tongue and digital markings. Acta Radiol., 43:4-31, 1992.
6. Jones, E., Sanford, M.M. and Doe, J.J. Ambulatory psychoneurosis in the waltzing mouse. J. Psychiatric Tales, 23:476-485, 1992.

7. Klickman, I. and Doe, J.J.: Periodontal disease - the cornerstone of general pathology. J. Amer. Dent. Assoc., 5:134-135, 1994.
8. Doe, J.J. and Smith, T.A.: Liver microsomal enzymes, ascorbic acid, and exodontia. Surgery and Metabolism (In Press).

### **Submitted for Publication**

1. Baltramunz, C.B. and Doe J.J.: My dwarf. Amer. J. Hum. Gen.
2. Doe J.J.: Unilateral axillarypruritus, pseudo-proboscis of the pinna and left ventricular hypertrophy. American J. Hum. en.

### **Educational Materials Published** (Textbooks, training manuals, electronic instructional material; indicate if used as educational text other than University of Washington)

1. Doe, J.J. and True, L.O. Oral Mucosal Lesions: An Atlas for Dental Students. Univ. Of Washington Press, Seattle, WA., 1993. University of Oregon, School of Dentistry, Oral Med. 322, 1993-present.
2. Doe, J.J. Oral Pathology: A CD-ROM Self-Instructional Course. Microsoft Corp, Redmond, WA., 1994. University of Colorado, Schools of Medicine and Dentistry,. Pathology 722, 1994.

### **Syllabi, Teaching Modules, and Other Written Teaching Materials**

1. Doe J.J.: "Craniofacial Growth" Technique Syllabus. University Press, 1990.
2. Doe, J.J.: "Oral Mucosal Lesions" Clinical Syllabus. University Press, 1991.

### **Audio Visual materials**

#### ***Videotapes***

1. Technique for Posterior Superior Alveolar Nerve Block. 1989.
2. Technique for Anterior Planatine and Nasopalatine Nerve Block. 1989.
3. Technique for the Intraorbital Nerve Block. 1989.

### **Presentations** (indicate if research or clinical presentation)

#### ***Major Invited Presentations*** (national and international meetings)

1. Biologically viable materials for esthetic dentistry: A State of the Art Review. Frontiers of Science in Dentistry. NIDR Annual Meeting, Bethesda, MD, September 26, 1994. Research

#### ***Other Scientific or Professional Presentations***

1. Stomatology For the General Practitioner, Annual Meeting of the Academy for General Dentistry, Miami, FL, October 21, 1993, Research.
2. Advanced Stomatology, speaker, Arizona State Dental Association, Phoenix, AZ, February 11- 12, 1993, Research and clinical.
3. Pain control, Pierce County Dental Society, Tacoma, WAS, July 1, 1993, Clinical.
4. Orthodontic Treatment and Craniofacial Growth, Snohomish District Dental Society Meeting, March 30, 1993, Clinical.
5. Caries Detection, Yakima District Dental Society, December 31, 1993, Clinical.

#### ***Continuing Dental Education Presentations***

1. Practical Approach to Stomatology, University of Washington postgraduate course, Tacoma, WA, November 1989, Clinical.
2. Pain Control Techniques, University of Washington postgraduate course, Seattle, WA, December 13-14 1977 and March 28-2 1991, Clinical.

### **Teaching Responsibilities**

- 1989-present Stomatology 401. 2 credit hours. Complete responsibilities and presented all lectures.
- 1989-present Stomatology 412. 4 credit hours. Assisted by giving 21 lectures per year.
- 1989-present Stomatology 433. A clinical course. Responsible for clinic instruction two half days per week.
- 1991-present Stomatology 480. Graduate course. Assisted by giving one lecture each quarter, A, W, Sp.

### **Administration and/or Dental School Service**

#### ***Chairpersonship***

- Honor System Revision 1989-1991
- Senior Class Advisor 1992
- Health Sciences Open House for Dentistry 1992
- Dean's Advisory Committee 1990-1991
- First Year Student Evaluation Committee 1991-1992
- Student Care Committee, Dean's Advisory Committee 1992-1993
- Second Year Orientation 1993

#### ***Membership***

- Design of Sophomore Laboratory 1989
- Subcommittee for Developing a Charting Syllabus 1990-1991
- Restorative Curriculum Subcommittee 1991-1993
- Student Issue Review Committee 1992-present
- Dental Faculty Retreat Committee 1993
- Review of Administrative Policy Statement 1993-present

#### ***Community Service***

- Vice Chairperson, Board of Directors, Georgetown Dental Clinic
- Board of Directors, Georgetown Community Council
- Volunteer - Seattle Boys' Club
- Soccer Coach - Woodland Soccer

The following summary tables for grants, publications, and teaching responsibilities are to be included in the promotion packet.

**Summary of Publications**  
for James J./Jane J. Doe

#	Title	Journal (juried or non-juried)	Author & Co-Author(s)	Role Played	Importance and Explanation
<b>Publications in Major Journals</b>					
1.	Genetic parameters in the Mindelbunk-Tojo syndrome	<i>Amer.JGumGen</i> , 3415-20, 1987. Juried	E. Delvinator and J.J. Doe Univ. Hawaii Study	Dr. Delvinator prepared the design, conducted the research. Dr. Doe analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript together with Dr. Delvinator.	MODERATE. This research showed that the Mindelbunk-Tojo syndrome has inherited characteristics. Master's thesis.
2.	Hypertrichosis, scrotal ears, Kaposi's sarcoma and hyperparathyroidism--an autosomal recessive disease.	<i>Arch.Int.Med.</i> , 34:561-7, 1989. Juried	J.J. Doe and E.F. Smith Univ Washington Study	Dr. Doe shared developing the research design with Dr. Smith. S/he conducted the research, analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript. Dr. Smith provided overall guidance	MODERATE. This was the second paper to appear about this new condition. Specific gene location was identified.
3.	Simplified repairs and alterations or removable partial dentures and conversion of an existing removable partial denture to an immediate denture.	<i>Dental Clinics of North America</i> , July 1990. Juried	J.J. Doe Univ. Washington Study	Invited paper on clinical topic of Dr. Doe's special interest.	MODERATE. Demonstrates how to effectively convert existing partial prosthesis to an immediate denture.
4.	Hypertelorism, phimosis and thrombophlebitis of the pterygoid plexus--case report.	<i>Brit.J. Plast.Surg.</i> , 23:231-42, 1991. Juried	J.J. Doe and A.C. Phips Univ. Washington Study	Dr. Doe conducted the study with Dr. Phips' collaboration in analysis and report writing.	MODERATE. Employed a unique methodology to identify and abnormality of the pterygoid plexus: a case report.
5.	Bifid uvula, congenital dislocation of the tongue and digital markings.	<i>Acta. Radiol.</i> , 43:4-31, 1992. Juried	J.B. Kames and J.J. Doe Univ. Washington Study	Dr. Kames was the PI. He planned the research project. Dr. Doe collaborated in research design and data gathering. Dr. Doe analyzed the data and wrote publication with Dr. Kames.	HIGH. First to clinically demonstrate significant sensitivity for a method to detect early pathologic changes in tongue structure and function.
6.	Ambulatory psychoneurosis in the waltzing mouse.	<i>J. Psychiatric Tales</i> , 23:476-685, 1992. Juried	E. Jones, M.M. Sanford and J.J. Doe Univ. Washington Study	Dr. Jones developed the design, conducted the research, analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript. Dr. Sanford and Dr. Doe assisted with accuracy	HIGH. Definitive early study showing methods for inducing and reversing abnormal brain function and related oral disease.

				measurements, the design and report writing.	
7.	Periodontal disease-- the cornerstone of general pathology.	<i>J.Amer.Dent. Assoc.</i> , 5:134-5, 1994. Juried	I. Klickman and J.J. Doe Univ. Washington Study	Dr. Doe designed and conducted the research. Dr. Klickman went on to earn an MS in Oral Medicine at the Univ of Michigan and taught at the Medical College of Virginia.	MODERATE. This clinical oriented study aimed at providing clinicians with information about the best techniques for detecting enzyme changes that predict healing responses to exodontia. The underlying importance was "planting a seed" by encouraging an individual to enter academic dentistry.
8.	Liver microsomal enzymes, ascorbic acid and exodontia	<i>Surgery and Metabolism</i> (Accepted, #1273) juried	J.J. Doe and T.A. Smith Univ. Washington Study	Research design was developed by Dr. Doe at the University of Washington. Dr. Smith collaborated in conduct of the research, analyzing the data and writing the article.	MODERATE. A review article presenting the relationship of basic pathophysiologic processes to several periodontal conditions.
9.	Effect of dental radiation on periodontal disease	<i>Acta. Radiol.</i> , (Accepted, #2015) juried	Doe, J.J and Hasbeen, U. Univ Washington study	Dr. Has been was the PI. He planned the research project. Dr. Doe collaborated in research design and data gathering, analyzed the data and wrote publication with Dr. Hasbeen.	HIGH. This study provides evidence of the curative powers of dental radiation in deep periodontal pockets.
10.	Periodontal disease II – the cornerstone of general pathology	<i>J Amer Dent Assoc</i> , 5:134-5, 1994. Juried	I. Klickman and J.J. Doe Univ. Washington Study	Dr. Doe designed and conducted the research. Dr. Klickman went on to earn an MS in Oral Medicine at the Univ of Michigan and taught at the Medical College of Virginia.	MODERATE. This second clinically oriented study aimed at providing clinicians with information about the best techniques for detecting enzyme changes that predict healing responses to exodontia.
11.	Tongue use and abuse.	<i>Oral Surg Oral Med &amp; Oral Path</i> 10:49-53, 1995 juried	J.J. Doe and F. Claptrap Univ. Washington Study	Dr. Doe designed and conducted the research. Dr. Klickman went on to earn an MS in Oral Medicine at the Univ of Michigan and taught at the Medical College of Virginia.	HIGH. This is the first study to demonstrate actual abuse of the tongue. Unique monitoring equipment was designed and built for this purpose.

12.	Inheritance of tooth size and shape in achondroplastic families	<i>Arch Int Med</i> 42:39-47, 1995 juried	B. Making, C. Hay, and J.J. Doe	Dr. Doe collaborated in research design and data gathering.	MODERATE. This study provides clinicians with guidelines for denture tooth selection in achondroplastic families.
-----	---	--	---------------------------------	---	---



**Summary of Teaching Responsibilities**  
for James J./Jane J. Doe

<b>Course/ Credits</b>	<b>Course Name</b>	<b>Students</b>	<b>% Involvement</b>	<b>Period</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>	<b>Evaluation Included</b>
Stoma 401	Craniofacial Growth	52 (first year)	100%	1989-present Autumn Qtr.	Dr. Doe is course director, presents all lectures, does all testing, and developed all teaching aids. This course was approved by the Curriculum Committee at the request of Dr. Doe	<input type="checkbox"/> Student <input type="checkbox"/> Peer
Stoma 412	Oral Pathology	52 (second year)	50%	1989-present Winter Qtr.	Dr. Doe is co-director with 50% responsibility for development of this course and for lecturing and laboratory leadership. Course responsibility also includes delivery of course materials to extramural dental school sites in Yakima and Wenatchee, WA.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student <input type="checkbox"/> Peer
Stoma 433	Stomatology	Third year	20%	1989-present A, W, Sp, Sum Qtrs.	Dr. Doe is responsible for clinic instruction two half-days per week. Videotapes on anesthesia techniques prepared by Dr. Doe are reviewed with students prior to each clinic session. Eight students are supervised each clinic session.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student <input type="checkbox"/> Peer
Stoma 480	Advanced Stomatology	4 graduate students in stomatology	10%	1991-present A, W, Sp Qtrs.	Dr. Doe provides one lecture each quarter on current advances in the treatment of oral lesions. Each lecture requires at least 20 hours of preparation by reviewing current literature.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student <input type="checkbox"/> Peer

**Summary of Grants**  
**for James J./Jane J. Doe**  
 (PI: Principal Investigator    CI: Co-Investigator)

#	Grant Title	Grant Amount	Dates	Granting Agency	Investigators	% of Overall Effort	Responsibility
1.	Orthodontic Treatment and Craniofacial Growth and Development	\$6,197	1991-1992	BRSB	J.J. Doe (PI) K. Rosey (Co-PI)	20 5	Dr. Doe designed the research project and wrote the grant. It provided basic support to allow Dr. doe's research efforts to begin at the University of Washington. Dr. Rosey served as advisor and co-PI.
2.	Craniofacial Anomaly Syndromes	\$232,000	1992-1995	Children's Hospital Research Fund, Seattle	R. Mine (PI) J.J. Doe (Co-PI)	25 20	Dr. Doe was co-PI and leader of the research team gathering clinical data relating to the prevalence, incidence and identifying risk factors for congenital craniofacial anomalies.
3.	Oral Infection and Retention of Surgical Implants	\$11, 000	1993-1994	Nobel Pharma	R. Jasper (PI) J.J. Doe(Invest)	25 10	Dr. Doe was the chief clinical investigator of this commercial grant to study how retention of oral implants is related to local infection.
4.	Application of Biotechnology to Caries Detection	\$387,000	1995-1998	NIDR	J.J. Doe (PI)	10	Dr. Doe is PI of this NIDR proposal currently under review. He will be responsible for all elements of the research to investigate application of recombinant-DNA technology to the development of a dental practice-based instrument for detecting dental caries.

## Appendix 11

### Faculty Teaching Portfolio Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

**General Information:** A candidate for promotion/tenure in the School of Dentistry must develop a dossier, called a Teaching Portfolio. The candidate uses the Teaching Portfolio to document their teaching effectiveness. The Teaching Portfolio is divided into three sections:

#### I. Teaching Experience:

- A. Course instruction:** Prepare a table listing courses taught since your last appointment or promotion. Include predoctoral, DDS, and graduate level courses. A sample table might resemble:

Course Name	Course Number	Credits	Quarter/Year
Operative Dent.	RESD 420	2	Autumn/1988

*Role:* I was course director and delivered 7 of the 10 two-hour lectures. I arranged for the 3 other speakers in this course to visit the class and gave them an outline of topics to be covered. Other faculty were used because they had special expertise in the assigned topics. I wrote and evaluated all tests. These included 2 half-hour quizzes and a final examination. The syllabus and tests are included in my portfolio, as well as a course evaluation by the students. Outside work required of the students consisted of reading assignments in the syllabus, averaging about 3 hours per week. The basic syllabus was developed by previous course directors, but I updated it by adding an index and photo plates (pages 23 and 64) and writing Chapters 8 and 9, which is new material covering dental materials recently introduced to the profession.

Course Name	Course Number	Credits	Quarter/Year
Operative Dent. Lab.	RESD 620	4	Autumn/1988

*Role:* I was one of 7 instructors in this all-day laboratory course. I supervised 8 students in their first cavity preparation and placement of amalgam, composite and gold inlay. This is a demanding course requiring constant attention to detail with each student. I participated in evaluating the 5 laboratory projects used as test material. I also prepared 2 of the teaching model displays (sample enclosed). These were useful for the students to visualize the desired size of cavity preparation.

- B. Work with graduate students:** Data is to be provided for all Masters and Doctoral level students in six specific areas. These are (1) number of students (current year); (2) number of committees chaired; (3) number of committees as committee member; (4) total number of students awarded the Master's degree; (5) total number of students awarded the Doctoral degree; and (6) graduate student evaluations of teaching effectiveness, provided by each graduate student and using EAC forms or personally developed teaching evaluation methods.

- C. Continuing Dental Education (CDE):** Prepare a table listing the CDE courses you have taught. Sample table headings are provided below:

Course Name	Date	Location	Describe Your Role in this Course
-------------	------	----------	-----------------------------------

#### II. Evaluation of Teaching

##### A. Summarized data from student evaluations

- Educational Assessment Center:* Summarize data from these forms in a table presenting courses taught by academic year. Titles and numbers are included. A sample table might resemble:

Course Number	Required or Elective Course Type (Lecture/Clinical)	Quarter/Year	# Students	Average Ratings
---------------	---	--------------	------------	-----------------

2. *Personally developed course evaluation procedures:* A summary of the data should be presented in a table similar to the one above but labeled “Self-Developed Recent Student Evaluations.”

- B. Self-assessment in response to peer evaluation of teaching efforts:** Summarize the peer teaching evaluation forms provided by members of your Peer Teaching Evaluation Review Committee (and other colleagues, if applicable). Include areas of strength and weakness noted and discuss discrepancies, if any, between your own assessment of your teaching and the evaluations provided by peers who have observed your teaching efforts.
- C. Self-assessment summary:** The candidate is to describe how he or she attempts to improve instruction, including approach to teaching and teaching philosophy. Examples might include modifications made in teaching based on student evaluations, attempts to utilize innovative teaching methods, and participation with colleagues to discuss improved teaching.

The following is an example of a self-assessment summary. It is provided to illustrate how a candidate might present a self-assessment summary related to teaching effectiveness.

***Response to Student and Peer Evaluations:***

I rely heavily on self-designed assessment tools, which enable more specific diagnostic questioning, especially in my Graduate teaching. My goal in evaluating Graduate small seminar and clinic teaching effectiveness is to foster a dialogue with the students on the specifics of each course (e.g. selection and order of assigned readings, value of student participation, value of clinical feedback and required course projects). While I feel that goal is met through my self-designed assessments, I have little in the way of conventional “summaries” to offer. I can say, however, that the students have responded favorably in general and have offered some useful comments concerning the value of certain texts and the contribution of discussion to their learning. One comment that more than one student has made (on my self-designed assessments, as well as on the Educational Assessment Center forms) acknowledges my willingness to hear student opinions. Since one important goal of graduate training is to foster professional development in the students, I am gratified by these comments. While I have always been open to student opinions, some of my early peer evaluations indicated that I should provide more critical feedback to students I am supervising in the clinic. I now provide each student with very clear instructions about how to improve his/her performance during each phase of a clinical procedure.

**Self Assessment of Progress in Teaching:**

I am committed to continuously improving my teaching. I make a special effort to review student evaluations of my courses and to respond to student concerns. This effort is evident in the increased ratings in my student evaluations upon my second and subsequent offerings of a course. In the graduate seminars as well as the DDS-level courses that I teach, I try to acquaint students firsthand with some of the fundamental knowledge as well as the cutting-edge research in the topic area. Through modeling and discussion, I try to foster critical inquiry as well as present a body of knowledge. I have found most students respond favorably to this approach and feel that students find me approachable and helpful, as well as instructive, when they approach me on the clinic floor as well as in the laboratory and in seminar courses.

I have placed special effort on enhancing my seminars that focus on first-hand reading of research. I found that many students need help to develop the critical reading and discussion skills that one expects at a graduate level, so in addition to in-class modeling, I provide students in my seminars with a list of questions they use to guide their reading and discussion of the articles. While by no means foolproof, these study guides have improved the quality

of class discussions by keeping them more focused and scholarly, and student comments in evaluations indicate that the study guides help them learn more from the articles. Sample study guides are attached to the seminar syllabi that can be found in the “Course Syllabi Section” of my Teaching Portfolio.

I have devoted special attention to RESD 528 and 529, the pre-clinical laboratory course. This course places extremely heavy demands on second-year dental students and is a prime requirement for their entry into the Restorative Clinic. I have sought to introduce alternative teaching methods and a better integrated sequencing of tasks to enhance student understanding as well as their ability to acquire fundamental operative skills. With the help of my teaching colleagues, I developed projects requiring students to analyze their own technical work. Through careful record keeping, I learned that students found these newer approaches to teaching, practicing, and self-evaluation very useful in helping them make the bridge between theory and practice. I was also gratified when my personal contribution to RESD 528 and 529 was rated as 4.00.

In addition to teaching courses in which I have primary responsibility, I have also had the opportunity to participate in teaching activities that cut across departmental lines. My involvement in the combined Perio-Pros-Restorative course (DENT 568) was to supervise the diagnosis, treatment planning, and placement of intra-coronal preparations in complex cases. I was pleased that the comments of graduate students indicate that my contributions to the multidisciplinary teaching and care team were valuable.

### ***III. Supportive Materials: Components of the Teaching Portfolio Related to Instructional Materials and Teaching Effort***

The purpose for permitting additional instructional materials and related documentation to be included as part of the Teaching Portfolio is to provide the candidate with every opportunity to ensure that all aspects of their teaching efforts are available for review. Such components of a Teaching Portfolio could include:

- A reflective statement about how the construction of the portfolio has led to any improvements in teaching.
- List of teaching awards received.
- A representative syllabus with information about the course content and objectives, teaching methods, reading and homework assignments, and student testing procedures.
- Representative samples from manuals and slide deck (not in its entirety)
- Tests and test reliability data and other data that show the extent of student learning; standardized test scores before and after the course. Please be selective and include the most relevant examples.
- Descriptions of availability of remediation.
- Teaching evaluations from other faculty not reflected in the PTERC Report.
- Selective examples of teaching materials, such as video tapes, slides, self-instructional modules, textbooks/chapters, etc.
- Contributions to professional teaching journals.
- List of relevant invitations to teach or conduct training workshops at other institutions or professional organizations.
- Evidence of use of candidate’s instructional materials by other teachers.
- Data and materials relevant to team teaching or interdepartmental/disciplinary teaching.

- Independent peer reviews of teaching materials.

## Appendix 12

### School of Dentistry Peer Evaluation Forms

The purpose of the Peer Evaluation Forms is to collect information about faculty members' teaching from their colleagues for use in reviews for tenure, promotion, and merit increases. It was designed to be used in the departments in the School of Dentistry. The system consists of four forms:

1. PEER OBSERVATION FORM: LECTURE
2. PEER OBSERVATION FORM: SMALL GROUP SEMINAR OR DISCUSSION
3. PEER OBSERVATION FORM: CLINICAL TEACHING
4. PEER OBSERVATION FORM: LABORATORY TEACHING

For a Word version of Peer Evaluation Forms, please [click here](#).

The department chair and the faculty member to be reviewed should determine the course(s) and the type(s) of teaching to be observed. It is suggested that the course(s) in which the faculty member holds major responsibilities be reviewed.

**PEER OBSERVATION FORM:  
LECTURE**

OBSERVED: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

OBSERVER: \_\_\_\_\_ SETTING: \_\_\_\_\_

**Directions:** Components of teaching using the lecture format are listed below. Rate each component on the scale from 1 to 5 by placing a number next to the item. Comment based on your specific observations of each item, identifying areas for improvements. Use the bottom of page 2 to summarize strengths and recommendations.

**Rating Scale:**

- 5 = outstanding
- 4 = above average
- 3 = good, needs few improvements
- 2 = satisfactory, needs improvement in some areas
- 1 = poor, needs improvement in several areas

<b>CLARITY AND ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
1. Begins by stating importance of topic, objectives, and by previewing main points.		
2. Presents 2 to 5 main points clearly with supporting examples.		
3. Uses instructional resources (e.g. slides).		
4. Summarizes to achieve closure.		

<b>PRESENTATION STYLE</b>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
5. Exhibits enthusiasm and stimulates interest in topic.		
6. Uses well-modulated, clearly articulated voice.		
7. Presents without disturbing mannerisms.		
8. Paces for note-taking.		

**Peer Evaluation Form: Lecture**

**Page 2**

<b>GROUP INTERACTION</b>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
9. Encourages active participation.		
10. Uses questions to challenge thought and stimulate discussion.		
11. Responds to questions in clear and non-threatening way.		



---

<b>CONTENT</b>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
12. Organizes content logically.		
13. Uses up-to-date materials and references.		
14. Presents content at appropriate level of complexity and quantity.		

---

<b>HANDOUTS AND EXAMS</b>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
15. Prepares appropriate supplementary resources.		
16. Examines and grades fairly.		

---

<b>STRENGTHS:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>
-------------------	-------------------------

**PEER OBSERVATION FORM:  
SMALL GROUP SEMINAR OR DISCUSSION**

OBSERVED: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

OBSERVER: \_\_\_\_\_ SETTING: \_\_\_\_\_

**Directions:** Components of small group teaching are listed below. Rate each component on the scale from 1 to 5 by placing a number next to the item. Comment based on your specific observations of each item, identifying areas for improvements. Use the bottom of page 2 to summarize strengths and recommendations.

**Rating Scale:**

- 5 = outstanding
- 4 = above average
- 3 = good, needs few improvements
- 2 = satisfactory, needs improvement in some areas
- 1 = poor, needs improvement in several areas

---

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduced topic, stated objectives, created the agenda.</li> <li>2. Established climate of mutual respect.</li> <li>3. Gained attention and motivated learning.</li> </ol>		

---

<b>GROUP PROCESS MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Exhibited enthusiasm and stimulated interest in learning.</li> <li>5. Encouraged active participation and group interaction.</li> <li>6. Used questions to clarify and stimulate thought.</li> <li>7. Recognized and reinforced student contributions.</li> <li>8. Listened attentively to what students were asking or telling.</li> </ol>		

**Peer Observation Form: Small Group Seminar or Discussion**

**Page 2**

---

<b>GROUP PROCESS MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Responded to questions raised by students or elicited response from group.</li> <li>10. Ensure that discussion kept on track.</li> </ol>		

11. Summarized key ideas periodically.

---

<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
12. Summarized key concepts without introducing new material.		
13. Provided closure or stimulated further thought.		

---

<b>STRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT</b>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
14. Selected an appropriate group process to accomplish objectives.		
15. Used the appropriate size group for the learning task.		
16. Utilized resources (visuals, handouts, cases, demonstrations) to promote learning.		
17. Arranged physical environment to facilitate learning.		

---

<b>STRENGTHS:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>
-------------------	-------------------------

**PEER OBSERVATION FORM:  
CLINICAL TEACHING**

OBSERVED: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

OBSERVER: \_\_\_\_\_ SETTING: \_\_\_\_\_

**Directions:** Components of clinical teaching are listed below. Rate each component on the scale from 1 to 5 by placing a number next to the item. Comment based on your specific observations of each item, identifying areas for improvements. Use the bottom of page 2 to summarize strengths and recommendations.

**Rating Scale:**  
 5 = outstanding  
 4 = above average  
 3 = good, needs few improvements  
 2 = satisfactory, needs improvement in some areas  
 1 = poor, needs improvement in several areas

	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
1. <b>KNOWLEDGE AND CLINICAL REASONING</b> (decisive in formulating practical management plans)		

	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
2. <b>CONSIDERED ALTERNATIVE TREATMENT PLANS</b> (weighed advantages/disadvantages of alternatives)		

	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
3. <b>PROVIDED DIRECTION AND FEEDBACK</b> (communicated expectations, observed performance, provided feedback)		

**Peer Observation Form: Clinical Teaching**

	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
4. <b>EFFECTIVELY USED AVAILABLE TIME</b> (lesson organized; instructor accessible)		

	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
5. <b>DEMONSTRATED CLINICAL</b>		

**SKILLS AND PROCEDURES**

(utilized skill, judgment, and technique)

<p>6. <b>ESTABLISHED RAPPORT</b> (showed respect and personal interest in trainees and patients, listened, was supportive)</p>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
<p>7. <b>WAS ENTHUSIASTIC AND STIMULATED INTEREST</b> (enjoys teaching and profession, dynamic and energetic)</p>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
<p>8. <b>PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS</b> (displayed self-confidence, openness, respect, responsibility)</p>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
<p>9. <b>ACTIVELY INVOLVED LEARNERS</b> (asked student plans before making recommendations, challenged thought, asked questions)</p>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
<b>STRENGTHS:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	

**PEER OBSERVATION FORM:  
LABORATORY TEACHING**

OBSERVED: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

OBSERVER: \_\_\_\_\_ SETTING: \_\_\_\_\_

**Directions:** Components of laboratory teaching are listed below. Rate each component on the scale from 1 to 5 by placing a number next to the item. Comment based on your specific observations of each item, identifying areas for improvements. Use the bottom of page 2 to summarize strengths and recommendations.

**Rating Scale:**  
 5 = outstanding  
 4 = above average  
 3 = good, needs few improvements  
 2 = satisfactory, needs improvement in some areas  
 1 = poor, needs improvement in several areas

	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
1. <b>PROVIDED CLEAR EXPLANATIONS OF SKILL TO BE LEARNED</b>		

	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
2. <b>CLEARLY EXPLAINED RATIONALE FOR SKILL OR PROCEDURE</b>		

	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
3. <b>EFFECTIVELY USED AVAILABLE TIME</b> (lesson was organized, instructor was available)		

	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
4. <b>PROVIDED DIRECTION AND FEEDBACK</b> (communicated expectations observed performance, provided feedback)		

	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
5. <b>PROVIDED EXAMPLES OF EXPECTED RESULTS</b>		

6. <b>CREATED A SUPPORTIVE, NON-THREATENING LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</b>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
7. <b>PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS</b> (displayed self-confidence, openness, respect, responsibility)	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
8. <b>WAS ENTHUSIASTIC AND STIMULATED INTEREST</b> (enjoys teaching and profession, dynamic and energetic)	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
9. <b>ESTABLISHED RAPPORT</b> (showed respect and personal interest in students and patients)	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
10. <b>PROVIDED REMEDIAL HELP WHEN NEEDED</b>	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
11. <b>ACTIVELY INVOLVED LEARNERS</b> (asked questions, challenged thought, asked about students' plans)	<b>RATING:</b>	<b>COMMENTS:</b>
<b>STRENGTHS:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	

## Appendix 13

### Candidate's Checklist for Promotion/Tenure Packet

(to assure most current version, please [click on link](#))

It is the candidate's responsibility to assemble their own promotion record

Candidate's Self-Assessment

- *April* of the year the candidate is considered for promotion. Candidate prepares Self-Assessment and discusses it at their annual review with their department chair. A good candidate letter can be very helpful to the chair. A self-examination of teaching is an opportunity to shape the discourse. See [Appendix 14](#) and [AHR Self-Assessment](#)
- Consistent with the UW's expressed commitment to excellence and equity, contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity should be included and highlighted in the promotion materials. [Faculty Code Section 24-32](#).
- Teaching professorial track: expound on teaching. Do not omit scholarship or service. Scholarly activities include, but are not limited to, authoring/co-authoring textbooks or book chapters; authoring open-source resources for students and/or faculty to support teaching and learning; restructuring curriculum; participating on task forces on education in area of specialty; and presenting at professional conferences. [Faculty Code Section 24-34 B.4](#)

Candidate CV [format](#) – see [Appendix 10](#).

[Teaching summary template](#)

Faculty Teaching Portfolio – see [Appendix 11](#)

Peer evaluations:

Assistant Professor—yearly (except research assistant professor)

Associate Professor tenure-track—yearly

Professor tenure-track—yearly

Associate Professor (tenured)-- every 3 years

Regardless of rank, the candidate must include peer evaluations in the year leading up to promotion and/or tenure review. Evaluations must be in chronological order, beginning with the earliest to the most recent evaluation.

If missing years, please list and explain: .....

Student evaluations – **Minimum of one course per academic year** in any year of teaching.

Must include standardized student assessments, provided by the IAS Course Summary Reports or the SoD Course Evaluation Surveys.



Evaluations must include both quantitative and qualitative course ratings and qualitative comments from summary reports.

Evaluations must be in chronological order, beginning with the earliest to the most recent evaluation.

If missing years, please list and explain: \_\_\_\_\_

- [Grant summary template](#)
- [Publication summary template](#)
- [Administration and Service template](#)
- Supplemental materials - please be selective. Only submit materials if they are substantive and will be helpful in evaluating a candidate's record.
- Required trainings - please ensure that you have completed UW and SOD (Relias) trainings, including Title IX training, and complied with the annual UW requirement to complete the Outside Professional Work for Compensation form (Form 1460), if applicable (there is no need to include approved 1460 forms in the promotion packet).
- **For promotion to full professor**, *the whole record of the candidate's qualifications will be reviewed, including time as Assistant Professor, if applicable, [Faculty Code Section 24-54 A](#).* Additionally, there is a particular emphasis on achievements that the candidate has made in their current rank, and how that fits into their whole body of work or research program. Candidates may include in their self-assessment, what they have done within their rank (e.g., time since their last promotion to associate professor) into context of their whole record of research/teaching/service by describing how it all fits together.
- **Associate Professor tenure-track and Professor tenure-track promotion; and Associate Professor WOT and Professor WOT seeking tenure award**, assembly and evaluation of tenure record is generally similar to review for promotion and tenure, promotion only, or tenure only.
- **Funding plans** should be addressed for research-track and WOT faculty.
- Submission of promotion portfolio must be in electronic form. Candidate should send documents to their department administrator to collate and submit to [Christina Wee](#), Academic HR Manager, Dean's Office.

## Appendix 14

### Candidate's Letter to Chair Sample Letter

Date

Dr. John Jones, Professor and Chairperson  
Department of Stomatology  
School of Dentistry  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195

Dear Dr. Jones:

I am writing to submit my promotion package to the rank of Associate Professor.

Candidate's letter should review and comment on following areas:

1. Scholarship, including national importance of publications and grants
2. Teaching
3. Administration and/or school service
4. Community service
5. Personal qualities
6. Future plans and career trajectory

*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 UW and it is important to place those achievements in context with how they fit 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 UW, and public service.*

Enclosed are my Curriculum Vitae, teaching syllabi, slides, handouts; copies of my published articles, articles in press, and submitted etc.

Sincerely yours,

John Q. Public, D.D.S  
Assistant Professor

JQP:abc  
Enclosure

## Appendix 15

### School of Dentistry *Ad Hoc* Review Committee Policy

(to assure most current version, please [click on link](#))

When departments lack three eligible voting faculty, an *ad hoc* review committee shall be formed to review and vote on matters related to promotion and tenure. This policy establishes the process for the creation of these committees in the School of Dentistry.

1. The Chair of the department, in consultation with the Associate Dean for Faculty, will appoint at least three School of Dentistry faculty members who have appropriate expertise and who are eligible by rank and title to vote on the promotion and/or tenure. These faculty, in addition to the members of the department's faculty that are eligible by rank and title to vote on the person being considered for promotion, shall serve as an *ad hoc* review committee.
2. When the Chair of the department is the person being considered for promotion and/or tenure, the Dean, in consultation with the Associate Dean for Faculty, will appoint a Review Chair from another department, superior in rank and title, and who will act in lieu of the Chair of the department in coordinating the review process. The Review Chair, in consultation with the Associate Dean for Faculty, will then appoint an *ad hoc* review committee of three School of Dentistry faculty members who are not members of the same department but who have the appropriate expertise and who are eligible by rank and title to vote on the promotion and/or tenure. If there are any eligible voting faculty members in the candidate's department, they shall be included in the committee.
3. The committee's report will serve in lieu of the departmental vote and will be advisory to the Chair of the department (for #1) or the Review Chair (for #2). The Chair's/Review Chair's written summary, provided to the candidate, shall identify the members of the *ad hoc* committee. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary.

## Appendix 16-1

### Department Chair's Checklist for Promotion/Tenure Packet

(to assure most current version, please [click on link](#))

#### CHAIR'S RESPONSIBILITIES

##### Peer Teaching Evaluation Review Committee (PTERC)

*By June 1 of first year of appointment*, the Department Chair forms a PTERC for faculty subject to mandatory promotion, or Assistant Teaching Professor or Associate Teaching Professor who are not subject to mandatory promotion but wishes to be considered for promotion. The earlier PTERC is formed may be beneficial to the candidate to give them sufficient time to improve their teaching skills if they receive PTERC reports with helpful suggestions sooner than later.

Research-track candidates may participate in instruction but are not required except insofar as required by their funding source.

- By August 1*, PTERC convenes to discuss peer teaching evaluations (by October 1 for non-mandatory promotion). At least 2 peer evaluations from each PTERC member can be didactic; seminar; clinical; or laboratory instruction(see [evaluation forms](#)). The PTERC should meet with the candidate to provide feedback to enhance the candidate's teaching effectiveness.
- By August 15*, PTERC submits report to department chair (October 15 for non-mandatory promotion). See [Appendix 9](#).

##### Letters of Evaluation

- By June 15* of the year the candidate is considered for mandatory promotion (or August 15 for non-mandatory promotion), the chair must request letters of assessment (not the candidate). Letters should be addressed to the dean (but sent to the chair. Do not share letters with the candidate). Specify a due date of Aug 15 in the solicitation letter for mandatory promotions (or Oct 15 for non-mandatory promotion).
- Solicit 3-4 external letters (from outside the UW) for promotion from assistant to associate professor; and 3-5 external letters (from outside the UW) for promotion from associate to full professor.
  - When evaluating Assistant Teaching Professors to Associate Teaching Professors, it may be appropriate to solicit letters from experts who are external to the candidate's department but internal to the UW. For Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor, evaluators must be qualified reviewers external to UW.

- All external evaluators should be recognized contributors to their field from a major research university. They should be able to provide an arm’s length assessment. Evaluators must be senior in rank to the candidate.
  - Letters of support are NOT considered evaluation letters.
  - Use [Chair’s Letter of Solicitation](#) UW template. Each external reviewer must be provided with the same representative set of the candidate’s materials. Typical materials may include the candidate’s CV and candidate’s self-assessment. External reviewers should not be asked to assess whether the candidate should be promoted/awarded tenure (although a reviewer may volunteer such an opinion). References to the UW Faculty Code (e.g., [Faculty Code Section 24-32](#) and [Section 24-34](#)) and [Executive Order 45](#) may be helpful for providing more context for external reviewers.
  - At a minimum, the following are to be included with the solicitation letter:
    - Curriculum Vitae
    - Candidate’s self-assessment
  - For those on *tenure-track; research track; or WOT track*, it would be helpful to the APT Committee to solicit specific comments on the quality of research done by the candidate. This might best be done by including links to several publications chosen by the candidate as representing their seminal work, and specifically asking reviewers to comment on the quality of the papers in their letters of evaluation. Such comments would help the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee establish that the published work is of good quality and of interest and importance to the field and will be used to substantiate that their scholarship is of “high quality.”
  - For *teaching professorial promotions*, the chair should explain to evaluators that the appointment has a primary emphasis on teaching, although scholarship and service are also required. Explain that scholarship may include, but is not limited to, creating innovative pedagogical methods; developing new courses; contributing to interdisciplinary teaching; and serving in a leadership role in professional organizations. Chair should include appointment qualifications for teaching professorial, as stated in [Faculty Code 24-34 B.3](#).
- The Chair should also include the candidate’s materials, such as their self-assessment; updated CV; PTERC report; teaching portfolio; and sample course materials.
- Promotion packet must include a sample of the solicitation letter and a statement describing the qualifications of the external reviewers, their relationship (if any) with the candidate, the manner in which they were chosen, and the reasons for the choices. Please collate reviewers’ information in a table or spreadsheet; [see template](#).
  - Please review additional instructions about [External Letters of Review](#) on the AHR website.

#### Joint Appointments

The primary unit may share with the secondary unit, the candidate’s promotion portfolio. The chair may collaborate with the secondary unit to create a list of evaluators. The secondary unit

must independently conduct their own assessment and vote and forward their dean's letter of recommendation and chair letter of recommendation (including vote results) to the primary unit to include in the candidate's portfolio for submission to the primary unit's Dean's Office.

Adjunct Appointment

Where a candidate has an adjunct appointment, only a written concurrence supporting the promotion is required from the Adjunct appointing unit chair.

Department meeting and vote

By *September 15* at the latest (or November 1 for non-mandatory/early promotion), the chair should hold a meeting with the voting faculty to discuss the candidate's qualifications for promotion and to conduct a faculty vote. The chair should make the candidate's promotion materials available to the voting faculty prior to this meeting, including the candidate's CV, self-assessment, PTERC report, letters of evaluation, etc. [Click here](#) on who can vote.

When a department lacks three eligible voting faculty members, an ad hoc committee shall be formed to review and vote on the promotion, see [SOD Ad Hoc Review Committee policy](#).

Chair Letter to Candidate

The department chair shall write a report to the candidate, providing a summary of faculty discussion and recommendation. The letter is intended to be meaningful to the candidate and include a summary of teaching, scholarship, and service. For confidentiality purposes, specific attributions should be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. If an *ad hoc* committee is formed, the report must identify members on the committee.

Documentation that the candidate was provided a copy of the report and opportunity to respond within 7 calendar days shall be included in the letter. The candidate, if they choose, may respond in writing to the report within 7 calendar days. At a minimum, the candidate must confirm receipt of letter.

Chair Letter to the Dean

The department chair's letter to the dean is very important as it shapes the discussion of the APT committee. The letter needs to offer the chair's independent assessment of the candidate and the candidate's role in the present and future development of the academic unit. The recommendation should ideally provide insight in the departmental discussion.

Outline of chair's letter to the dean:

- Summary of department review and vote
- Candidate's years in rank; promotion from-to; mandatory/non-mandatory
- Scholarship and research
- Teaching (didactic and/or clinical)
- Service
- Summary of letters of assessment
- Candidate's personal qualities
- Current and future role of candidate in the department

- Conclusion/recommendation. If the candidate holds a multi-year term, please specify appointment length (clinical dental pathway: 3-5 years; research track: 1-5 years; assistant teaching professor: 1-5 years; associate teaching professor: 1-7 years; teaching professor: 1-10 years)
- Vote count
  - Total Voting Eligible:
  - Favorable:
  - Unfavorable:
  - Abstain:
  - Absent:

Must specify if the votes include the chair's vote (chairs may choose to abstain from voting since they are making their recommendation to the dean). In so far as possible, , the chair should explain the basis of negative votes. See [Promotion Matrix](#) for who are eligible to vote on promotions

## Appendix 16-2

### Chair's Letter of Solicitation Template

(to assure most current version, please [click on link](#))

Professor \_\_\_\_\_  
Department of \_\_\_\_\_  
University of \_\_\_\_\_  
City, State zip \_\_\_\_\_

Dear Professor \_\_\_\_\_:

I am writing to ask you to evaluate Assistant Professor \_\_\_\_\_ who is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ at the University of Washington. Your letter will be used in our Department, School and University review. I enclose a copy of Professor \_\_\_\_\_ curriculum vitae and bibliography for your assistance in making this evaluation, in addition to other material the candidate has provided for your review.

Your letter, which we need to have no later than \_\_\_\_\_ should contain the following information:

- How and for how long have you known the candidate?
- Your view of the significance, independence, influence and promise of the candidate's work, and the degree of his/her national/international reputation.
- Some comparison of the candidate's accomplishments with others at a similar career stage in the same or related fields.

The opinions of outside reviewers are a necessary and valued part of the University of Washington's promotion review process. Your letter will help us to document the external evaluation of Professor \_\_\_\_\_'s work. Because I would like to include a statement about the referees when I forward their letters to our Dean, I would appreciate it if you could return a copy of your C.V. with your letter.

Under University of Washington policy your letter, as part of the official personnel file, will be held in confidence. While not given access to it, the candidate and/or members of the public may be, upon formal request in accordance with the Washington State Public Records law, provided with excerpts of all such confidential evaluations in the candidate's file without disclosure of the identifications of the evaluators.

Interpretations by the courts of the Washington State Public Disclosure law have held that external letters of evaluation sought in the normal course of promotion reviews are exempt from disclosure. The University treats these letters as internal confidential documents and does not release them to the candidate nor others outside of faculty and administrators directly involved in the promotion decision process. We commit to retain your evaluation in such confidence, except to the extent we are required to disclose its contents by adjudication or court order, and even then, we will make every effort to protect your personal identity.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to respond to this request.

Sincerely,

[NAME]



## Appendix 16-3

### Chairperson's Letter of Recommendation Sample Letter to the Dean

Date

Dr. Daniel Decanal  
Dean School of Dentistry

RE: ACADEMIC PROMOTION FOR DR. JOHN DOE

Dear Dean Decanal:

This letter is in support of Dr. John Doe who has been proposed for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor in the Department of Stomatology.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Dr. Doe received their dental degree from the University of All Smiles in 1990. They completed an Advanced General Dentistry program at the same institution in 1992. They were in private practice from 1992-1994. Dr. Doe was appointed as an Acting Assistant Professor at the University of Washington School of Dentistry in the Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery (OMS) in 1994; subsequently, they were appointed Assistant Professor tenure-track in 1996. Dr. Doe will have been at the rank of Assistant Professor for five years on June 30, 2001, which qualifies them for consideration for promotion to Associate Professor.

#### **SCHOLARSHIP AND RESEARCH**

Dr. Doe has conducted significant research on multiple genetic disorders, pain control methods and the metabolism of ascorbic acid. The first and third areas have been published in respected dental periodicals while the second is in thesis form but as yet is unpublished. He is participating in continuing research with the Department of Speech. In addition, he is a co-principal investigator on a funded NIH grant. Substantial progress has been made toward achieving the goals of that grant. He has eight publications and one manuscript in press to his credit.

Dr. Doe has collaborated in writing several departmental teaching syllabi and handouts. All of these contributions have been excellent.

Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae lists ten presentations, a number of which have been to regional and national dental organizations. The fact that he was invited to present material at these meetings indicates the high level of regard his research has gained on a national level.

#### **TEACHING**

Dr. Doe has developed into an excellent teacher. This is supported by peer evaluation, student critique and the receipt of the outstanding Instructor award from the Class of 17 and 1976. Dr. Doe is an enthusiastic teacher who is superbly organized and is capable of motivating students to perform well. Dr. Doe is generally regarded by his peers at the University of Washington and around the United States, as a very knowledgeable and effective lecturer in stomatology.

As his curriculum vitae indicates, Dr. Doe was responsible for designing and implementing the revised introductory course in the treatment of oral lesions (STOM 460 and 461). This required an innovative modification in the methods of teaching and curricular design. Peer review of the course indicates that Dr. Doe has done a superb job designing and carrying out the course during the Autumn Quarter of 1976. Many new instructional aids had to be developed for this course including slides, color video cassette tapes and a revised syllabus. Two innovative training devices replacing laboratory exercises normally carried out by dental students were developed by Dr. Doe. An evaluation of the course materials submitted with this promotion request will attest to Dr. Doe's unique ability in designing instructional materials.

### **ADMINISTRATION AND/OR SCHOOL SERVICE**

Dr. Doe has become well known for his ability to chair a variety of dental school committees listed in his curriculum vita. In addition, he has served as a member of numerous committees since 1974.

### **COMMUNITY SERVICE**

Dr. Doe has contributed considerable time and effort serving on several different committees in the Seattle-King County District Dental Society. In addition, he has been active in teaching a number of continuing dental education courses sponsored by the University of Washington. He has been on the Board of Directors of the Georgetown Dental Clinic since 1974.

### **SUMMARY OF LETTERS OF ASSESSMENT**

I solicited four external letters of assessment. Three of the evaluators were external to the UW and one from within the UW School of Dentistry; three are full professors and one associate professor. Dr. ABC remarked that Dr. Doe's research on zirconia and implants was highly valuable to the dental profession as the area was constantly shifting. Dr. LMN stated that he had learned much from Dr. Doe's article on abutment design regarding peri-implantitis. Dr. LMN concluded by saying that given Dr. Doe's significant teaching load, Dr. Doe's research and publications were noteworthy. Dr. DEF indicated that she has seen Dr. Doe grow into a confident teacher over the years and actively engages with their students, that their energy is boundless and the care that they show to the students is evident. Dr. ABC called out that Dr. Doe's service on the Admissions, Student Progress and Curriculum committees are the most important internal committees and was an indication of the high level of trust that senior administration had in their abilities.

### **PERSONAL QUALITIES**

Dr. Doe is one of the most cooperative and pleasant faculty members I have ever had the pleasure of working with. This view is shared by all members of the Stomatology faculty and staff.

The enclosed letters of assessment and curriculum vitae provide additional information regarding the accomplishments of Dr. Doe. I feel that he has more than satisfied the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor.

### **VOTE COUNT**

In the department there are eight (8) eligible voting faculty members who are currently superior in rank to Dr. Doe. At a faculty meeting held on June 30, 19\_\_, six (6) of these faculty were present and voted 6 to 0 to approve this promotion. The vote includes the department chair vote [or does not include the department chair's vote].

As Chairperson of the Department, I concur in this recommendation.

Sincerely,

John Q. Public, D.D.S.  
Professor and Chairperson

## Appendix 17

### Administrator's Checklist for Promotion/Tenure Packet

(to assure most current version, please [click on link](#))

*(A Word version is available on the SODHR website for you to download and use. Please include your completed checklist when you send over the promotion materials)*

Submit to Academic HR Manager, Dean's Office

#### Instructions:

- Individual pdf documents except for the following:
  - Letters of assessment
  - PTERC evaluations
  - Peer evaluations\*
  - Student evaluations\*
  - Supplemental materials
- PDF files according to order below
- Send via One Drive  
*\*In chronological order, beginning with the earliest to the most recent evaluation*

Please collate materials in order as listed below:

- Chair letter to dean
- Chair letter to candidate
- Candidate's acknowledgement of receipt (and response, if submitted) to chair report
- Joint appointing unit dean and chair letters, if applicable
- Adjunct appointing unit chair concurrence, if applicable
- Candidate's Letter (Self-Assessment)
- Candidate CV
- Letters of Evaluation  
 (Include sample solicitation letter; and reviewers' information in a table or spreadsheet; [see template](#))
- Peer Teaching Evaluation Review Committee (PTERC) report
- PTERC evaluations (at least 2 peer evaluations from each PTERC member; can be didactic; seminar; clinical; or laboratory instruction)
  - ❖ Confirm evaluations are complete: Yes  No
- Teaching summary
- Teaching portfolio
- Peer evaluations - yearly for assistant professor, associate professor tenure-track, professor tenure-track; once every 3 years for associate professor and full professor. Regardless of rank, must

include peer evaluations in the year leading up to promotion and tenure review. Must include evaluator's name; conducted in the same academic year; in *chronological order, beginning with the earliest to the most recent evaluation*

- ❖ Confirm evaluations are complete: Yes  No
- ❖ If missing years, please list and explain: \_\_\_\_\_

Student evaluations – Minimum of one course per academic year in any year of teaching. Must be in *chronological order, beginning with the earliest to the most recent evaluation*

- ❖ Confirm evaluations are complete: Yes  No
- ❖ If missing years, please list and explain: \_\_\_\_\_

- Grant summary
- Publication summary
- Administration and Service summary
- Supplemental materials

#### QUESTIONS?

[Christina Wee](#), Academic HR Manager, Office of the Dean

## Appendix 18

### Procedural Guide for the Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

**Preface:** Committee members shall not serve on PTERC or write letters of support for any appointment or promotion candidates.

#### A. New Faculty Appointments

1. The appointment package with Chair's letter and faculty vote, curriculum vitae and letters of recommendation will be circulated by the AHR Manager to the members of the committee via email for review. The offer letter is excluded from the appointment packet as salary offer is not under the purview of the APT Committee. Instead, the job posting, or job description should be included in the packet. Members may cast their votes electronically or request to meet, particularly if a negative vote(s) is cast.
2. In the event that the Chair has to recuse themselves because the candidate is in the same department as the Chair, the member leading the discussion will draft the recommendation letter. The letter will list the vote result, including vote count and the basis for the recommendation.
3. The same criteria will be used in making appointments as are spelled out in the guidelines for promotions. Although it may be difficult to obtain meaningful information in all areas of involvement if the individual is coming from another institution, it is the department chair's responsibility to provide as much information as possible in the chair's recommendation letter to the dean.
4. It is expected that the department chair consults with the Associate Dean for Faculty and APT Committee chair on the qualifications of the proposed candidate before conducting department faculty vote and making the job offer.

#### B. Promotions

**September 25<sup>th</sup>:** deadline for submitting promotion package for mandatory review/promotion from the department Chair to the Office of the Dean.

**November 1<sup>st</sup>:** deadline for submitting promotion package for non-mandatory review/promotion (this is an SOD deadline which may be modified by the Academic HR Manager, depending on the number of early/non-mandatory promotion requests received each year).

The APT Committee will meet after each of these deadlines and then forward the recommended actions to the Dean. The following procedures will be followed:

1. To ensure that all of the necessary materials are included for the promotion request, the Academic HR Manager in the Dean's Office will review the promotion packet for completeness before distributing the materials to the APT Committee.

2. After the 1<sup>st</sup> committee meeting in the fall when the committee chair has been selected, the chair will identify if there are any members who share the same primary appointing department candidates. If so, the member will be recused from discussion and voting but may participate in the discussion and vote at the department level. If a member has an appointment in the same department as a candidate, but it is neither the member's or the candidate's primary appointing department, then the member may participate in the APT discussion and vote for that candidate. In this case, the APT member shall not participate in the discussion or vote at the department level and should not be considered in the total count of eligible voting faculty.
3. The chair will assign primary and secondary reviewers among its members. Each candidate for promotion and/or tenure will customarily be assigned to one primary reviewer and one secondary reviewer. Dates are established for when the committee meets to discuss and vote on the promotion(s). The committee generally meets in October-November for mandatory promotion consideration(s) and November-January for non-mandatory promotion consideration(s) to meet central Academic HR's due dates.
4. The committee administrative support personnel shall distribute the candidate's promotion materials to all committee members.
  - a. The primary reviewer will do an in-depth review of the candidate's materials and provide a detailed analysis, leaving out the reviewer's opinion on whether the candidate should be promoted. The secondary reviewer should also perform a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's promotion materials but does not need a detailed written evaluation. If the primary reviewer needs additional information, it is obtained via the Chair of the APT Committee and not directly from the candidate or their department.
  - b. The primary reviewer's report shall be forwarded to the APT Committee administrative support in advance of meeting(s). The primary reviewer will present their evaluation of the candidate's materials at the meeting. After the primary reviewer has presented their evaluation, the secondary reviewer will also share their evaluation with the committee.
  - c. In the event any candidate for promotion is a member of the committee Chair's department, the Chair will have to recuse themselves from participating in the discussion and appoint a committee member to lead the discussion. The review report should not be shared with the Chair.
5. The committee will vote at the end of the meeting once discussion has ended on each promotion candidate. Voting may be conducted openly or secretly; if secretly, members will write down their votes and submit to the committee support staff who will count the votes and announce the voting results. If there is a tie vote, it means that the committee's recommendation is not favorable; see #8 below.
6. The committee Chair will promptly draft a recommendation letter for each promotion candidacy and distribute the draft via email to the other members for feedback. In the event that the Chair has to recuse themselves because the candidate is in the same department as the Chair, the

member leading the discussion will draft the recommendation letter. The letter will list the vote result, including vote count and the basis for the recommendation.

7. If the committee's recommendation is not favorable or if it conflicts with the department's faculty vote, the committee submits a memo to the candidate, notifying them of its recommendation and reasons. For the purpose of confidentiality, specific attributes shall be omitted from the memo. See [Faculty Code Section 24-54 C](#). The committee submits its recommendation to the Dean.
8. After receiving the committee's recommendation(s), the Dean shall decide on their recommendation to the Provost. If the recommendation is favorable, the Dean shall transmit their recommendation and candidate's promotion packet to the Provost and notify the candidate and their department chair.
9. If the Dean's recommendation is not favorable, the Dean provides the candidate with an initial recommendation and reasons prior to issuance of decision and invites the candidate to meet with them. The candidate may respond in writing within 7 calendar days. The Dean shall make a decision on whether to reverse their initial recommendation. If promotion is mandatory and whether or not the Dean's final recommendation is favorable or not favorable, the Dean transmits their recommendation and candidate's response, if any, and candidate's promotion packet to the Provost. The Dean will inform the candidate and their department chair of the final recommendation.
10. If the promotion is non-mandatory and the Dean's recommendation is not favorable, the Dean will follow step 9 above. If the candidate does not submit a written response, the Dean informs the candidate of their final recommendation and reasons (the candidate's promotion packet will not be forwarded to the Provost). If the candidate submits a written response, the Dean will transmit their final recommendation, the candidate's response and promotion packet to the Provost for informational purposes only.
11. The Provost reviews the promotion candidacy and informs the Dean of their decision. The Dean informs the candidate of the Provost's decision and if not favorable, the reasons for the negative decision.
12. Committee discussion, reports and actions on appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions will be considered confidential with the committee. Such confidentiality is considered desirable for the following reasons:
  - a. Recommendations of the committee are advisory to the Dean. Because the Dean may decide against concurrence with a committee recommendation, it would be improper and unfair to the faculty member involved for committee members to publicize these recommendations.

The appropriate channel of communication for all committee recommendations is from the committee Chair to the Dean to the department Chair to the departmental faculty member.
  - b. It is desirable that reviewers be protected against any possible ill feelings arising from an unfavorable reviewer's report. For this reason, the identity of reviewers is known only to the

committee Chair who is responsible for assigning reviewers and to those members of the committee participating in the review discussion (not members in the same department as the candidate who are recused from participating in the discussion).

In keeping with University policy, the Dean has legitimate access to all documents of the Committee and may provide these to any member of his/her administrative staff so designated for purposes of assisting the Dean in arriving at decisions on appointments, promotions and tenure.

The State's Public Records law may make this desired confidentiality impossible. Thus, committee members cannot be guaranteed that their written letters, comments and analyses can be kept confidential; however, it is the policy of the UW that the records of advisory APT committees are confidential.

13. The APT Committee is advisory to the Dean. Its primary function is to review the academic qualifications of those proposed for appointments, promotion and/or tenure award. Committee votes should be confined to the academic qualifications of the faculty under consideration and are to be **kept confidential**.
14. Monitoring of adherence to prescribed procedures is the function of the Office of the Dean. It is within the purview of the APT Committee to review the promotion materials for compliance with the Faculty Code. When clarifications arise with the appointment or promotion/tenure materials which have a bearing on the academic qualification of the candidate will be addressed by the APT Chair informing the candidate's department chair.
- 15 After Committee has voted on the promotion and submitted its recommendation to the Dean, the Committee may write to the Associate Dean for Faculty to inform them of the deficiencies and/or irregularities encountered in reviewing the materials with the aim to ensure that future candidates are aware of the specific requirements for materials to be submitted that are consistent with Faculty Code and SOD APT Manual. For example, student evaluations should also include UW standardized student assessments provided by the [Office of Educational Assessment](#), where available, as non-standard unit student evaluations may be difficult for the Committee to evaluate. At the discretion of the Associate Dean for Faculty, the information may be shared with the candidate and their department chair after Provost has issued a decision.



## Appendix 19

### Guidelines Governing Membership on the APT Committee

#### A. Composition and Academic Rank of Members:

1. The APT Committee shall consist of seven members. Committee members must be an Assistant Professor or above. There shall be no more than one Assistant Professor and two (2) Associate Professors on the Committee. Any member below the rank of full Professor shall not participate in the annual promotion session if they are being considered for promotion at that time.

a. Whereas the assistant professor on the committee is coming up for promotion consideration, the assistant professor shall recuse themselves from participating in any mandatory promotion reviews (from assistant to associate professor) for the remainder of the year.

b. Whereas an associate professor on the committee is coming up for promotion consideration, the associate professor shall recuse themselves from participating in any non-mandatory promotions (from associate to full professor) for the remainder of the year.

“Year” is defined as beginning of UW Fall Quarter until June 30 of the following year.

2. Standing Committees shall elect their chairs at their first meeting each year at the beginning of fall quarter and report the results to the Dean and the Faculty Council. The Chair of the APT Committee must be at the rank of full professor.

3. Nominations, elections, terms of service shall be as described in Sections 2 and 3 of the [Bylaws of the Faculty](#).

#### B. Responsibilities

1. To establish guidelines governing appointment, promotion, and tenure consistent with the University Faculty Code.

2. To review candidates and advise the Dean regarding proposed appointments, promotions and the award of tenure.

#### C. Vacancy In Office: see Article X [Bylaws of the Faculty](#)

#### D. Annual Reports:

The APT Committee shall submit a written report to the Dean and Faculty Council that shall be distributed in advance to faculty for potential discussion at the Fall Faculty Meeting.

Please refer to the [Bylaws of the Faculty](#) to be assured of up-to-date information.

## Appendix 20

### Supplemental Information

The following information is not under the purview of the APT Committee, rather, it is included for faculty informational purposes only.

#### *I. Resignations & Terminations*

**A. Resignations:** Because the process of replacing faculty who resign takes time for recruitment and approval of recommendations, faculty members have a professional obligation to give written notice of resignation at the earliest opportunity, but not later than 3 months prior to the termination date or within 15 days of notification or re-appointment, whichever date occurs later. Resignations should ordinarily become effective at the end of an academic year. (Faculty Code, Chapter 24, [Section 24-56 A.](#))

#### **B. Terminations & Non-renewal of Appointments:**

Several situations exist by which both non-tenured faculty may be terminated and/or have their appointments not renewed. Procedures and review processes are outlined in Faculty Code, Chapter 25, [Section 24-53.](#)

#### *II. Procedures For Salary Increases Based Upon Merit* Faculty Code, Chapter 24, [Section 55.](#)

Faculty at the UW shall be reviewed annually by their colleagues to evaluate their merit and to arrive at a recommendation for an appropriate merit salary increase. Such reviewers shall consider the faculty member's cumulative record, including contributions to research/scholarship, teaching, and service, and their impact on the department, school, university, and appropriate regional, national and international communities. Both faculty and chairs should familiarize themselves with these procedures and the circumstances to which they apply. Except for research track faculty (unless part of salary support is to provide instruction), evidence of student and collegial evaluation of a faculty member's teaching is essential for salary increases based on merit.

The merit and salary of each faculty member below the rank and title of professor shall be considered by the voting members of the department who are superior in academic rank and title, and they shall recommend any salary increase which they deem merited. The chair of a department shall consider the merit and salary of each full professor in their unit. Before forwarding their recommendations to the dean, the chair shall seek advice from full professors according to the procedure approved by the voting members of the unit.

More information may be found in Faculty Code, Chapter 24, [Section 55.](#)

#### *III. Procedure for Renewal of Annual Appointments*

Acting, adjunct, affiliate, clinical and instructional titles hold annual appointments. Review for reappointment shall occur annually. Voting members of each department superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend renewal or termination of the appointment, except that the voting faculty at the rank of professors shall consider whether to

recommend renewal of professors. The voting faculty of a department may recommend that the review be delegated to an elected committee of its voting faculty; however, it does not alter faculty rank requirements, and the committee shall expire one calendar year after it is formed.

The department chair shall transmit their recommendation to the dean. If the chair does not concur with the recommendation, they may submit a separate recommendation to the dean. The dean shall decide on reappointment recommendations submitted by the chair. For non-renewals, the dean shall notify the faculty member in a timely manner as prescribed in Faculty Code Chapter 24, [Section 24-41](#).