Promotion Process
Yr to Yr Faculty, Non Continuing Eligible

For year to year faculty in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS), there should be very clear position responsibilities. There must be criteria and measures for the activities that are part of the job description and a process for evaluation just as there are for regular faculty. Even if little or no research is involved, there should be criteria and measures for the activities that are a part of the job. The process should be equitable for both continuing and non continuing eligible faculty in similar positions.

The model which we have used for professorial titles, non tenure eligible and which is used in the College of Medicine is also appropriate for faculty with agent titles, non continuing eligible. These candidates are evaluated by the same process as other CALS faculty with similar positions up through the level of the Dean. The packet then goes to the Provost for a final decision. There is no review by a university committee as there would be if they were continuing or tenure eligible.

The dossier should be the same as for continuing eligible faculty with similar titles. It should include a clear position description and appropriate criteria and guidelines for promotion to each level in the position (i.e., asst. agent, assoc. agent, and full agent). The College guidelines specifically address the use of the position description to provide the context for all evaluations so if the position description does not call for scholarly research the candidate would not be evaluated on that basis. An abstract of the College guidelines and a set of Extension guidelines would be part of the packet.

Outside letters (5-7) should be obtained by the unit head. The candidate should not contact any of the outside reviewers. The University allows the candidate to suggest names but the unit head makes the final selection which may include no more than half from the candidate’s list. The unit head describes the process of selection and provides brief background information on the referees.

Independence may be an issue if the candidate knows all or most of the appropriate people who would provide outside letters. If necessary, that would be an area for the unit head and Dean to address in their letters. A more complete explanation of this part of the packet is available on CALS "Collective Wisdom" site: http://ag.arizona.edu/dean/cwindex.html

There should be review by both a unit level committee and a college level committee. It is also possible to modify the peer committee by adding someone with greater knowledge of the candidate’s area of responsibility to the regularly designated members.