

This *Guide* provides candidates, heads, and mentors with an overview of the procedures for reviews of career-track faculty with lecturer and professor titles. The University has made considerable progress with clarifying promotion criteria and procedures for career-track faculty in the year since the Faculty Senate recommended the change from non-tenure to career-track titles and expanded voting rights to career-track faculty who have been working at the university full time for at least three years. Colleges and departments have reviewed and revised their procedures, and career-track faculty now have a better sense of how to go up for promotion. This *Guide* contributes to these ongoing efforts by providing advice for candidates, reviewers, and administrators. College criteria are available on the Career-Track Faculty page: <http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/career-track-faculty>.

Career-track professors have more extensive reviews than lecturers. Promotion reviews for senior or principal lecturers are conducted by departmental committees and heads or directors with the approval of their dean, as noted in section 3.3.03 of the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel* (UHAP). Career-track professors have a broader review because they have a broader range of roles, including research professors who bring in grants to underwrite their positions as well as faculty whose instructional duties extend into upper-division and graduate courses. Career-track professors are reviewed by a department committee, a head or director, a college committee, a dean, and the Provost, as noted in UHAP 3.3.03C. College procedures vary. Some colleges require external reviews for career-track professors, and in the health sciences, professors on the clinical track or with clinical scholar titles may be reviewed only at the department and college levels.

Table of Contents

- **From Hiring to Promotion** ([page 2](#))
 - Using the Promotion Process to Advance your Career
- **Promotion Policies** ([page 3](#))
 - The University's Inclusive View of Scholarship
 - Policies on Promotion Review Committees
 - Additions to Dossiers
 - Notifications of Candidates on Recommendations
 - Considering Findings of Professional Misconduct
 - Appeals of Promotion Reviews
 - Clinical Faculty Reviews
 - Reviews of Student Evaluations
 - Provost Awards for Innovations in Teaching
- **Advice on Preparing Dossiers** ([page 5](#))
 - Advice on Candidate Statements
 - Creating Teaching Portfolios
 - Using Service and Outreach Portfolios to Document Impact
- **Overview of the Dossier** ([page 7](#))
 - Avoiding the Most Common Problems in Dossiers

Career-track reviews use the sections of the Dossier Template related to lecturers' and professors' assigned duties. These are the most frequently used sections, though some colleges do not require external reviews even for professors:

- Section 1: Summary Data Sheet
- Section 2: Summary of Workload
- Section 3: Dept. and College Guidelines
- Section 4: CV and List of Collaborators
- Section 5: Candidate Statement
- Section 6: Teaching Portfolio Resources
- Section 7: Evaluation of Teaching
- Section 8: Service and Outreach Portfolio
- Section 10: Letter from Outside Reviewers and Collaborator (External or Internal)
- Section 11: Recommendations on Promotion

Information on all Dossier sections is provided in the "Overview of the Dossier."

This *Guide* and related information on career-track reviews are on the Vice Provost's website: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/career-track-faculty>

The [University Handbook for Appointed Personnel \(UHAP\)](#) provides policies for personnel procedures. Promotion procedures for career-track faculty are covered in UHAP [Chapter 3.3.03](#).

From Hiring to Promotion

If you are a faculty member on the career track, you should use your annual reviews as opportunities to talk with your head or director about your workload assignment and the criteria for your promotion review. Your assigned duties establish the basic expectations that will be used to evaluate your achievements. Some career-track faculty have less defined and more shifting workload assignments. Shifting course assignments and other changes can help you build your teaching profile, while creating challenges in deepening your expertise. Annual reviews should provide you with a chance to clarify your duties and document your contributions.

Each year you will prepare an annual report for the Annual Performance Review (APR). Depending on your assigned duties, your teaching, research, service, and professional performance will be reviewed by a peer committee who makes a recommendation to your head, who then makes the final assessment. Your head or director should meet with you to discuss your work and your progress. Beyond these basic requirements, the procedures for APRs vary across departments and programs. Ask for information on the process. It should provide you with feedback on how you can improve your work and make progress toward promotion.

You should use your meetings with your head and other senior faculty to discuss your duties and related resources, including any mentoring support that may be available. These meetings are crucial opportunities to clarify expectations for teaching, scholarship, service, and outreach. You should use these discussions to review your department's experience with supporting career-track faculty going up for promotion. In these discussions, you should realize that some questions about promotion cannot be answered with specifics because individuals' duties vary, and the qualities of individual contributions are difficult to benchmark in generalizable terms.

For more information on the Annual Performance Reviews, visit the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs website: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/annual-performance-review>.

For more information on mentoring, see the Faculty Mentoring Resources on the Diversity and Inclusive Excellence website: <http://diversity.arizona.edu/mentoring-resources>.

Use annual review meetings to get as much feedback as possible:

- Get assessments of your teaching.
- Use input on your annual report to prepare the Candidate Statement.
- Get input on your upcoming plans.
- Welcome frank assessments to get suggestions on how to improve.

Ask questions about teaching:

- How is teaching assessed?
- Can I teach a range of courses?
- Will my mentoring, clinical and other instructional work be assessed?

Clarify service expectations:

- What service commitments are most valued in our department?
- What committee assignments will help me learn about our department?
- How can I align my service expectations with my professional interests?

Annual reviews may be considered during promotion reviews, but good annual reviews do not guarantee promotion because:

- Annual reviews focus on one year.
- They do not include external reviews.
- Contributions are not assessed in as much depth as in promotion reviews.
- Annual reviews do not include faculty from outside your department.

Using the Promotion Process to Advance Your Career

Use promotion criteria to develop an action plan. To do that, you need to translate promotion criteria into goals to work on and discuss with senior faculty. To leverage your impact, these goals should align with the priorities of your program and department. Your annual reports provide an opportunity to reflect upon your goals and contributions and get feedback on how to characterize them in your annual review and in your Candidate Statement in your dossier. Through your discussions with colleagues, you will learn how to talk about the impact of your teaching, research, service, and outreach. As part of these discussions, enlist peers to observe your teaching and other instructional work to help document your effectiveness. Mentoring, advising, and even outreach may be

integral to your teaching, but you will need to make those connections for your colleagues in your annual review and in your Candidate Statement in your dossier.

Promotion Policies

Yearly Promotion Review Schedule

- **Career-Track Dossiers are due to the Provost's Office on or before November 15;** however, departments and colleges may deviate from the other dates suggested in this schedule.

Action	Point Person	Due Date
Candidates are notified of their upcoming review	Department Head/Director	April
Annual Workshop: Instructions on the Process and Preparation of Dossiers for Promotion & Tenure and Continuing Status & Promotion	Vice Provost	Mid-April each year
Final Preparation of Dossier by Candidate	Candidate	April– June
Candidate provides list of potential Outside Evaluators to Department Head or Director	Department Head/Director	May– June
Candidate delivers dossier to Department	Department Head/Director	May– June
Letters requesting review are sent to Outside Evaluators	Department Head, Director, or Committee Chair	By mid-July
Departmental Committee review, letter written and added to dossier	Departmental Committee Chair	August 16 th – September 14 th
Department Head or Director review, letter written and added to dossier	Department Head/Director	September 15 th – 30 th
Dossier delivered to Dean's Office	Dean	October 1 st
College Committee review, letter written and added to dossier	Chair of College Committee	October 16 th – 31 st
Dean's review, letter written and added to dossier	Dean	November 1 st – November 14 th
Dossiers due in Office of the Provost	Provost	November 15th
Provost's letters of decision sent to candidates		March 31 st

The University's Inclusive View of Scholarship

Candidates and reviewers should consider UA's "inclusive view of scholarship." Our University promotion criteria recognize that research enriches teaching, service, and outreach in ways that are vital to our mission as a student-centered land-grant university:

The University values an inclusive view of scholarship in the recognition that knowledge is acquired and advanced through discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Depending on the assigned duties of individual candidates and the criteria of their departments and colleges, promotion reviews may consider original research contributions in peer-reviewed publications as well as integrative and applied forms of scholarship that involve cross-cutting collaborations with business and community partners, including translational research, commercialization activities, and patents.

Our inclusive view of scholarship has taken on new significance with the University's transition to becoming a Hispanic-serving institution, as Interim Provost Goldberg noted in his memo launching promotion reviews in 2018:

Our inclusive view of scholarship has taken on new meaning now that we have become a Hispanic-serving institution (HSI). . . . Our integrated vision of research, outreach, and teaching has helped us recognize faculty contributions to our 100% student engagement initiative, our expansion of online and global offerings, and our wide-ranging outreach and bridge programs. . . . As we take up the work of being an HSI, we need to ensure that we recognize HSI-related activities in teaching, outreach, and research in our promotion reviews.

Our inclusive view of scholarship is particularly useful with assessing the leadership and impact of instructional faculty who do not have assigned research duties. The "scholarship of teaching" provides a framework for assessing teaching as a research-based practice that can help candidates and reviewers consider teaching innovations as applied forms of scholarship. Models for this approach are available on the University's "inclusive view of scholarship" webpage: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship>

Peer Reviews of Student Evaluations

Committees should consider research on student evaluations in making peer reviews of teaching to complete Dossier Section 7. For this section, committees submit a memo based on their reviews of the candidate's Teaching Portfolios, their teaching observations, their assessments of Teacher-Course Evaluations (TCEs), and their responses to candidates' self-assessments of their teaching. The University uses this multimodal assessment of teaching to avoid an excessive reliance on TCEs because research shows that student evaluations can be biased by faculty members' gender, ethnicity, national origin, disability, and sexual orientation and identity as well as by a range of extraneous factors such as the modality or type of course. For further information, see Linse's "[Interpreting and using student ratings data: Guidance for faculty serving as administrators and on evaluation committees](#)" (2017). Research on student evaluations underlines the fact that they are not measures of student learning but student perceptions of instructors' effectiveness. As such, they can be useful data to consider as part of a multimodal peer review of teaching. To conduct teaching observations, committee use the OIA's [Review of Teaching Protocol](#) and the [Criteria for Peer Reviews of Teaching](#).

Policies on Promotion Review Committees

Each college and department must have a standing committee to advise the dean and department head.

- Career-track promotion committees may include faculty from other tracks, as noted in UHAP 3.3.03.A, but **career-track faculty should generally be a majority of the members of the committee**. At least three faculty members must serve on the committee to conduct the promotion review.
- **All committee members and external reviewers must have a rank superior to the candidate**. When reviewing candidates for promotion to full, committee members and reviewers must be at the full rank.

- **Committee members or administrators who have coauthored substantial publications or grants with a candidate within the last five years should generally recuse themselves** to avoid raising questions about the independence of reviews. If recusing committee members is not feasible, for example because of the size of the department, the committee must address the concerns about conflicts of interest in its letter.
- **Individuals who serve concurrently** on departmental, college and/or University promotion committees must recuse themselves from voting on any case they provided a vote in an earlier committee.
- **Review committees' assessments are to be independent of the administrators** whom they advise. Standing committees normally will meet without the administrator whom they advise, as noted in UHAP.

As required in UHAP, review committees should begin their deliberations by reviewing department and college promotion criteria for research, teaching, and service and outreach. Committees should also review these standards at the end of the process and suggest revisions to their administrators. This requirement is important for career-track committees because of recent University changes in career-track promotion reviews.

Departments that do not have criteria for reviews of career-track lecturers and professors may use their college criteria, the University's optional promotion criteria for lecturers and professors, or create their own criteria and arrange for departmental review, vote and approval by the dean and provost before the review. All approved criteria and resources are available on the Career-Track Promotion page: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/career-track-faculty>.

Additions to Dossiers

On rare occasions, information on a candidate's work becomes available during the review process. For example, a candidate receives an award, grant or publication. Such information may be added using these procedures:

- Candidates notify a committee chair, head or other administrators of a recent development.
- The administrator or committee chair decides that the information is significant enough to be added to the dossier.
- The candidate is informed that the materials will be added.
- The expanded dossier must be re-reviewed by all levels of reviewers.
- If the additional materials consist of factual information that might be deleterious to the candidate's case, the candidate must be given the opportunity to add a response to the dossier.
- If the dossier is under review by the Office of the Provost, a request to amend the dossier must be received by February 1st, unless the request comes from the University P&T or Continuing Status committee. After February 1st, reassessments of dossiers will only be made for exceptional achievements and not for the acceptance of a single article or grant, especially if such work is already listed in candidates' CVs as being a work in progress or under review.

Recognizing Candidates' Interdisciplinary Collaborations

As noted in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel criteria for promotion in [3.3.03](#), "the University values collaboration among colleagues, both externally and internally, and the candidate's contributions to such collaborations will be considered in promotion and tenure reviews." The University's commitment to interdisciplinary collaborations was reinforced in 2014-15 by a series of Heads Up forums on improving support for faculty with multidisciplinary appointments in annual and promotion reviews. To help ensure that such collaborations are fully acknowledged in promotion reviews, Promotion Dossiers include several elements to document candidates' collaborative contributions and enable committees to assess them:

- Shared appointments (those involving a split FTE) are to be acknowledged in the Summary Data Sheet in [Section 1](#) and in [Section 4](#) on the candidate's curriculum vitae.
- Such appointments are to be detailed by heads of both departments in [Appendix A](#): Checklist for Shared Appointments, which is also to be used in drawing up such appointments.
- [Appendix C](#) should be used to acknowledge and evaluate faculty involvement in Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs and other interdisciplinary units such as the BIO5 Institute.

- If a candidate is involved in a GIDP or other interdisciplinary unit, an evaluation letter should be solicited from the GIDP chairperson or unit director and included in [Section 9](#), and the departmental review committee should note and evaluate the candidate's interdisciplinary contributions.
- The departmental review committee for a candidate with a shared appointment must include at least one member from the cooperating department. Outside committee members should also be included from GIDPs or other interdisciplinary units if a candidate's research, teaching, and service have a strong interdisciplinary component ([Appendix C](#)).
- Department heads for shared appointments may collaborate upon a single letter, or letters may be submitted by both department heads.

Considering Findings of Professional Misconduct

The policies governing promotion are set out in UHAP 3.3.03.B. Those policies specify that

the University expects the highest standards of professional conduct, as detailed in the Statement on Professional Conduct in UHAP 7.01.01. This Statement sets out the expectation that faculty will uphold scholarly standards, maintain intellectual honesty, and 'respect the dignity of others,' including their 'right to express differing opinions.' In assessing professional conduct, reviewers may consider documented violations of other University's policies, such as those on Research Integrity, Nondiscrimination and Anti-Harassment, Misuse of University Assets, and Workplace Violence.

As noted in the UHAP 3.3.03.B, reviewers may decide to consider annual reviews when reviewing candidates who have been reprimanded for professional misconduct. If annual reviews are considered, then consideration should also be given to any written response or appeal that may have been submitted by the faculty member.

Promotion committee members, department heads, and deans should understand that the UHAP provisions on considering professional misconduct clearly distinguish general concerns about candidate's collegiality from violations of university policies and reprimands for behaviors that directly affect candidates' teaching, research and service. As noted in the American Association of University Professors' [On Collegiality as a Criterion in Evaluations](#), "collegiality is not a distinct capacity to be assessed independently of the traditional triumvirate of teaching, scholarship, and service. It is rather a quality whose value is expressed in the successful execution of these three functions." Violations of professional conduct should be assessed against how they affect a candidate's effectiveness in working with students, fellow researchers, and external and internal collaborators to achieve the goals set out in their assigned duties.

Questions on this policy and related procedures should be address to Asya Roberts in the Provost's Office at 626-0202 or asya@arizona.edu.

Clinical-Track Faculty Promotions

Provisions in UHAP [Chapter 3.3.03](#) were made for promotion reviews of faculty in the Colleges of Medicine in Tucson and Phoenix with clinical series and clinical scholar titles. These provisions are being used on a provision basis pending final approval from the President. Such clinical faculty use a Clinical Dossier Template that aligns with their clinical duties. Clinical faculty reviews include reviews by departmental committees, heads, college committees, and the appropriate dean. Appeals of deans' decisions may be made to the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences.

Questions on these provisions should be directed to Associate Dean Kenneth Knox at the College of Medicine, Phoenix (knox@email.arizona.edu) or Deputy Dean Judy Dimarco in the College of Medicine, Tucson (jdimarco@email.arizona.edu).

Additional Advice on Preparing Dossiers

Advice on Candidate Statements

If you are going up for promotion, you will use your Candidate Statement to characterize your program of work to highlight how your major contributions have met the expectations for promotion. Your expectations for promotion should be clearly aligned with your assigned duties, but some promotion criteria are so broadly defined that it can be challenging to articulate how your achievements align with them. Your Candidate Statement is where you address that challenge by articulating how you have achieved excellence in teaching, research, and service.

If your duties emphasize teaching, then you should draft your Candidate Statement with an eye to the Criteria for Peer Reviews of Teaching and Nominations for Provost Awards for Innovations in Teaching when drafting your Candidate Statement. The criteria for nominations are briefly listed in Dossier Section 7. Here are some questions that can help you consider how your teaching contributions align with these criteria:

- Are there distinctive aspects of your teaching assignments that your reviewers should know in assessing your teaching? For example, do you teach gateway or online courses, or do your courses enroll large numbers of non-majors who find your courses particularly challenging?
- How have you revised your courses to take account of research on teaching and your own observations of how students learn?
- How do you structure your courses around learning outcomes, and what assessment tools do you use?
- Have you worked to develop inclusive curricula and learning strategies, for example by drawing upon the principles of universal design or by considering the experiences of our diverse student populations?
- What improvements have you made from the feedback you have received from students and colleagues?
- How have you worked to improve your teaching by attending workshops or getting involved in collaborations on teaching?
- How have you mentored and advised students, aided with recruitment and retention, and worked to create more inclusive and supportive programs of study?

If research is a significant part of your duties, you should use the Candidate Statement to detail your research, scholarship, and creative activities. You should discuss the advances you have made in your program of work, the recognition you have garnered, and the impact that you have had, including your impact on the mission of your unit and the University more generally. Here are some questions to help you with that:

- How can you characterize your scholarly contributions in ways that highlight your contributions to specialists while also helping non-specialists understand what you do?
- How can you highlight your achievements in ways that relate them to promotion expectations, especially your departmental and college criteria?
- How can you use your major achievements to demonstrate the progress and impact of your overall program of work and your professional effectiveness?
- How can you benchmark the progress and impact of your program of work?
 - How has your research, scholarship and creative work advanced since your dissertation?
 - If you work on research or other teams with senior colleagues, how can you demonstrate your independent contributions in those collaborations?
 - Where is your work headed? What will its impact be, and how will you achieve it?
- How can you relate your assigned duties to demonstrate that you have achieved excellence in research, teaching, and service?
- How can you relate your research and scholarship to your teaching and service to demonstrate your impact?

To document your leadership and impact, you should draw on the university's "inclusive view of scholarship" to discuss how your effectiveness in your position and your contributions to the mission of your unit. Our "inclusive view of scholarship" recognizes "original research contributions in peer-reviewed publications as well as integrative and applied forms of scholarship that involve cross-cutting collaborations with business and community partners, including translational research, commercialization activities, and patents." Our integrated vision of the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of engagement provides a useful framework for you to frame your service and teaching even if you do not have a significant portion of your workload assigned to research. If your service has extended to providing leadership on curricular, outreach, or other institutional initiatives, you should consider

including Section 8: The Portfolio to Document Leadership in Service and Outreach to document your broader impact, as discussed further below.

Creating Teaching Portfolios

Teaching Portfolios are required in all dossiers for candidates with assigned teaching duties. A Teaching Portfolio is a collection of selected instructional materials to support the discussion of teaching in the Candidate Statement. You may also want to refer to related research to show how your teaching is informed by best practices in the field. You should include a selection of instructional materials from a range of classes to document instructional innovations, curricular designs, and outcomes assessments. A full list of possible materials is included in the [Promotion Dossier Template](#). You should consult with your head or the chair of your review committee on formats.

- [Brown University's The Teaching Portfolio by Hannelore B. Rodriguez-Farrar](#)
- University Center for the Advancement of Teaching at Ohio State University's Teaching Portfolio Resources: <http://ucat.osu.edu/read/teaching-portfolio>
- University of California, Berkeley provides detailed advice on each aspect of the teaching portfolio. <https://career.berkeley.edu/PhDs/PhDportfolio>
- [How to Write a Statement of Teaching Philosophy](#) by The Chronicle of Higher Education
- Rubric for Evaluating Teaching Portfolios from the University of Indiana: http://medsci.indiana.edu/m620/sotl_08/teaching_portfolio_rubric.pdf

If you do not include a substantive discussion of your teaching in your Candidate Statement, you should discuss your teaching philosophy, course goals, and student populations in your Teaching Portfolio, as noted in Section 6 of the Dossier Template. These materials help to provide reviewers with a better sense of the contexts in which you teach. Reviewers and candidates can find advice on the [Peer Review of Teaching Protocol](#) webpage developed by Dr. Ingrid Novodvorsky in the Office of Instruction and Assessment.

Using Service and Outreach Portfolios to Document Impact

If service and outreach duties make up a significant portion of your assigned duties, you should submit a Service and Outreach Portfolio to document the scope, quality and impact of your contributions. A Service and Outreach Portfolio can help you document your community and economic impact. This portfolio can also be used to document administrative service, especially if you have developed programs and initiatives that demonstrate the impact of your work. A template letter is provided in Appendix E for requesting letters to document collaborations with business and community partners, including underserved groups, schools and state agencies, and collaborators on commercialization activities and tech transfer.

Overview of the Dossier

The Office of the Provost evaluated 46 career-track dossiers in 2018-2019, including career-track faculty transitioning from lecturer to a professorial track. Every dossier is read by over twenty reviewers, including external reviewers, departmental and college committees, and heads and deans. To avoid time-consuming problems, Promotion Dossiers must follow the Dossier Template and established procedures. Dossiers are returned to departments when required formats and procedures are not followed. **As noted in the [Most Common Problems](#) section, most problems arise from using workload descriptions to praise contributions and enlisting collaborators to serve as reviewers. When heads have coauthored with candidates, a surrogate head should be solicited, and the head should submit a collaborator letter, which comes right after external reviews in dossiers and has a comparable impact on all subsequent reviews.**

Candidates are responsible for following procedures and submitting materials in a timely manner. If a dean or college committee determines a dossier is missing essential elements, the evaluation process may be halted until materials are secured. In some circumstances, a dean may choose to reinstate the department-level review. Likewise, if the University Advisory Committee finds that reviews have been affected by a poor dossier, the committee may request that materials be revised or added. This action reinstates the review at the departmental level. While these steps may be taken when candidates have not provided required information, candidates are responsible for submitting complete dossiers by deadlines.

The Dossier Template provides checklists of requirements to divide the sections of Promotion Dossiers. The checklists note the items to be reviewed in each section, and thereby help to ensure consistency and completeness in Dossiers. The checklists also help to save time in each level of the review process.

Section 1: Summary Data Sheet

This sheet helps to ensure that reviews follow the appropriate procedures for the candidate's track. For example, with reviews for assistant, committees cannot divide the decisions on promotion and tenure.

Section 2: Summary of Candidate's Workload Assignment

This one-page form is filled out by heads to provide specifics on assigned duties. It should not praise contributions. It should specify what a figure such as "40% teaching" generally entails in the candidate's unit.

If the candidate's duties have changed over the time in rank, the changes should be specified.

Workload assignments should note shared appointments. *Shared appointments* are defined as those where candidates' budget lines are split between two or more units. The Promotion Dossiers for split appointments should include the *Checklist for Shared Appointments* ([Appendix A](#)). This form helps to ensure that the heads of the units and the individuals all agree upon the terms of the appointment, including the teaching load, service expectations, and the constitution of the peer-review committee. For candidates with shared appointments, department heads may collaborate on a single recommendation letter, or they may decide to submit separate recommendations.

Section 3: Departmental and College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Include a one-page summary following [Appendix B](#) format.

Section 4: Curriculum Vitae and List of Collaborators

The List of Collaborators should include all individuals who have collaborated with the candidate within the sixty months preceding the submission of the dossier. Such collaborations include coauthoring books, articles, abstracts, papers, or grant proposals or coediting journals, compendia, or conference proceedings. If the candidate has not collaborated with anyone in the last five years, simply note that fact in the list.

- Publications should be listed in chronological order.
- Place an * to the left of the title of publications substantially based on work done as a graduate student.
- Page numbers and all other publication data should be included.
- For foreign publications, provide English translations of titles.
- Peer-reviewed publications should be distinguished from proceedings and other publications.
- Scholarly presentations should be limited to period in rank.
- Distinguish invited from submitted presentations.
- List only pending or funded grants during the period in rank.
- Grants should be organized according to source of funding (federal, industry, foundations).
- Check the list of collaborators to ensure it is accurate.

Section 5: Candidate Statement

Candidate Statements vary across disciplines and types of positions. Some reviewers will specifically focus on assessing candidates' scholarship or position effectiveness while others will be more broadly interested in candidate's overall program of work. Candidates should speak with heads and committee chairs on such points.

Section 6: Teaching Portfolio

Candidates are responsible to provide information and supporting documentation on their teaching and advising. Syllabi, assignments, and other supporting documentation are for reviews by departmental committees and heads. **These instructional materials will not be forwarded for college or University reviews.**

Section 7: Evaluation of Teaching

In addition to their recommendation on promotion, departmental committees should submit a separate memo with an assessment of the candidate's Teaching Portfolio, an observation of the candidate's teaching and a review of the candidate's student evaluations. One recent teaching observation should be conducted and included in the dossier using the teaching observation tools developed by Office of Instruction and Assessment's [Review of Teaching Protocol](#). Please contact Dr. Ingrid Novodvorsky (novod@email.arizona.edu) for more information.

Evaluations of teaching should use the [Criteria for Peer Reviews of Teaching](#). These criteria are to be used for assessing candidates' teaching.

Section 8: Portfolio to Document Leadership in Service and Outreach

This section should be used by candidates whose outreach and service duties are a major part of their assigned duties. The Leadership Portfolio has two parts: an Overview of the candidate's service or outreach efforts and Supplementary Documentation that provides evidence and assessments of the candidate's impact. The Overview is forwarded for reviews at the college and university levels, while the Supplementary Documentation is for departmental reviews and will not generally be forwarded for subsequent reviews. Candidates who have significant service and outreach duties may request that external reviewers receive their portfolios. Collaborator letters should be included after external review letters.

For guidance on preparing these portfolios, candidates should consult our resource page on the scholarship of engagement: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship>.

Section 9: Documentation for Interdisciplinary Candidates

Reviews of candidates who are active in Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs and other interdisciplinary units should follow the *Guidelines for Acknowledgment and Evaluation of Faculty Participation in GIDPS and Other Interdisciplinary Units* ([Appendix C](#)). Candidates should discuss their interdisciplinary contributions in their Candidate Statement.

Section 10: Letters from Outside Evaluators (External and Internal)

Dossiers are required to include three to eight signed letters from academic departments outside or from the University of Arizona. Letters must be from independent, outside or internal evaluators who are not collaborators of the candidate and not from faculty in the same department as the candidate. Collaborators are defined as individuals who have coauthored books, articles, abstracts, or grant proposals within the five years before the submission of a dossier. Collaborators also include individuals who have been a candidate's dissertation advisor, supervisor, or close coworker in a lab, department, or residency program, even if this relationship occurred more than five years prior to the review. To ensure the independence of outside reviews, candidate may not influence or attempt to influence the assessments of outside evaluators.

All communications with external reviewers should be fully documented. A sample letter to external reviewers is included as [Appendix D](#). **Heads should not deviate from the exact wording of the sample letter only with the permission of their dean, and substantive changes must be approved by the Office of the Provost.** While candidates should suggest evaluators to their head, **no more than half of the evaluators can come from these suggestions.** If the candidate suggests the same reviewer as the head or committee, the reviewer should be counted as being from the candidate.

Section 11: Recommendations for Promotion

Administrators and committee members should not have collaborated with the candidate in a **substantial and ongoing** way. In such occurrences, they should recuse themselves and, in the case of a department head, appoint a surrogate head. If recusing committee members is not feasible, for example because of the size of

the department, the committee letters must address the concerns about the independence of the collaborators. If these concerns are not addressed, Dossiers may be returned to departments to provide committees with the opportunity to do so. If the candidate is active in a GIDP, an evaluation from the GIDP Chair should be included in Section 8. The positive and negative comments of the outside reviewers should be fairly and fully represented in the letters of the departmental committee and/or department head.

Avoiding the Most Common Problems in Dossiers

When procedures are not followed, Dossiers have to be returned to departments to repeat the reviews at each level in the process. **Six problems result in most of the returns of Dossiers to departments.** All Dossiers should be reviewed to check on these problems to avoid delays.

1. Does the Workload Assignment describe the candidate's duties in non-evaluative terms that provide adequate details on the candidate's teaching load and any split appointments? As the first document in the dossier, the Workload Assignment provides the baseline for reviewers to make independent assessments of candidates' achievements, so the workload description should not praise the candidates' contributions. While a position description should not use evaluative terms, it should provide enough detail to clarify how many courses are expected and what duties are included in the appointment.

2. Were no more than half of the external reviewers suggested by the candidate, and did the process follow the prescribed procedures, including the required template? No more than half of the reviewers can come from the candidate's suggestions. Each step in the process should be documented using the checklist in the Dossier Template. Any changes in the letter to reviewers must be approved by the Provost's Office.

3. Were any coauthors and collaborators of candidates included as external reviewers, committee members, or administrators? The University looks to external reviewers to provide an independent assessment, and their impartiality is called into question when they have collaborated with a candidate. Collaborators should not serve as external or internal reviewers. Questions about the independence of reviewers can lead to Dossiers being returned to departments and colleges.

As with the provisions used by NSF and other groups to ensure the impartiality of reviews, collaborators are defined as individuals who have coauthored books, articles, abstracts, or grant proposals within the last five years. Collaborators also include individuals who have been a candidate's dissertation advisor, supervisor, or close coworker in a lab, department, or residency program, even if this occurred more than five years prior to the review.

Committee members or administrators who have coauthored substantial publications or grants with a candidate should recuse themselves to avoid raising concerns about their impartiality. Rather than serving on review committees or in administrative roles, collaborators should provide a separate letter that describes the independent contributions of the candidate. Collaborator letters are placed immediately after external review letters and have a comparable impact. If recusal is not feasible, for example because of the size of a department, concerns about conflicts of interest must be addressed in the letter reviewing the candidate. Questions about this matter should be directed to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

4. Are there sufficient independent outside review letters (three minimum) received to conduct the full review? A search of the dossier materials in electronic form (PDF) is necessary to ensure that all requested and solicited letters from outside reviewers are truly independent of the candidate. If it is found that outside reviewers are close friends, former co-workers, mentors, mentees of the candidate, then additional independent letters must be solicited. Especially, if the total letters for outside reviewers do not meet the minimum (three minimum, eight maximum) to continue with the internal review of the dossier.

5. Is a separate teaching review provided by the department committee following the Office of Instruction and Assessment's [Peer Review Protocol](#)? This memo should be included in section seven of the dossier. Detailed assessments of candidates' teaching are particularly essential with unusual teaching assignments such as team-taught classes or residencies. If Teacher-Course Evaluations are not available, student assessments should be provided along with benchmarks for comparative assessments. Summaries of students' individual comments should be prepared by committees to ensure the comments are representative. Dossiers that do not have reviews of teaching ([Section 7](#)) should be returned by college offices to departments to avoid creating subsequent delays.

6. Is a faculty member serving as a surrogate head for their current department head/director's review for promotion? Deans and delegated Associate Deans can appoint a surrogate outside of the department to conduct the review to mitigate any issues of mentoring, internal collaborations or questions of maintaining a balanced process.