2021 ANNUAL WORKSHOP FOR TENURE-TRACK AND CONTINUING STATUS

Preparing the Promotion Dossier

Thursday, February 25, 2021
Agenda

• Introductions
• The Promotion Review Process
  • Tenure-Track
  • Continuing Status Track
• The Promotion Dossier
• Evaluation of Teaching
  • Provost Award for Innovations in Teaching
• Tips and Strategies from University Committees
Introductions

Andrea Romero
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Rebecca Perez
Assistant Director, Instructional Data
Office of Instruction and Assessment

Daniela Zarnescu,
Professor, Molecular and Cellular Biology
Co-chair University Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure

Russell Tronstrad
Specialist, Agricultural-Resource Economics
University Advisory Committee on Continuing Status Promotion
Spring 2021 Workshops

- Making Your Statement for Promotion
- Using Portfolios to Document Impact, Innovation, and Leadership
- Going Up for Full
- Preparing for Promotion on the Career Track
- Promotion Reviews for Administrators, Department Heads and Directors
  - Friday, March 12 at 10:00–11:30 am. Please register by March 10 at 4 p.m.
- Promotion Reviews for Committee Members
  - Thursday, March 25 at 10:30-12:00 pm. Please register by March 23 at 4 pm.
- RPT Administrator Training for Department, Unit or College Coordinators or Managers
  - Tuesday, April 6 at 11:00-12:30 pm. Please register by April 2 at 12 pm.
- Candidate Training for Dossier Submission to Review, Promotion, Tenure (RPT)
  - Thursday, April 22 at 10:00-11:30 am. Please register by April 20 at 4 pm.
The Promotion Review Process
Promotion Policy and Faculty Affairs Resources

- University Handbook for Appointed Personnel
  - Tenure-Track
    - Chapter 3.3
  - Continuing Status
    - Chapter 4A.3

- Faculty Affairs Website Resources
  - [https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/about-promotion](https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/about-promotion)
    - Inclusive View of Scholarship
    - Guide to Promotion
    - Promotion Clock
    - Promotion Criteria
    - Continuing Status & Promotion
    - Promotion & Tenure
    - Promotion and Career-track Faculty
    - Promotion Workshops
The Promotion Process for Candidates

- Meet with Department Head Spring before
  - Confirm and discuss first page, workload page
  - Share candidate’s list of external reviewers or those not to be contacted
  - Agree on deadline for submission of materials

- Department creates P & T Committee the Spring before review
  - Peer Observation of candidate using OIA form
  - Teaching Summary Memo
  - Nomination for Provost Innovation in Teaching

- Develops a list of external reviewers (with input from candidate and sometimes with input from review committee)
  - Department Head contacts external reviewers early
  - No more than half of letters can be nominated by candidate
  - Must be arms-length
  - 3-8 external reviewer letters

- Department gives candidate deadline for submission of complete dossier.
  - First Page- Candidate and Department Head
  - Workload and summary – Department Head
Administrator Notifications to Candidates

Candidates are notified by the department head or director and dean when their dossier has moved forward to the next level of the review.

- This is required for candidates under review.
- The written notifications to the candidate can be included in the dossier.
  - Receive letter from Department Head – Fall
  - Receive letter from Dean –Early Spring
  - Receive letter from University –last Friday of April

- Review the policy in the [University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP) 3.3.02C](#), for more information.
The Promotion Review Process

Levels of Reviews

External Reviews

Department Review
- Department Committee
- Department Head or Director

College Review
- College Committee
- Dean

University Review
- University Committee
- Provost
Requesting Tenure-Clock Delays in Reviews

Submit requests at least one semester before the review.

- **Birth or Adoption**
- **Personal Reasons** such as personal health or family or partner health and care
- **Prestigious External Commitments** that take time away from research
- **Adverse Professional Circumstances** that are beyond the candidate’s control
- **COVID-19**
  - [https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/covid-19-clock-delay](https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/covid-19-clock-delay)
Additions to Dossiers?

• Up to **February 1**, additions may be made (for example, a major grant or publication).

• **However, the addition must be requested by an administrator or committee chair.**

• Additions require re-review at earlier levels.

• Candidate must be informed.

• Candidate must be given chance to respond if the information is negative (such as poor teaching evaluations).
Appeals of Promotion Decisions

- The Provost’s decision may be appealed, as detailed in UHAP 3.3.02.e and UHAP 4A.3.02.

- **Appeals to the President must be made in writing within 30 days of the Provost’s decision.**

- Access to redacted dossier is provided following the Provost’s Office protocol.

The President’s decision is final, except in cases of discrimination or unconstitutional violations of due process.
Protect the Process to Ensure Fair Reviews

- Follow the *Guide to the Promotion Process*.
- Consult with your department head, dean or the Provost’s Office on procedural variations or questions.
- Follow formats in Dossier Template
- Promotion review committee training that includes implicit bias training
- External and internal reviewers cannot be collaborators.
- Use Collaborator Letters from those who are not independent.
- Process and voting is CONFIDENTIAL
- Notify Candidates about teaching reviews and when forwarding dossiers.
UHAP 7.01 Professional Conduct

- Inclusive & respectful
  - Value all voices

- Integrity and established standards
  - Fairness & honesty, avoid conflict of interest

- Good stewards of university resources

- Safe environment for all who work with us
  - No discrimination, harassment, intimidation, inclusive

- Academic freedom and freedom of speech
  - Opposing views, critical thinking, scholarly rigor

- Instructional commitment
  - Curiosity, student belief in their own ability

- Commitments to research, scholarship & creative activities
  - New knowledge that challenges our thinking

- Service and outreach commitments

http://policy.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/UHAP%207.01%20Professional%20Conduct.pdf
Evaluation

• Workload Distribution

• Unit Criteria for Promotion
  • Each unit has their own unique promotion guidelines that clarify what is considered of value within their field and what is typical in terms of workload, teaching, and service at each rank.

• College Criteria for Promotion

• Inclusive Scholarship
  • The University values an inclusive view of scholarship in the recognition that knowledge is acquired and advanced through discovery, integration, application, and teaching.
  • The University values collaboration among colleagues, both externally and internally, and the candidate's contributions to such collaborations will be considered in promotion reviews.
  • 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.
  • [https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship](https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship)
Committee Review

- Full and complete dossier (easy to read and understand, no confusion)
  - Adhere to dossier format exactly
- Evaluate in fair and consistent way against unit promotion criteria
- Clarity on position title, type of promotion, job description
  - Continuing status: Every case should have a detailed position description (as an attachment to Section 2), which are very helpful. Reasons:
    - Candidates may have workload changes over the past 5-6 years.
    - Both internal and external reviewers need to understand what exactly the candidate’s duties and changes (e.g. administrative, service, scholarship %)
- No conflict of interest for external reviewers or internal reviewers
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
Candidate Choice of External Reviewers

- Provide department head the name, rank, institution, email, short bio, and reason for choosing
- Experts in your field (3-4)
  - Leave some names for your department head to choose
  - Consider interdisciplinary representation
- Rank above your own current rank
- Peer institutions is a key consideration
- **Arms-length:** [https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/promotion-dossiers](https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/promotion-dossiers)
  - No co-authors (any published work, abstracts, grant proposals within 5 years before submission of dossier)
  - No co-investigators or consultants on grants
  - No previous mentors or advisors
  - Editors of journals or books are ok
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>AAU</th>
<th>MED SCHOOL</th>
<th>PAC 12</th>
<th>LAND-GRANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of Arizona</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Davis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado, Boulder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, College Park</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Twin Cities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External Reviewers

*Solicited by the Department Head or the Committee Chair.*

- External Reviewers **MUST** be independent and at or above the rank the candidate is being reviewed for promotion.
- Only head or committee chair should contact outside reviewers.
- No more than half can come from candidate’s list.
- Document the selection process.
- Use the required template for requesting letters.
- Include all solicited letters.
- Submit brief bios of external reviewers, not CVs.
- Experts at peer institutions.
Collaborator Letters (optional)

DONE BY DEPARTMENT HEAD

• Collaborators
  • Very helpful if engaged in large collaborations (they can speak to your role and quality of collaboration or your expertise)
  • Very helpful to represent view of non-academic partners
  • Co-authors on scholarship or grant proposals within 5 years of the dossier submission
  • Collaborators include
    • Dissertation advisors,
    • Supervisors
    • Close co-worker in lab, department, or residency program
    • Collaborators on book editing or journal editing projects
Continuing Status Reviews
Distinctive Aspects of Continuing-Status Reviews

- CS reviews consider *position effectiveness* as well as *teaching, research & service*.
- Thus, the job description and allocation of time are even more important.
- Work with your supervisor to align your duties with your unit’s guidelines for promotion, and
- Make sure to document your contributions to publications and grants.
- Finally, develop an assessment plan to demonstrate the impact of your activities.
Overview
Use Your Dossier to Document Your Impact

- Address non-specialists as well as experts.
- Make sure your head or committee chair understands who would be appropriate reviewers.
- Use the Candidate Statement and to discuss the progress and impact of your program of work.
- Discuss soliciting collaborator letters to document the impacts of your work.
- Document your efforts to improve your teaching.
- Consider asking graduates and former students for letters.
- Use the Service and Outreach Portfolio to document your leadership contributions.
Tips to start early from Yan Han, University Libraries

• Begin **EARLY** to understand all of the performance expectations
  • Job description and workload assignments
  • Pay special attention if workload assignments changed
• Regularly meet (at least annually) with departmental chair to discuss expectations and set goals.
• Candidate Statement is important.
  • Try to write one at 3rd year
  • The final one can be started as early as a year ahead (4th or 5th year).
Ten Tips for Successful P&T
Brian Erstad

1. Understand the Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Expectations at Your Institution
2. Develop an Action Plan at Least Two to Three Years Prior to P&T Application
3. Balance Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Relative to Promotion and Tenure Expectations
4. Synergize Teaching, Scholarship, and Service and Develop a Niche/Focus in Each
5. Prioritize and Balance Your Time Toward Actions Most Influential to P&T

Viswesh V, Hassell K, Coyne L, Erstad BL. AJPE 2021;85:Article 8414
Ten Tips for Successful P&T
Brian Erstad

6. Track Achievements in Detail in the Format Required for Promotion and Tenure Application
7. Seek Out Faculty Guidance on Promotion and Tenure and Look at Examples of Dossiers
8. Identify One or More Mentors and Meet with Them Regularly
10. Seek Feedback and Have Your Dossier Reviewed by Senior Colleagues

Viswesh V, Hassell K, Coyne L, Erstad BL. AJPE 2021;85:Article 8414
The Promotion Dossier

2021-22 Review Templates will be available by March 15th, 2021
Evaluation

- **Workload Distribution**
- **Unit Criteria for Promotion**
  - Each unit has their own unique promotion guidelines that clarify what is considered of value within their field and what is typical in terms of workload, teaching, and service at each rank.
- **College Criteria for Promotion**
- **Inclusive Scholarship**
  - The University values an inclusive view of scholarship in the recognition that knowledge is acquired and advanced through discovery, integration, application, and teaching.
  - The University values collaboration among colleagues, both externally and internally, and the candidate's contributions to such collaborations will be considered in promotion reviews.
  - 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.
  - [https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship](https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship)
# The Promotion Dossier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Prepared By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1:</td>
<td>Summary Data Sheet</td>
<td>Dept. Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2:</td>
<td>Summary of Candidate's Workload of Assignment</td>
<td>Dept. Admin, Head/Director &amp; Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3:</td>
<td>Dept. &amp; College Criteria (not the full guide)</td>
<td>Dept. Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4:</td>
<td>Curriculum Vitae &amp; List of Collaborators</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5:</td>
<td>Candidate Statement</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6:</td>
<td>Teaching Portfolio</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7:</td>
<td>Evaluation of Teaching &amp; Recommendation for Provost Award</td>
<td>Dept. Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8:</td>
<td>Portfolio to Document Leadership in Service &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9:</td>
<td>Membership in Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
<td>Candidate, GIDP Chair &amp; Dept. Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10:</td>
<td>Letter from Outside Evaluators &amp; Collaborators</td>
<td>Dept. Administration, Committee Chair &amp; Head/Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 11:</td>
<td>Recommendations <em>(from Internal Reviewers)</em></td>
<td>Dept., College &amp; Univ. Levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to the [Guide](#) for tips on preparing dossiers
Section 1:
Summary Data Sheet

https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/00_2019-20_01-11%20CT_Promotion%20Dossier.pdf
## 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 (T) faculty only*

**TITLE FOR WHICH YOU ARE APPLYING:**

**FACULTY TRACK:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Eligible</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**REVIEW TYPE:**

- **Mandatory Review**
- **Early Review**
- **3rd Year Retention**
- **Promotion to Associate Rank with Tenure (T)**
  *Votes on pay are not separable for candidates considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure*
- **Promotion to Full Professor with Tenure**
  *Votes can be separable for candidates considered for promotion to full professor with tenure*
- **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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>RANK/TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FACULTY SERVICE AT THE UA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>RANK/TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 2: Summary of Candidate's Workload Assignment

**Summary of Workload Assignment For:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL OF:</th>
<th>FTE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Outreach %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal and External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Service %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Service %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Activities %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None &amp; describe activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock Delays or Leave(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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-credit 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 GIBPs and other interdisciplinary units.
Section 2: Workload Assignment

Prepared by the Department Head

The Workload Assignment should be kept current and accurate.

- Use percentages and define meaning
  - 40% teaching, which means ... number of courses
  - 40% research, which means ...
  - 20% service, which means ...

- Describe duties, do not praise achievements.
- Use the template provided in the dossier.
- Electronic signatures (.png) are acceptable to attach to the workload section.
Your Job Description Sets the Expectations for Review

- Explain your contributions in non-technical terms.
- **Include all job descriptions and note changes.**
- Often job descriptions include statements of duties that are used to assess position effectiveness.
- Duties may include the following categories:
  - Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity,
  - Outreach/Service,
  - Teaching/Educational Outreach, and
  - Position Effectiveness
  - Clinical Service
  - Administrative Service
  - Extension
Pandemic Context

- Additional stress, frustration, anxiety and even burnout
- Increased workload
  - Remote learning pivot and student safety
- Deterioration of work-life balance
- Fewer uninterrupted blocks of time
- Grief, loss, loneliness, illness, death
- Teaching Challenges and Additional Service
  - Extraordinary support for students and colleagues
- Research Challenges
  - Access to lab, access to human participants, slow down in lab activities or materials, loss of grad students, Loss of funding

For more info and further reading: https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/covid-19-context
Systemic Barriers

• Systemic influences affected the work experiences of women and BIPOC individuals during the pandemic.

• Caregiving has been a very prominent issue.
  • *Concerns about underreporting in COVID19 statements*

• UArizona COVID19 Instructor Survey Report – Spring 2020:
  • [https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/faculty-reports-and-data](https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/faculty-reports-and-data)
SECTION 2A: IMPACT ON CAREER PROGRESSION FROM COVID-19 (Required: 2021 and Forward)

• [https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/covid-19-context](https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/covid-19-context)

• 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 no more than a 2 page description (single spaced) for this subsection.

  • 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.
COVID-19 considerations

Starting Point For The Honest Conversation

Asking The Right Questions

TEACHING
How many course(s) were transitioned to an online mode during Spring 2020?
Was completion of online-education training or attendance at teaching meetings required?
Did faculty member mentor students during Spring 2020?

RESEARCH
Was access to their research lab reduced or eliminated?
Was unspent start-up funding pulled to offset university finances?
Was there irreplaceable loss of research animals, subjects, supplies, field seasons, or travel?
Were invited seminars and/or conference presentations cancelled?
Was the research program altered to address issues related to COVID-19?

SERVICE
Did faculty member contribute to department or university initiatives related to COVID-19?
Did they contribute to public discussions, community engagement related to COVID-19?
Did the scope of service duties change during Spring 2020?

Evaluation Committees Should:
Be diverse - Include women and faculty of color.
Be informed - Understand inequality and inequity at their institutions.
Be transparent - Detail plans to promote gender equity and race parity.
Be proactive - Distribute a clear and documented procedure for (re)evaluation.
Be trained - Understand how COVID-19 differentially impacts the careers of women.

(Malisch, et al., 2020)
Additional Considerations

• Most peer institutions are instituting the same type of protocol, so it will be expected and common in dossiers sent to external reviewers.
  • Indicate systemic barriers

• Possible Positive Impacts
  • Creativity/good outcomes of teaching
  • Indicate if Service activities are COVID-19 related
  • Provide examples of publicly significant contributions
Section 3
Department and College Promotion Criteria
Sections 4: CV
Documenting Your Activities

• Follow the required CV format exactly.

• **TEMPLATES VARY BY TRACK**
  - PROMOTION AND TENURE
  - CONTINUING STATUS AND PROMOTION
  - CAREER-TRACK PROMOTION

• Get models for CVs from others in your department and your field
Section 4: Curriculum Vitae and List of Collaborators

- Follow format and organization
  - Chronology of Education
  - Chronology of Employment
  - Honors & Awards
  - Service/Outreach
  - Publications/Creative Activity
  - Works in Progress
  - Media
  - Conferences/Scholarly Presentations
  - Awarded Grants & Contracts
  - List of Collaborators and Affiliations
Section 5: Candidate Statement
Tell the Story of Your Achievements and Impact

- No More than 5 pages
- **Use the Candidate Statement to**
  - Characterize your research and teaching and service
    - Reflect on what you do and how you do it
  - **Connect** across all areas of workload if possible
  - Describe and demonstrate the impact of your work.
- Audience
  - Experts in your field, department committee, department head, college committee, dean, university committee
  - What do they need to know that is not clear in your CV?
  - First paragraph and last paragraph matter (position your work and key things that you are known for)
Section 6:
Evaluation of Teaching
Office of Instruction and Assessment (OIA)
Evaluation of Teaching Quality

Teaching quality framework, University of Colorado
https://www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework/
Holistic Evaluation of Teaching

- Best Practice focuses on multiple sources of teaching quality
  - Student surveys
  - Peer observation
  - Course Materials
  - Teaching Statement (within candidate statement)
    - Evidence-based learning strategies
    - Inclusive curricula and classrooms
  - Extent of Teaching
    - Courses taught during time in rank
  - Individual Student contact
  - Instructional Innovation and Collaborations
  - Teaching Awards & Teaching Grants
  - Supporting Documentation
    - Syllabi and major assignments
    - Curricular reviews and other contributions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Semester(s) Taught</th>
<th>Co-Taught?</th>
<th>Co-Teaching Percent Effort</th>
<th>Last Academic Year Taught</th>
<th>Total Number of Years Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(for example) Introduction to Biology</td>
<td>MCB 181R</td>
<td>InPerson</td>
<td>Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6: The Teaching Portfolio

• **Supporting Instructional materials** (such as syllabi, slide presentations, class assignments, student project, and curricular reports) *stay at the department-level of the review.*

• **Information on Teaching and Advising will be forwarded past department**

• **Document advising and mentoring.**
  • New mentoring matrix will be available this year

• **Link to Additional resources**
OIA Consultation & Support Services

Assistance with Peer Observations of Teaching & SCS/TCEs

Contact:

Ingrid Novodvorsky
Director of Teaching, Learning & Assessment
Office of Instruction and Assessment
novod@arizona.edu and 520-626-4187

Rebecca Pérez
Assistant Director, Instructional Data
Office of Instruction and Assessment
rperez@email.arizona.edu and 520-626-0536
For each item, look at the pattern of response rates.

Items with a greater proportion of strongly disagree and disagree may indicate teaching practices that can benefit from the introduction of new strategies.
Interpreting SCS Results

Teaching Practice: Builds upon students' prior knowledge and experience

SCS Item: This course expanded my knowledge and skills in this subject matter.

Example Strategies:
• Visible Thinking: Illustrate how information links/connects with foundational concepts using diagrams or graphic organizers such as concept maps or mind maps. Both the instructor and students should have the opportunity to reveal their thinking to others and to discuss as a group.
• Make it relevant: Use models/contexts that make sense to students, relating to experiences they are likely to have had in their own lives. This can help facilitate the connection between new and prior knowledge.
• Encourage reflection: Have students revisit their ideas, and ask them frequently how their understanding has changed. How do new concepts/processes relate to those presented earlier in the course?
Identifying Trends in SCS/TCE Comments

http://shiny.bi.arizona.edu/

100 Most Commonly Used Words

Top 10 Words with Positive Sentiment
Based on the entire dataset

- like
- liked
- helpful
- interesting
- good
- easy
- enjoyed
- well
- helped
- great

Top 10 Words with Negative Sentiment
Based on the entire dataset

- boring
- useless
- missed
- miss
- slowly
- problems
- hate
- frustrating
- confusing
- complex

(you’ll need to use VPN if you are off campus)
Section 7: Evaluating Teaching
DONE BY PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE

• Use Peer Review of Teaching Protocol to conduct at least one teaching observation.

• Committees write a separate memo to recommend candidates for the Provost Award for Innovations in Teaching.

• Award criteria:
  • innovative teaching strategies
  • active learning strategies and other evidence-based instructional practices
  • inclusive teaching strategies and course content to address diverse learning styles and experiences
  • teaching awards, grants, and other recognized achievements in teaching
  • effective mentoring and advising, including collaborations with students from diverse backgrounds.
Section 8: Service and Outreach Portfolio

- This section is **optional** for P&T candidates, but all candidates should discuss the impact of their service.
  - In P&T reviews, these materials remain in departments unless requested by candidate

- This section is **required for continuing status reviews** that include educational outreach or have it as a key component of their workload.
  - Program Overview (description & assessment) (adoptions by other institutions)
  - Expert testimony or consultations
  - On-line resources for community, business, agency, or disciplinary associations
  - Newsletters, pamphlets or articles for popular or special interest publications
  - Technical reports, research studies, and presentations
  - Articles for popular publications and instructional materials,
  - News reports
Additional Information

• **Checklist for shared appointments**

• **Section 9: membership in graduate or other interdisciplinary programs**
  - Candidate description of GIDP membership or interdisciplinary programs/initiatives
  - Chairperson of GIDP evaluation of candidate contribution
  - Department Committee summary/evaluation of candidate contributions to GIDP
Words from the University Advisory Committees

- **UAC_PT (Promotion and Tenure)** – committee of 12 faculty representing all Colleges across UArizona.
- **UAC_CSP (Continuing Status and Promotion)** – committee of 5 faculty representing units with continuing status faculty across UArizona.

Words from the University Advisory Committees

- Curriculum Vitae
  - Be clear about accomplishments in rank versus previous career stage
  - Be clear about scholarly activities involving trainees (undergraduates, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows)
  - Be specific, accurate, clearly distinguish funding from local versus federal sources; highlight honors; categorize service
- Spellcheck😊
Candidate Statement - **This is your opportunity to shine!**

- Accessible – limit jargon please!
- Balanced: appealing to experts that write evaluation letters and clear to non-experts
- Most compelling dossiers integrate research teaching and service. How do each of these components inform the others? How do they synergize?
- Speak to how your accomplishments meet the expectations and support the mission of the unit. **What is the impact of your activities?**
- UACPT/UACCSP can only evaluate the dossier in front of them, so be comprehensive, make no assumption about what the committee knows.
Words from the **University Advisory Committees**

- External evaluators
  - UACPT/UACCSP relies on external letters comments!
  - Be informed about the process
  - Pay attention to procedural issues
Words from the University Advisory Committees

• A privilege and a distinct pleasure to learn about all of your amazing accomplishments!

• Good luck!
They provide a variety of virtual programs and resources including:

- Weekly Monday Motivator
- Monthly Core Curriculum Webinars
- Monthly Guest Expert Webinars
- Access to Multi-Week Courses
- Access to Dissertation Success Curriculum for graduate students
- Private Discussion Forum for peer-mentoring, problem-solving, & moderated writing challenges
- Monthly accountability buddy matches
- Access to 14-Day Writing Challenges
- Access to the Member Library that includes past webinar materials, referrals, and readings
HOW TO CLAIM YOUR INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIP

**Step 1:** Go to [https://www.facultydiversity.org/join](https://www.facultydiversity.org/join). Then select your institution from the drop-down menu and click “Continue.”

**Step 2:** On the institution’s landing page, click “Activate My Membership.”

**Step 3:** Complete a brief registration form using your institution email address.

**Step 4:** Open your institution email. Click “Activate Account” in the confirmation email.