

# PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS 2020-2021

## SECTION 1: SUMMARY DATA SHEET

DATE:

NAME:

EMPLOYEE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER:

CURRENT TITLE:

HOME DEPARTMENT:

COLLEGE:

CAMPUS ADDRESS:

UA BUILDING:

ROOM #

PO BOX#

SHARED APPOINTMENT:

SHARED: FACULTY MEMBER'S BUDGET LINE IS SPLIT BETWEEN TWO OR MORE DEPARTMENTS. INCLUDE APPENDIX A: CHECKLIST FOR SHARED APPOINTMENTS

TERMINAL DEGREE:

MONTH/YEAR OF TERMINAL DEGREE:

FINAL YEAR OF TENURE ELIGIBILITY:

FOR TENURE-ELIGIBLE (TE) FACULTY ONLY

TITLE FOR WHICH YOU ARE APPLYING:

---

FACULTY TRACK:	TENURE ELIGIBLE	TENURED	
REVIEW TYPE:	MANDATORY REVIEW	EARLY REVIEW	3 <sup>RD</sup> YEAR RETENTION
	PROMOTION (P) TO ASSOCIATE RANK WITH TENURE (T) <small>(VOTES ON P&amp;T ARE NOT SEPARATED FOR CANDIDATES CONSIDERED FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE)</small>		
	PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR WITH TENURE <small>(VOTES CAN BE SEPARATED FOR CANDIDATES CONSIDERED FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR WITH TENURE)</small>		
	TENURE ONLY, NO PROMOTION IN RANK		
	PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR RANK		
	TRACK TRANSFER (EX: FROM CAREER TRACK ASST. PROF. TO ASST. PROF. TENURE ELIGIBLE)		

---

### FACULTY SERVICE ELSEWHERE AFTER TERMINAL DEGREE

INSTITUTION	DATES	RANK/TITLE
-------------	-------	------------

### FACULTY SERVICE AT THE UA

INSTITUTION	DATES	RANK/TITLE
-------------	-------	------------

## SECTION 2: SUMMARY OF CANDIDATE'S WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENT

### SUMMARY OF WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENT FOR:

DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL OF:

FTE:

Duties for the period 2013-14 through 2020-21 have been distributed as follows:

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Teaching %								
Research %								
Service/Outreach % <i>Internal and External</i>								
Administrative Service %								
Clinical Service %								
Extension%								
Other Professional Activities% <small>Name &amp; describe activity</small>								
Clock Delays or Leave(s)*								
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

\* Do not include percentages for years in which candidates were on leaves without pay and did not have assigned duties, but do include percentages for years with clock delays to recognize candidates' assigned duties. Use an asterisk for years with delays.

#### Requirements to meet departmental expectations for **TEACHING**:

Example: 40% teaching means approximately four 3-unit courses each academic year. This should correspond to general expectations in the department. Do not list specific course numbers, student names, etc.

#### Requirements to meet departmental expectations for **RESEARCH**:

Example: 40% research, which means an active research program that produces publishable research and/or tools or instruments that contribute to such research and grants. Do not list research projects, grants, or any information that specifically relates to the candidate's activities, as opposed to general expectations in the department/unit.

#### Requirements to meet departmental expectations for **SERVICE**:

Example: 20% service, which includes service to the department and university, participation or leadership in national or international scientific organizations or advisory groups, and outreach to schools and the general public. Do not list committees the candidate has served on or specific service duties.

#### Requirements and description for workload assignment in **ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE, CLINICAL SERVICE, EXTENSION** (please see note below following "Additional Pages Attached"), and **OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES**:

Use Appendix A for Shared Appointments and Appendix C for participation in GIDPs and other interdisciplinary units.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Candidate's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department Head's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

he Additional Pages Attached:

## **SECTION 2A: IMPACT ON CAREER PROGRESSION FROM COVID-19 (OPTIONAL)**

Candidates can use this subsection of the dossier to describe the influence of COVID-19 on any aspect of their position (e.g. changes in research/creative activities, teaching, service, job position, clinical service, etc.). Please note that Student Course Surveys and Peer Observations were not conducted during Spring 2020 for the majority of faculty and are not required in the promotion dossier from that semester. The purpose of this section is to help reviewers understand how changes implemented due to the global pandemic of COVID 19, which began in Spring 2020 may have impacted the trajectory of the candidate's work. Please provide up to one-page description (single spaced) for this subsection.

### **SECTION 3: DEPARTMENT AND COLLEGE PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**Include:** *Relevant parts* of departmental *and* college promotion and tenure criteria summarized using the **one-page** format as an aid to the University Advisory Committee in its deliberations. See example in [Appendix B](#). You may also include the full set of guidelines if you feel that it would be helpful.

## SECTION 4: CURRICULUM VITAE AND LIST OF COLLABORATORS

### CURRICULUM VITAE

#### Chronology of Education

All colleges and universities attended  
Institutions, degrees and dates awarded  
Title of doctoral dissertation/master's thesis *and* name of director/advisor  
Major field(s)

#### Chronology of Employment

 Include active Shared and Courtesy Appointments at UA

#### Honors and Awards

#### Service/Outreach

 Limit to period in current rank or last five-years in current rank.

Local/State Outreach	College Committee(s)
National/International Outreach	University Committee(s)
Departmental Committee(s)	Other Committees (Internal or External)

#### Publications/Creative Activity (Published or Accepted in Chronological Order)

*Place a \* to the left of any publication title substantially based on work done as a graduate student.  
Provide English translations of titles for foreign publications. Include all publication information, including page numbers and the sequence of co-authors' names.*

Scholarly books and monographs (distinguish scholarly works vs. textbooks)  
Chapters in scholarly books and monographs  
Refereed journal articles, published or accepted in final form  
Other publications

#### Work in Progress (Include all publications/creative activity that is under review, in progress or not yet submitted)

##### Media

Performances	Exhibits	Shows	Recordings (audio/video)
--------------	----------	-------	--------------------------

#### Conferences/Scholarly Presentations

Limit to period in current rank or last five-years in current rank. Distinguish between invited from submitted presentations.

Colloquia	Seminars	Symposia	Conferences
-----------	----------	----------	-------------

#### Awarded Grants and Contracts

Limit to period in current rank or last five-years in current rank. List percent effort on grant; role [PI, Co-PIs]; all co-PIs; source and amount.

Federal	State	Industry	Private Foundation
---------	-------	----------	--------------------

#### LIST of COLLABORATORS and their Organizational Affiliations

Collaborators include all individuals who have within five-years or 60 months preceding the submission of this dossier co-authored on projects, books, articles, reports, abstracts, papers or grant proposals.

List of collaborators on grants and publications from last five years  
Graduate, Postdoctoral, Thesis Advisors or Sponsors

#### Signed Statement by Candidate

The candidate's signature should appear on the last page of **Section 5** with the following statement: ***Sections 4 and 5 are true and accurate statements of my activities and accomplishments. I understand that misrepresentation in securing promotion on the career or tenure track may lead to dismissal or suspension under ABOR Policy 6-201 J.***

## SECTION 5: CANDIDATE STATEMENT

### Candidate Statement of Accomplishments and Objectives (3-5 pages)

For advice on the Candidate Statement, see the Guide to the Promotion Process for Continuing and/ or Tenure Track: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/guide-promotion-process>. Or, the Guide to the Career-Track Promotion Process: [https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2019.06.21\\_19-20%20Guide%20to%20the%20Career-Track%20Promotion%20Process\\_Final.pdf](https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2019.06.21_19-20%20Guide%20to%20the%20Career-Track%20Promotion%20Process_Final.pdf)

Candidates may also wish to consult the “Inclusive View of Scholarship” in the University’s promotion criteria: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship>.

#### **Signed Statement by Candidate on the CAREER Track**

The candidate's signature should appear on the last page of Section 5 with the following statement: ***Sections 4 and 5 are true and accurate statements of my activities and accomplishments. I understand that misrepresentation in securing promotion on the career track may lead to dismissal or suspension under ABOR Policy 6-201 J.***

#### **Signed Statement by Candidate on the CONTINUING Track**

The candidate's signature should appear on the last page of Section 5 with the following statement: ***Sections 4 and 5 are true and accurate statements of my activities and accomplishments. I understand that misrepresentation in securing career-track promotion may lead to dismissal or suspension under ABOR Policy 6-302 G.***

#### **Signed Statement by Candidate on the TENURE Track**

The candidate's signature should appear on the last page of Section 5 with the following statement: ***Sections 4 and 5 are true and accurate statements of my activities and accomplishments. I understand that misrepresentation in securing promotion on the tenure track may lead to dismissal or suspension under ABOR Policy 6-201 J.***

## SECTION 6: TEACHING PORTFOLIO

Candidates have the opportunity in the teaching portfolio to represent their teaching through a wide range of information and supporting documentation to demonstrate their teaching quality, outcomes assessment, and course design. Portfolios may include a statement of teaching philosophy (no more than 3 pages) that is additional to the candidate statement, which provides reflection on your goals as a teacher, your pedagogical approach, as well as course development or design changes over time.

**Information on Teaching and Advising** will be forwarded to college/university committees.  
**Supporting Documentation** will NOT be forwarded to college or university committees; this material is summarized in the departmental letters by the department committee and department head.

Candidates may use the Service Portfolio in Section 8 to document their leadership of curricular reforms beyond their own classes. Questions may be directed to Asya Roberts: [asya@arizona.edu](mailto:asya@arizona.edu) or 626-0202.

### INFORMATION on TEACHING and ADVISING

(**FORWARD** with the dossier for college and university review)

**Extent of Teaching** Limit to period in current rank or last five-years in current rank

List of Courses Taught (We encourage you to use the table format provided here: [click to download table template](#)).

- Note if classes are taught online or in other nontraditional formats.

**Course Descriptions** Limit to period in current rank or last five-years in current rank

Brief Statements (2-3 sentences) on courses are useful to characterize student populations and instructional settings.

**Student Evaluations** Limit to period in current rank or last five-years in current rank

TCE Comparison Reports and SCS Reports ([Candidates should provide reports in the teaching portfolio.](#))

**Individual Student Contact** Limit to period in current rank or last five-years in current rank

Collaborations with undergraduates and graduates on research projects

Advising (number of undergraduate advisees)

Mentoring and Career counseling

Participation in honors program

Faculty advising of clubs and associations

Off-campus internships, service learning and other engagement activities

Clinical instruction

Independent studies directed and in progress

Theses directed and in progress

Dissertations directed and in progress

Service on other dissertation and graduate committees

### Contributions to Instructional Innovations and Collaborations

Limit to period in current rank or last five-years in current rank

Teaching workshops attended or delivered

Development of online and other course materials

Collaborations on curricular and outcomes assessment committees

Research on curriculum and pedagogy that contributes to such collaborations

**Teaching Awards and Teaching Grants** Limit to period in current rank or last five-years in current rank

Department and college

National and international

University

Grants for teaching innovations

Continue to Next Page

**Prepared by the Candidate**

## SECTION 6: TEACHING PORTFOLIO

**Teaching Philosophy Statement (optional)** Limit to a total of 3 pages

**Peer Observations (optional)** Limit to period in current rank or last five-years in current rank.

Please **include any previous teaching observations *not done*** for promotion review.

### SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

*(DOES NOT GET FORWARDED* with the dossier for college and university review, this content is summarized in the departmental letters written by the department committee and department head)

Syllabi and major assignments

Examples of course content (lecture material, activities, websites, etc.)

Curricular reviews, and other contributions to scholarship on teaching

Open-ended student comments from TCE or SCS

Examples of student product or outcomes from courses, research, or mentoring activities

### Teaching Portfolio Additional Resources

More information on portfolios is available on line: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/teaching-portfolios-and-reviews>

#### Online Resources on Teaching Portfolios

- [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](http://medsci.indiana.edu/m620/sotl_08/teaching_portfolio_rubric.pdf)
- [Inclusive Curricula and Classrooms Classroom observations](#), Candidate Statements, and other aspects of Teaching Portfolios should demonstrate that candidates are utilizing evidence-based methods such as universal design principles to meet the needs of all learners, including those from traditionally unrepresented backgrounds. Further information on inclusive pedagogies is available at <https://diversity.arizona.edu/creating-inclusive-classrooms>



## SECTION 7: PEER OBSERVATION AND PROVOST AWARD FOR INNOVATIONS IN TEACHING NOMINATION

### Peer Observation by Departmental Committee

It is **preferred** for a member of the departmental review committee to conduct at least one peer observation of teaching during the year before or semester of the promotion review. Observations of teaching for candidates undergoing a promotion review will use the [Classroom Observation Tool](#) from the Office of Instruction and Assessment (OIA). **Please include the report and letter from the classroom observation conducted for promotion review in this section.** For assistance with peer observations, please contact Dr. Ingrid Novodvorsky in the Office of Instruction and Assessment: [novod@email.arizona.edu](mailto:novod@email.arizona.edu). It is recommended that units choose 10 items (out of the 82 possible) to guide the observation; the unit may choose the items based on the specific course or overall unit teaching philosophy. A pre-observation meeting can be conducted with the candidate. There is no need to meet with the candidate after completing the observation for the promotion review.

### Nomination Memo for Provost Award for Innovations in Teaching

Departmental committees are encouraged to write a **memo to nominate candidates for the Provost Award for Innovations in Teaching** for candidates who have made significant contributions to innovation in teaching. Candidates will NOT be considered for this award without this nomination memo. This award is only available for candidates going through the promotion process.

[Criteria](#) for nomination that can be highlighted in the nomination memo include the following types of innovations or recognition of innovation:

- Innovative teaching strategies;
- Active learning strategies and other evidence-based instructional practices;
- Well-structured course syllabi with defined learning outcomes;
- Inclusive teaching strategies and course content to address diverse learning styles and experiences;
- Development of new cutting-edge courses, new content or new pedagogy;
- Involvement in workshops and collaborative reforms of teaching;
- Innovation of collaborative learning spaces;
- Leadership in faculty learning communities;
- Impactful student evaluations and comments for student learning, achievement, and outcomes;
- Teaching awards, grants, and other recognized achievements in teaching; and
- Effective mentoring and advising, including collaborations with students from diverse backgrounds.

**Prepared by the Departmental Committee**

## **SECTION 8: PORTFOLIO TO DOCUMENT LEADERSHIP IN SERVICE AND OUTREACH (OPTIONAL IN CAREER AND TENURE REVIEWS)**

Candidates can use this section to document the impact of their leadership on outreach, service, and instructional programs. While the Service and Outreach Portfolio is optional in promotion and tenure reviews, it is required in continuing status reviews if a candidate is responsible for a major outreach program, as in Cooperative Extension or the University Libraries. The Service and Outreach Portfolio provides candidates with an opportunity to describe and document a program they have developed. This documentation is for departmental reviews and should only include information for the time in rank, or if that time is limited, the last five years. Please note some items are not forwarded to college/university committees. However, if a candidate has provided significant leadership in developing outreach, curricular or other initiatives, he or she may request that the department head or committee chair send the Service and Outreach Portfolio to external reviewers.

- Service and Outreach Portfolios can be used to document collaborations with business and community partners, tech transfer and commercialization activities, and other forms of translational research highlighted in the inclusive view of scholarship included in the University's promotion criteria: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship>
- Candidates should consult our resource page on the scholarship of engagement: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship>

### **PROGRAM OVERVIEW** (*FORWARD* with the dossier for college and university review)

#### **Description of Program**

Provide a short description of the service or other educational programming provided by the candidate, including the program goals and objectives. Describe the needs that the program is intended to serve, the ways its components were developed, and the methods used to communicate to potential audiences.

#### **Assessment of Program**

Describe the assessments that have been developed for the program, including the feedback from collaborators and clients that is included below. Characterize the program's accomplishments and provide specific measures of the program's success and the ways they were obtained.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION** (*DO NOT FORWARD* with the dossier for college and university review)

Limit to period in current rank or last five-years in current rank.

#### **Supporting Documentation**

Materials from seminars or workshops

Technical reports, research studies, and presentations

Newsletters, pamphlets, and articles for popular and special interest publications

Online resources developed for community, business, agency, or disciplinary associations

Expert testimony or consultations

#### **Documentation of Impact**

Letters from community or business collaborators noting the impact of the programs or services

Department committee solicited letters from collaborators must be included in section 10.

Letters from academic collaborators noting the impact and/or methodological rigor of the contributions Department committee solicited letters from collaborators must be included in section 10.

News reports on service contributions

Grants secured to support or build on service contributions

Contracts to support contributions

Adoptions of programs and materials by other institutions or groups

## **SECTION 9: MEMBERSHIPS IN GRADUATE OR OTHER INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS**

Reviews of candidates who are members of Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs (GIDPs) or involved with other interdisciplinary programs should follow the *Guidelines of Acknowledgment and Evaluation of Faculty Participation in Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs and other Interdisciplinary Units* ([Appendix C](#)). Candidates may also choose to discuss their GIDPs or other interdisciplinary participation in their Candidate Statements.

### **Documentation of Candidate's Membership(s) in GIDPs or other Interdisciplinary Programs or Initiatives**

Candidate's Description of relevant activities relating to interdisciplinarity

**Prepared by the Candidate**

---

### **Evaluation(s) of Candidate's Contributions to GIDPs and Other Interdisciplinary Programs**

A written evaluation of candidate should be made by the chairperson of the relevant GIDP or interdisciplinary program and provided to departmental committee for inclusion in the dossier.

Additional information (if appropriate) may also be provided by the chairperson of the relevant GIDP or other interdisciplinary program to the departmental committee for inclusion in the dossier.

**Prepared by the Chairperson of the relevant GIDP or Interdisciplinary Initiative**

---

Summary and evaluation of the candidate's contributions to the GIDPs or other interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary programs.

**Prepared by the Departmental Committee**

## SECTION 10: LETTERS FROM INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL REVIEWERS AND COLLABORATORS

### Independent External Reviewers

Complete and sign the [worksheet](#), part 1 & 2, for the selection of independent external reviewers.

*The candidate should suggest possible reviewers to the department head, but **no more than half of the reviewers can come from the candidate**. If the candidate suggests the same reviewer as the head or committee, the reviewer should be counted as being from the candidate. Each step in the process of enlisting reviewers must be documented in part 2 of the worksheet. **Reviewers must be a rank higher than the current rank of the candidate**. Supervisors who have collaborated with the candidate in the last five-years, must recuse themselves from the selection process of external reviewers and the promotion review.*

Brief statement on each external reviewer's national or international standing. (See [Bio Template](#))  
**DO NOT include full/short CVs or screen shots of web pages.**

Provide a copy of the letter sent by the head or chair of the review committee. Use the required template letter in [Appendix D](#) at: [https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2020-21\\_AppendixD\\_PT\\_Required%20Template%20Letter%20to%20Independent%20External%20Reviewers.pdf](https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2020-21_AppendixD_PT_Required%20Template%20Letter%20to%20Independent%20External%20Reviewers.pdf)

*The letter sent to reviewers must not deviate from the sample letter without permission of a dean. Letters with substantial changes must be approved by the Office of the Provost.*

Three to eight (*minimum of three, however, five are strongly encouraged*) letters signed and printed on letterhead from independent, external reviewers who are NOT collaborators of the candidate. Letters that may be identified as coming from collaborators, as defined below, will not be considered among independent external letters. They will be placed in the section for collaborator letters. Letters must be solicited and received during the current promotion cycle.

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

*The University looks to external reviewers to provide an independent assessment, and their impartiality is paramount to maintaining the rigor of the external review process. Collaborators must not serve as external or internal reviewers. Questions about the independence of reviewers can lead to Dossiers being returned to departments and colleges.*

### Letters from Collaborators (encouraged, but **not required** and **placed after Independent External Letters**)

Brief statement on each collaborator's national or international standing. (See [Bio Template](#))  
**DO NOT include full/short CVs or screen shots of web pages.**

Solicited letters signed and printed on letterhead from collaborators. Use the sample letter in [Appendix E](#) at [https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2020-21\\_AppendixE\\_CT\\_CSP\\_PT\\_Template%20Ltr%20Collaborators.pdf](https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2020-21_AppendixE_CT_CSP_PT_Template%20Ltr%20Collaborators.pdf)

Unsolicited letters of support must be signed and printed on letterhead.

# WORKSHEET FOR THE SELECTION OF INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Include Independent External Reviewers Considered During the Process

Download a sortable spreadsheet [here](#).

External Reviewers Information (Alphabetize)	Suggested by	Independent	Reviewer Contacted	Response	Letter Received by Department?
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:

\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE OF DEPARTMENT HEAD

*\*Independent is defined as **not** the candidate's major professor, supervisor, co-author, co-PI/investigator, dissertation advisor, collaborator, or otherwise closely associated with the candidate.*

## WORKSHEET FOR THE SELECTION OF COLLABORATORS

Include Collaborators Considered During the Process

Download a sortable spreadsheet [here](#).

Collaborator Information (Alphabetize)	Suggested by	Independent	Collaborator Contacted	Response	Letter Received by Department?
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:
Name: Title: Institution:	Dept. Head Candidate Committee	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Reason if no:	Yes No Date Received:

\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE OF DEPARTMENT HEAD

*\*Independent is defined as **not** the candidate's major professor, supervisor, co-author, co-PI/investigator, dissertation advisor, collaborator, or otherwise closely associated with the candidate.*

## **WORKSHEET FOR THE SELECTION OF INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL REVIEWERS**

## **PART II**

### **To Be Completed By the Department Head or Director**

Describe the selection process for independent external reviewers. If initial contact was made to discover the availability of outside reviewers prior to the letter (Appendix D) being sent, include the wording of the message sent. What criteria were used to select reviewers? Include the roles of the committee and the department head in the selection process.

**BRIEF STATEMENT ON EACH REVIEWER'S NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL STANDING**

Reviewer Name:

Selected by:

Organization:

Title:

Brief Bio:

Reviewer Name:

Selected by:

Organization:

Title:

Brief Bio:

Reviewer Name:

Selected by:

Organization:

Title:

Brief Bio:



**BRIEF STATEMENT ON EACH REVIEWER'S NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL STANDING**

Reviewer Name:

Selected by:

Organization:

Title:

Brief Bio:

Reviewer Name:

Selected by:

Organization:

Title:

Brief Bio:

Reviewer Name:

Selected by:

Organization:

Title:

Brief Bio:

**BRIEF STATEMENT ON EACH COLLABORATOR'S NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL STANDING**

Reviewer Name:

Selected by:

Organization:

Title:

Brief Bio:

Reviewer Name:

Selected by:

Organization:

Title:

Brief Bio:

Reviewer Name:

Selected by:

Organization:

Title:

Brief Bio:

**BRIEF STATEMENT ON EACH COLLABORATOR'S NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL STANDING**

Reviewer Name:

Selected by:

Organization:

Title:

Brief Bio:

Reviewer Name:

Selected by:

Organization:

Title:

Brief Bio:

Reviewer Name:

Selected by:

Organization:

Title:

Brief Bio:

## SECTION 11: INTERNAL EVALUATIONS FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

Promotion reviews are based on assessments of candidates' assigned teaching, service, research, and other duties according to benchmarks set out in department, college and University criteria. In making such assessments, internal reviewers should follow the policies in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel for [promotion and tenure](#), along with the University's Statement on Professional Conduct in [UHAP 7.01.01](#). That Statement sets out the expectation that all faculty are accountable and must be inclusive and respectful, demonstrate integrity, follow established standards, protect University assets, and provide a safe environment for those who work, learn, and visit with us. If a candidate has been found to have committed research or other forms of professional misconduct, that finding may be considered in promotion reviews. Findings of professional misconduct should be assessed against how they affect candidates' abilities to achieve the purposes of their assigned teaching, research and service duties. More information on these provisions is provided in the Guide to the Promotion Process.

**Please see Section 10 for a full description of independent assessment that is relevant not only for external reviewers, but also for internal reviewers.** *Committee members or administrators who have coauthored substantial publications or grants with a candidate must recuse themselves to avoid raising concerns about their impartiality. Rather than serving on review committees or as an administrative reviewer, collaborators should provide a separate letter that describes the independent contributions of the candidate. Collaborator letters are placed immediately after the independent external review letters in section 10. Any questions regarding whether committee members, heads or deans are independent or collaborators should be discussed with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs before the committee meets.* Questions on these procedures should be directed to Asya Roberts in the Provost's Office at 626-0202 or [asya@arizona.edu](mailto:asya@arizona.edu).

### Department Committee's Report

Dated letter addressed to head or director on letterhead with signatures of committee including the following content:

- ***Vote count on promotion and/or tenure, including recusals, abstentions and absences;***
- Evaluation of research, scholarship, or creative activities;
- Evaluation of teaching and advising with a thorough discussion of the candidate's teaching portfolio considering the following criteria:
  - Evaluation and summary of content in the section on teaching and advising (this material from the candidate will move forward to the college level);
  - Evaluation and summary of content in the supporting documentation (***this material from the candidate does NOT move to the college level; therefore, this summary is the source for next level evaluations***);
- Evaluation of service and/or outreach activities;
- Summary and discussion of external reviewer recommendations and comments;
- Minority viewpoint (if there was a split vote on the decision); and
- Explanation of any committee members' collaboration with candidate that has already been deemed to not be a conflict of interest.

### Department Head or Director's Evaluation

Dated letter addressed to dean on letterhead with signature of head or director including the following content:

- ***Recommendation on promotion and/or tenure;***
- Independent assessment of candidate's teaching and advising, service, and research, scholarship, or creative activities;
- Summary and discussion of external and internal reviews;
- ***Explanation of any full departmental faculty vote; and***  
Explanation of any collaboration with candidate that has already been deemed to not be a conflict of interest.

**Continue to Next Page**

## College Committee's Report

Dated letter addressed to dean on letterhead with signatures of all committee members including the following content:

- ***Vote count on promotion and/or tenure, including recusals, abstentions and absences;***
- Evaluation of teaching and advising, service, and research, scholarship, or creative activities; *(Supporting documentation from the candidate's teaching and/or service portfolios can be requested if necessary.)*
- Summary and discussion of prior external and internal reviews;
- Minority viewpoint (if there was a split vote); and
- Explanation of any committee members' collaboration with candidate that has already been deemed to not be a conflict of interest.

## Dean's Evaluation

Dated letter addressed to the Provost on letterhead with signature of dean including the following content:

- ***Recommendation on promotion and/or tenure;***
- Independent assessment of candidate's teaching and advising, service, and research, scholarship, or creative activities; *(Supporting documentation from the candidate's teaching and/or service portfolios can be requested if necessary.)*
- Summary and discussion of external and internal reviews; and
- Explanation of any collaboration with candidate that has already been deemed to not be a conflict of interest.

**Prepared by the College**



**8. PEER EVALUATIONS**

Committee will be composed of the peer review committee from the primary unit and at least one member of the secondary unit.

Evaluation criteria Please use percentages for teaching, research, and service.

Primary Unit:	Teaching	Research	Service
Secondary Unit:	Teaching	Research	Service

**9. PROBATIONARY, TENURE/CONTINUING STATUS AND PROMOTION REVIEWS**

Tenure/continuing status is held in the primary academic unit. Review committees will be composed of members of the tenure/continuing status and promotion committee of the primary unit and at least one member of the secondary unit. A single dossier will be forwarded to the dean.

**10. OFFICE SPACE AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT:**

Office is provided by the primary unit or secondary unit.

Administrative support is provided by the primary unit or secondary unit.

Travel funds are provided by the primary unit or secondary unit. Normally \$ are provided in travel funds. Travel funds typically are for the following purposes:

**11. ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS**

**SIGNATURES – PRIMARY UNIT**

_____	_____	_____
<small>Signature, Department Head</small>	<small>Print Name</small>	<small>Date</small>

**SIGNATURES – SECONDARY UNIT**

_____	_____	_____
<small>Signature, Department Head</small>	<small>Print Name</small>	<small>Date</small>

**APPENDIX B: [DEPARTMENT] CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO [RANK/TITLE AND TENURE OR CONTINUING STATUS]**

*NOTE: CANDIDATE FOR [TENURE OR CONTINUING STATUS] MUST ALSO MEET THE CRITERIA FOR RANK AT WHICH [TENURE OR CONTINUING STATUS] IS SOUGHT.*

	<b>Associate [Title]</b>	<b>Full [Title]</b>
<b>Teaching</b>	Contributes to department's teaching load. Receives positive student evaluations. Contributes to development of department's academic program evidenced by contributions to course syllabi. Receives favorable peer teaching evaluations from senior colleagues. Participates in student advising, including service on graduate students' thesis or dissertation committees.	Exercises leadership in department's teaching load. Receives recognition as a teacher through awards or other documentation. Exercises leadership in department's academic program development as evidenced by experience in originating or revising courses as documented in course syllabi. Receives positive student and peer teaching evaluations. Outstanding record of student advising, including service as chair of graduate students' thesis or dissertation committees.
<b>Research or Scholarly/Creative Activity</b>	Engages in quality original research/scholarly activity as evidenced by publication record. Establishes the promise of sustained scholarly activity in one or more areas. Provides evidence of recognition at regional and national levels. Contributes to grants and contract activities. Involves graduate students in collaborative research and scholarly activities.	Demonstrates record as a productive scholar through continuing publication activity over a period of years. Establishes a clear and coherent line of inquiry. Provides evidence of recognition at national and international levels. Exercises leadership in seeking outside funding for research through grants and contracts. Exercises students in collaborative research and scholarly activities.
<b>Service/Outreach</b>	Contributes to department committees. Contributes to profession through service to professional organizations and/or professional journals. Contributes to local or state policy by sharing expertise.	Exercises leadership in department through service as committee chairperson and/or outstanding and continued service to department committees. Contributes to college and university committees. Contributes to profession through outstanding and continued service to professional organizations and/or professional journals, providing evidence of national and international impact.



## **APPENDIX C: GUIDELINES FOR ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND EVALUATION OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN GRADUATE INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS AND OTHER INTERDISCIPLINARY UNITS**

In 1992 the Faculty Senate approved the policy that faculty efforts in “interdisciplinary activities should be recognized” in promotion (career, tenure or continuing status) reviews. This Appendix provides updated guidelines on the procedures for acknowledgment and evaluation of faculty participation in the teaching, research, and service activities of Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs (GIDPs) and other interdisciplinary units

### **Policy**

In cases where participation in the activities of GIDPs and interdisciplinary units comprises an integral part of a candidates’ professional activities, these efforts should be included and acknowledged in promotion reviews at all levels of evaluation along with other relevant activities.

### **Implementation Procedures**

The following are the implementation guidelines:

1. A faculty person who is a member of a GIDP or actively involved in an interdisciplinary unit such as BIO5 will be asked to include, as part of his or her Promotion Dossier, the details of relevant activities (teaching, research, and service) in the appropriate GIDP or interdisciplinary unit.
2. The head of the home department shall request an evaluation from the chair of the relevant GIDP or director of the interdisciplinary unit. This written evaluation will report on the degree of participation and the quality of the activities of the candidate in the GIDP or unit.
3. This evaluation should be written by the chair of the GIDP or director of the unit (in accordance with the prevailing policies of the relevant home department and/or college). The evaluation will be sent to the candidate’s home department promotion committee for inclusion in the candidate’s Promotion Dossier.
4. Additional input may also be solicited from the GIDP or unit whenever it is deemed appropriate e.g., when the candidate has served as a chair of a GIDP or interdisciplinary unit. This inclusion will be done with the candidate’s written consent.
5. Once documentation of activities in GIDP or interdisciplinary unit has been incorporated into the candidate’s dossier, it shall be considered by the department, college, and university promotion committees as an integral part of the evaluation of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure.
6. When candidates have significant participation in a GIDP or interdisciplinary unit, a representative from the unit or GIDP should be asked to serve on the departmental committee.

## APPENDIX D: REQUIRED TEMPLATE FOR LETTER TO SOLICIT INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Dear Referee:

The Department of *[name of department]* is evaluating *[name of candidate]* for *[examples: promotion to associate professor with tenure; tenure-only; promotion to full professor]*.

Since you are recognized as a leading scholar in *[name of candidate]*'s field, we would appreciate your assistance in assessing the candidate's record of work. The University of Arizona values an [inclusive view of scholarship](#) in the recognition that knowledge is acquired and advanced through discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Given this perspective, promotion and tenure reviews, as detailed in the criteria of individual departments and colleges, will recognize 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.

In your letter, please note how well you know the candidate. If you have collaborated with the candidate within the last five years, we will appreciate your describing the nature and extent of your collaborations. The University of Arizona defines collaborators as individuals who within the last five years have coauthored books, articles, abstracts, and grant proposals. Collaborators also include individuals such as dissertation advisors, mentors and former coworkers who have worked so closely with a candidate that questions may arise about whether they can offer independent assessments of the candidate's achievements. Rather than submitting external review letters, collaborators are invited to submit collaborator letters that outline the significance of the independent contributions of candidates.

We have attached the following materials to help you evaluate *[name of candidate]*'s record:

1. *Section 2: Summary of Workload Assignment;*
2. *Section 3: Department, Unit and College Criteria;*
3. *Section 4: Curriculum Vitae and List of Collaborators;*
4. *Section 5: Candidate Statement;*
5. *(Optional) Section 6: Teaching Portfolio and/or Section 8: Leadership Portfolio for Service and Outreach; and*
6. a representative set of *[examples: articles; slides; audio and/or video recordings]*

**This paragraph may be included if appropriate to the candidate:** The University of Arizona highly values interdisciplinarity, so we request that you also consider *[name of candidate]*'s interdisciplinary contributions to teaching, research and service. As part of *[name of candidate]*'s duties, *[they]* participate in the following interdisciplinary units and/or Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs: *[Names of units and/or GIDPs]*. A description of *[name of candidate]*'s interdisciplinary efforts in these programs is included in the dossier.

We appreciate your providing a detailed assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's research record, including the significance and impact of candidate's disciplinary contributions, recognition at national or international levels, and promise of sustained scholarly activity. As part of your assessment, please evaluate the relative ranking of the journals, presses and other venues in which the candidate has published. Our criteria also include consideration of teaching and service. If you have information and recommendations based on these areas, we will appreciate your comments on them. **Finally, we ask that you specifically state if you recommend that the candidate be awarded *[examples: promotion to associate professor with tenure; tenure-only; promotion to full professor]*.**

I greatly appreciate your willingness to invest your time in this process. Please include a copy of your abbreviated curriculum vitae with your review. Your recommendation will be treated with the greatest possible confidentiality permitted by the Arizona Board of Regents' policy and applicable law.

Please return your evaluation by *[date]*. If you are unable to do so or have questions about the process, please let me know as soon as possible. Thank you for your contributions to this review.

## APPENDIX E: SUGGESTED TEMPLATES TO SOLICIT LETTERS FROM RESEARCH COLLABORATORS AND FROM PROFESSIONAL, CLIENT OR OTHER COMMUNITY COLLABORATORS

Dear **[Name of Research Collaborator]**:

The Department of [name of department] is evaluating the academic and professional standing of [name of candidate], who is being considered for [examples: promotion to associate rank with continuing status or tenure; tenure-only, continuing status only; or promotion to full rank].

Since you have collaborated with [name of candidate], we would appreciate your assistance in assessing the candidate's contributions by providing us with a letter of evaluation on your work together. We have enclosed the following materials to help you in evaluating [name of candidate]'s record:

1. *Section 2*: Summary of Workload Assignment and/or position description;
2. *Section 3*: Department, Unit and College Criteria;
3. *Section 4*: Curriculum Vitae and List of Collaborators;
4. *Section 5*: Candidate Statement;
5. *(Optional) Section 6*: Teaching Portfolio and/or *Section 8*: Leadership Portfolio for Service and Outreach; and
6. Selected set of research publications.

In your evaluation, we would appreciate your characterizing the scope and length of your collaborations and the contributions that [name of candidate] has made to those collaborations. What was the extent of the candidate's contributions to your research partnership? How important were those contributions to the research? How do those contributions fit into the candidate's overall research program? We would also welcome your assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the [name of candidate]'s record, including such things as the significance and independence of the candidate's contributions to the literature and to the field, the promise of sustained scholarly activity, and the regional, national, or international recognition that has been earned by [name of candidate]. Please also indicate whether you recommend that [he/she] be awarded [examples: tenure or continuing status and promotion to associate rank; promotion to full rank] on the basis of your evaluation.

The University of Arizona values an inclusive view of scholarship in the recognition that knowledge is acquired and advanced through discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Given this perspective, promotion and tenure reviews, as detailed in the criteria of individual departments and colleges, will recognize 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. Please note that our criteria for [promotion to associate rank with continuing status or tenure; tenure-only, continuing status only; or promotion to full rank] include consideration of applied research, outreach education, teaching and service. If you have information and recommendations based on these areas, we would also appreciate your comments related to [name of candidate]'s full program.

Your recommendation will be treated with the greatest confidentiality permitted by the Arizona Board of Regents policy and applicable law. I am aware that your consideration and evaluation of the work of our colleague will require considerable time, and greatly appreciate your willingness to assist us in this way.

We would also appreciate receiving on a separate page [a short statement of your background and relationship to the candidate's program; a copy of your abbreviated vita].

Thank you for participating in this review and please let me know if you have any questions about this process.

Please return your evaluation by [date]. If you are unable to do so, please let me know as soon as possible.

## APPENDIX E: SUGGESTED TEMPLATES TO SOLICIT LETTERS FROM RESEARCH COLLABORATORS AND FROM PROFESSIONAL, CLIENT OR OTHER COMMUNITY COLLABORATORS

Dear **[Name of Professional, Client, or Other Community Collaborator]**:

The Department of [name of department] is evaluating the academic and professional standing of [name of candidate], who is being considered for [examples: promotion to associate rank with continuing status or tenure; tenure-only, continuing status only; or promotion to full rank].

Since you have collaborated with [name of candidate], we are writing to ask for your assistance in assessing their contributions by providing us with a letter of evaluation on your work together. We have enclosed the following materials to help you in evaluating [name of candidate]'s record:

1. *Section 2*: Summary of Workload Assignment and/or position description;
2. *Section 3*: Department, Unit and College Criteria;
3. *Section 4*: Curriculum Vitae and List of Collaborators;
4. *Section 5*: Candidate Statement; and
5. *Section 8*: Leadership Portfolio for Service and Outreach

In your evaluation, we would appreciate your characterizing the length and scope of your collaborations with [name of candidate], the effectiveness and usefulness of the candidate's contributions, and the impact that they have had. We are especially interested in specifics that demonstrate the quality of [name of candidate]'s work with you and the contributions that the work has made to serving your needs. If you are familiar with the [name of candidate]'s field of study, we would appreciate your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record, including such things as significance and independence of his/her contributions to the literature and to the field, recognition at regional, national or international levels, and promise of sustained research-based activity.

We appreciate your taking the time to offer your assessments because the University of Arizona values an inclusive view of scholarship in the recognition that knowledge is acquired and advanced through discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Given this perspective, our promotion and tenure reviews recognize 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.

Your recommendation will be treated with the greatest confidentiality permitted by the Arizona Board of Regents policy and applicable law. I am aware that your consideration and evaluation of the work of our colleague will require considerable time, and greatly appreciate your willingness to assist us in this way.

We would also appreciate receiving on a separate page [a short statement of your background and relationship to the candidate's program; a copy of your abbreviated vita].

Thank you for participating in this review and please let me know if you have any questions about this process.

Please return your evaluation by [date]. If you are unable to do so, please let me know as soon as possible.