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GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Tenure and promotion in the College of Humanities are granted only to candidates who have demonstrated excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service/outreach in accordance with the expectations defined by the units in which they hold appointments. All tenure and promotion reviews should look at the totality of the candidate’s scholarly, teaching, and service/outreach record with emphasis on current trajectory. Although reviews typically comprise the period beginning with the candidate’s most recent appointment or promotion, the review should recognize that candidates come to tenure and/or promotion by following multiple paths, which may require a longer term record of achievement to be recognized during the review.

Excellent research should have a demonstrable impact on the area of study to which it contributes and should provide evidence of distinguished achievement as well as a presumption of future distinction. Such research can include collaborative, integrative, and applied forms of scholarship and can involve scholarly collaborations with other faculty and universities, as well as business and community partners.

Excellent teaching is marked by the instructor’s ability to engage students in the learning process and by the rigor and scope of the courses taught; effectiveness is measured by student and peer evaluations of the instructor and the courses taught.

Excellent service is expected on various levels: within the university community, at the departmental, collegial, and university level, as well as by participation in professional organizations and academic collaborations at university, local, national, and international levels. Outreach engages the faculty in extramural community activities that are related to their professional expertise.

The overarching criteria for granting tenure are the quality, quantity, and effectiveness of the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and service/outreach. Implicit in these criteria is the promise of continued excellence in all of these areas.

1. SCHOLARSHIP

For faculty in the College of Humanities, which consists of departments and programs in literature, linguistics, discourse analysis, rhetoric and composition, second language acquisition and pedagogy, creative writing, religious studies, and related area studies, these university guidelines may be realized in diverse combinations of intellectual activities and products. In every case, candidates must provide evidence of sustained and significant contributions to their professional area as judged according to
criteria which include measures of both quality and quantity. More specific evidence may be required by individual component departments and programs within the College of Humanities, provided that the definition of and requirements for that evidence follow accepted criteria and are in compliance with University and College guidelines. Each candidate must be guaranteed fair representation for review by specialists sharing his or her area of expertise. For faculty who are involved in interdisciplinary scholarship, which is valued and encouraged, review must represent the full scope of the candidate’s work.

1.1 EVIDENCE OF SUSTAINED SCHOLARSHIP

Primary evidence of sustained scholarship or creative work includes (but may not be limited to) publication or acceptance for publication of the following products over the duration of the candidate's time in current rank:

- Book(s) or monograph(s) by reputable publishers.
- Scholarly contributions to rigorously refereed professional venues or creative works in respected venues, including on-line publications.
- Editing, compiling, and translation which contribute substantively to intellectual development in the field.
- Applied scholarship (e.g., textbooks, software, and web-based work) which is firmly grounded in the candidate's own contributions to theory and research in the field.
- Evidence of integrative and/or applied scholarship, which can involve collaborations with other UA faculty or programs or with business and community partners, including translational research connected to community, international, or commercial activity.

Supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship or creative work may include (but may not be limited to) the following products and activities:

- Publication of book reviews in respected venues.
- Publication of articles or other scholarly products in non-refereed venues, including on-line publications that might not be rigorously reviewed, or creative works in alternative venues.
- Publication of reference works, such as encyclopedia entries.
- Scholarly papers or readings of creative work presented at local, regional, national, and international professional meetings.
- Participation in professional colloquia and panels of a scholarly or creative nature.
- Management of or contribution to professional web sites.
- Research grant proposals submitted or funded.
- Other editing, compiling, translation, and bibliography contributions.
- Other instances of applied scholarship.
- Work in progress.

The determination of "reputable" publishers and other "respected" venues is best made within each academic specialization; documentation of publishers' status in marginal cases is the responsibility of candidates and departmental/program administrators and review committees, augmented by input from external reviews. Publications in languages other than English are of equal value to English, provided that language is accessible for and subject to departmental/program and external review. Individual departments and programs will be the final arbiters of what may and may not be included as primary or supplementary evidence.
1.2 EVIDENCE OF SIGNIFICANCE AND QUALITY

Primary evidence for scholarship or creative work must include stipulation of its significance and quality by not only departmental but national and international colleagues (especially external peer reviewers from other institutions), as well as, where appropriate, collaborative or community partners.

Supplementary evidence for significance and quality of scholarship or creative work may include (but may not be limited to) the following indicators:

- Major awards, grants, and fellowships.
- Invitations to review manuscripts for publication, grant applications, and candidates for promotion at peer institutions.
- Having one's work cited, reprinted, or translated into other languages.
- Invitations to present work to scholarly or artistic communities.
- Attraction of advanced students to work under one's direction and guidance.
- Major research-based contributions to outside institutions, communities, or businesses.

**Associate Professor:** Promotion to associate professor with tenure carries the expectation that scholars or creative writers who are selected to provide external review will recognize the significance of a candidate's professional contributions.

**Full Professor:** Promotion to professor carries the expectation that scholars or creative writers who themselves are widely recognized as experts in the field, nationally and internationally, will recognize the significance of a candidate's professional contributions.

1.3 EVIDENCE OF QUANTITY

Adequate quantity in scholarly or creative productivity cannot be specified exactly in measures such as number of publications or pages in print, but the following guidelines generally apply:

**Associate Professor:** Promotion to associate professor with tenure requires (1) publication or acceptance for publication by a reputable publisher of at least one major work plus evidence of additional sustained scholarly or creative contributions, or (2) publication or acceptance for publication in respected venues of a substantial number of other scholarly and/or creative products. This evidence may include some or all of the publications by candidates prior to their appointment in current rank, such as publications during post doctoral and visiting appointments or post MFA creative activity. All work completed while a graduate student must be marked with an asterisk (*) in the dossier. Supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship or creativity is taken into account, but does not replace the expectation for publication of original scholarly or creative work.

**Full Professor:** Promotion to professor normally requires publication or acceptance for publication by a reputable publisher of at least one major work of scholarship subsequent to appointment as associate professor plus evidence of additional sustained scholarly contributions, or (2) publication or acceptance for publication in rigorously reviewed venues of a substantial number of other scholarly and/or creative products subsequent to appointment as associate professor. Again, supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship is taken into account, but does not replace the expectation for publication of original scholarly or creative work.
2. TEACHING

The instructional function of the University requires faculty members who can effectively communicate the content of the current body of knowledge and the latest research results in the classroom and other learning environments, through individual student contact, and through professional modes of publication. Excellence in teaching includes, but is not limited to:

- organizing and conducting courses appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
- bringing to the classroom, and other learning environments, the most effective pedagogical approaches;
- engaging the students, according to their capacities, in the current discourses and debates within a field;
- enabling students to articulate issues and solve problems on their own;
- being available outside the classroom for further instruction and advice;
- advising and mentoring students at all levels.

For **Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:**

- Candidates must present evidence of successful teaching appropriate to the unit's mission, including lower division, upper division, and graduate courses for units involved at these levels.

- Candidates should be engaged in educating individual students at the highest level of their discipline and, where appropriate, should be directing master's and doctoral work.

Faculty members must show effectiveness within the classroom and other learning environments in organizing and presenting material and in stimulating intellectual response. Evidence on teaching effectiveness must come from: student evaluation; a peer review of the teaching portfolio and of the quality of feedback to students on their work; recognition of advising responsibilities; and participation in faculty development activities. Other evidence may include, but is not limited to: grants for teaching innovations; teaching awards; selection to teach in prestigious programs; achievements by students; and in-class peer evaluation. Evidence of efforts to improve teaching effectiveness (e.g., the appropriate use of technology) should be provided. Availability to students during office hours is an expectation.

For **Promotion to Professor:**

- Candidates must present evidence of continued high quality teaching and mentoring, in the classroom, in other learning environments and through individual student contact, as appropriate to the unit’s mission. This should include lower division, upper division, and graduate courses for units involved at these levels.

- Candidates should continue to be engaged in educating individual students at the highest level of their discipline and, where appropriate, should be directing master’s and doctoral work.

- Candidates should have attained a leadership role in developing unit curricula, providing evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of other faculty, and contributing to more effective unit teaching approaches.
Evidence of teaching effectiveness should continue to come from student evaluations, peer evaluations, advising, achievements by students, teaching grants and awards, successful innovation, selection to teach in prestigious programs here and elsewhere, and participation in faculty development activities. All of this should be documented in a Teaching Portfolio submitted by each candidate, which should include all the applicable material in the current Provost’s Guidelines for Teaching Portfolios. Faculty are expected to improve their teaching continually by staying current with the latest developments in the discipline and with pedagogical techniques.

3. SERVICE/OUTREACH

Service includes: service on departmental (or unit), college, and University committees; service to professional associations and on public committees where faculty disciplinary knowledge is required. Service becomes an increasingly important part of a faculty member's activities as he or she advances through the professorial ranks. Outreach is a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching and research/creative activity. It involves delivering, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with University and unit missions. Service/outreach activities may include, but are not limited to:

- serving on campus committees and teams;
- actively participating in faculty governance at unit, college or university levels;
- participating in activities of professional societies or organizations in one’s discipline;
- applying one’s expertise to address local, regional, national, or international issues;
- providing non-credit courses, extension programs, or short courses to governmental agencies and professional organizations;
- presenting community lectures or performances;
- technical reports to outside communities;
- articles for popular and special interest publications;
- online resources developed for communities, businesses, agencies, or disciplinary associations;
- expert testimony or consultation inside or outside the University.

In some cases, one or more of these items can be counted as “Scholarship” depending on departmental criteria and/or the candidate’s field(s) of expertise. The candidate must articulate clearly the ways in which these items are part of the candidate’s scholarship.

For **Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:**

- Candidates must contribute to academic planning at the unit level and, perhaps, at the college and university levels, by effectively carrying out committee assignments.

- Candidates should participate in local, regional and national meetings, be active in professional societies, and participate in peer review processes.

- Candidates should share their professional expertise with the public through outreach avenues such as local schools, libraries, organizations, commissions, consulting assignments, or panels.
An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Evidence of the above should be provided and should reveal that assistant professors worthy of promotion to associate professor with tenure have begun to develop a habit of service, that their judgments are professionally respected and valued, and that they have demonstrated the ability to find linkages between their discipline and public interests, needs, and opportunities.

Care must be taken, however, on the part of both the candidate and administration not to over-commit assistant professors by demanding a level of service that interferes with their development of a coherent research program and of teaching skills. While women and minorities are underrepresented on the faculty, it will be particularly important to resist the temptation to burden them with excessive service expectations.

For **Promotion to Professor:**

Candidates for full professor must have accepted much more service responsibility than that required for lower ranks. An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Evidence of service/outreach may include, but is not limited to the following:

- leadership in faculty governance, in mentoring of junior faculty, and in establishing academic unit and college goals, objectives and performance standards;
- participation in professional associations, on professional review panels, and in the review of journal articles, grants and proposals;
- work with governmental and non-profit agencies that involves one's disciplinary expertise; and
- various forms of outreach *to wider communities and organizations, as in presenting* lectures, giving performances, and organizing events that build on and extend the candidate’s disciplines.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Immediately upon assuming their duties, all newly-hired tenured or tenure-eligible faculty members, regardless of rank, will receive from their respective department heads copies of three sets of promotion and tenure materials:

1.1. The promotion and tenure guidelines adopted by their respective departments

1.2. The College of Humanities Promotion and Tenure Criteria, together with the College of Humanities Promotion and Tenure Timetable

1.3. All relevant university promotion and tenure documents

Department heads will also provide copies of these promotion and tenure documents, where appropriate, to all candidates for hire into tenured or tenurable positions.

The specific qualifications required for tenure and/or promotion are discussed in full in the departmental promotion and tenure documents and in the College of Humanities Promotion and Tenure Criteria. What follows herein pertains only to the “procedures” to be followed in conducting tenure and/or promotion reviews.

2. APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

The procedures to be followed in the College of Humanities for the constitution of promotion and tenure committees must conform to those regulations which, by regental authority, are binding upon the university as a whole. We therefore note the following governing paragraphs from the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP, 2014, 3.3.02 [a]):

2.1. STANDING COMMITTEES

“Provided there are sufficient faculty members to warrant such a committee, each college, department, or unit will have a Standing Advisory Committee on Faculty Status to advise the dean and immediate administrative head before recommendations on reviews for tenure, promotion, and nonrenewal are forwarded to higher levels. Each such committee will include at least three tenured faculty members from the unit. If a unit does not have sufficient faculty members to constitute such a committee, then the faculty
and administrative head will consult with the appropriate dean on forming such a committee from other units. In promotion or tenure matters, the advisory committees will be so constituted that recommendations will be made only by faculty members holding rank superior to the rank of the candidate being considered, except in the case of full professors where the committee members will each be a full professor. Standing Advisory Committees generally will meet without the administrator whom they advise.”

2.2. THE COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE (A.K.A. THE DEAN’S COMMITTEE)

2.2.1. Each year the dean will appoint a College of Humanities promotion and tenure committee and will name its chairperson. The committee will be charged to act in the best interest of the College of Humanities as a whole.

2.2.2. The dean will make appointments to the College of Humanities promotion and tenure committee in such a way as to ensure compliance with the equitable gender and minority representation requirements of federal and state anti-discrimination laws and with the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) and university policies and rules against discrimination. No one who is otherwise qualified shall be barred from service on promotion and tenure committees on the basis of religion, race, color, national origin, physical disability, or sexual orientation.

2.2.3. The committee will consist of no fewer than four members. Those members will be from different departments of the College of Humanities; one will be from departments or programs in other colleges. Appointments will be for one or two years.

2.2.4. The dean will appoint to this committee only faculty members who have met the current criteria by which the candidates under consideration are being judged. Members of the committee from units other than the College of Humanities shall be those who have met the current criteria for promotion to full or associate professor in their respective fields. Associate professors may serve when there is no candidate for promotion to the rank of full professor.

2.2.5. The committee will be presented with a detailed statement of the university’s affirmative action policies and guidelines, which will be explained by a representative of the Affirmative Action Office. Also, it will be explained to the whole committee at their first meeting that, should there arise in the course of deliberation any questions regarding race, gender or other sorts of bias, then, at the request of one or more members, the committee will consult with a representative of the university’s Affirmative Action Office for advice and guidance in such matters.

2.2.6. In any given year, it is likely that the committee will include members from departments that are presenting candidates. It is therefore stipulated that a committee member may not participate in discussions concerning candidates from his or her own department, that he or she must leave the room during such discussions, and that he or she must abstain from voting on those cases.

2.2.7. The membership of this committee will be considered public information, and the dean will announce the names of its members at the beginning of each academic year.

2.2.8. Faculty under review for possible promotion and tenure are to have no direct or indirect contact with the committee or its members regarding their own cases.

2.2.9. UHAP 3.3.02 [c.]: “At the time a recommendation regarding renewal, nonrenewal, promotion or continuing status is transmitted by the immediate administrative head, the dean or division administrator to the next administrative level, the faculty member involved should be advised in writing of the nature of the recommendation. The faculty member is not entitled to a statement of the reasons for the recommendation.”
2.3. DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEES

Membership on standing or ad hoc departmental promotion and tenure committees is by appointment. In each department, it is the department head who appoints the members of that department’s promotion and tenure committee, after thorough consultation with the department faculty. However, a department head’s discretion in this matter is subject to the following constraints:

2.3.1. In accordance with UHAP regulations, a standing departmental promotion and tenure committee “will include at least three tenured faculty members.”

2.3.2. Department heads will make their appointments to the promotion and tenure committees in such a way as to ensure compliance with university affirmative action and non-discrimination guidelines and policy. To this end, whenever feasible and appropriate, department heads may appoint to their committees tenured faculty from other departments and programs who are qualified to evaluate the candidates’ work. No one who is otherwise qualified shall be barred from service on promotion and tenure committees on the basis of religion, race, color, national origin, physical disability, or sexual orientation.

2.3.3. Whenever possible, the departmental promotion and tenure committee will include at least one member with expertise in the candidate’s particular field. The committee should also include as many members as possible conversant with the candidate’s general area of specialization.

2.3.4. The committee will be presented with a detailed statement of the university’s affirmative action policies and guidelines, which will be explained by a representative of the Affirmative Action Office. Also, it will be explained to the whole committee at their first meeting that, should there arise in course of deliberation any questions regarding race, gender or other sorts of bias, then, at the request of one or more members, the committee will consult with a representative of the university’s Affirmative Action Office for advice and guidance in such matters.

2.3.5. Each candidate, in consultation with the head, will compile a list of five University of Arizona faculty members with the rank and expertise necessary to evaluate the candidate. The list may include former or present members of the departmental standing promotion and tenure committee. The department head will select from this list two persons who, if they are not already members of the standing promotion committee, will join it as ad hoc members to participate in discussion of, and to vote upon, that particular candidate’s case. Appointment of such additional, ad hoc members is also subject to the qualifications listed immediately above (2.3.1., 2.3.2, 2.3.3).

2.3.6. Whenever the department’s workload so demands, a department head may appoint more than one promotion and tenure committee.

2.3.7. Members of the promotion and tenure committee are not permitted to discuss the candidate’s evaluation with her/him, unless the committee as a whole should formally request such a discussion. Any such request on the part of a committee must be communicated to the candidate through the department head. Likewise, any questions the candidate may have regarding the committee’s procedures must also be directed to the department head.

2.3.8. UHAP 3.3.02 [c.]: “At the time a recommendation regarding renewal, nonrenewal, promotion or continuing status is transmitted by the immediate administrative head, the dean or division administrator to the next administrative level, the faculty member involved should be advised in writing of the nature of the recommendation. The faculty member is not entitled to a statement of the reasons for the recommendation.”
2.4. SPECIAL CASES

There are at least two cases, both involving promotion to full professor, that are not addressed specifically by the UHAP and College of Humanities procedural guidelines:

2.4.1. The head/director of a unit is an associate professor who seeks promotion to full professor. In such a case, the head/director cannot serve as the head vis à vis the promotion committee.

2.4.2. A unit does not have enough full professors to constitute a promotion committee (which must be composed of at least three full professors).

In the first case, in which the head of a department or director of a program is an associate professor who seeks promotion to full professor, the dean, after thorough consultation with the faculty of the unit, will appoint a surrogate promotion head or director (SPH/D) who holds the rank of full professor.

If circumstances permit, the SPH/D will be a tenured member of the unit; otherwise the dean will consult with the unit and appoint, from within the College of Humanities, an SPH/D whose teaching and research activities are as closely related as possible to those of the unit.

If circumstances permit the appointment of a committee from within the unit, the SPH/D will then appoint the required number of Full Professors to serve as an ad hoc Promotion Committee - with the proviso that, if the unit has a standing promotion committee, all full professors on the committee will be eligible for, but will not automatically be appointed to, the ad hoc promotion committee. The ad hoc committee will be independently appointed by the SPH/D in consultation with the faculty of the unit.

If the circumstances do not permit the appointment of a committee from within the unit, the procedure spelled out below is to be followed.

In the second case, in which a unit does not have enough full professors to constitute a promotion committee, the dean of the college will consult with the head or director and with the faculty of the unit and will appoint as many additional, ad hoc members who are full professors from other College of Humanities units to the promotion committee as are required to reach the three members required by UHAP policy.

In cases where committee members must be chosen from another College of Humanities unit, the same considerations that govern the appointment of a SPH/D are to be taken into account. The dean will appoint committee members whose teaching and research activities are as closely related as possible to those of the unit.

3. PREPARING THE PROMOTION AND TENURE FILE

The following procedures are to be understood as subordinate to and governed by the procedures outlined in the document issued every spring by the Provost’s Office (hereinafter referred to as the current Provost’s Guidelines) which deals with continuing status and promotion process and preparation of dossiers. This document, which must be studied carefully by all involved in the promotion and tenure process, is subject to change. Changes that it may undergo in the future may necessitate changes in the College of Humanities procedures and thus may require alteration of the directions given below.

3.1. IDENTIFICATION AND NOTIFICATION OF CANDIDATES

By March 1 of each year department heads will write to all members of their departments who are eligible for tenure and/or promotion, inviting candidates for mandatory or optional review to submit their
candidacies to the department head and the chairperson of the departmental promotion and tenure committee. For dates of all subsequent steps, see the most recent *College of Humanities Promotion and Tenure Timetable*.

3.2. PROPER FORMAT FOR THE PREPARATION OF DOSSIERS

3.2.1. Dossiers must be prepared using the outline form (headings and subheadings) from the most recent version of *the Provost’s Guidelines for Preparing Promotion and Tenure Cases* issued each spring by the Provost. **Such dossiers must include a Teaching Portfolio and should, in some cases, if mandated by the position description of the candidate or agreed on between the candidate and his/her department head, include a Service and Outreach Portfolio, both compiled according to the Provost’s Guidelines.**

3.2.2. All published or forthcoming works listed in a dossier must be cited according to the complete citation form, i.e., all citations must include title, publisher, place and date of publication, and page numbers.

3.2.3. In the event that a candidate for promotion and tenure presents published (or soon to be published) materials which cannot be given adequate critical evaluation because they are written in a language insufficiently known to members of the departmental or the college committee, the chairperson of either committee may request that the candidate prepare an English translation of selected portions of the materials (or a précis of them) that would permit the committee to make an informed evaluation. In certain cases it may be deemed necessary to invite a consultant, fluent in the language in question, to participate in the committee’s discussions (but not to vote).

3.3. REFEREES AND LETTERS OF EVALUATION

3.3.1. Each candidate may submit up to ten names of potential reviewers from outside the University of Arizona, but in so doing must take care to nominate only those persons whose objectivity will not be put in question (for example, by previous close association with the candidate as a research collaborator, co-editor, or dissertation adviser).

3.3.2. To the list of possible reviewers nominated by the candidate the department head will add the names of other persons of his or her own choosing who are knowledgeable in the candidate’s field.

3.3.3. The full list of potential reviewers, i.e., the list of all those whom the candidate has suggested together with all others whom the head is considering, will be discussed with the candidate who will be given the opportunity to present compelling and legitimate reasons for removing any person(s) from the list. A list of all potential reviewers to whom the candidate has objected will be kept as a part of the official promotion and tenure file.

3.3.4. The final decision as to which persons will serve as reviewers will be made by the department head, in consultation with the departmental promotion and tenure committee - this in accordance with the current Provost’s Guidelines, which specify that candidates may suggest names, but the department head or review committee should select the individuals to be contacted. It is understood, however, that in any case in which a candidate has presented compelling reason for removing a particular person from the list of potential reviewers, the department head will respect the candidate’s wishes and not solicit a reference from that person.

3.3.5. Some (but no more than half) of those finally selected to serve as reviewers will be from the candidate’s list of nominees.

3.3.6. The names of all reviewers finally chosen, including those suggested by the candidate, will be kept confidential. At no point in the process will the candidate contact, either directly or indirectly, external reviewers or potential reviewers regarding the tenure and/or promotion review. If contacted by a
reviewer, the candidate shall refrain from responding to questions about the promotion and tenure case and, instead, shall direct the reviewer to the department head or the chairperson of the departmental promotion and tenure committee for any required information or directions.

3.3.7. By the date established in the current College of Humanities Promotion and Tenure Timetable, the department head will write a standard letter to all outside reviewers requesting an evaluation of the candidate (a sample letter is usually provided in the current Provost’s Guidelines). Referees will be assured that their letters of reference will be held in strictest confidentiality, within the limits of applicable law, ABOR policy and university regulations. The letters to all reviewers must be substantively identical.

3.3.8. At least three of the letters of reference included in any promotion and tenure file must be recent.

3.3.9. In the department head’s letter to the dean, the department head shall call attention to letters that are not in accordance with federal and state antidiscrimination laws, or with ABOR and university policies and rules against discrimination.

3.3.10. For further information on outside reviewers, consult the current version of the Provost’s Guidelines. These Guidelines additionally include, where appropriate to the description of the candidate’s position, the following documentations of scholarly and service or outreach impact:

- letters from academic, community, or business collaborators
- letters from University collaborators noting the impact and rigor of the candidate’s work
- verifiable news or media reports on service contributions
- grants secured, whether for research, teaching, or service contributions
- contracts for external contributions or translational research
- adoptions of programs and materials by other institutions

3.4. COLLECTION OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

3.4.1. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide a copy, offprint, or preprint of each work published or accepted for publication. Each manuscript accepted for publication but not yet actually published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher, journal editor, or other responsible person indicating its acceptance.

3.4.2. A candidate’s teaching record must be documented, not merely asserted, by way of a Teaching Portfolio compiled according to Provost Guidelines. It is the responsibility of the department head and the candidate to provide an evaluation of teaching and advising, as directed in the current Provost’s Guidelines.

3.4.3. Proof of professional honors or recognition and proof of professional service, both within and without the university, is the responsibility of the candidate. He or she should submit all pertinent documentation when citing such honors, awards, or service, e.g., letters of appointment to committees; letters of recognition from local, regional, national organizations; etc. These can, and in some cases should, be submitted within a Service and Outreach Portfolio.

3.4.4. In any case in which a professional honor or award is cited, the candidate should also provide some information or documentation about the award or honor.

3.4.5. The candidate should discuss with the department head submission of any other documents that may be deemed pertinent to promotion or tenure action.

3.4.6. Significant new materials may be added to the candidate packet during the review process in accordance with the procedures described in the current Provost’s Guidelines.
3.4.7. The department head shall ensure that the candidate’s file remain intact and the identical file as was reviewed at the department level be forwarded intact to the dean’s level.

4. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND SERVICE

4.1. EVALUATION OF RESEARCH

4.1.1. As noted above, the candidate must provide copies of all her or his published and soon to be published works. The candidate should also provide copies of any published reviews of those works which he or she wishes the committees to consider.

4.1.2. It is possible that an external reviewer’s initial letter will prompt further questions on the part of the department head or the departmental committee. In such cases the department head may request a second letter of reference from the reviewer, asking him or her to provide clarification of points in the initial letter or requesting additional information. All such follow-up requests, and all responses to them, must be in writing. Referees will again be assured that all such correspondence will be held in the strictest confidentiality within the limits of applicable law.

4.1.3. The departmental committee will summarize the content of all available reviews of the candidate’s publications.

4.1.4. The departmental committee will evaluate anthologies, books, and journals in which the candidate’s works have appeared or will appear, and will summarize their relative standing in the candidate’s field.

4.1.5. The departmental committee will summarize and evaluate invited and volunteered conference papers, talks, poetry readings, performances, etc. that the candidate has given, while also assessing the relative importance of the meetings (conferences, colloquia, etc.) at which the contributions were made.

4.1.6. The departmental committee will summarize the relative importance of the candidate’s scholarly and creative production. If the candidate is said to have national or international standing or his/her research is found to have community, business, or international impact beyond academia, this claim must be substantiated.

4.1.7. In addition to judging the quality of the candidate’s individual contributions, the departmental committee will also assess the coherence, quality, development, and potential value of the candidate’s overall research program and will assess the relevance to that general program of all individual research products, including evidence of translational research.

4.1.8. Scholarly editing, where it can be shown to require sustained research and original or critical activity, may be offered as another example of scholarly activity. In most instances, however, journal editing or similar activity will be understood as “professional service.”

4.2. EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A full statement of what information to provide on teaching, and what not to provide, is contained in the current Provost’s Guidelines, which mandates the compilation of a Teaching Portfolio. The following procedural points are for use by the candidate, the department head, and the promotion and tenure committees in implementing those guidelines.

4.2.1. The committees will evaluate local, regional, national awards or recognition the candidate may have won for teaching, and determine their importance.
4.2.2. The departmental committee will appoint qualified individuals to provide peer review of the candidate’s teaching. This may include actual classroom visits arranged in consultation with the candidate.

4.2.3. The head will provide summary statements of the results of teaching evaluations conducted since the candidate’s last formal promotion evaluation, or for at least the three years preceding the year of the current review. The departmental committee will evaluate and comment on the candidate’s teaching effectiveness.

4.2.4. The departmental committee will include any other pertinent information concerning the quality of the candidate’s teaching.

4.3. EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The committees will evaluate and summarize all evidence provided by the candidate concerning service to the department, university, region, and/or profession – in some cases, based on a Service and Outreach Portfolio, and will carefully weigh all claims made about the significance of such service.

5. SUPPLEMENTARY PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED IN CONSIDERING THE TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION OF FACULTY ENGAGED IN INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS (SEE CURRENT PROVOST’S GUIDELINES, APPENDIX C.)

Participation in the activities of interdisciplinary programs or collaborations with community, international, or business partners, may comprise an ongoing and integral part of a faculty member’s professional activities. To the extent that this is so, these efforts should be recognized, alongside other relevant activities, in the evaluation procedures for promotion and tenure.

If the candidate’s formal workload includes a significant portion within graduate and/or undergraduate interdisciplinary programs, then it shall be evaluated according to the procedures outlined below, consistent with current Graduate College procedures. Moreover, if the candidate, in consultation with the department head, considers his or her informal or “overload” participation in teaching, research, or service within the framework of an interdisciplinary program or within a university or external collaboration to constitute a significant portion of his or her workload, the head of the home department shall seek a written evaluation of the candidate’s performance from the director of the interdisciplinary program or the chief executive of a collaborative enterprise (or his/her designee) according to the procedures outlined below. These procedures are to be followed in addition to, not in place of, all the other procedures prescribed above.

5.1. The candidate will be asked to include, as part of her or his promotion and tenure dossier, a detailed statement of all teaching, research, and service activities that she or he has undertaken as a participant in the relevant interdisciplinary program.

5.2. The head of the candidate’s home department shall request from the director or chairperson of the relevant interdisciplinary program an evaluation of the degree and quality of the candidate’s contributions to the interdisciplinary program.

5.3. This evaluation will be written by the director or chairperson of the interdisciplinary program in consultation with an ad hoc committee comprising three tenured faculty of appropriate rank. The evaluation document will be sent to the head of the candidate’s home department for inclusion in the candidate’s promotion and tenure dossier.
5.4. Ordinarily, membership on such an ad hoc committee will be drawn from the interdisciplinary program’s executive council and will include the director or chairperson of the interdisciplinary program. However, in the case of a candidate being considered for promotion to full professor in an interdisciplinary program the director or chairperson of which is not a full professor, that director or chairperson will join the ad hoc committee as a non-voting member (that is to say, he or she will participate in the discussion of the candidate’s case but will not vote), and an additional full professor shall be added to the committee.

5.5. In cases in which the ad hoc committee mechanism appears unnecessary or redundant (e.g., when the candidate’s involvement in the interdisciplinary program’s activities is minimal, or when there is a large overlap between the membership of the home department’s promotion and tenure committee and the interdisciplinary program’s ad hoc committee), one or more tenured members of the interdisciplinary program’s executive council may be invited by the head of the home department to serve as pro tempore and ad hoc voting members of the home department’s promotion and tenure committee.

5.6. In the case of a member of a graduate interdisciplinary program, additional input may be solicited from the university’s director of graduate interdepartmental programs whenever this is deemed appropriate by the candidate, by the head of the home department, or by the director or chairperson of the interdisciplinary program.

5.7. Once documentation of a candidate’s interdisciplinary program activities has been incorporated into the candidate’s dossier it will be considered - at all stages of review and by all reviewers - as integral to the evaluation of the candidate.

6. APPEALS

Should a candidate feel that procedures have not been followed at the departmental committee level; a written appeal may be directed to the department head. Should a candidate feel that procedures have not been followed at the level of the department head or of the College of Humanities promotion and tenure committee, a written appeal may be directed to the dean. For further information concerning the appeal process as stipulated in the University Handbook of Appointed Personnel, see UHAP 3.3.02 [e.].

Throughout this document, the terms “publication,” “publisher,” and “published” shall be understood to refer both to work available in printed form (books, articles, etc.) and to work available in electronic media (computer programs, software, etc.).
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES

GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND CONTINUING STATUS FOR CONTINUING-ELIGIBLE ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

Date: Approved May 2014 by the Dean’s Advisory Council
Approved June 2014 by Vice Provost Thomas Miller

I. Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Continuing Status

Academic professionals hired into continuing-eligible positions must have demonstrated experience conducting the types of professional activities that are required by the position. Candidates are hired with the hope that they will earn continuing status. It is therefore essential that the workload responsibilities of continuing-status-eligible scholars, including what counts as “Scholarly Activity” (see I-B below), and the percentage of time to be spent on each workload area, are clearly defined at the time of hire and are reviewed each academic year. These duties and responsibilities must be clearly specified in the letter of offer. There can be changes in these as years go by, but these must be specified in writing in documents signed by both the supervisor and the continuing-eligible academic professional.

Units in which a continuing-eligible candidate holds an appointment and/or participates, the College, and the University all have an important interest in continuing-status decision. Continuing status should be granted only to candidates who have demonstrated excellence, as well as a promise of continued excellence in the future, in the categories outlined below. In all cases, college-level evaluations should be carried out in accordance with the workload and responsibilities of the candidate’s position and in accordance with all relevant unit-level and college-level guidelines.

A. Teaching and Supervision

When teaching is part of the candidate’s workload, the candidate must have established a consistent record of excellent teaching. When applicable to the professional’s defined workload, the candidate should also have demonstrated excellence in supervising and administering the teaching of others, such as GATs and instructors. Evaluations of performance in this category must be consistent with those of the unit. Evaluation shall be made on the basis of a) course syllabi and other course materials, b) peer evaluations, including reports from classroom observations, c) students’ course evaluations, and d) any other relevant evidence presented. All of this should be documented, if teaching is part of the workload, in a Teaching Portfolio submitted by each candidate, which should include all the applicable and appropriate material in the current Provost’s Guidelines for Teaching Portfolios.
B. Scholarly Activity

The College of Humanities requires evidence that distinction has been achieved in scholarly activity. Scholarly activity is defined broadly as employing intellectual and creative resources in the service of the obligations of the position. The quantity of scholarly production may vary by position, discipline, and job description. Nonetheless, the candidate should have established a strong record of scholarly activity and evidence of leadership in his or her field that indicates an emerging reputation of distinction at the regional and national level and a promise of sustained contribution into the future.

Measures of achievement include, but are not limited to, publications; evaluations from independent external reviewers; grants, contracts, and awards; and invitations to deliver papers at professional meetings, university lecture series, and national or international workshops and conferences. Where applicable, publications should be peer-reviewed and of sufficient quantity to establish an emerging regional and national reputation and to ensure a sustained contribution into the future. Consistent with a broad definition of public scholarship, candidates may also engage in the dissemination of knowledge to non-academic publics by publishing in trade publications specific to their fields, magazines and newsletters, electronic sites, and other media. Major research-based contributions to outside institutions, communities, or businesses are considered to be of great value in continuing-eligible positions where they are part of the defined workload. Evaluation of these publications will be on the basis of their strategic value to the field and on the extent to which they effectively represent the candidates as experts in their areas of knowledge.

C. Service, Outreach, and Administration

The habit of service and outreach is an integral component of the scholarly enterprise. Active and high-quality engagement within the university and with local, regional, and national constituencies is expected.

Evidence of excellence in this category should include contributing to the activities of departmental committees or other department-level service. Chairing committees and serving on college- or university-level committees is not mandatory, but when demonstrated in the dossier constitutes important additional evidence of excellence. Candidates should also show evidence of contributing to the broader profession through activities such as service to professional organizations, advisory committees, professional journals, and groups working on issues important to the local community, the state, and the nation. Depending on the duties prescribed for the position, such service contributions can include:

- serving on campus committees and teams;
- actively participating in faculty governance at unit, college or university levels;
- participating in activities of professional societies or organizations in one’s discipline;
- applying one’s expertise to address local, regional, national, or international issues;
- providing non-credit courses, extension programs, or short courses to governmental agencies and professional organizations;
- presenting community lectures or performances;
- technical reports to outside communities;
- articles for popular and special interest publications;
- online resources developed for communities, businesses, agencies, or disciplinary associations;
- expert testimony or consultation inside or outside the University.

In some cases, one or more of these items can be counted as “Scholarly Activity” depending on departmental criteria, the candidate’s field(s) of expertise, and the particular workload responsibilities of the candidate.
D. Professionalism and Collegiality

Integral to the three principal areas of responsibility outlined above are the standards of professionalism and collegiality. It is expected that continuing-eligible academic professionals will have actively participated in building and maintaining partnerships with other academic departments and support units across campus, as relevant. Academic professionals should also develop links with local, regional, and national constituencies. All of these activities require the highest level of professionalism and collegiality.

II. General Procedures for Continuing Status Reviews

The President of the University may grant continuing status to continuing-eligible personnel on the recommendation of the Head/Director of the local unit, the Dean of the College, and the Provost, acting on the advice of the appropriate standing committees on continuing status. Continuing status may be granted at any time during the first six years (seven if the provost has previously granted the candidate a one-year “parental delay” or other delay).

College procedures for continuing status reviews are intended to ensure a fair process for all candidates. Academic professionals who hold continuing-eligible or continuing appointments are subject to continuing status and promotion procedures as stipulated by the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual, Chapter 4 of the University Handbook for Appointment Personnel, and the most current guidelines for dossier preparation from the Provost’s office.

In accordance with the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel 4.10.01, if at any time the College of Humanities has three or more academic professionals with continuing status, a standing committee on continuing status will be created at the college level. When there are fewer than three personnel with continuing status, for the purpose of continuing-status reviews, an ad hoc college-level Continuing Status Committee will be formed in any year when continuing-eligible personnel are under review. Committee membership will typically include some members of the college-level Promotion and Tenure Committee, augmented by no fewer than three continuing-status professionals from COH and/or other campus units. Care will be taken to insure that at least some members of the committee have expertise in areas related to the candidates’ specializations.

The Continuing Status Committee will evaluate all continuing-status candidate dossiers and, following University stipulations, make a recommendation to the Dean of the college. If there has been previous input from a continuing-status review committee at the unit level, members from that unit may not be present for discussions concerning candidates from their own department, nor may they vote on those cases. However, if there is no committee for continuing status at the department level, the augmented committee will ideally include a member from the candidate’s unit, and that member will not have to recuse himself or herself, nor abstain from voting. Also, if there is no departmental committee, the head of the continuing-status candidate’s home department will submit a review to the college committee.

Upon receiving the committee’s recommendation, the Dean reviews the committee findings and forwards his/her recommendation to the University-Wide Committee on Continuing Status.
GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Tenure and promotion in Africana Studies within the College of Humanities are granted only to candidates who have demonstrated excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service/outreach in accordance with the requirements and expectations defined by Africana Studies. All tenure and promotion reviews should look at the totality of the candidate's scholarly, teaching, and service/outreach record with emphasis on current trajectory. Although reviews typically comprise the period beginning with the candidate's most recent appointment or promotion, the review should recognize that candidates come to tenure and/or promotion by following multiple paths, which may require a longer term record of achievement to be recognized during the review.

Excellent research on the part of Africana Studies faculty should have a demonstrable impact on the specific area of study to which it contributes and should provide evidence of distinguished achievement as well as a presumption of future distinction. Such research can include collaborative, integrative, and applied forms of scholarship and can involve scholarly collaborations with other faculty and universities, as well as business and community partners.

Excellent teaching is marked by the faculty member's ability to engage students in the learning process and by the intellectual rigor and scope of the courses taught; effectiveness is measured by student and peer evaluations of the instructor and the courses taught. Given the nature of Africana Studies as an interdisciplinary discipline within the field of Ethnic Studies where students may experience difficulty in engaging with challenging paradigms of knowledge from Africana history, culture, and experience that may result in skewed evaluations, it is important for peer evaluations to be essential in the evaluation of faculty teaching.

Excellent service is required on various levels: within the university community, at the departmental, collegial, and university level, as well as by participation in professional organizations such as the National Council for Black Studies, the African Studies Association, the Modern Language Association, the Association for the Study of African American Life and History, and other related organizations and academic collaborations at university, local, national, and international levels. Outreach engages the faculty in extramural community activities that are related to their professional expertise.

The overarching criteria for granting tenure are the quality, quantity, and effectiveness of the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service/outreach. Implicit in these criteria is the promise of continued excellence in all of these areas.
1. **SCHOLARSHIP**

For faculty in Africana Studies, which consists of areas as diverse as critical race and social theory, literature, linguistics, women's studies, political economy, sociology, history, philosophy, religion, education, business, law and civil rights, aesthetics of performing arts, music, dance, media, anthropology, digital humanities, and film, and related area studies, these university guidelines may be realized in diverse combinations of intellectual activities and products. In every case, candidates must provide evidence of sustained and significant contributions to their professional area as judged according to criteria that include measures of both quality and quantity. This evidence must follow accepted criteria and be in compliance with University and College guidelines. Each candidate must be guaranteed fair representation for review by specialists sharing her or his area of expertise. For faculty who are involved in interdisciplinary scholarship, which is valued and encouraged, review must represent the full scope of the candidate's work.

1.1 **EVIDENCE OF SUSTAINED SCHOLARSHIP**

Primary evidence of sustained scholarship or creative work includes (but may not be limited to) publication or acceptance for publication of the following products over the duration of the candidate’s time in current rank:

a. Book(s) or monograph(s) by reputable publishers.
b. Scholarly contributions to rigorously refereed professional venues or creative works in respected venues, including online publications.
c. Editing, compiling, and translations which contribute substantively to intellectual development in the field of Africana Studies.
d. Applied scholarship (e.g., textbooks, software, and web-based work) which is firmly grounded in the candidate's own contributions to theory and research in the field of Africana Studies.
e. Evidence of integrative and/or applied scholarship, which can involve collaborations with other UA faculty or programs or with business and community partners, including translational research connected to community, international, or commercial activity.

Supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship or creative work may include (but may not be limited to) the following products and activities:

a. Publication of book reviews in respected venues.
b. Publication of articles or other scholarly products in non-refereed venues, including online publications that might not be rigorously reviewed or creative works in alternative venues.
c. Publication of reference works, such as encyclopedia entries.
d. Scholarly papers or readings of creative work presented at local, regional, national, and international professional meetings.
e. Participation in professional colloquia and panels of a scholarly or creative nature.
f. Management of or contribution to professional web sites.
g. Research grant proposals submitted or funded.

h. Other editing, compiling, translation, and bibliography contributions.

i. Other instances of applied scholarship.

j. Work in progress that describes concrete efforts in research and toward publication or production.

The determination of “reputable” publishers and other “respected” venues is best made within each faculty member’s academic specialization; documentation of publishers’ status in marginal cases is the responsibility of candidates and departmental/program administrators and review committees, augmented by input from external reviews. Publications in languages other than English are of equal value to English, provided that language is accessible for and subject to departmental program and external review. Africana Studies will be the final arbiter of what constitutes primary or supplementary evidence in consonance with the College of Humanities criteria.

1.2 EVIDENCE OF SIGNIFICANCE AND QUALITY

Primary evidence for scholarship or creative work must include stipulation of its significance and quality, by not only departmental but national and international scholars in the field of Africana Studies (especially external peer reviewers from other institutions) as well as, where appropriate, collaborative or community partners.

Supplementary evidence for significance and quality of scholarship or creative work may include (but may not be limited to) the following indicators:

a. Major awards, grants, and fellowships.

b. Invitations to review manuscripts for publication, grant applications, and candidates for promotion at peer institutions.

c. Having one's work cited, reprinted, or translated into other languages.

d. Invitations to present work to scholarly or artistic communities.

e. Attraction of advanced students to work under one's direction and guidance.

f. Major research-based contributions to outside institutions, communities, or businesses.

Associate Professor: Promotion to associate professor with tenure carries the expectation that scholars or creative writers who are selected to provide external review will recognize the national and international significance of a candidate's professional contributions.

Full Professor: Promotion to professor carries the expectation that scholars or creative writers who themselves are widely recognized as experts in the field, nationally and internationally, will recognize the significance of a candidate's professional contributions in a national and international capacity.
1.3 **EVIDENCE OF QUANTITY**

Adequate quantity in scholarly or creative productivity cannot be specified exactly in measures such as number of publications or pages in print, but the quality needs to be academically substantial. The following guidelines generally apply in this regard of academic substance:

**Associate Professor:** Promotion to associate professor with tenure requires (1) publication or acceptance for publication by a reputable publisher of at least one major work plus evidence of additional sustained scholarly or creative contributions, or (2) publication or acceptance for publication in respected venues of a substantial number of other scholarly and/or creative products. This evidence may include some or all of the publications by candidates prior to their appointment in current rank, such as publications during post-doctoral and visiting appointments. All work completed while a graduate student must be marked with an asterisk (*) in the dossier. Supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship or creativity is taken into account, but does not replace the expectation for publication of original respectable, scholarly, and creative work.

**Full Professor:** Promotion to professor normally requires publication or acceptance for publication by a reputable publisher of at least one major work of scholarship subsequent to appointment as associate professor plus evidence of additional sustained scholarly contributions, or (2) publication or acceptance for publication in rigorously reviewed venues of a substantial number of other scholarly and/or creative products subsequent to appointment as associate professor. Again, supplementary of sustained scholarship is taken into account, but does not replace the expectation for publication of original respectable, scholarly, and creative work.

2. **TEACHING**

The instructional function of the University requires faculty members who can effectively communicate the content of the current body of knowledge and the latest research results particularly as extant in the area of Africana Studies and Ethnic Studies, in the classroom and other learning environments, through individual student contact and through professional modes of publication. Excellence in teaching includes, but is not limited to:

a. organizing and conducting courses appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
b. bringing to the classroom, and other learning environments, the most effective pedagogical approaches;
c. engaging the students, according to their capacities, in the current discourses and debates within the field of Africana Studies;
d. enabling students to articulate issues and solve problems on their own;
e. being available outside the classroom for further instruction and advice as during scheduled office hours;
f. advising and mentoring students at all levels.
For **Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:**

a. Candidates must present evidence of successful teaching appropriate to Africana Studies mission, including lower division, upper division, and graduate courses when appropriate;

b. Candidates should be engaged in educating individual students at the highest level of their discipline and, where appropriate, should be directing masters and doctoral work.

Faculty members must show effectiveness within the classroom and other learning environments in organizing and presenting material and in stimulating intellectual response. Evidence on teaching effectiveness must come from: student evaluation; a peer review of the teaching portfolio and of the quality of feedback to students on their work; recognition of advising responsibilities; and participation in faculty development activities. Other evidence may include, but is not limited to: grants for teaching innovations; teaching awards; selection to teach in prestigious programs; achievements by students; and in-class peer evaluation. Evidence of efforts to improve teaching effectiveness (e.g., the appropriate use of technology) should be provided. Availability to students during office hours is required.

For **Promotion to Full Professor:**

a. Candidates must present evidence of continued high quality teaching and mentoring, in the classroom, in other learning environments and through individual student contact, as appropriate to Africana Studies mission. This should include lower division, upper division, and graduate courses when appropriate.

b. Candidates should continue to be engaged in educating individual students at the highest level of their discipline and, where appropriate, should be directing masters and doctoral work.

c. Candidates should have attained a leadership role in developing Africana Studies curricula, particularly in constructing new and innovative courses in meeting department curricular needs, providing evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of other faculty, and contributing to more effective unit teaching approaches.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness should continue to come from student evaluations, peer evaluations, advising, achievements by students, teaching grants and awards, successful innovation, selection to teach in prestigious programs here and elsewhere, and participation in faculty development activities. All of this should be documented in a Teaching Portfolio submitted by each candidate, which should include all the applicable material in the current Provost's Guidelines for Teaching Portfolios. Faculty are expected to improve their teaching continually by staying current with the latest developments in the discipline and with pedagogical techniques.
3. SERVICE/OUTREACH

Service includes: service on Africana Studies, College, and University committees; service to professional associations and on public committees where faculty disciplinary knowledge is required. Service becomes an increasingly important part of a faculty member’s activities as she or he advances through the professorial ranks. Outreach is a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching and research and creative activity. It involves delivering, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with University and unit missions. Service/outreach activities include, but are not limited to:

a. serving on campus committees and teams;
b. actively participating in faculty governance at unit, college or university levels;
c. participating in activities of professional societies or organizations in one's discipline;
d. applying one's expertise to address local, regional, national, or international issues, specifically needs of the sister program within the Tucson Unified School District and with which Africana Studies has an established partnership, and African American Student Affairs;
e. providing non-credit courses, extension programs, or short courses to governmental agencies and professional organizations;
f. presenting community lectures or performances particularly those that have an impact on the local community;
g. technical reports to outside communities;
h. articles for popular and special interest publications;
i. online resources developed for communities, businesses, agencies, or disciplinary associations;
j. expert testimony or consultation inside or outside the University.

In some cases, one or more of these items can be counted as “Scholarship” depending on departmental criteria and/or the candidate's field(s) of expertise. The candidate must articulate clearly the ways in which these items are part of the candidate's scholarship.

For **Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:**

a. Candidates must contribute to academic planning at the unit level and, perhaps, at the college and university levels, by effectively carrying out committee assignments.
b. Candidates should participate in local, regional and national meetings, be active in professional societies, and participate in peer review processes.
c. Candidates should share their professional expertise with the public through outreach avenues such as local schools, specifically the African American Studies Department at the Tucson Unified School District, with which Africana Studies has an established partnership, libraries, organizations, agencies, commissions, consulting assignments or panels.
An important measure of quality of service in Africana Studies is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Evidence of the above should be provided and should reveal that assistant professors worthy of promotion to associate professor with tenure have begun to develop a habit of service, that their judgments are professionally respected and valued, and that they have demonstrated the ability to find linkages between their discipline and public interests, needs, and opportunities. Care must be taken, however, on the part of both the candidate and administration not to over-commit assistant professors by demanding a level of service that interferes with their development of a coherent research program and of teaching skills. It will be particularly important to resist the temptation to burden assistant professors with excessive service expectations that undermine the path to tenure.

For **Promotion to Full Professor:**

Candidates for full professor must have accepted much more service responsibility than that required for lower ranks. An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Evidence of service/outreach may include, but is not limited to the following:

a. leadership in faculty governance, in mentoring of junior faculty, and in establishing academic unit and college goals, objectives and performance standards;

b. participation in professional associations, on professional review panels, and in the review of journal articles, grants and proposals;

c. work with governmental and non-profit agencies that involves one's disciplinary expertise; and

d. various forms of outreach to wider communities and organizations, as in presenting lectures, giving performances, and organizing events that further interest in the discipline.
PART ONE : CRITERIA

The general principles and specific criteria of the Department of French and Italian regarding Promotion and Tenure are the same as those of the College of Humanities (cited in Part Three below) for the areas of Scholarship, Teaching, and Service.

PART TWO: PROCEDURES

A. Departmental P&T committee

Requirements for college and departmental promotion and tenure committees are set forth in the College of Humanities Promotion & Tenure Procedures (http://w3.coh.arizona.edu/coh/aiapdf), which are quoted there directly from the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel:

Provided there are sufficient numbers of faculty members to warrant such a committee, each college, department, or other unit will have a Standing Advisory Committee on Faculty Status to advise the dean and immediate administrative head before recommendations on reviews for tenure, promotion, and nonrenewal are forwarded to higher levels. Each such committee will include at least three tenured faculty members from the unit. If a unit does not have sufficient faculty members to constitute such a committee, then the faculty and administrative head will consult with the appropriate dean on forming such a committee from other units. In promotion or tenure matters the advisory committees will be so constituted that recommendations will be made only by faculty members holding rank superior to the rank of the faculty member being considered, except in the case of full professors where the committee members will each be a full professor. Standing Advisory Committees generally will meet without the administrator whom they advise. (http://hr.arizona.edu/policy/appointed-personnel/3.3.02)

COH guidelines further stipulate that “the Department Head’s discretion in this matter [consultation with departmental P&T committee] is subject to the provisions listed in Section 1.B of the COH Promotion and Tenure Procedures Statement” (currently Section 2.3); these provide that “a department head’s discretion in this matter is subject to the following constraints” which include a list of 8 items (plus 2 “special cases”), namely (in summary):

2.3.1 committee must have at least 3 tenured faculty members
2.3.2 must ensure compliance with affirmative action & non-discrimination policy
2.3.3 will include at least 1 member with expertise in the candidate’s field .. and should also include as many members as possible conversant with the candidate’s general area of specialization
2.3.4 affirmative action procedures must be explained to the committee at first meeting
2.3.5 candidate in consultation with the head will compile a list of 5 UA faculty with appropriate rank and expertise to evaluate the candidate...

2.3.6 head may appoint more than one P&T committee based on workload

2.3.7 committee members cannot discuss the case

2.3.8 candidate should be advised in writing of the nature of the recommendation ... but is not entitled to a statement of the reasons for the recommendation.

B. Third-year review guidelines.

The policy and procedures for third-year review may be found at the website of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs: http://w3.arizona.edu/~vprovacf/p&t/3-yrreview.html.

C. Sixth-Year Review and Subsequent Promotion Reviews

The currently applicable promotion and tenure guidelines are found on the following website: http://academicaffaires.arizona.edu/p&t. This site provides links to documents pertaining to all aspects of the Promotion and Tenure Process including Dossier Preparation; Appeals; Early Review; Extraordinary Review; Probationary Review; Tenure Clock; Reference Documents; Data; plus detailed information on P&T/Continuing Status Workshops for Faculty, Department Heads, Deans and Peer Review Committees.

PART THREE: COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA
(approved 10/17/07)

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Tenure and promotion in the College of Humanities are granted only to candidates who have demonstrated excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service/outreach in accordance with the expectations defined by the units in which they hold appointments. All tenure and promotion reviews should look at the totality of the candidate’s scholarly, teaching, and service/outreach record with emphasis on current trajectory. Although reviews typically comprise the period beginning with the candidate’s most recent appointment or promotion, the review should recognize that candidates come to tenure and/or promotion by following multiple paths, which may require a longer term record of achievement to be recognized during the review.

Excellent research should have a demonstrable impact on the area of study to which it contributes and should provide evidence of distinguished achievement as well as a presumption of future distinction. Such research can include collaborative, integrative, and applied forms of scholarship and can involve scholarly collaborations with other faculty and universities, as well as business and community partners.

Excellent teaching is marked by the instructor’s ability to engage students in the learning process and by the rigor and scope of the courses taught; effectiveness is measured by student and peer evaluations of the instructor and the courses taught.

Excellent service is expected on various levels: within the university community, at the departmental, collegial, and university level, as well as by participation in professional organizations and academic
Outreach engages the faculty in extramural community activities that are related to their professional expertise.

The overarching criteria for granting tenure are the quality, quantity, and effectiveness of the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and service/outreach. Implicit in these criteria is the promise of continued excellence in all of these areas.

1. SCHOLARSHIP

For faculty in the College of Humanities, which consists of departments and programs in literature, linguistics, discourse analysis, rhetoric and composition, second language acquisition and pedagogy, creative writing, religious studies, and related area studies, these university guidelines may be realized in diverse combinations of intellectual activities and products. In every case, candidates must provide evidence of sustained and significant contributions to their professional area as judged according to criteria which include measures of both quality and quantity. More specific evidence may be required by individual component departments and programs within the College of Humanities, provided that the definition of and requirements for that evidence follow accepted criteria and are in compliance with University and College guidelines. Each candidate must be guaranteed fair representation for review by specialists sharing his or her area of expertise. For faculty who are involved in interdisciplinary scholarship, which is valued and encouraged, review must represent the full scope of the candidate’s work.

1.1 EVIDENCE OF SUSTAINED SCHOLARSHIP

Primary evidence of sustained scholarship or creative work includes (but may not be limited to) publication or acceptance for publication of the following products over the duration of the candidate’s time in current rank:

- Book(s) or monograph(s) by reputable publishers.
- Scholarly contributions to rigorously refereed professional venues or creative works in respected venues, including online publications.
- Editing, compiling, and translation which contribute substantively to intellectual development in the field.
- Applied scholarship (e.g., textbooks, software, and web-based work) which is firmly grounded in the candidate’s own contributions to theory and research in the field.
- Evidence of integrative and/or applied scholarship, which can involve collaborations with other UA faculty or programs or with business and community partners, including translational research connected to community, international, or commercial activity.

Supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship or creative work may include (but may not be limited to) the following products and activities:

- Publication of book reviews in respected venues.
- Publication of articles or other scholarly products in non-refereed venues, including online publications that might not be rigorously reviewed, or creative works in alternative venues.
- Publication of reference works, such as encyclopedia entries.
- Scholarly papers or readings of creative work presented at local, regional, national, and international professional meetings.
- Participation in professional colloquia and panels of a scholarly or creative nature.
- Management of or contribution to professional web sites.
- Research grant proposals submitted or funded.
- Other editing, compiling, translation, and bibliography contributions.
- Other instances of applied scholarship.
- Work in progress.

The determination of “reputable” publishers and other “respected” venues is best made within each academic specialization; documentation of publishers’ status in marginal cases is the responsibility of candidates and departmental/program administrators and review committees, augmented by input from external reviews. Publications in languages other than English are of equal value to those in English, provided that language is accessible for and subject to departmental/program and external review. Individual departments and programs will be the final arbiters of what may and may not be included as primary or supplementary evidence.

1.2 EVIDENCE OF SIGNIFICANCE AND QUALITY

Primary evidence for scholarship or creative work must include stipulation of its significance and quality by not only departmental but national and international colleagues (especially external peer reviewers from other institutions), as well as, where appropriate, collaborative or community partners.

Supplementary evidence for significance and quality of scholarship or creative work may include (but may not be limited to) the following indicators:

- Major awards, grants, and fellowships.
- Invitations to review manuscripts for publication, grant applications, and candidates for promotion at peer institutions.
- Having one’s work cited, reprinted, or translated into other languages.
- Invitations to present work to scholarly or artistic communities.
- Attraction of advanced students to work under one’s direction and guidance.
- Major research-based contributions to outside institutions, communities, or businesses.

**Associate Professor:** Promotion to associate professor with tenure carries the expectation that scholars or creative writers who are selected to provide external review will recognize the significance of a candidate’s professional contributions.

**Full Professor:** Promotion to professor carries the expectation that scholars or creative writers who themselves are widely recognized as experts in the field, nationally and internationally, will recognize the significance of a candidate’s professional contributions.

1.3. EVIDENCE OF QUANTITY

Adequate quantity in scholarly or creative productivity cannot be specified exactly in measures such as number of publications or pages in print, but the following guidelines generally apply:
**Associate Professor:** Promotion to associate professor with tenure requires (1) publication or acceptance for publication by a reputable publisher of at least one major work plus evidence of additional sustained scholarly or creative contributions, or (2) publication or acceptance for publication in respected venues of a substantial number of other scholarly and/or creative products. This evidence may include some or all of the publications by candidates prior to their appointment in current rank, such as publications during post doctoral and visiting appointments or post MFA creative activity. All work completed while a graduate student must be marked with an asterisk (*) in the dossier. Supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship or creativity is taken into account, but does not replace the expectation for publication of original scholarly or creative work.

**Full Professor:** Promotion to professor normally requires (1) publication or acceptance for publication by a reputable publisher of at least one major work of scholarship subsequent to appointment as associate professor plus evidence of additional sustained scholarly contributions, or (2) publication or acceptance for publication in rigorously reviewed venues of a substantial number of other scholarly and/or creative products subsequent to appointment as associate professor. Again, supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship is taken into account, but does not replace the expectation for publication of original scholarly or creative work.

2. **TEACHING**

The instructional function of the University requires faculty members who can effectively communicate the content of the current body of knowledge and the latest research results in the classroom and other learning environments, through individual student contact, and through professional modes of publication. Excellence in teaching includes, but is not limited to:

- organizing and conducting courses appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
- bringing to the classroom, and other learning environments, the most effective pedagogical approaches;
- engaging the students, according to their capacities, in the current discourses and debates within a field;
- enabling students to articulate issues and solve problems on their own;
- being available outside the classroom for further instruction and advice;
- advising and mentoring students at all levels.

For **Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:**

- Candidates must present evidence of successful teaching appropriate to the unit’s mission, including lower division, upper division, and graduate courses for units involved at these levels.
- Candidates should be engaged in educating individual students at the highest level of their discipline and, where appropriate, should be directing master’s and doctoral work.

Faculty members must show effectiveness within the classroom and other learning environments in organizing and presenting material and in stimulating intellectual response. Evidence of teaching effectiveness must come from: student evaluation; a peer review of the teaching portfolio and of the quality of feedback to students on their work; recognition of advising
responsibilities; and participation in faculty development activities. Other evidence may include, but is not limited to: grants for teaching innovations; teaching awards; selection to teach in prestigious programs; achievements by students; and in-class peer evaluation. Evidence of efforts to improve teaching effectiveness (e.g., the appropriate use of technology) should be provided. Availability to students during office hours is an expectation.

For **Promotion to Professor:**

- Candidates must present evidence of continued high quality teaching and mentoring, in the classroom, in other learning environments and through individual student contact, as appropriate to the unit’s mission. This should include lower division, upper division, and graduate courses for units involved at these levels.

- Candidates should continue to be engaged in educating individual students at the highest level of their discipline and, where appropriate, should be directing master’s and doctoral work.

- Candidates should have attained a leadership role in developing unit curricula, providing evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of other faculty, and contributing to more effective unit teaching approaches.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness should continue to come from student evaluations, peer evaluations, advising, achievements by students, teaching grants and awards, successful innovation, selection to teach in prestigious programs here and elsewhere, and participation in faculty development activities. *All of this should be documented in a Teaching Portfolio submitted by each candidate, which should include all the applicable material in the current Provost’s Guidelines for Teaching Portfolios.* Faculty are expected to continually improve their teaching by staying current with the latest developments in the discipline and with pedagogical techniques.

### 3. SERVICE/OUTREACH

Service includes: service on departmental (or unit), college, and University committees; service to professional associations and on public committees where faculty disciplinary knowledge is required. Service becomes an increasingly important part of a faculty member’s activities as he or she advances through the professorial ranks. Outreach is a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching and research/creative activity. It involves delivering, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with University and unit missions. Service/outreach activities include, but are not limited to:

- serving on campus committees and teams;
- actively participating in faculty governance at unit, college or university levels;
- participating in activities of professional societies or organizations in one’s discipline;
- applying one’s expertise to address local, regional, national, or international issues;
- providing non-credit courses, extension programs, or short courses to governmental agencies and professional organizations;
- presenting community lectures or performances.
- **technical reports to outside communities**;


• articles for popular and special interest publications;
• online resources developed for communities, businesses, agencies, or disciplinary associations;
• expert testimony or consultation inside or outside the University.

In some cases, one or more of these items can be counted as “Scholarship” depending on departmental criteria and/or the candidate’s field(s) of expertise. The candidate must articulate clearly the ways in which these items are part of the candidate’s scholarship.

For **Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:**

• Candidates must contribute to academic planning at the unit level and, perhaps, at the college and university levels, by effectively carrying out committee assignments.

• Candidates should participate in local, regional and national meetings, be active in professional societies, and participate in peer review processes.

• Candidates should share their professional expertise with the public through outreach avenues such as local schools, libraries, organizations, commissions, consulting assignments or panels.

An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Evidence of the above should be provided and should reveal that assistant professors worthy of promotion to associate professor with tenure have begun to develop a habit of service, that their judgments are professionally respected and valued, and that they have demonstrated the ability to find linkages between their discipline and public interests, needs, and opportunities.

Care must be taken, however, on the part of both the candidate and administration not to over-commit assistant professors by demanding a level of service that interferes with their development of a coherent research program and of teaching skills. While women and minorities are underrepresented on the faculty, it will be particularly important to resist the temptation to burden them with excessive service expectations.

For **Promotion to Professor:**

Candidates for full professor must have accepted much more service responsibility than that required for lower ranks. An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Evidence of service/outreach may include, but is not limited to the following:

• leadership in faculty governance, in mentoring of junior faculty, and in establishing academic unit and college goals, objectives and performance standards;
• participation in professional associations, on professional review panels, and in the review of journal articles, grants and proposals;
• work with governmental and non-profit agencies that involves one’s disciplinary expertise; and
• various forms of outreach to wider communities and organizations, as in presenting lectures, giving performances, and organizing events that further interest in the discipline.
Criteria for Promotion and Tenure
Department of German Studies
The University of Arizona

Criteria for tenure and promotion in the Department of German Studies are based on strong performance in each of the three areas of (1) research (2) teaching and (3) service to the department, university, community, and profession. The department's commitment to excellence in research and teaching gives these two areas special significance. With regard to engagement, excellent service is expected on various levels: within the university community, at the departmental, collegial, and university level, as well as by participation in professional organizations and academic collaborations at university, local, national, and international levels.

For Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

(1) In assessing the quality and quantity of research the departmental P & T committee will consider the following, though the list is not intended to be exhaustive: scholarly books or monographs, articles in refereed journals, chapters in books, essays in collections, published instructional materials, papers read at professional meetings, honors and awards for scholarly and professional attainment, scholarships, fellowships, grants, journal and book editorships and other editorial work related to scholarly books and journals, published translations in the field of specialization, other forms of refereed publications (e.g., electronic publications) since the time of appointment. Scholarly rigor and originality of conception and insight will be more relevant than the number of pages produced. A capacity to make continuing and increasingly significant contributions must be evident. Such research can include collaborative, integrative, and applied forms of scholarship and can involve scholarly collaborations with other faculty and universities, as well as business and community partners. For scholars of literature, cultural, and area studies, this will normally mean the acceptance for publication of a book or its equivalent. For scholars of linguistics; applied linguistics, second-language acquisition, and pedagogy, it will mean the publication or acceptance for publication of a significant number of single or jointly authored articles, chapters in books, or their equivalent, that reflect a coherent program of research. Quality of performance is measured not by promise but by demonstrated attainment. Please see COH Promotion and Tenure Criteria, re “Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure,” regarding both the quality and quantity of “Research.”

(2) In assessing teaching effectiveness the committee will consider the following: peer review of classroom visits; formal student TCE evaluations; organizing and conducting courses appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter; appropriateness of course, materials, objectives and assessments; use of innovative approaches (including technology); philosophy of teaching (written statement by the candidate); directing independent studies courses and Honors, Master's, and Ph.D. theses; and teaching awards and nominations, and advising and mentoring students at all levels. Please see the COH
**Promotion and Tenure Criteria.** “Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure,” under “Teaching.”

(3) The evaluation of departmental and professional service will be based on the candidate’s record of contributions to the department, profession, university, and community. Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must present evidence that they are contributing to the decision making and academic/institutional governance at the departmental, college, and university levels by effectively carrying out committee assignments. Departmental and university administrators should not overburden assistant professors by demanding a level of service that interferes with their development of a coherent research program and of teaching skills. See COH Promotion and Tenure Criteria, “Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure,” under "Service."

**For Promotion to Full Professor**

(1) In assessing the quality and quantity of research the departmental P & T committee will consider the following, though the list is not intended to be exhaustive: scholarly books or monographs, articles in refereed journals, chapters in books, essays in collections, published instructional materials, papers read at professional meetings, honors and awards for scholarly and professional attainment, scholarships, fellowships, grants, journal and book editorships and other editorial work related to scholarly books and journals, published translations in the field of specialization, other forms of refereed publications (e.g., electronic publications), since the time of appointment to Associate Professor with Tenure. Candidates must provide evidence of sustained productivity of such high caliber as to have achieved not only full national but preferably also international recognition for their work. Such research can include collaborative, integrative, and applied forms of scholarship and can involve scholarly collaborations with other faculty and universities, as well as business and community partners. For scholars of literature, cultural, and area studies, this will normally mean the acceptance for publication by a reputable press of a second major peer-reviewed scholarly book or a major work of scholarship. Note that the word "normally" above means that, in circumstances dictated by a particular field, the candidate may present the equivalent of a monograph or scholarly work, i.e., a concentration of single or jointly authored articles in rigorously peer-reviewed journals, or chapters in books, that reflect a coherent program of research and together constitute the kind of significant professional contribution described above. For scholars of linguistics; applied linguistics, second-language acquisition, and pedagogy, it will mean the publication or acceptance for publication of a significant number of single or jointly authored articles, chapters in books, or their equivalent, that reflect a coherent program of research. Quality of performance is measured not by promise but by demonstrated attainment. Please see the COH Promotion and Tenure Criteria, “Promotion to Professor,” under "Research."
(2) In assessing teaching effectiveness the committee will consider the following: continued high quality teaching and mentoring, peer review of classroom visits; formal student evaluations; organizing and conducting courses appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter; appropriateness of course materials, objectives and assessments; use of innovative approaches; philosophy of teaching (written statement by the candidate); directing independent studies courses and Honors, Master's, and Ph.D. theses; teaching awards and nominations, and advising and mentoring students at all levels. Faculty are to be available for regular office hours. Please see COH Promotion and Tenure Criteria, "Promotion to Professor," under "Teaching."

(3) The evaluation of departmental and professional service will be based on the candidate’s record of contributions to the department, profession, university, and community. Candidates for promotion to full professor must have accepted more substantial service responsibility than candidates in lower ranks. This includes sustained effective membership on departmental, COH, and university committees and service to professional organizations. See the COH Promotion and Tenure Criteria, "Promotion to Professor," under "Service."

Original version approved 1/30/08; by vote of the German Studies faculty. Approved by COH Faculty Review Committee 2-14-08; FINAL 4-08; Present version approved by vote of the German Studies faculty 11-26-2014.
This document embraces the principles set out in the Provost’s “Guide to the Promotion Process,” the College of Humanities “Promotion and Tenure Criteria,” and the College of Humanities “Promotion and Tenure Procedures”. To provide a necessary context for the description of actual policies and criteria governing its promotion and tenure decisions, the Religious Studies Program affirms the broad principles set forth in the following preamble.

PREAMBLE

The Religious Studies Program takes it to be the fundamental principle underlying the promotion and tenure process that the faculty of the University of Arizona, acting in conjunction with the University as a state institution, have been vested by the State of Arizona with the power to grant degrees, both graduate and undergraduate. From such power, recognized as vested in the faculty, it follows that members of an academic discipline are charged with the primary responsibility for providing a fair and accurate evaluation of all candidates for promotion and tenure within that discipline. That responsibility remains in force throughout the entire promotion and tenure process.

Initial recommendation for promotion or tenure must be made by the Religious Studies Program, and only by scholars with proven qualifications. It is understood that other committees and administrators will review the Program’s recommendations to ensure that equitable standards prevail across the campus and that the recommendations were made fairly and in accordance with University procedures.

To ensure equity and professional standards in its own promotion process, Promotion and/or tenure committees in the Religious Studies Program will, whenever possible, be composed of persons professionally qualified, by reason of academic training and specialization, to provide an informed peer review of the candidate’s contributions to the discipline. Religious Studies is highly interdisciplinary; thus, the Religious Studies Program does not have a standing promotion and tenure committee comprised of faculty with lines in the Program. Instead, when a Religious Studies faculty member is a candidate for promotion and/or tenure, a promotion and tenure committee will be convened that is comprised of faculty who have the expertise to evaluate the candidate’s research, teaching, and service. The committee may be comprised of faculty outside the Religious Studies Program whenever necessary, to ensure an informed peer review of the candidate’s contributions to his or her field. Whenever it is feasible and appropriate, the Director of the Religious Studies Program (hereafter the Director of the Program) may make further appointments to the Committee so as to ensure equitable gender and minority representation. Each candidate must be guaranteed a committee comprised of faculty who can provide a fair review of his or her research, teaching, and service.
Recommendations in cases of promotion and/or tenure will be based solely on the candidate’s record of teaching, research, and service. The University prohibits discrimination in its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or genetic information and is committed to maintaining an environment free from sexual harassment and retaliation. Such factors will be excluded from all personnel deliberations.

**General Policies and Criteria**

1. Evaluation of candidates for promotion and/or tenure in the Religious Studies Program shall be the responsibility of a Committee on Promotion and Tenure appointed by the Director of the Program and composed of at least three tenured faculty members, holding rank superior to the rank of the candidate being considered, except in the case of promotion to full professor, where the committee members shall each be a full professor.

2. Each candidate, in consultation with the Program Director, will compile a list of University of Arizona faculty members with the rank and expertise necessary to evaluate the candidate. The Program Director will contact potential committee members and appoint them to the ad hoc promotion and tenure committee convened to evaluate the candidate. Appointment of members to the promotion and tenure committee are subject to the qualifications listed immediately above.

3. It is the responsibility of the Director of the Program to ensure that appointments to the committee provide for equitable gender and minority representation, whenever such representation is feasible and appropriate.

4. Whenever possible, the promotion and tenure committee will include at least one member with expertise in the candidate’s particular field. Qualified persons may be drawn from outside of the Religious Studies Program whenever necessary.

5. The membership of this committee will be considered public information.

6. Members of the promotion and tenure committee are not permitted to discuss the candidate’s evaluation with her/him, unless the committee as a whole should formally request such a discussion. Any such request on the part of a committee must be communicated to the candidate through the Director of the Program. Likewise, any questions the candidate may have regarding the committee’s procedures must also be directed to the Director of the Program.

7. In arriving at its recommendations, the Committee should comply with all current promotion and tenure policies and procedures in force for units in the College of Humanities, as well as with the general directives contained in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, as far as the actual circumstances of the evaluation process permit. Evaluation of candidates must conform to the Promotion & Tenure Guidelines set forth by the “Provost’s Guide to the Promotion Process,” issued every spring.
8. The Director of the Program shall normally not be a party to the deliberations of the Committee, except when asked to advise the committee on a procedural matter. All recommendations shall be determined by closed ballot and communicated to the Director of the Program in writing. All personnel deliberations and decisions shall be held in strict confidence.

   a. At the time when a recommendation regarding renewal, nonrenewal, promotion or tenure is transmitted by the Director of the Program to the dean, the Director of the Program will notify that faculty member in writing of the nature of the recommendation. The faculty member is not entitled to a statement of the reasons for the recommendation.

9. In evaluating the candidate’s record of productivity, the Committee should consider not only past accomplishments but future promise, including evidence of an enduring commitment to research, teaching, and service. While considering each case on its particular merits, the Committee should apply both qualitative and quantitative measures. Although absolute qualitative and quantitative levels of productivity appropriate for tenure and/or for promotion to the ranks of associate or full professor are difficult to prescribe, the Committee is nevertheless advised to use the following criteria as a guide in determining whether minimum standards have been met.

10. Ordinarily, a recommendation for tenure will be made only if a recommendation for promotion to associate professor rank can be made at the same time. As the initial step in the tenure review process, the Committee will therefore evaluate the candidate’s record to determine if it is sufficient for promotion to the rank of associate professor.

11. In the case of a candidate seeking early promotion and/or tenure, the teaching record must be exceptional, and scholarship and service should meet unusually high standards of quality and should in addition substantially exceed the quantitative minimums provided for each rank.

12. Particularly close scrutiny is paid to peer evaluation of tenure-track non-tenured faculty in the third year. This evaluation forms the basis for the Program’s recommendations for continuance of the faculty member’s appointment, and is examined as part of the promotion and tenure review.

13. If a candidate for promotion and/or tenure is affiliated with a Graduate Interdisciplinary Program [GIDP], participation in that program shall be regarded as an integral part of his or her professional record. Evaluation of such participation by the Religious Studies Program will conform in principle to the Promotion & Tenure Guidelines for evaluation of GIDP members set forth in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel and will be given proportional weight by the Committee in arriving at a final recommendation on promotion and/or tenure.
14. A shared appointment is an appointment of a faculty member whose budget line is split between two, or rarely more, units. When an appointment is shared, it is essential that the individual and the heads of the two units holding the line have a clear understanding of all aspects of their appointment (to include teaching load, research, administration, service responsibilities, merit pay, peer evaluation, status and promotion, etc.). Evaluation of candidates with shared appointments will conform to the Promotion & Tenure Guidelines set forth by the “Provost’s Guide to the Promotion Process,” issued every spring, and the guidelines set forth in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel.

Criteria for Evaluating Teaching, Scholarship, and Service/Outreach

I. TEACHING

The Religious Studies Program expects teaching excellence. In the classroom, faculty should demonstrate a command of the material and should be able to convey information clearly. Faculty are expected to honor their responsibility to their students to meet classes as scheduled and to provide a syllabus within the first week of classes. They make themselves available to their students at regular, convenient office hours. They are sensitive to student diversity and take care to make the classroom a congenial and supportive environment for students of different backgrounds. They treat each student with respect. They excite and challenge their students, encourage and inspire curiosity and exploration. They help students develop their skills in critical thinking.

Excellence in teaching includes, but is not limited to:

- organizing and conducting courses appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
- bringing to the classroom, and other learning environments, the most effective pedagogical approaches;
- engaging the students, according to their capacities, in the current discourses and debates within a field;
- enabling students to articulate issues and solve problems on their own;
- being available outside the classroom for further instruction and advice;
- advising and mentoring students at all levels.
A. Peer Review

In evaluating a candidate’s teaching record, the Committee may examine syllabi, course descriptions, course objectives, examinations and other pertinent materials. Junior faculty standing for promotion and tenure must undergo at least one mandatory classroom visit during the evaluation process, for which a written report will be prepared and included in the tenure and promotion file. Dossiers of senior faculty applying for promotion also must include written reports of actual classroom visits arranged in consultation with the candidate.

Instructional grants received, when competitive [e.g., external or internal grants for improvement of instruction and NEH summer seminar grants], shall be construed as strong evidence for positive peer review.

The Committee should also take into consideration as many of the following criteria as are applicable:

- Appropriateness of course content, procedures and objectives, quality of syllabus, reading lists, assignments and examinations.
- Stability of teaching effectiveness over the years.
- Successful and innovative teaching methods and/or materials.
- Course or program proposals [new or revised].
- Evidence of having remained current in relevant field of specialization.
- Directing Honors theses.
- Directing independent studies.
- Working with graduate students.

B. Student Evaluation

Teaching awards, whether conferred by the University, by private groups, or by professional organizations, shall be construed as strong evidence of positive student evaluation.

The Committee may also consider any or all of the following criteria, whenever applicable:

- Results of student evaluations, mandatory for each course.
- Student comments in response to requests by the Religious Studies Program, the Committee, or the instructor.
- Personal interviews with students.
For **Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:**

- Candidates must present evidence of successful teaching appropriate to the unit's mission, including lower division, upper division, and, as appropriate, graduate courses.
- Candidates should be engaged in educating individual students at the highest level of their discipline and, where appropriate, should be directing master's and doctoral work.

Faculty members must show effectiveness within the classroom and other learning environments in organizing and presenting material and in stimulating intellectual response. Evidence on teaching effectiveness must come from: student evaluation; a peer review of the teaching portfolio and of the quality of feedback to students on their work; recognition of advising responsibilities; and participation in faculty development activities. Other evidence may include, but is not limited to: grants for teaching innovations; teaching awards; selection to teach in prestigious programs; achievements by students; and in-class peer evaluation. Evidence of efforts to improve teaching effectiveness (e.g., the appropriate use of technology) should be provided. Availability to students during office hours is an expectation.

For **Promotion to Professor:**

- Candidates must present evidence of continued high quality teaching and mentoring, in the classroom, in other learning environments and through individual student contact, as appropriate to the unit’s mission. This should include lower division, upper division, and graduate courses for units involved at these levels.
- Candidates should continue to be engaged in educating individual students at the highest level of their discipline and, where appropriate, should be directing master’s and doctoral work.
- Candidates should have attained a leadership role in developing unit curricula, providing evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of other faculty, and contributing to more effective unit teaching approaches.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness should continue to come from student evaluations, peer evaluations, advising, achievements by students, teaching grants and awards, successful innovation, selection to teach in prestigious programs here and elsewhere, and participation in faculty development activities. All of this should be documented in a Teaching Portfolio submitted by each candidate, which should include all the applicable material in the current Provost’s Guidelines for Teaching Portfolios. Faculty are expected to improve their teaching continually by staying current with the latest developments in the discipline and with pedagogical techniques.
II. SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarly attainment is understood to include local, national and international recognition of a faculty member’s research, publication, and other contributions to the candidate’s field. The Committee will require candidates for promotion and/or tenure to provide copies of all relevant publications and encourage the submission of any other pertinent supportive documents.

A. Evidence of Sustained Scholarship

Primary evidence of sustained scholarship includes (but may not be limited to) publication or acceptance for publication of the following products over the duration of the candidate’s time in current rank:

- Book(s) or monograph(s) by reputable publishers.
- Scholarly contributions to rigorously refereed professional venues, including online publications.
- Critical editions of and commentaries on primary texts.
- Creation of special scholarly exhibitions or museum displays, as documented by catalogues, photographs, slides, and videos.
- Editing, compiling, and translation which contribute substantively to intellectual development in the field.
- Evidence of integrative and/or applied scholarship (e.g., textbooks, software, and web-based work), which is firmly grounded in the candidate’s own contributions to theory and research in the field. This can involve collaborations with other UA faculty or programs or with business and community partners, including translational research connected to community, international, or commercial activity.

Supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship may include (but may not be limited to) the following products and activities:

- Publication of book reviews in respected venues.
- Publication of articles or other scholarly products in non-refereed venues, including online publications that might not be rigorously reviewed.
- Publication of reference works, such as encyclopedia entries.
- Scholarly papers presented at local, regional, national, and international professional meetings.
- Participation in professional colloquia and panels of a scholarly nature.
- Management of or contribution to professional web sites.
- Research grant proposals submitted or funded.
- Other editing, compiling, translation, and bibliography contributions.
- Other instances of applied scholarship.
- Work in progress.
The determination of “reputable” publishers and other “respected” venues will be made by
the Committee in accordance with recognized disciplinary standards in the candidate’s
field. Documentation of publisher’s status in marginal cases is the joint responsibility of
the candidate and the Director of the Program, augmented by input from external reviews.
Publications in languages other than English are of equal value to English, provided that
language is accessible for and subject to review by the Program and external review. The
Religious Studies Program will be the final arbiter of what may and may not be included
as primary or supplementary evidence.

B. Evidence of Significance and Quality

Primary evidence for scholarship must include stipulation of its significance and quality
by not only peers at the University of Arizona but national and international colleagues
(especially external peer reviewers from other institutions).

Supplementary evidence for significance and quality of scholarship may include (but may
not be limited to) the following indicators:

- Major awards, grants, and fellowships.
- Invitations to review manuscripts for publication, grant applications, and
candidates for promotion at peer institutions.
- Having one’s work cited, reprinted, or translated into other
languages.
- Invitations to present work to scholarly communities.
- Attraction of advanced students to work under one’s direction and
guidance.
- Published reviews of the candidate’s publications.
- Reader’s reports solicited by editors.
- Major research-based contributions to outside institutions, communities, or
businesses.

C. Evidence of Quantity

Adequate quantity in scholarly productivity cannot be specified exactly in measures such
as number of publications or pages in print, but the following guidelines generally apply:

**Associate Professor:** Promotion to associate professor with tenure requires (1)
publication or acceptance for publication by a reputable publisher of at least one major
work plus evidence of additional sustained scholarly contributions, or (2) publication or
acceptance for publication in respected venues of a substantial number of other scholarly
products. This evidence may include some or all of the publications by candidates prior to
their appointment in current rank, such as publications during post-doctoral and visiting
appointments. All work completed as a graduate student must be marked with an asterisk
(*) in the dossier. Supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship is taken into account,
but does not replace the expectation for publication of original scholarly work.

**Full Professor:** Promotion to professor normally requires (1) publication or acceptance
for publication by a reputable publisher of at least one major work of scholarship
subsequent to appointment as associate professor plus evidence of additional sustained scholarly contributions, or (2) publication or acceptance for publication in rigorously reviewed venues of a substantial number of other scholarly products subsequent to appointment as associate professor. Again, supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship is taken into account, but does not replace the expectation for publication of original scholarly work.

III. SERVICE/OUTREACH

The Committee shall evaluate productivity in the category of “service/outreach” in four separate areas: to the Program, the University, the profession, and the community and/or general public. Activities commonly categorized as “service/outreach” are enumerated below, but this list should not be taken to exclude others that may be submitted for review by the candidate. Professional activity at the national or international level shall be weighed, along with research and pedagogical recognition, in determining whether a candidate is in the process of achieving or has achieved a national and/or international reputation. Whenever possible, the evaluation should address both quantity and quality of service, based on documentation provided by the candidate. Service becomes an increasingly important part of a faculty member's activities as he or she advances through the professorial ranks.

As the Religious Studies Program grows into a substantial unit, faculty service in program building and advancing the stature of the Religious Studies Program at the University of Arizona is particularly valued.

A. Program Service

- Membership on standing or ad hoc committees.
- Course and degree advisement for majors, minors and graduate students.
- Mentoring of junior, visiting, or adjunct faculty.
- External and internal recruitment.
- Advising Religious Studies student organizations.

B. University Service

- College and/or University-wide committees.
- Elective offices.
- Honors and awards for University service.
- Lectures or other presentations outside of the Religious Studies Program to groups of students, faculty, or guests of the University.
- Honors Program participation.
- College and University-sponsored outreach to prospective or enrolled students, parents, or alumni/ae.
- Uncompensated translation or research services for members of the University community.
C. Professional Service

- Service as an officer or on committees of professional organizations.
- Service as organizer, section chair, presider or commentator at professional meetings.
- Editor, guest editor, or member of editorial board for professional journal or press.
- Reader or referee for professional journals, presses, grant agencies, or other institutions.
- Participant in NEH-sponsored summer institutes or other externally funded workshops or institutes.
- Honors and awards received from professional groups for service to the profession.

D. Public Service

- Translator or consultant for media or civic organizations.
- Public lectures addressed to the general public.
- Publications in non-refereed periodicals designed to inform the general public of ongoing developments in the field of religious studies.
- Outreach to schools and community colleges.
- Any other activity that obviously represents a useful service to the public and draws upon professional skills.

In some cases, one or more of the above items can be counted as “Scholarship” depending on departmental criteria and/or the candidate’s field(s) of expertise. The candidate must articulate clearly the ways in which these items are part of the candidate’s scholarship.

For **Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**:

- Candidates must contribute to academic planning at the unit level and, perhaps, at the college and university levels, by effectively carrying out committee assignments.
- Candidates should participate in local, regional and national meetings, be active in professional societies, and participate in peer review processes.
- Candidates should share their professional expertise with the public through outreach avenues such as local schools, libraries, organizations, commissions, consulting assignments, or panels.

An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Evidence of the above should be provided and should reveal that assistant professors worthy of promotion to associate professor with tenure have begun to develop a habit of service, that their judgments are professionally respected and valued, and that they have demonstrated the ability to find linkages between their discipline and public interests, needs, and opportunities.

Care must be taken, however, on the part of both the candidate and administration not to over-commit assistant professors by demanding a level of service that interferes with their development of a coherent research program and of teaching skills. While women and
minorities are underrepresented on the faculty, it will be particularly important to resist the temptation to burden them with excessive service expectations.

For **Promotion to Professor:**

Candidates for full professor must have accepted much more service responsibility than that required for lower ranks. An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Evidence of service/outreach may include, but is not limited to the following:

- leadership in faculty governance, in mentoring of junior faculty, and in establishing academic unit and college goals, objectives and performance standards;
- participation in professional associations, on professional review panels, and in the review of journal articles, grants and proposals;
- work with governmental and non-profit agencies that involves one's disciplinary expertise; and
- various forms of outreach to wider communities and organizations, as in presenting lectures, giving performances, and organizing events that build on and extend the candidate’s disciplines.

**PREPARING THE PROMOTION AND TENURE FILE**

**NOTE:** the following procedures are to be understood as subordinate to and governed by the procedures outlined in the “Provost’s Guidelines for Preparing Promotion and Tenure Cases,” a document issued every spring by the Provost’s Office. This document, which must be studied carefully by all involved in the promotion and tenure process, is subject to change. Changes that it may undergo in the future may necessitate changes in COH procedures and thus may require alteration of the directions given below.

**A. Identification and Notification of Candidates**

By March 1 of each year the Director of the Program will write to all members of the Program who are eligible for tenure and/or promotion, inviting candidates for mandatory or optional review to submit their candidacies to the Director of the Program and the Chair of the Program’s promotion and tenure committee. [For dates of all subsequent steps, see “College of Humanities Promotion and Tenure Annual Timetable”].

**B. Proper Format for the Preparation of Dossiers:**

1. Dossiers must be prepared using the outline form [headings and subheadings from the most recent version of “Provost’s Guidelines for Preparing Promotion and Tenure Cases” issued each spring by the Provost.
2. All published or forthcoming works listed in a dossier must be cited according to the complete citation form, i.e., all citations must include publisher, place and date of publication, and page numbers.

3. In citations of jointly authored works, the percentage of the candidate’s contribution must be specified.

4. In the event that a candidate for promotion and tenure presents published or soon-to-be-published materials which cannot be given adequate critical evaluation because they are written in a language insufficiently known to members of the Religious Studies Program committee or the COH committee, the chair of either committee may request that the candidate prepare an English translation of selected portions of the materials [or a precis of them] that would permit the committee to make an informed evaluation. In certain cases it may be deemed necessary to invite a consultant, fluent in the language in question, to participate in the committee’s discussions [but not to vote].

C. Referees and Letters of Evaluation:

1. Each candidate may submit up to ten names of potential reviewers from outside the University of Arizona, but in so doing must take care to nominate only those persons whose objectivity will not be put in question [for example, by previous close association with the candidate as a research collaborator, co-editor, or dissertation adviser].

2. To the list of possible reviewers nominated by the candidate the Director of the Program will add the names of other persons of his or her own choosing who are knowledgeable in the candidate’s field.

3. The full list of potential reviewers --i.e., the list of all those whom the candidate has suggested together with all others whom the Director of the Program is considering --will be discussed with the candidate, who will be given the opportunity to present compelling and legitimate reasons for removing any person(s) from the list. A list of all potential reviews to whom the candidate has objected will be kept as a part of the official promotion and tenure file.

4. The final decision as to which persons will serve as reviewers will be made by the Director of the Program, in consultation with the Program’s promotion and tenure committee --this in accordance with the Provost’s Guidelines, which specify that “candidates may suggest names, but the Department Head or review committee should select the individuals to be contacted.” It is understood, however, that in any case in which a candidate has presented compelling reason for removing a particular person from the list of potential reviewers, the Director of the Program will respect the candidate’s wishes and not solicit a reference from that person.

5. Some [but no more than half] of those finally selected to serve as reviewers will be from the candidate’s list of nominees.
6. The names of all reviewers finally chosen, including those suggested by the candidate, will be kept confidential. At no point in the process will the candidate contact, either directly or indirectly, external reviewers or potential reviewers regarding the tenure and/or promotion review. If contacted by a reviewer, the candidate shall refrain from responding to questions about the promotion and tenure case and, instead, shall direct the reviewer to the Director of the Program or the Chair of the Program’s promotion and tenure committee for any required information or directions.

7. By May 1, the Director of the Program will write a standard letter to all outside reviewers requesting an evaluation of the candidate [a sample letter is provided in the Provost’s Guidelines, Appendix D]. Referees will be assured that their letters of reference will be held in strictest confidentiality, within the limits of applicable law, ABOR policy, and University regulations. The letters to all reviewers must be substantively identical.

8. At least three of the letters of reference included in any promotion and tenure file must be recent [i.e., as the Provost’s Guidelines stipulate, “Dated within one year of the date of the department committee’s report”].

9. In the Director of the Program’s letter to the Dean, the Director of the Program shall call attention to letters that are not in accordance with Federal and State antidiscrimination laws, or with ABOR and University policies and rules against discrimination.

10. For further information on outside reviewers, consult the current version of the Provost’s Guidelines.

D. Collection of Supporting Documents:

1. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide a copy, offprint, or preprint of each work published or accepted for publication. Each manuscript accepted for publication but not yet actually published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher, journal editor, or other responsible person indicating its acceptance.

2. A candidate’s teaching record must be documented, not merely asserted. It is the responsibility of the Director of the Program to provide systematic summaries of standardized teaching evaluations. However, student evaluations alone will not suffice. Peer evaluations, based in part on class observation, are also required, as are formal evaluations of course syllabi and other teaching materials.

3. Proof of professional honors or recognition and proof of professional service, both within and without the University, is the responsibility of the candidate. He or she should submit all pertinent documentation with citing such honors, awards, or service-- e.g., letters of appointment to committees; letters of recognition from local, regional, national organizations; etc. [see Provost’s Guidelines].

4. In any case in which a professional honor or award is cited, the candidate should also provide some information or documentation about the award or honor.
5. The candidate should discuss with the Director of the Program submission of any other documents that may be deemed pertinent to promotion or tenure action.

6. Significant new materials may be added to the candidate packet during the review process in accordance with the procedures described in the Provost’s “Guide to the Promotion Process.”
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PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

Department of Russian and Slavic Studies
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I. CRITERIA

A. Criteria for Research, Scholarship and Creative Work:

The Department of Russian and Slavic Studies is committed to the importance of research and/or its creative equivalent as a sine qua non for Promotion & Tenure guidelines at the University of Arizona. Criteria reflecting an expansion of intellectual and creative frontiers include such factors as: evidence of a sustained program of scholarly research including pedagogical and methodological research, and/or creative contributions of exceptional merit and sufficient in quantity; evidence of significance and quality (as judged by peers within and outside of the University); evidence of adequate quantity. *In addition, research can include collaborative, integrative, and applied form of scholarship and can involve scholarly collaborations with other faculty and universities, as well as business and community partners.*

All decisions for Promotion and Tenure will be made subject to the rules and regulations as outlined in the current set of College of Humanities Promotion and Tenure documents, hereinafter referred to as the COH P&T Documents. The following reflects these rules and regulations and clarifies research activities by the faculty of the Department of Russian and Slavic Studies who are tenure and/or promotion eligible.

The following clarifications should be noted at this time:

- Although primary emphasis will be placed on works done at current rank, the reference to numbers of books and articles described below does not refer solely to the total number published since the candidate has been at this university, and;

- The concept of “publication” includes whatever is regarded as the equivalent of publication in the candidate's discipline including a corpus of innovative instructional materials (e.g., print, computer, audio, video), scholarly or artistic translations, exhibitions, artistic productions, designs, commissions for artistic or creative activity.
a. **Primary Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure** will consist of sustained scholarship or creative work including (but not limited to): acceptance for publication by peer-reviewed journals of a significant number of single-authored articles (or a larger number of joint-authored articles or a combination of the two) that reflect a sustained, coherent program of research or the acceptance by a reputable press of a single-authored monograph or major work along with a lesser number of articles or their equivalent, as described above; editing, compiling, and translation which contribute substantively to the field; *applied, collaborative and integrative scholarship that can involve scholarly collaborations with other faculty and universities, as well as business and community partners including translational research connected to community, international, or commercial activity.*

Secondary evidence for promotion in this category may include the regular presenting of professional papers, editing scholarly journals, publication of book reviews and reference works, work in progress, management of/contribution to professional web sites, submitted or funded grants and awards for scholarship, having one's work translated or reprinted, being cited by peers and other evidence as described in the COH P&T Documents.

b. **Primary Evidence for Promotion to Full Professor** will consist of sustained scholarship or creative work including: the acceptance for publication by peer-reviewed journals of an additional series of single-authored articles of such quality and quantity to have made a major impact on the field; or a larger number of joint-authored articles or a combination of the two of such quality and quantity as to have made a major impact on the field. The Department of Russian and Slavic Studies also considers the acceptance of a single-authored monograph or major work by a reputable press as scholarship worthy of consideration for promotion along with a lesser number of articles or their equivalent as described above. *Research can also include applied, collaborative and integrative scholarship that can involve scholarly collaborations with other faculty and universities, as well as business and community partners including translational research connected to community, international, or commercial activity.*

Secondary evidence for promotion will be that s/he will have contributed to all or nearly all of the categories of such evidence listed under Promotion to Associate Professor, and that the candidate will have achieved a full national, if not international, reputation as attested by letters, citations and reviews.
B. Criteria for Teaching:

The Department of Russian and Slavic Studies considers teaching to be a natural extension of one's scholarly pursuits. It is a continuous testing and sharing of one's own process of discovery. The ultimate goal is to stimulate the student's intellectual curiosity and to model the skills of scholarly discipline, analytical rigor, interpretive insight, and precise language. Russian language, literature, linguistics and culture are extremely fertile ground for such teaching, offering both the challenge of strangeness and the satisfaction of universal human questioning to an exceptionally high degree. The Department of Russian and Slavic Studies also expects teacher effectiveness in preparing students for future professional life. For example, the graduates of our program have consistently had great success in obtaining positions with the federal government.

a. Promotion to Associate Professor, with tenure: Good teaching includes organizing and conducting a course appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter; bringing to the classroom the latest discoveries or techniques; engaging the students, according to their capacities, in the current discourse and the current debates within a field; enabling them to articulate issues and solve problems on their own; being available outside the classroom for further instruction and advice; and advising and mentoring students. It also involves the training of successful graduate and professional students, where appropriate.

In the assessment of good teaching, primary evidence must include, but not be limited to, student evaluations, peer evaluation of the teaching portfolio, recognition of advising responsibilities, and participation in faculty development activities. Secondary evidence may include, but not be limited to: grants for teaching innovations, teaching awards, selection to teach in prestigious programs, and, where possible, measurements of student performance.

b. Promotion to Full Professor: Candidates must present evidence of continued effectiveness in teaching at all levels involved. They should be directing master's and doctoral work where appropriate. Evidence of teaching effectiveness should continue to come from good (not just satisfactory) scores on student surveys. Secondary evidence might include comments especially by Honors or graduate students; peer evaluations; teaching grants and awards; selection to teach in prestigious programs not only here but elsewhere, and participation of faculty development activities. All of this should be documented in a teaching portfolio submitted by each candidate, which should include all the applicable material in the current Provost's Guideline for Teaching Portfolios. [Note: This portfolio is mandated, but does not move beyond the departmental P&T committee. See Provost's Guide to the Promotion Process at: http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/guide-promotion-process]
C. Criteria for Service/Outreach

The Dept. of Russian and Slavic Studies fully endorses the major role played by service and outreach in its various manifestations from the departmental level to the global level. Service to the institution and profession includes: campus committees and teams; participation in faculty governance at the unit, college, or university level; directorships of institutes and programs; offices held in professional societies; sections chaired at professional meetings; seminars; public readings; panel appearances; workshops; reading for editors or publishers; consultation; interpreting; judging; work on selection committees; invitations to serve on national and international committees and review panels; service on governing boards and committees of professional organizations at the state, national, or international level; service on advisory committees of city, county, state, federal, or international bodies (if professionally relevant); service to other schools (if academically or professionally relevant), etc. Outreach activities to schools, community and business groups includes: talks to civic groups and other social, scientific, or professional organizations (if relevant to the candidate’s profession), volunteer work on civic, medical or social welfare programs (if relevant to the candidate’s profession), volunteer work on civic, medical or social welfare programs (if professionally relevant), technical report to outside communities, articles for popular or special interest publications, online resources developed for communities, businesses, agencies, or disciplinary associations, expert testimony or consultation inside or outside the University. It should be noted that the quality as well as the quantity of service is to be considered.

In some cases, one or more of these items can be counted as “Scholarship”; the candidate must clearly articulate the ways in which these items are part of the candidate’s scholarship.

a. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure: Candidates must contribute to academic planning at least at the unit level by effectively carrying out committee assignments; they should participate in local, regional, and national meetings and be active in professional societies; they should, to the extent possible, share their professional expertise with the public through outreach avenues (e.g. local schools, libraries, organizations, commissions, consulting assignments, or panels.)

b. Promotion to Full Professor: Candidates must demonstrate much more service responsibility than that required for lower ranks. Evidence of service/outreach might include, but not be limited to: leadership in faculty governance, mentoring junior faculty, establishing unit and/or college goals, objectives, and performance standards; participation in professional associations and review panels; review of articles, grants, proposals; various forms of wider outreach activities to communities and organizations (e.g. lectures, giving performances, organizing events that build on and extend the candidate’s disciplines.)
II. PROCEDURES

For a candidate to receive tenure and/or promotion in the department, s/he must demonstrate teaching excellence, high scholarship, academic and professional service. All decisions for tenure and promotion will be made subject to the rules and regulations as outlined in the current COH P&T Documents. It is the responsibility of the department and candidate to ensure that the Promotion and Tenure dossier is prepared in full compliance with the guidelines/checklist established in the current Provost’s “Guide to the Promotion Process” and “Promotion & Tenure Dossier Templates,” issued every spring and hereinafter referred to as the Provost’s P&T Guidelines [http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/]

A. Responsibilities of the Candidate:

The candidate is expected to provide all of the necessary information requested by the head of the department no later than June 1st in order for the department to be able to meet the deadlines for the following fall as established by the College of Humanities and the University Administration. In addition, the candidate should provide a list of potential outside evaluators to the Department Head in May and no later than June 1.

1. The candidate applying for tenure and/or promotion must submit to the head of the department a complete and up-to-date academic vita as outlined in the section on Curriculum Vita in the Provost’s P&T Guidelines. If it would be beneficial to the candidate to not present materials exceeding the page limit; such materials, when possible, should be listed in addenda to the Curriculum Vita.

2. The candidate must provide a statement of Accomplishments and Objectives on Research, Teaching and Service/Outreach as dictated by the Provost’s P&T Guidelines.

3. As of this revision, promotion and tenure dossiers must include a Teaching Portfolio and should, in some cases, if mandated by the position description of the candidate or agreed on between the candidate and the department head, include a Service and Outreach Portfolio, both compiled according to the Provost’s Guidelines.

B. Responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee:

1. The department head will appoint the members of the department’s standing Promotion and Tenure Committee which will be composed of at least three tenured members of the faculty. Provided that there is no conflict with the criteria and procedures set by the COH P&T Documents currently in force, these appointments shall consist of those faculty nominated by the departmental Committee on Committees and voted upon by the department at large. In matters concerning promotion and/or tenure of a specific candidate, a committee for each candidate shall be constituted so that recommendations shall be made only by faculty members holding rank superior to the rank of the candidate being considered, except in the
case of full professors where the committee members shall each be a full professor. Members of each candidate's committee will be selected in accordance with the provisions of COH P&T Documents.

2. The Promotion and Tenure Committee should collect all documentation as stipulated in the Provost’s P&T Guidelines.

3. Upon receiving all of the information concerning the candidate as outlined above, the Committee on Promotion and Tenure will meet, act, and give its recommendation or recommendations to the Head of the Department, who will submit the final recommendations to the Dean of the College of Humanities.

The Committee's recommendation will be forwarded to both the Department Head and the candidate. As stated in section 3.302 [c] of the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, the faculty member "is not entitled to a statement of the reasons for the recommendation."

III. THIRD-YEAR REVIEWS

A. Purpose of Periodic Reviews

The third-year reviews of the performance of tenure-track faculty have the following purposes:

1. Informing the candidate of the department’s expectations of untenured tenure-track faculty (these expectations should reflect those of the college and university as well).

2. Providing a formal evaluation of the candidate’s progress toward tenure, with an indication that progress toward tenure is satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

3. Suggesting ways in which the candidate’s documentation and record might be improved.

4. Advising the head of the department on the candidate’s progress toward tenure.

B. Deadlines

The College of Humanities will set the deadlines for the third-year reviews.

C. Preparation of Supporting Material

The candidate should consult appropriate department, college, and university guidelines for rank and tenure criteria. These guidelines will specify what materials may be submitted and the manner in which the candidate’s record should be presented.
D. Preparation of the Review Letter

The letter of review should be written by the chair of the P&T committee and should reflect the views of the committee. The P&T committee should endeavor to weigh all pertinent material submitted by the candidate in assessing the quality of the candidate’s contribution to the university. The letter should state very clearly the department’s expectations with respect to tenure and should include a frank assessment of the candidate’s progress. The P&T committee may (but is not obligated to) offer suggestions as to how the candidate may more effectively meet expectations of the department and the university.

E. Reconsideration procedures

If the candidate feels that the letter from the P&T committee does not fairly reflect efforts and accomplishments, s/he may ask the committee to reconsider. Such a request for reconsideration must be made by the appropriate deadline. The P&T committee may then choose to write a new letter or stand behind its original letter. In the latter case, both the letter from the committee and the letter requesting reconsideration remain part of the candidate’s file. If the reconsideration results in a new letter, only the new letter will go into the candidate’s file.

F. Non-Retention Recommendations by the Head

If the department head recommends non-retention following a third-year review, s/he and the department P&T committee will follow guidelines specified in Chapter 3.3 of UHAP and by the provost (see current Provost’s P&T Guidelines).
GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Tenure and promotion in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese are granted only to candidates who have demonstrated excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service/outreach in accordance with the expectations defined by the department. All tenure and promotion reviews should look at the totality of the candidate's scholarly, teaching, and service/outreach record with emphasis on current trajectory. Although reviews typically comprise the period beginning with the candidate's most recent appointment or promotion, the review should recognize that candidates come to tenure and/or promotion by following multiple paths, which may require a longer term record of achievement to be recognized during the review.

Excellent research should have a demonstrable impact on the area of study to which it contributes and should provide evidence of distinguished achievement as well as a presumption of future distinction. Such research can include collaborative, integrative, and applied forms of scholarship and can involve scholarly collaborations with other faculty and universities, as well as business and community partners.

Excellent teaching is marked by the instructor's ability to engage students in the learning process and by the rigor and scope of the courses taught; effectiveness is measured by student and peer evaluations of the instructor and the courses taught.

Excellent service is expected on various levels: within the university community, at the departmental, collegial, and university level, as well as by participation in professional organizations and academic collaborations at university, local, national and international levels. Outreach engages the faculty in extramural community activities that are related to their professional expertise.

The overarching criteria for granting tenure are the quality, quantity, and effectiveness of the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service/outreach. Implicit in these criteria is the promise of continued excellence in all of these areas.

1. SCHOLARSHIP

For faculty in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, which consists of programs in literature, cultural studies and linguistics, these university guidelines may be realized in diverse combinations of intellectual activities and products. In every case, candidates must provide evidence of sustained and significant contributions to their professional area as judged according to criteria which include measures of both quality and quantity. The definition of and requirements for that evidence follows accepted criteria and are in compliance with University and College guidelines. Each candidate must be guaranteed fair
representation for review by specialists sharing his or her area of expertise. For faculty who are involved in interdisciplinary scholarship, which is valued and encouraged, review must represent the full scope of the candidate's work.

1.1 EVIDENCE OF SUSTAINED SCHOLARSHIP

Primary evidence of sustained scholarship or creative work includes (but may not be limited to) publication or acceptance for publication of the following products over the duration of the candidate's time in current rank:

- Book(s) or monograph(s) by reputable publishers.
- Scholarly contributions to rigorously refereed professional venues or creative works in respected venues, including on-line publications.
- Editing, compiling, and translation which contribute substantively to intellectual development in the field.
- Applied scholarship (e.g., textbooks, software, and web-based work) which is firmly grounded in the candidate's own contributions to theory and research in the field.
- Evidence of integrative and/or applied scholarship, which can involve collaborations with other UA faculty or programs or with business and community partners, including translational research connected to community, international, or commercial activity.

Supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship or creative work may include (but may not be limited to) the following products and activities:

- Publication of book reviews in respected venues.
- Publication of articles or other scholarly products in non-refereed venues, including on-line publications that might not be rigorously reviewed, or creative works in alternative venues.
- Publication of reference works, such as encyclopedia entries.
- Scholarly papers or readings of creative work presented at local, regional, national, and international professional meetings.
- Participation in professional colloquia and panels of a scholarly or creative nature.
- Management of or contribution to professional web sites.
- Research grant proposals submitted or funded.
- Other editing, compiling, translation, and bibliography contributions.
- Other instances of applied scholarship.
- Work in progress.

The determination of "reputable" publishers and other "respected" venues is best made within each academic specialization; documentation of publishers' status in marginal cases is the responsibility of candidates and departmental program administrators and review committees, augmented by input from external reviews. Publications in languages other than English are of equal value to English, provided that language is accessible for and subject to departmental program and external review. The department will be the final arbiter of what may and may not be included as primary or supplementary evidence.
1.2 EVIDENCE OF SIGNIFICANCE AND QUALITY

Primary evidence for scholarship or creative work must include stipulation of its significance and quality by not only departmental but national and international colleagues (especially external peer reviewers from other institutions).

Supplementary evidence for significance and quality of scholarship or creative work may include (but may not be limited to) the following indicators:

- Major awards, grants, and fellowships.
- Invitations to review manuscripts for publication, grant applications, and candidates for promotion at peer institutions.
- Having one's work cited, reprinted, or translated into other languages.
- Invitations to present work to scholarly or artistic communities.
- Attraction of advanced students to work under one's direction and guidance.
- Major research-based contributions to outside institutions, communities, or businesses

**Associate Professor:** Promotion to associate professor with tenure carries the expectation that scholars or creative writers who are selected to provide external review will recognize the significance of a candidate's professional contributions.

**Full Professor:** Promotion to professor carries the expectation that scholars or creative writers who themselves are widely recognized as experts in the field, nationally and internationally, will recognize the significance of a candidate's professional contributions.

1.3 EVIDENCE OF QUANTITY

Adequate quantity in scholarly or creative productivity cannot be specified exactly in measures such as number of publications or pages in print, but the following guidelines generally apply:

**Associate Professor:** Promotion to associate professor with tenure requires (1) publication or acceptance for publication by a reputable publisher of at least one major work plus evidence of additional sustained scholarly or creative contributions, or (2) publication or acceptance for publication in respected venues of a substantial number of other scholarly and/or creative products. This evidence may include some or all of the publications by candidates prior to their appointment in current rank, such as publications during post doctoral and visiting appointments. All work completed while a graduate student must be marked with an asterisk (*) in the dossier. Supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship or creativity is taken into account, but does not replace the expectation for publication of original scholarly or creative work.

**Full Professor:** Promotion to professor normally requires publication or acceptance for publication by a reputable publisher of at least one major work of scholarship subsequent to appointment as associate professor plus evidence of additional sustained scholarly contributions, or (2) publication or acceptance for publication in rigorously reviewed...
venues of a substantial number of other scholarly and/or creative products subsequent to appointment as associate professor. Again, supplementary evidence of sustained scholarship is taken into account, but does not replace the expectation for publication of original scholarly or creative work.

2. TEACHING

The instructional function of the University requires faculty members who can effectively communicate the content of the current body of knowledge and the latest research results in the classroom and other learning environments, through individual student contact, and through professional modes of publication. Excellence in teaching includes, but is not limited to:

- organizing and conducting courses appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
- bringing to the classroom, and other learning environments, the most effective pedagogical approaches;
- engaging the students, according to their capacities, in the current discourses and debates within a field;
- enabling students to articulate issues and solve problems on their own;
- being available outside the classroom for further instruction and advice;
- advising and mentoring students at all levels.

For Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:

- Candidates must present evidence of successful teaching appropriate to the department's mission, including lower division, upper division, and graduate courses.
- Candidates should be engaged in educating individual students at the highest level of their discipline and, where appropriate, should be directing master's and doctoral work.

Faculty members must show effectiveness within the classroom and other learning environments in organizing and presenting material and in stimulating intellectual response. Evidence on teaching effectiveness must come from: student evaluation; a peer review of the teaching portfolio and of the quality of feedback to students on their work; recognition of advising responsibilities; and participation in faculty development activities. Other evidence may include, but is not limited to: grants for teaching innovations; teaching awards; selection to teach in prestigious programs; achievements by students; and in-class peer evaluation. Evidence of efforts to improve teaching effectiveness (e.g., the appropriate use of technology) should be provided. Availability to students during office hours is an expectation.

For Promotion to Professor:

- Candidates must present evidence of continued high quality teaching and mentoring, in the classroom, in other learning environments and through individual student contact, as appropriate to the department's mission. This should include lower division, upper division, and graduate courses.
• Candidates should continue to be engaged in educating individual students at the highest level of their discipline and, where appropriate, should be directing master's and doctoral work.

• Candidates should have attained a leadership role in developing departmental curricula, providing evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of other faculty, and contributing to more effective teaching approaches.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness should continue to come from student evaluations, peer evaluations, advising, achievements by students, teaching grants and awards, successful innovation, selection to teach in prestigious programs here and elsewhere, and participation in faculty development activities. All of this should be documented in a Teaching Portfolio submitted by each candidate, which should include all the applicable material in the current Provost’s Guidelines for Teaching Portfolios. Faculty are expected to continually improve their teaching by staying current with the latest developments in the discipline and with pedagogical techniques.

3. SERVICE/OUTREACH

Service includes: service on departmental, college, and University committees; service to professional associations and on public committees where faculty disciplinary knowledge is required. Service becomes an increasingly important part of a faculty member's activities as he or she advances through the professorial ranks. Outreach is a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching and research/creative activity. It involves delivering, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with University and department missions. Service/outreach activities include, but are not limited to:

• serving on campus committees and teams;
• actively participating in faculty governance at department, college or university levels;
• participating in activities of professional societies or organizations in one's discipline;
• applying one's expertise to address local, regional, national, or international issues;
• providing non-credit courses, extension programs, or short courses to governmental agencies and professional organizations;
• presenting community lectures or performances;
• technical reports to outside communities;
• articles for popular or special interest publications
• online resources developed for communities, businesses, agencies, or disciplinary associations;
• expert testimony or consultation outside the University
In some cases, one or more of these items can be counted as “Scholarship” depending on departmental criteria and/or the candidate’s field(s) of expertise. The candidate must articulate clearly the ways in which these items are part of the candidate’s scholarship.

For **Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:**

- Candidates must contribute to academic planning at the departmental level and, perhaps, at the college and university levels, by effectively carrying out committee assignments.

- Candidates should participate in local, regional and national meetings, be active in professional societies, and participate in peer review processes.

- Candidates should share their professional expertise with the public through outreach avenues such as local schools, libraries, organizations agencies, commissions, consulting assignments or panels.

An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviews. Evidence of the above should be provided and should reveal that assistant professors worthy of promotion to associate professor with tenure have begun to develop a habit of service, that their judgments are professionally respected and valued, and that they have demonstrated the ability to find linkages between their discipline and public interests, needs, and opportunities.

Care must be taken, however, on the part of both the candidate and administration not to over-commit assistant professors by demanding a level of service that interferes with their development of a coherent research program and of teaching skills. While women and minorities are underrepresented on the faculty, it will be particularly important to resist the temptation to burden them with excessive service expectations.

For **Promotion to Professor:**

Candidates for full professor must have accepted much more service responsibility than that required for lower ranks. An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Evidence of service/outreach may include, but is not limited to the following:

- leadership in faculty governance, in mentoring of junior faculty, and in establishing departmental and college goals, objectives and performance standards;

- participation in professional associations, on professional review panels, and in the review of journal articles, grants and proposals;

- work with governmental and non-profit agencies that involves one's disciplinary expertise; and various forms of outreach to wider communities and organizations, as in, presenting lectures, giving performances, and organizing events that further interest in the discipline.
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I. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees.

Membership on standing departmental promotion and tenure committees is by appointment. In each department, it is the Department Head who appoints the members of that department’s promotion and tenure committee, after thorough consultation with the department faculty. However, a Department Head’s discretion in this matter is subject to the following constraints.

1. In accordance with UHAP regulations, a Standing departmental promotion and tenure committee “shall be composed of at least three tenured faculty members.”

2. Department Heads will make their appointments to the promotion and tenure committees in such a way as to ensure compliance with University affirmative action and non-discrimination guidelines and policy. To this end, whenever feasible and appropriate, Department Heads may appoint to their committees tenured faculty from other departments and programs who are qualified to evaluate the candidates’ work. No one who is otherwise qualified shall be barred from service on promotion and tenure committees on the basis of religion, race, color, national origin, physical disability, or sexual orientation.

3. Whenever possible, the departmental promotion and tenure committee will include at least one member with expertise in the candidate’s particular field. The committee should also include as many members as possible conversant with the candidate’s general area of specialization.

4. The committee will be presented with a detailed statement of the University’s affirmative action policies and guidelines, which will be explained by a representative of the Office of Institutional Equity. Also, it will be explained to the whole committee at their first meeting that, should there arise in course a deliberation any questions regarding race, gender or other sorts of bias, then, at the request of one or more members, the committee will consult with a representative of the University’s Office of Institutional Equity for advice and guidance in such matters.

5. Each candidate, in consultation with the head, will compile a list of five University of Arizona faculty members with the rank and expertise necessary to evaluate the candidate. The list may include former or present members of the departmental standing promotion and tenure committee. The Department Head will select from the list two persons who, if they are not already members of the standing promotion committee, will join it as ad hoc members to participate in discussion of, and to vote upon, that particular candidate’s case. Appointment of such additional, ad hoc members is also subject to the qualifications listed immediately above.
6. Whenever the department’s workload so demands, a Department Head may appoint more than one promotion and tenure committee.

7. Members of the promotion and tenure committee are not permitted to discuss the candidate’s evaluation with her/him, unless the committee as a whole should formally request such a discussion. Any such request on the part of a committee must be communicated to the candidate through the Department Head. Likewise, any questions the candidate may have regarding the committee’s procedures must also be directed to the Department Head.

8. UHAP 3.3.02 [c] LEVELS OF REVIEW

“At the time a recommendation regarding renewal, nonrenewal, promotion, or continuing status is transmitted by the immediate administrative head, the dean or division administrator to the next administrative level, the faculty member involved should be advised in writing of the nature of the recommendation. The faculty member is not entitled to a statement of the reasons for the recommendation.”

Special Cases
For a description of the procedures for Special Cases involving promotion to Full Professor see: Promotion and Tenure: Procedures, College of Humanities

II. PREPARING THE PROMOTION AND TENURE FILE.

(NOTE: the following procedures are to be understood as subordinate to and governed by the procedures outlined in the “Provost’s Guide to the Promotion Process,” a document issued every spring by the Provost’s Office. This document, which must be studied carefully by all involved in the promotion and tenure process, is subject to change. Changes that it may undergo in the future may necessitate changes in COH procedures and thus may require alteration of the directions given below.

A. Identification and Notification of Candidates.

By March 1 of each year Department Heads will write to all members of their departments who are eligible for tenure and/or promotion, inviting candidates for mandatory or optional review to submit their candidacies to the Department Head and the Chairperson of the departmental promotion and tenure committee. (For dates of all subsequent steps, see the most recent COH Promotion and Tenure Timetable).

B. Proper Format for the Preparation of Dossiers:

1. Dossiers must be prepared using the outline form (headings and subheadings) from the most recent version of “Provost’s Guide to the Promotion Process” issued each spring by the Provost. Such dossiers must include a Teaching Portfolio and should, in some cases, if mandated by the position description of the candidate or agreed on between the candidate and his/her department head, include a Service and Outreach portfolio, both compiled according to the Provost’s Guidelines.
2. All published or forthcoming works listed in a dossier must be cited according to the complete citation form, i.e., all citations must include publisher, place and date of publication, and page numbers.

3. In citations of jointly authored works, the percentage of the candidate’s contribution must be specified.

4. In the event that a candidate for promotion and tenure presents published or soon-to-be published materials which cannot be given adequate critical evaluation because they are written in a language insufficiently known to members of the departmental or the COH committee, the chairperson of either committee may request that the candidate prepare an English translation of selected portions of the material (or a précis of them) that would permit the committee to make an informed evaluation. In certain cases it may be deemed necessary to invite a consultant, fluent in the language in question, to participate in the committee’s discussion (but not to vote).

C. Referees and Letters of Evaluation.

1. Each candidate may submit up to ten names of potential reviewers from outside the UA, but in so doing must take care to nominate only those persons whose objectivity will not be put in question (for example, by previous close association with the candidate as a research collaborator, co-editor, or dissertation advisor).

2. To the list of possible reviewers nominated by the candidate the Department Head will add the names of other persons of his or her own choosing who are knowledgeable in the candidate’s field.

3. The full list of potential reviewers – i.e., the list of all those whom the candidate has suggested together with all others whom the head is considering – will be discussed with the candidate, who will be given the opportunity to present compelling and legitimate reason for removing any person(s) from the list. A list of all potential reviewers to whom the candidate has objected will be kept as a part of the official promotion and tenure file.

4. The final decision as to which persons will serve as reviewers will be made by the Department Head, in consultation with the departmental promotion and tenure committee – this in accordance with the Provost’s Guidelines, which specify that “candidates may suggest names, but the Department Head or review committee should select the individuals to be contacted.” It is understood, however, that in any case in which a candidate has presented compelling reason for removing particular persons from the list of potential reviewers, the Department Head will respect the candidate’s wishes and not solicit a reference from that person.

5. Some (but no more than half) of those finally selected to serve as reviewers will be from the candidate’s list of nominees.
6. The names of all reviewers finally chosen, including those suggested by the candidate, will be kept confidential. At no point in the process will the candidate contact, either directly or indirectly, external reviewers or potential reviewers regarding the tenure and/or promotion review. If contacted by a reviewer, the candidate shall refrain from responding to questions about the promotion and tenure case and, instead, shall direct the reviewer to the Department Head or the Chairperson of the departmental promotion and tenure committee for any required informational or directions.

7. By the date established in the current COH Timetable, the Department Head will write a standard letter to all outside reviewers requesting an evaluation of the candidate. A sample letter is provided in the Provost’s Guidelines. Referees will be assured that their letter of reference will be held in strictest confidentiality, within the limits of applicable law, ABOR policy, and the University regulations. The letters to all reviewers must be substantively identical.

8. At least three of the letters of reference included in any promotion and tenure file must be recent.

9. In the Department Head’s letter to the Dean, the Department Head shall call attention to letters that are not in accordance with Federal and State antidiscrimination laws, or with ABOR and University policies and rules against discrimination.

10. For further information on outside reviewers, consult the current version of the Provost’s Guidelines. These Guidelines additionally include, where appropriate to the description of the candidate’s position, the following documents of scholarly and service or outreach impact:

   - letters from academic, community or business collaborators
   - letters from University collaborators noting the impact and rigor of the candidate’s work
   - verifiable news or media reports on service contributions
   - grants secured, whether for research, teaching, or service contributions
   - contracts for external contributions or translational research
   - adoptions of programs and materials by other institutions

D. Collection of Supporting Documents.

1. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide a copy, offprint, or preprint of each work published or accepted for publication but not yet actually published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher, journal editor, or other responsible person indicating its acceptance.

2. A candidate’s teaching record must be documented, not merely asserted, by way of Teaching Portfolio compiled according to Provost’s Guidelines. It is the responsibility of the Department Head to provide an evaluation of teaching and advising as directed by the current Provost’s Guidelines. Peer evaluations, based
in part on class observation, are required, as are formal evaluations of course syllabi and other teaching materials.

3. Proof of professional honors or recognition and proof of professional service, both within and without the University, is the responsibility of the candidate. He or she should submit all pertinent documentation when citing such honors, awards, or service – e.g., letters of appointment to committees; letters of recognition from local, regional, national organizations; etc. These can, and in some cases should, be submitted within a Service and Outreach Portfolio.

4. In any case in which a professional honor or award is cited, the candidate should also provide some information or documentation about the award or honor.

5. The candidate should discuss with the Department Head submission of any other documents that may be deemed pertinent to promotion or tenure action.

6. Significant new materials may be added to the candidate packet during the review process in accordance with the procedures described in the Provost’s Guidelines.

7. The Department Head shall ensure that the candidate’s file remain intact and that the identical file as was reviewed at the department level be forwarded intact to the Dean’s level.

III. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND SERVICE

A. Evaluation of Research.

1. As noted above, the candidate must provide copies of all her or his published and soon to be published works. The candidate should also provide copies of any published reviews of those works which he or she wishes the committee to consider. It is the responsibility of the committee to consider any other substantive reviews it deems appropriate. (It is to be understood that there may be valid reasons for discounting particular reviews, favorable or unfavorable).

2. It is possible that reviewer’s initial letter will prompt further questions on the part of the Department Head or the departmental committee. In such cases the Department Head may request a second letter of reference from the reviewer, asking him or her to provide clarification of points in the initial letter or requesting additional information. All such follow-up requests, and all responses to them, must be in writing. Referees will again be assured that all such correspondence will be held in the strictest confidentiality within the limits of applicable law.

3. The committee will summarize the content of all available reviews of the candidate’s publications.
4. The committee will evaluate anthologies, books, and journals in which the
candidate’s works have appeared or will appear, and will summarize their relative
standing in the candidate’s field.

5. The committee will summarize and evaluate invited and volunteered Conference
papers, talks, poetry readings, performances, etc. that the candidate has given,
while also assessing the relative importance of the meetings (conference,
colloquia, etc.) at which the contributions were made.

6. The committee will summarize the relative importance to the department and
institution of the candidate’s scholarly and creative production. If the candidate is
said to have national or international standing or his/her research is found to have
community, business, or international impact beyond academia, this claim must
be substantiated.

7. In addition to judging the quality of the candidate’s individual contributions, the
committee will also assess the coherence, quality, development, and potential
value of the candidate’s overall research program and will assess the relevance to
that general program of all individual research products, including evidence of
translational research.

    Scholarly editing, where it can be shown to require sustained research and
original critical activity, may be offered as another example of scholarly activity.
In most instances, however, such editing will be understood as “professional
service.”

B. Evaluation of Teaching.

A full statement of what information to provide on teaching, and what not provide, is
contained in the Provost’s Guidelines which mandates the compilation of a Teaching
Portfolio. The following procedural points are for use by the candidate, the
Department Head, and the promotion and tenure committees, in implementing those
guidelines.

1. The committees will evaluate local, regional, national awards or recognition the
candidate may have won for teaching, and determine their importance.

2. The departmental committee will appoint qualified individuals to provide peer
review of the candidate’s teaching. This must include actual classroom visits
arranged in consultation with the candidate.

3. The head will provide summary statements of the results of teaching evaluations
conducted since the candidate’s last formal promotion evaluation, or for at least
the three years preceding the year of the current review. The committee will
evaluate and comment on the candidate’s teaching effectiveness.

4. The committee will include any other pertinent information concerning the quality
of the candidate’s teaching.
C. Evaluation of Service.

The committees will evaluate and summarize all evidence provided by the candidate concerning service to the department, university, region, and/or profession and will carefully weigh all claims made about the significance of such service.

IV. SUPPLEMENTARY PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED IN CONSIDERING TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION OF FACULTY ENGAGED IN INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS

SEE Current Provost’s Guidelines, Appendix C
Promotion and Tenure: Procedures
College of Humanities, Section 5

Participation in the activities of interdisciplinary programs or collaborations with community, international, or business partners, may comprise an ongoing and integral part of a faculty member’s professional activities. To the extent that this is so, these efforts should be recognized, alongside other relevant activities, in the evaluation procedures for promotion and tenure.

If the candidate’s formal workload includes a significant portion within graduate and/or undergraduate interdisciplinary programs, then it shall be evaluated according to the procedures outlined below, consistent with current Graduate College procedures. Moreover, if the candidate, in consultation with the department head, considers his or her informal or “overload” participation in teaching, research or service within the framework of an interdisciplinary program or within a university or external collaboration to constitute a significant portion of his or her workload, the head of the home department shall seek a written evaluation of the candidate’s performance from the director of the interdisciplinary program or the chief executive of a collaborative enterprise (or his/her designee).

V. Appeals to the President

See UHAP 3.3.02[e].

NOTE: Throughout this document, the terms “publication,” “publisher” and “published” shall be understood to refer both to work available in printed form (books, articles, etc.) and to work available in electronic media (computer programs, software, etc.)