



Protocol for Reappointment, Promotion, & Tenure Discussions

A. EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION:

1. Eligible above-rank faculty who participate in the meeting to discuss/vote on a colleague's reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure case are required to maintain confidentiality. All verbal and written information provided before and during the meeting, including comments made by colleagues, as well as documents for internal-only review, may not be shared with the candidate under review. Faculty may not share a candidate's materials or discuss any portion of the meeting's proceedings with others outside of the SSWCJ, including with others at UW Tacoma, at any time for any reason.
2. Everyone is asked to follow the established protocol including staying on and within time (see below).
3. Everyone is expected to participate in a constructive and respectful discussion.

B. PROCESS AND PROTOCOL FOR DISCUSSION:

Pre-meeting preparation: Please review the school's P&T guidelines, this memo, and candidate's *entire* file prior to the meeting (you will receive advance access of the candidate's file). Bring your comments and/or questions to the meeting.

Meeting protocol: Only eligible above-rank faculty may participate in the meeting. The P&T committee chair will facilitate the discussion. Either the P&T committee chair or a designated P&T committee member will take notes. The note-taker will periodically engage in member-checking by paraphrasing information back for clarification as they take notes.

1. The P&T committee chair will start the meeting by summarizing the committee's report based on the evidence provided in the candidate's dossier.
2. Each eligible above-rank faculty who wishes to contribute to the discussion will have time to comment on the candidate. If deemed necessary, the P&T committee chair may determine a time limit for comments to give meeting participants time to contribute.
3. When possible, limit redundant statements/repeating what others have stated. Though it is acceptable to concur with colleagues as appropriate (e.g., "I concur with _____. I'd also like to add that the candidate has published book chapters. While book chapters are not always considered peer-review, most of their chapters appear in peer-review publications and reflect sufficient scholarly independence and evidence of peer-reviewed scholarship as per P&T guidelines.").
4. Comments about each candidate should be appropriate and relevant to one's cumulative record and performance as a faculty member—not about non-performance indicators such as how one feels about the person or judging one's personality (including positive or negative remarks about collegiality, unless there is direct evidence that certain behaviors have clearly impacted someone's performance as a faculty member). See below in Section C for additional guiding principles.
5. Final vote options are yes, no, and abstain. An abstention should be avoided if possible (see UW OAP guidelines) as it will count as a no vote, rather than a neutral vote. If you attend the meeting, you are required to vote.
6. The designated note-taker will invite all voting faculty to review the voting faculty discussion summary report. Voting faculty will have an opportunity to suggest corrections or edits. Understand that suggested corrections or edits will be considered in the context of the meeting discussion, not comments or critiques not discussed during the official voting faculty meeting discussion. Please respond with suggested corrections or edits within 24 hours or when indicated in the notification to vote.

C. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR THE DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION PROCESS:

As a respectful community, faculty must take active measures to evaluate candidates in a consistent, equitable, and rigorous manner. Faculty discussions on reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure are to focus on areas of strengths and for growth/improvement. Discussions should provide constructive feedback in relation to the candidate's cumulative record and overall performance as a faculty member at UW. *Only pertinent information related to the candidate's performance will be included in the final written report.* Below are some guiding practices to help through this process.

Category 1: Acceptable forms of feedback: please make assessments and comments that adhere to the following:

1. Comments about the candidate's performance in relation to evidence presented in file including CV, evaluations of instruction (by colleagues/peers and students), external letters, annual reviews, narrative statement, and other supporting evidence provided by the candidate that has direct bearing to evaluate effectiveness in the areas of scholarship of research/dissemination of works, teaching, and service/community outreach.
2. Direct and observable comments about the candidate's prospects for future performance as related to the criteria noted above.
3. Direct comments about the quality of work in relation to one's rank that are based on evidence.

When making specific evaluations or judgements, it may be helpful to reference our school's P&T criteria, as well as other text in (e.g., our school's mission, UWT's strategic plan, UW Faculty Code).

Category 2: Inappropriate types of feedback: please avoid making any irrelevant assessments about the following:

1. General comments about a colleague's fit and likability (positive or negative) should be avoided because such assessments are often based on biased information and other cognitive distortions that have no direct bearing on one's performance.
2. The candidate's academic credentials and/or professional experiences are irrelevant at this point, Remember: this person was already hired at UW through a complete national search. Thus, avoid commenting on the candidate's academic credentials.
3. Assessments and comments based on evidence gleaned from the candidate's materials (e.g., CV, external reviewers' letters, annual reviews) should not be partial, incomplete, or inaccurate references to make one's case whether it is positive or negative.
4. Making remarks about a candidate's perceived or real style, disposition, and/or identities, especially in relation to comments about the person's perceived or real competence.
5. Making any judgments or statements that are based emotions/feelings about a person or other types of unverifiable assumptions. Examples: " _____ just isn't friendly or warm" (as such comments have potential for perpetuating cultural/racial and gender biases) or "But _____ is a nice person" when someone else raises a concern about poor or uneven performance (such comments are not relevant to one's performance).

Comments that do not directly pertain to the candidate's performance as a faculty member in the scholarly areas of the professoriate, research/dissemination of works, teaching, and service/community outreach, will be disregarded in the final report.