PART I

Getting Started

University-Wide Promotion Committee
2012 – 2013

Introduction

These guidelines are meant to assist everybody in going through the arduous promotion process. There is no way in which the process will be made easy or stress-free. If you have never applied for promotion and intend to do so this year, please understand that this can be a stressful experience.

Although we cannot relieve the tension you are already feeling, we will try in this document to give you a better sense of what you need to do to be successful; how the UWPC makes its decisions; and, should you not succeed this year, what the UWPC will do to try to help you understand why.

Promotion is a developmental process. This document provides assistance in making the process more fair, more clear, and more understandable and organized. Your first task, should you decide to apply for promotion, is to read this document for the hints it will give you.

Statement of Philosophy

Everyone should have a fair and equal opportunity to be promoted. Standards and criteria acceptable to the academic community should be used in the promotion process. The committee should be as open and as public as possible while respecting the rights and privacy of individuals. The promotion process should be developmental, helping candidates reach acceptable levels of performance given the criteria. Constructive feedback should be provided to candidates on their documentation if they are not promoted.

Some Operating Principles

1. For teaching faculty, effectiveness in teaching is a necessary prerequisite for promotion. Student evaluations are only one component of the materials that will be considered in assessing effectiveness in teaching. Appropriate levels of scholarly growth and service are expected from all candidates.
2. Errors in the application process or promotion documents should be considered inadvertent unless evidence is found to the contrary. Such errors should not jeopardize a candidate's opportunity. If the committee finds serious errors or irregularities in an application that it cannot reconcile, the problem should be clarified with the candidate and/or the candidate's DPC. If the committee is unable to reconcile error or inconsistency in a record, that is, if the committee believes mistakes are not inadvertent mistakes or misunderstandings, but deliberate violations or misrepresentations, the candidate should be notified in writing and reported for possible disciplinary action.
3. Unsuccessful candidates for promotion should be given meaningful feedback on shortcomings in their work. Minor shortcomings in the presentation of the evidence or process should not disadvantage a candidate. That is, ideally, people should only be successful because of their performance. None of this precludes the committee from critically judging a candidate, if the evidence presented for promotion is particularly sloppy, careless, or confusing. This should be rare.
4. Refereed publications, including those developed from one's dissertation, are encouraged.

5. Collaborative work is a meaningful form of scholarship, and appropriate contributions should be recognized.

Explanation of Ranking Categories

The UWPC will use three categories for ranking candidates. Although these categories are listed in the Statement of Promotion Policies and Procedures (1995), there is little explanation of what they mean. In order to help you understand the evaluation of your materials we provide the following definitions.

HIGHLY RECOMMEND – Based on the materials presented to us, the UWPC believes that people in this group have met and exceeded the requirements for promotion to the next rank.

RECOMMEND – Based on the materials presented to us, the UWPC believes candidates in this category have, at least, met the minimum criteria for promotion to the next rank. This group is recommended. There is no generalization that can be made about what separated this group from those who were highly recommended. For that reason the committee may provide individual feedback to each candidate about what we perceived to be the strengths and weaknesses in the materials we reviewed.*

NOT RECOMMEND – In reviewing materials, the committee did not find evidence of consistent quality teaching and/or did not find evidence of scholarship and service of sufficient quality to merit promotion. After careful consideration, the UWPC decided not to recommend promotion at this time. This decision was not reached lightly. We did not question the candidate's commitment to IUP nor ultimate potential to succeed in the system. What the UWPC decided was that the candidate did not warrant promotion this year based on the sum of the evidence presented.*

* The UWPC will provide feedback for the candidates in this category who are not promoted.

Responsibilities of the Applicant

1. Determine your eligibility for promotion.
2. Correctly complete, copy, place in folders, and label with your name and rank sought, nine (9) copies of all forms and documents, including a three-page Statement of Promotability. Application forms are due to the UWPC Chair on or before 4:30 PM, November 1, 2012.
3. In addition (as stated in the S3P Part 1.I.6), by November 1, 2012 the applicant must submit one (1) copy of the application, clearly labeled, to (a) his or her department Chair, (b) his or her DPC Chair, (c) his or her Dean, and (d) the President or the President's designee (typically the Provost).
4. Also on or before November 1, 2012, prepare a full set of supporting evidence for submission to your DPC. Supporting evidence is of two types. One package of documentation should be for final submission to the UWPC and should only contain supporting evidence for your teaching effectiveness, including student evaluation reports, up to five scholarly achievements, and up to five service achievements. Additional Documentation of other achievements should be ready by

November 1, 2012 in the manner clearly prescribed by your DPC. The Additional Documentation will be held by the DPC and must be available to the UWPC until April 15, 2013.

5. The candidates must verify that their personnel file is complete and up to date with respect to academic credentials.

Rights of the Applicant

1. You have the right to review the recommendations of your DPC, department Chair, and Dean on or before February 1, 2013.
2. If you disagree with or are concerned with the recommendation of your DPC, department Chair, or Dean, you have a right to appear before them in a timely fashion.
3. The candidate may choose to respond in writing to any of the letters written by the DPC, department Chair, or Dean on or before February 15, 2013. Responses should be delivered to the UWPC Chair and a copy delivered to the President or the President's designee (typically the Provost).
4. Candidates have an unambiguous right to appear before the UWPC before it submits its recommendation to the President. This right may be used to comment on the recommendations by the DPC, department Chair, or Dean.

Responsibilities of the DPC

1. Hold an organizational meeting on or before October 1, 2012, elect a DPC Chair, and notify the UWPC Chair of the results of the election. Failure to do so may invalidate the DPC recommendation.
2. Comply with the DPC membership restrictions in the S3P (1995).
3. Make all promotion application materials available to the candidate. Promotion application materials may be picked up from the Provost's office or the UWPC Chair's office.
4. For departments who have administrative faculty, the DPC needs to develop Criteria for Evaluation of professional responsibilities for those faculty members as stated in the S3P, Part I.F. A working draft (15 copies) needs to be submitted to the UWPC for approval by October 15, 2012. The final copy of the Criteria for Evaluation (9 copies) needs to be submitted with the DPC's report on January 15, 2013.
5. Verify, review, and evaluate all the evidence available and make a recommendation to the UWPC based on specific reference to the evidence. The supporting documentation due to you on November 1, 2012 is of two types. The Application Supporting Documentation (UWPC), the first type, will be forwarded to the Provost's office for use by the UWPC and should meet its requirements. This material contains and documents the best, up to five, achievements in scholarship; the best, up to five, achievements in service; and also contains full documentation of teaching and professional responsibilities. Additional Documentation (DPC), the second type, <u>will remain with the DPC</u> and should be in a format prescribed by the DPC, but must be available to the UWPC until April 15, 2013 for clarification. The DPC must **clearly convey** the format of this additional documentation to the applicant.
6. Write a three-page recommendation for each candidate.

7. Advise the candidate of his or her right to review the recommendation, to appear before the DPC on or before February 1, 2013 to give a written response to the DPC recommendation, and to appear before the UWPC.
8. Submit to the UWPC, on or before February 1, 2013, a list of all candidates from the department, nine (9) copies of the three-page recommendation for each candidate, one (1) copy of the DPC Checklist, and one (1) copy of the DPC Transmittal Form which will indicate whether the applicant was "Highly Recommend," "Recommend," or "Not Recommend" by the department. For administrative faculty, the DPC needs to submit nine (9) copies of their Criteria for Evaluation.
9. Submit to the Provost's office, on or before January 15, 2013, the Application Supporting Documentation (UWPC), a copy of the Transmittal Form, and a list of candidates.
10. Submit to the Provost's office, on or before February 1, 2013, a copy of the DPC's three-page recommendation.

Responsibilities of the Department Chair

1. Comply with the guidelines in Part II.B of the S3P.
2. Independently review and consider the candidate's November 1, 2012 application and accompanying materials, including supporting evidence.
3. Submit nine (9) copies of a two-page assessment, on the Report Form, of each candidate on or before February 1, 2013. The Chair should emphasize fulfillment of professional responsibility, but may also wish to discuss teaching, scholarship, and service.
4. Provide the candidate with an opportunity to read the recommendation, to sign the recommendation Transmittal Form, and to meet with the Chair on or before February 1, 2013.

Responsibilities of the Dean

1. After examining the candidate's application and promotion file, the Dean shall submit nine (9) copies of a one-page recommendation or report, on the Report Form, for each candidate to the UWPC Chair on or before February 1, 2013.
2. Provide the candidate with an opportunity to read the recommendation, to sign the recommendation Transmittal Form, and to meet with the Dean on or before February 1, 2013.

Responsibilities of the UWPC

1. Provide DPC's with all necessary application forms and instructions for distribution to the applicants.
2. Oversee the publication and distribution of the S3P.
3. Verify the minimum qualifications of the applicant (S3P Part I.A – Part I.D).
4. Review in detail all required promotion materials submitted by the candidate, the candidate's department Chair, the DPC, and the Dean, to determine the degree to which a candidate has met the criteria appropriate for rank.
5. Inform the candidates of their right to appear before the UWPC.

6. Submit to the President three lists of candidates for each rank sought: "Highly Recommend," "Recommend," and "Not Recommend." Within the lists "Recommend" and "Highly Recommend," rank candidates in the order that the committee believes reflects the merit of the documents submitted in support of the request for promotion.
7. Provide feedback to those who were not in the "Highly Recommend" category and not promoted.
8. Provide an opportunity for feedback in person to those candidates in the "Not Recommend" category.

Timeline

Note: If any date falls on Saturday or Sunday, then the deadline is moved to the following Monday.

October 1, 2012

DPC must send a roster of their membership to the UWPC Chair, David Chambers, 105 Keith Annex, Department of Political Science, by October 1, 2011. Failure to do so may invalidate a DPC's recommendation.

October 15, 2012

For departments with administrative faculty, the DPC delivers to the UWPC Chair, David Chambers,
105 Keith Annex, Department of Political Science, 15 copies of the draft of their Criteria for Evaluation of professional responsibilities.

November 1, 2012 by 4:30 PM

Applicant has the original application signed by both, his or her department Chair and his or her DPC Chair (Page 2 of the Application Form). The copies can be made beforehand, but the **original** must be signed by the aforementioned. **The UWPC prefers ALL copies to be signed.**

Applicant delivers **to the DPC**:

- One (1) copy of the Promotion Application Forms: Form 1 through Form 6.
- Application Supporting Documentation (UWPC): Documentation for subsequent submission to the Provost's office for use by the UWPC; containing evidence of teaching effectiveness, fulfillment of professional responsibility, up to five items of scholarship, and up to five items of service.
- Additional Documentation (DPC): Documentation for all other scholarship and service will be submitted to the DPC to be checked and which will be held by the DPC for possible examination by the UWPC until April 15, 2013.

Applicant delivers **to the UWPC Chair**, David Chambers, 105 Keith Annex, Department of Political Science:

- One (1) original and eight (8) copies of the completed Promotion Application Forms: Form 1 through Form 6; place the original and each copy in a separate manila folder with the candidate's name and rank sought clearly typed or printed on each folder.
- One (1) copy of the Candidate Checklist

By this date, the applicant also delivers one (1) copy of the application to (a) his or her **department Chair**, (b) to his or her **Dean**, and (c) to the **President or the President's designee (typically the Provost)**.

REMARKS:

NO CHANGES TO THE SUPPORTING MATERIALS MAY BE MADE AFTER NOVEMBER 1, 2012.

NO WORK COMPLETED AFTER NOVEMBER 1, 2012 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE PROMOTION PROCESS.

January 15, 2013 by 4:30 PM

DPC delivers **to the Provost's office**, 205 Sutton Hall:

- The Application Supporting Documentation (UWPC)

Candidate should have received by this date a copy of the DPC's recommendation and had an opportunity to discuss it with the DPC.

February 1, 2013 by 4:30 PM

DPC delivers **to the Provost's office**, 205 Sutton Hall:

- One (1) copy of the completed three-page recommendation
- One (1) copy of the DPC Transmittal Form
- List of all candidates from the department

DPC delivers **to the UWPC Chair**, David Chambers, 105 Keith Annex, Department of Political Science:

- Nine (9) copies of its completed three-page recommendation
- List of all candidates from the department
- One (1) copy of the DPC Transmittal Form
- One (1) copy of the DPC Checklist
- For each administrative faculty who has applied, nine (9) copies of the DPC Criteria for Evaluation

Chair delivers **to the UWPC Chair**, David Chambers, 105 Keith Annex, Department of Political Science:

- Nine (9) copies of his or her two-page recommendation, on the Report Form
- One (1) copy of his or her Transmittal Form
- One (1) copy of his or her Checklist

Chair delivers **to the Provost's office**, 205 Sutton Hall:

- One (1) copy of his or her two-page recommendation, on the Report Form

Dean delivers **to the UWPC Chair**, David Chambers, 105 Keith Annex, Department of Political Science:

- Nine (9) copies of his or her one-page recommendation, on the Report Form
- One (1) copy of his or her Transmittal Form
- One (1) copy of his or her Checklist

Dean delivers **to the Provost's office**, 205 Sutton Hall:

- One (1) copy of his or her one-page recommendation, on the Report Form

Candidate should have received by this date a copy of both the Chair's recommendation and the Dean's recommendation and had an opportunity to discuss it with each of them.

February 15, 2013 by 4:30 PM

Candidate delivers **to the UWPC Chair**, David Chambers, 105 Keith Annex, Department of Political Science:

- Nine (9) copies of his or her written response to the Chair's or Dean's recommendation, if any

Candidate delivers **to the Provost's office,** 205 Sutton Hall:

- One (1) copy of his or her written response to the Chair's or Dean's recommendation, if any

Candidate delivers **to the UWPC Chair**, David Chambers, 105 Keith Annex, Department of Political Science:

- Nine (9) copies of his or her written response to the DPC's recommendation, if any
  (Continued on next page)

Candidate delivers **to the Provost's office,** 205 Sutton Hall:

- One (1) copy of his or her written response to the DPC's recommendation, if any

March 25, 2013

Candidates who have not been recommended for promotion are notified by the UWPC.

April 6, 2013

The UWPC completes the appeal process.

April 15, 2013

UWPC Chair delivers candidates' ranking to the President (or President's designee) and applicants.

July 15, 2013

President announces promotions on or before this date.
UWPC provides feedback after this date.
Contact the Provost's office for the return of your Application Supporting Documentation after this date.

Am I eligible?

Two documents govern the promotion process. Familiarity with both is advisable. Article 12, Performance Review and Evaluation of Faculty, and Article 16, Promotions, of the CBA set ground rules which are the basis for the IUP Statement of Promotion Policies and Procedures (S3P).

Length of Service

Generally, applicants will not apply for promotion before their fifth year of service at IUP. Exceptions to this rule are sometimes granted by the Provost. If you believe that you may be a candidate for early promotion, then you must apply to the Provost in writing prior to October 1, 2012 by using the Request for Approval for Early Application for Promotion Form.

Degree and Teaching Experience

Assistant Professor:

a. Master's Degree plus 10 semester hours of graduate credits.

b. At least four years of teaching. You may include the year in which you apply. Part-time teaching should be listed as credit hours. Graduate teaching assistantships are counted on a two–for–one basis for up to two years. Do not count graduate research assistantships.

Associate Professor:

a. Earned Doctorate*, or Master's plus 40 hours of additional graduate credit, or total of 70 hours of graduate credit including a Master's degree, or all course work toward Doctorate complete and certified (ABD).

b. At least five years of teaching.

Professor:

a. Earned Doctorate*. Exceptions to the earned Doctorate requirement have been made under the 3% clause of Act 182. Please consult APSCUF or the Provost for possible exceptions.

b. At least seven years of teaching.

* Certain "terminal degrees" may substitute for an earned Doctorate; these include a J.D. and an M.F.A. under certain circumstances. Consult your DPC or the Provost for further information. (S3P Part 1.C)

Typical Material of Successful Applications

In this section information is provided to help you choose supporting material for your promotion application. The UWPC believes that most candidates merit promotion and wants to help candidates prepare their application in such a way that this fact is clearly evident. Addressed are the three areas of evaluation.

Effective teaching and performance of professional responsibilities

Applicants who are successfully promoted typically include the following products in their supporting materials (some products refer to teaching faculty only):

1. **Student Evaluations (from student evaluation forms)** — no single number or composite of numbers is used. In fact, overall rankings of instruction tend to vary widely among successful applicants. Supporting materials usually include Student Evaluations from three (3) consecutive regular semesters immediately prior to the application for promotion.
2. **Student Comments** — these are very helpful and often present a more balanced picture of classroom teaching than numerical ratings. The supporting materials of successful candidates typically include **all** student comments from Student Evaluation Forms.
3. **Syllabi, tests, exercises, and student products** — again, these help provide a fuller picture of the quality of your instruction. Good supporting materials may include thoughtful and up–to–date syllabi, challenging and relevant tests and exercises, and evidence of innovative techniques. Classroom materials developed by the candidate are often included. Involvement in teaching projects or collaborations might be included as well. These types of materials are often missing, incomplete, or poorly organized and explained in the supporting evidence of unsuccessful candidates.
4. **Peer evaluations** — typically, all peer evaluations which have been completed are included.
5. **Awards** — information about when and why your teaching was recognized is helpful; many successful candidates do not have "awards" for teaching, however.
6. **Evidence of effective student advisement or other professional responsibilities** — materials developed to help students, examples of memos, solicited and unsolicited student feedback, and work products related to professional responsibilities are often included.
7. **AWE** – in the case of faculty receiving **alternative workload assignments or with non-teaching assignments**, clear documentation of their activities which make it easy for the committee to see quality and time commitment are often included.

In summary, good supporting materials in the area of teaching may include: syllabi that are thorough, clear, and reflect your teaching philosophy; exercises and tests that are challenging and correspond to the syllabus and content material; student comments that generally indicate a concerned, approachable, and fair teacher; teaching strategies that work; special efforts to improve teaching; a pattern of growth or improvement; exceptional student products; and supportive peer comments.

On the other hand, poor supporting materials in the area of teaching often include skimpy syllabi; unclear exercises or tests; confusing student materials; missing Student Evaluation Forms; missing student comments or evaluations that seem to have a preponderance of judgments which indicate lack of effort, lack of concern, unavailability, lack of respect for students, lack of consistency, unfairness; peer comments which are uninformative; and lack of visible effort to improve teaching.

Continuing scholarly growth

The supporting materials in the area of Continuing Scholarly Growth of those successfully promoted typically might include several, but not all, of the following:

1. Clear documentation of **regional and national conference presentations**.
2. Evidence of **publication that has undergone some form of review process**.
3. Clear documentation of **grant activity**; good supporting materials clearly show how the grant reflects or contributes to scholarly growth.
4. Clear documentation of **contributions to the scholarly growth of others through leadership positions, newsletter editorships, colloquia, or sponsored workshops**.
5. Clear documentation of a **single important work**, such as a book, monograph, or longer article.
6. Clear documentation of **forms of scholarship in the arts**; e.g., musical compositions, juried art show participation, invited performances, commissioned works.

Awards for scholarship should be included as they are often helpful in determining the value of work to the larger scholarly community, but should be presented in the context of the work which earned the award.

The supporting materials of candidates who are unsuccessful often lack the types of products listed above. They do not have clear documentation of the author's percentage of contribution or of the prestige of the professional presentations or peer-reviewed publications. Neither do they show clear evidence of contributing to the scholarly growth of others. In the absence of these, there also may be no single important work which could account for their scholarly activity.

Service: contribution to the University and/or community

In the area of service, the supporting materials of successful candidates usually includes some, but not all, of the following:

1. Documented evidence of **continuous departmental service**.
2. Documented evidence of **service at the college and university level**.
3. Documented evidence of **service to the campus and local community**.
4. Documented evidence of **development of new courses or programs of study or revision of courses or programs of study**.

The supporting materials of successful candidates often provide information about the amount of time spent in the particular service activity and provide examples of products that result from service activity. Grant activities which allow needed equipment, services, or programs to come to the university or community may be included. Unsuccessful candidates' supporting materials often lack documentation of this type, making service difficult to evaluate.

How does the UWPC make its decisions?

The UWPC uses a checklist which follows the criteria for Promotion of Teaching and Administrative Faculty from the S3P, Part I.E – H.

The Decision Procedure

The same process is used for all ranks. After carefully reviewing all materials submitted for each candidate and determining an independent ranking, UWPC members meet and vote in three steps. First, a "Not Recommend" group is discussed and a vote is taken. In general, arguments are made to keep people out of this group. Each UWPC member votes his or her own conscience in a secret ballot. Second, a vote is taken for all remaining candidates for "Highly Recommend" for effective teaching, scholarly growth, and service. Candidates who are "Highly Recommend" are then numerically ranked. Finally, the remaining "Recommend" candidates are numerically ranked.

Although the UWPC discusses candidates, it does so based only on the information presented to it. At no point is personal knowledge or hearsay, positive or negative, permitted to enter the process. Discussion is a discussion of the evidence. Discussion usually occurs around candidates who are close to making a cutoff, not about ranking within categories.

In evaluating the evidence you present, the committee searches for quality, thoughtfulness, and signs of commitment. A well-ordered set of supporting materials is important. Good organization permits the UWPC members to concentrate on what you say and what you have done. Misplaced documentation or poorly documented achievements could be missed.

A more detailed explanation of the workings of the UWPC judgment process follows.

I. Setting
   1. The UWPC Chair shall schedule, organize, and run the meetings and shall be responsible for communicating the results of the meetings.
   2. The sub-committees shall meet in a convenient setting with comfortable chairs and adequate tabletop space.

II. Not Recommend
   1. Clarification of materials.
   2. Vote individually on candidates.
   3. Record vote and save ballots.
   4. Candidates with 5 or more votes out of 7* to <u>Not Recommend</u> are given no further consideration.

III. Appeals
   1. Letters to those on the <u>Not Recommend</u> list are distributed by the deadline.
   2. Appeals are requested, scheduled, and determined as granted or denied by the deadline.

3. Candidates whose appeal has been denied are notified.
4. Candidates whose appeal has been granted are notified and they are included in the list of those candidates who will be ranked.

IV. Highly Recommend

1. Clarification of materials.
2. Vote individually on candidates.
3. Record vote and save ballots.
4. Candidates with 4 or more votes out of 7* are Highly Recommend.
5. Candidates with 3 votes out of 7* are reconsidered via further analysis of supporting materials.
6. Vote individually on candidates mentioned in Item #5.
7. Record vote and save ballots.
8. Candidates with 4 or more votes out of 7* are Highly Recommend.
9. Additional clarification of materials of Highly Recommend candidates.
10. Rank individually candidates mentioned in Item #9.
11. Record rankings and save ballots.
12. For each candidate in this category, remove the highest rank. If there are ties, then remove only one of them. Remove the lowest rank. If there are ties, then remove only one of them. Then average the remaining ranks.
13. The final ranks will be determined by the average rank from Item #12.
14. For each candidate in this category, record and save average rank and final rank.

    * Note: In the event there are fewer than 7 subcommittee members, two-thirds of the members must vote to Highly Recommend.

V. Recommend

1. Clarification of materials of those left. (Those **NOT** "Not Recommend" and **NOT** "Highly Recommend").
2. Rank individually candidates mentioned in Item #1.
3. Record rankings and save ballots.
4. For each candidate in this category, remove the highest rank. If there are ties, then remove only one of them. Remove the lowest rank. If there are ties, then remove only one of them. Then average the remaining ranks.
5. The final ranks will be determined by the average rank from Item #4.
6. For each candidate in this category, record and save average rank and final rank.

The S3P does give the UWPC clear guidance and clear expectations of performance by rank. The section below is taken verbatim from the S3P, Part I.H.

Assistant Professor

The primary characteristics of the rank of Assistant Professor are that the candidate meet the minimum statutory requirements and achieves increasing excellence in teaching. The degree to which other criteria have been met will also be considered.

Associate Professor

For advancement to the rank of Associate Professor, in addition to meeting the minimum statutory requirements, the candidate will demonstrate excellence in teaching and in one additional area, either research or service.

Professor

For advancement to the rank of Full [sic] Professor, in addition to meeting the minimum statutory requirements, the candidate will demonstrate excellence in all three areas of teaching, scholarly growth, and service. In other words, the UWPC will seek a balance among these three areas. The committee acknowledges, however, that it is not always possible to balance these three areas equally and that, because of the vicissitudes of careers and personal lives, a candidate may have chosen to focus effort on either service or scholarship. If a candidate presents an imbalanced portfolio, the committee will look for excellence in teaching, extraordinary success in either service or scholarship, and clear signs of dedicated activity in the remaining area.

Deliberation

The information contained here — forms, the influence of presentation, and expectations by rank — should assist you in presenting your argument for promotion. Finally, your materials will be judged and ranked by seven of your peers. UWPC members have different notions of what the ideal IUP professor should look like. We discuss factual statements in the evidence about candidates and review them based on our internal value sets as committee members. As a group we try to assure that a fair weighing of the evidence is made. Voting takes place by secret ballot.

We can tell you, that while we find a clustering of ranking for many candidates, disagreements can be as large as the pool of applicants. For example, one UWPC member's number 1 candidate may be another UWPC member's number 14. This potential disparity is not meant to scare or discourage you. Once high and low votes are dropped, an important part of the process, concurrence is much stronger.

Notification, Feedback, and the Appeals Process

Notification of your category and rank within category will be available on or before April 15, 2013. All candidates who are not in the "Highly Recommend" group and who are not promoted will receive feedback in the form of either letters or conferences after July 15, 2013.

Faculty determined to be “Not Ready At This Time” (Not Recommended) for promotion will receive a letter of notification which includes the rationale for this decision from the UWPC by March 25, 2013. The promotion applicant will have **THREE WORKING DAYS** in which to make a request to the UWPC Chair for a meeting to appeal the committee’s decision, if so desired. The meeting, when requested, will be scheduled and held before April 6, 2013 with the appeals committee. The applicant’s promotion materials will be available at the meeting.

The applicant will be given the opportunity to address the appeals committee and may refer to the materials contained in their promotion box in support. No new or additional material will be accepted by the committee or presented by the applicant. The sole purpose of the meeting is to provide an opportunity for the applicant to explain or clarify existing materials related to the questions raised by the UWPC. The applicant will be allowed and encouraged to explain or make their case related to the areas in question (teaching, scholarly growth, and service).

After all appeals have been heard, a vote of the appeals committee(s) will take place to determine if the applicant(s) is not ready at this time for promotion, or becomes a part of the recommended pool of applicants. The appeals committee recommendation on each applicant appealing the original recommendation will be determined by a majority vote of the three members of the committee.

All promotion applications that were recommended from the initial screening along with those added after an appeal would then be ranked by the UWPC according to established categories and procedures.