2024-2025 Cycle
Tenure-Track Faculty Promotion Workshop
We respectfully acknowledge the University of Arizona is on the land and territories of Indigenous peoples. Today, Arizona is home to 22 federally recognized tribes, with Tucson being home to the O’odham and the Yaqui. Committed to diversity and inclusion, the University strives to build sustainable relationships with sovereign Native Nations and Indigenous communities through education offerings, partnerships, and community service.
PURPOSE
Working together to expand human potential, explore new horizons and enrich life for all.

MISSION
Continuously improve how we educate and innovate so we can lead the way in developing adaptive problem-solvers capable of tackling our greatest challenges.

CORE VALUES
INTEGRITY • COMPASSION • EXPLORATION • ADAPTATION INCLUSION • DETERMINATION
FACULTY AFFAIRS MISSION STATEMENT

Our mission in Faculty Affairs is to cultivate institutional structures for faculty advancement across the career lifespan. We take an ecosystem equity approach across all system levels that considers:

- Recruitment
- Professional Advancement
- Retention

Our work is grounded in an affirming, transparent, and inclusive approach to supporting faculty.
Faculty Affairs Vision

• To nurture a humanistic approach to faculty activity that fosters excellence, equity and impact.

• We aspire to high levels of accountability, efficiency, and transparency.

• To promote understanding of the role and contributions of faculty.

• To adhere to the fundamental values of our land grant institution and R1 status.
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University of Arizona
Workshops, Policies & Process
2024-2025 Promotion Cycle Workshops & Resources

PROMOTION DOSSIER TEMPLATES AND INSTRUCTIONS

GUIDE TO 2024-2025 PROMOTION FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

ONLINE WORKSHOPS

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR FACULTY ON OUR WEBSITE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Faculty Affairs Policies & Resources

facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/about-promotion

- Inclusive View of Scholarship
- Guide to Promotion
- Promotion Clock
- Promotion Criteria by College
- Continuing Status and Promotion
- Promotion and Tenure
- Promotion and Career-track Faculty
- Promotion Workshops
Academic Freedom

Learning requires concentrated attention and happens best in environments where a wide range of perspectives are welcome and encouraged. Allowing space for opposing views is central to academic inquiry, and that responsibility rests with all of us. Academic freedom, which is essential to the advancement of knowledge, is rooted in and regulated by the norms of the disciplinary communities within which the faculty are credentialed. In research, this means we are free to pursue areas of inquiry, wherever they may lead. In education, it means the freedom to teach from our disciplines, and the freedom of our students to engage within the parameters of the discipline openly and fully. Academic freedom also allows us to comment on University or unit governance without fear of retribution. ARS §15-1601(B) and our Guidelines for Shared Governance: Memorandum of Understanding entered into by the Faculty and the Administration of the University of Arizona describe the statutory and mutually agreed upon role of faculty in the governance of the University.

As faculty and academic professionals, we bear special responsibilities to contribute to informed deliberations on academic issues. Our primary responsibility to our academic discipline and to our society is to seek and state the truth based on available evidence. Guided by recognition of the value of evidence-based inquiry to our community and an informed citizenry, we recognize our shared obligation to exercise critical judgment and self-discipline in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. To this end, we devote our energies to developing and improving critical thinking and scholarly rigor through teaching, research, and engagement with the University’s broader constituencies.
University Handbook for Appointed Personnel

Professional Conduct

UHAP 7.01

- 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
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.
Inclusive Scholarship Policy was driven by some of the following factors:

- Increasing speeds of technology
- Large data science and collaborative science
- New demands for scholarly transparency and accountability in midst of hyper-competitiveness and haste to reach positive outcomes and funding
- Public scrutiny of relevance of scholarship
- Widespread calls for scholarship of relevance to diverse communities
- University of Arizona Values
- Land Grant Mission to serve local students
- Extend knowledge from campus to local region
- Hispanic Serving Institution Designation
- Dedication to excellence in serving students of all backgrounds
- Seal of Excelencia
National Efforts for Inclusive Scholarship, Publicly-Engaged Scholarship, and Broader Impacts Scholarship

PTIE Coalition broadens criteria to be inclusive of innovation and entrepreneurship impacts
UArizona is part of this coalition of over 65 universities

American Public Land Grant Universities (APLU) Modernizing scholarship
Supported by the Rita Allen Foundation, the Kavli Foundation, the Bourroughgs Wellcome Fund, APLU, and the University of Michigan as part of the Civic Science Fellows Program, APLU and the University of Michigan, Council on Research, Food, Agriculture & Natural Resources, and the Commission on Economic and Community Engagement

Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) improves ways in which research is evaluated

Broadening Conceptions of Scientific and Scholarly Productivity: Improving openness, inclusion and impact Initiative from the Council of Graduate Studies – American Educational Research Association (AERA)
On-going Efforts at University of Arizona

• 2022 Promotion and Tenure Criteria Workgroup Report
• Suggested Revisions to the P&T Process
• Suggested Revisions to P&T Dossier

• Topics Covered
  1. Collaborative Activities and P&T
  2. Inclusive View of Scholarship
  3. Open Access Scholarship
  4. Community Engagement in the Promotion & Tenure Process
  5. Hispanic Serving Institution – servingness to students
  6. Summary of Discussion
The scholarship of discovery includes investigations inquiries that generate new knowledge.

The scholarship of integration makes interdisciplinary connections to synthesize knowledge in new ways.

The scholarship of application is concerned with applying knowledge to social issues, sometimes to test theories and ground knowledge making.

The scholarship of teaching includes transforming and extending as well as transmitting knowledge.

The scholarship of engagement extends these forms of inquiry by collaborative inquiries on social issues.

Based on The Scholarship of Engagement,
Center for Experiential Learning, Loyola University
Publicly Engaged Scholarship

- **Type 1. Research—business, industry, commodity group funded.** Sponsored research or inquiry supported through grants or contracts from businesses, industries, trade associations, or commodity groups (e.g., agricultural or natural resources groups) that generates new knowledge to address practical problems experienced by public or practitioner audiences.

- **Type 2. Research—nonprofit, foundation, government funded.** Sponsored research or inquiry supported through grants or contracts from community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, foundations, or government agencies that generates new knowledge to address practical problems experienced by public or practitioner audiences.

- **Type 3. Research—unfunded or intramurally funded applied research.** Community-responsive or community-based research or inquiry that is not funded by a community partner but instead is pursued by faculty through intramural support or as financially unsupported research or inquiry.

- **Type 4. Creative activities.** Original creations of literary, fine, performing, or applied arts and other expressions or activities of creative disciplines or fields that are made available to or generated in collaboration with a public (non-university) audience.
Publicly Engaged Instruction

- **Type 5. Instruction—for credit—nontraditional audiences.**
  - Classes and instructional programs that offer student academic credit hours and are designed and marketed specifically to serve those who are neither traditional campus degree seekers nor campus staff.

- **Type 6. Instruction—for credit—curricular, community-engaged learning.**
  - Classes and curricular programs where students learn with, through and from community partners, in a community context, under the guidance and supervision of faculty members.

- **Type 7. Instruction—noncredit—classes and programs.**
  - Classes and instructional programs marketed specifically to those who are neither degree seekers nor campus staff.

- **Type 8. Instruction—noncredit—managed learning environments.**
  - Scholarly resources designed for general public audiences that are often learner-initiated and learner-paced (e.g., museums, galleries, libraries, gardens, exhibits, expositions).

- **Type 9. Instruction—noncredit—public understanding, events, and media.**
  - Scholarly resources designed for the general public that are accessible through print, radio, television, or web media. General examples include self-paced educational materials and products (e.g., bulletins, pamphlets, encyclopedia entries, educational broadcasting, CD-ROMs, software, textbooks for lay audiences); dissemination of scholarship through media (e.g., speakers’ bureaus, TV appearances, newspaper interviews, radio broadcasts, web pages, and podcasts, if scholarly and readily available to the public); and popular writing in newsletters, popular press, or practitioner-oriented publications.
Publicly Engaged Service

- **Type 10. Service—technical assistance, expert testimony, and legal advice.** Provision of university-based knowledge or other scholarly advice through direct interaction with non-university clients who have requested assistance to address an issue or solve a problem.

- **Type 11. Service—co-curricular service-learning.** Service-learning experiences that are not offered in conjunction with a credit-bearing course or academic program and do not include reflection on community practice or connections between content and the experience.

- **Type 12. Service—patient, clinical, and diagnostic services.** Services offered to human and animal clients, with care provided by university faculty members or professional or graduate students, through hospitals, laboratories, and clinics.

- **Type 13. Service—advisory boards and other discipline-related service.** Contributions of scholarly expertise made by faculty, staff, and students at the request of non-university audiences on an ad hoc or ongoing basis.

- **Type 14. Commercialized activities.** Translation of new knowledge generated by the university to the public through the commercialization of discoveries (e.g., technology transfer, licenses, copyrights, and some forms of economic development).

Systemic Approach to Inclusive Scholarship Shifts in Promotion

**Faculty**: Promotion Workshops, Mentoring, Dossier Templates

**Department Heads & Committees**: Inclusive Scholarship in Criteria, Administrator & Review Committee Training

**Deans & Committees**: Inclusive Scholarship in Criteria, Administrator & Review Committee Training

**President and Provost**: Visible Messaging, Regular Meetings with Affinity Groups, Data & Reports, Holding Units Accountable, Inclusive Scholarship Policy

**Peer Institutions**: PTIE, APLU, WICHE, Modified External Reviewer Letter
The Promotion Review Process

Levels of Reviews

External Reviewer Letters

Department Review
- Department Committee
- Department Head or Director

College Review
- College Committee
- Dean

University Review
- University Committee
- Provost
Notifications to the Candidate

• Late Fall: Candidates are notified by the department head/director when their dossier has moved forward to the next level of the review.

• Early Spring: Candidates are notified by the Dean when their dossier has moved to the next level of the review.

• Last Friday of April: Decision letter from the University.
Impartial Reviews are Fundamental to the Rigor of the Process

Reviewers must be Independent or Arms-length

Conflict of Interest Considerations for the Candidate

- Co-authors on publications or collaborators on grants within the past five years.
- Personal or financial connections.
- Dissertation Chair, Post-doc advisor, mentors, co-instructor, close co-worker in lab.
External Reviewers

- Minimum 3 external letters
- No more than half of external reviewers can come from candidate list
- Peer institutions prioritized
- Must be at least one rank above candidate

Collaborators

- Coordinated by Department Head – but not required
- Collaborator letters can provide letters to understand role in collaboration and contributions
- Not for evaluation
## Peer Institutions

<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></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado, Boulder</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></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>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
The Promotion Process for Candidates

Meet with Department Head Spring before submission

- Review Section 1 and Section 2 together
- Confirm plan for peer observation of teaching
- Confirm if GIDP evaluation is needed
- Share candidate’s list of external reviewers
- Share list of collaborators (Section 4A)
  - All co-authors in the past five years (unless arms-length)
  - All P.I.’s/Co-P.I.’s in the past five years
  - Dissertation/Post-doc Mentors, advisors, or chairs
  - Co-instructors
- Share names (internal and external reviewers) on the list for conflict of interest
  - Personal or financial obligations
- Agree on deadline for submission of materials to be sent to external reviewers
- Candidate prepares Section 1, 2, 2A, 3, 4, 4A, 4B, 5, 6, 7 (optional), 8 (optional)
## Section 4A: Template for Collaborator List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate's Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborator's Last Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Example) Wildcat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department Head Process

Meet with candidate Spring before submission
- Confirm submission dates
- Receive collaborator list
- Receive conflict of interest names both internal/external
- Confirm and sign Section 1, Section 2
- Discuss plan for peer observation of teaching
- Confirm if GIDP evaluation is needed

Confirm departmental committee has no conflict of interests
- Check with Associate Dean for CoI with College Committee
- Identify appropriate peer reviewer for teaching observation and set up teaching review with appropriate forms

Manage external reviewer process and forms
Manage collaborator letters and forms
- Support candidate submission of materials in RPT and committee deadlines
- Confirm that faculty affairs coordinator has completed training for submission
- Review Checklist for RPT Case review prepared by faculty affairs coordinator

Provide notification to candidate when dossier is moved to college level
What Can You Do To Ensure Fair Reviews?

- Follow the Guide to the Promotion Process
- Follow the appropriate Dossier Template formats. Confirm all information is accurate and true
- Give early information about conflict of interest
- Give early information about collaborators
- Maintain confidentiality in process
- Complete Candidate Promotion Workshops from Faculty Affairs (university & college)
The Promotion Dossier
# 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. Admin/Head/Director Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2, 2A:</td>
<td>Summary of Candidate's Workload of Assignment &amp; Pandemic Impact Statement</td>
<td>Dept. Admin, Head/Director &amp; Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3:</td>
<td>Dept. &amp; College Criteria (brief version)</td>
<td>Dept. Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4, 4A, 4B:</td>
<td>Curriculum Vitae, List of Collaborators, Representative Work</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5:</td>
<td>Candidate Statement</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6, 6A, 6B:</td>
<td>Teaching Portfolio and Resources, Information on Teaching &amp; Mentoring, Supporting Documentation</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7, 7A, 7B:</td>
<td>Portfolio for Leadership, Extension, Service &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>Candidate (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8, 8A:</td>
<td>GIDP Membership and Description of Contributions</td>
<td>Candidate (optional), GIDP Chair &amp; Dept. Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9, 9A, 9B:</td>
<td>Peer Teaching Observation, Provost Award for Innovations in Teaching Nomination</td>
<td>Dept. Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10, 10A, 10B:</td>
<td>Letters from Independent External Reviewers, Letters from Solicited Collaborators</td>
<td>Dept. Head/Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 11:</td>
<td>Internal Evaluations <em>(from Internal Reviewers)</em></td>
<td>Dept., College &amp; Univ. Levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promotion Dossier Templates and Guides

Templates and Guides are often Track-Specific

### 2024-2025 Promotion Dossier Templates:

1. 2024-2025 Guide to the Promotion Process for Continuing Status and Tenure-Track Faculty
   - Tenure-track and Continuing track submission deadline is Friday, January 17, 2025.
2. 2024-2025 Guide to Career Track Promotion
   - Career-track submission deadline is Friday, December 13, 2024.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Career Track Promotion</th>
<th>Continuing Status &amp; Promotion</th>
<th>Promotion &amp; Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Summary Data Shoot</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Summary of Candidate’s Workload Assignment</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td>(Word document)</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Pandemic Impact Statement -</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Template for all tracks]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>Departmental &amp; College Criteria</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Template for all tracks]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td>Curriculum Vita -</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Template for all tracks]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>List of Collaborators ([View List])</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Representative Work</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5</td>
<td>Candidate Statement</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6</td>
<td>Teaching Portfolio and Resources</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Template for all tracks]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information on Teaching and Mentoring ([View list], [View mentoring])</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td>View pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 1: Summary Data Sheet

Make sure to complete all sections or indicate n/a.

Check that the correct boxes have been selected.

It is important to know if this is a mandatory year for review.

This is sent to external reviewers.
SECTION 2: SUMMARY OF CANDIDATE’S WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENT - TENURE-TRACK AND CONTINUING TRACK

FOR:

DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL OF: ________________________________ FTE: ________________________________

**Period in current rank only** Duties for the period 2017-2018 through 2024-2025 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>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern and External Services%</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>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</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>Name and all below to describe activity (for CE and CS only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock Delays or Leave%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Do not include percentages for years in which candidates were on leaves without pay or non-sabbatical leaves. Do include percentages for years with clock delays or sabbatical leave to recognize candidates’ assigned duties. Use an asterisk next to the years with delays. List sabbaticals as “SABB” leaves without pay or “SABP” and clock delays as “CD” in the “Clock Delays or Leave%” row. This table can be modified if there is a need to include more years in rank.

Requirements to meet departmental expectations for TEACHING:

Example: 40% teaching means approximately 40-3x3 courses each academic year. This should correspond to general expectations in the department/unit. Do not list specific course numbers, student names, etc. This section should be non-evaluative.

Requirements to meet departmental expectations for RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP or CREATIVE ACTIVITY:

Example: 40% research means an active research program that produces publishable research and/or built-in 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. This should be non-evaluative.

Requirements to meet departmental expectations for SERVICE:

Example: 20% service, which includes service in the department/unit and university, participation or leadership in national or international scientific organizations or advisory boards, and outreach to schools and the general public. Do not list committees the candidate has served on or specific service duties. This sections should be non-evaluative.

Requirements and description for ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE, CLINICAL SERVICE, EXTENSION and OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES (it is required for continuing-eligible and continuing status positions to include the official position description(s) assigned during their current rank, please see note below following “Additional Pages Attached”):

This section should be non-evaluative. (See Appendices for Dossier Appendments and Appendices for participation in GIDPs and other interdisciplinary units.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE’S SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT HEAD’S SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Additional Pages Attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dossier preparation for continuing-eligible or continuing status positions **REQUIRES** the official position descriptions assigned during current rank.

Prepared and Signed by Department/Unit Head. Signed by the Candidate

Form revised 2/18/2024

- Include all years in rank, even if need to modify table to add years
- Each column should add up to 100%
- Indicate sabbaticals or tenure-clock delays (no need for reason)
Section 2: Workload Assignment

Prepared by the Department Head
Signed by the Department Head and Candidate

- Describe duties, do not praise achievements
- Non-Evaluative Language
- Candidate's Signature
- Department Head's Signature
- Electronic signatures (.png) are acceptable to attach to the workload section
# APPENDIX A: CHECKLIST FOR SHARED APPOINTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>CANDIDATE:</th>
<th>TITLE:</th>
<th>PRIMARY DEPARTMENT:</th>
<th>SECONDARY DEPARTMENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 1. DISTRIBUTION OF WORKLOAD % BY DEPARTMENT (FOR ALL FACULTY TRACKS):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching %</th>
<th>Percent of Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity %</th>
<th>Distribution of Credits for Awards:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service %</th>
<th>Internal and External Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Service %</th>
<th>Clinical Service %</th>
<th>Extension Service %</th>
<th>Other Professional Activities %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. PROBATIONARY, TENURE/CONTINUING STATUS AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

(This section is not-applicable for career track faculty)

Tenure/continuing status is reviewed 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.

## 3. ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

---

## SIGNATURES – PRIMARY UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT HEAD’S SIGNATURE</th>
<th>PRINT NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SIGNATURES – SECONDARY UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT HEAD’S SIGNATURE</th>
<th>PRINT NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2A:
Pandemic Impact Statement
(Required: 2021 and Forward) (no more than 2 pages)

Describe the influence of COVID-19 on any aspect of their workload (e.g. changes in research/creative activities, teaching, service, job position, clinical service, etc.).

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.

For more information on COVID-19 Context
https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/covid-19-context
COVID-19 Pandemic Changes to Dossier

- Peer Institutions Agreed Upon Changes
- Pandemic Statement required for all
- COVID-19 considerations for External Reviewer Letters
- No student course surveys during Fall or Spring 2020
- Minimum of two clock delays are typical for most tenure-eligible faculty during this period
- Reviewer training includes pandemic/covid-19 considerations
• 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
Systemic Barriers & Impact

• 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 COVID-19 statements
• UArizona COVID-19 Instructor Survey Reports:
  • https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/faculty-reports-and-data
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)
Section 3: Department and College Promotion Criteria

(One Page Matrix/Brief Version)
(Full Set of Guidelines is permitted if helpful)
Section 3: Departmental & College Criteria

Please include one-page matrix for the relevant parts of the department and college promotion criteria. (Using Appendix B)

If the department does not have its own criteria, please use college’s criteria/matrix.

If including the longer version of the criteria, please also include the one-page matrix.
SECTION 4: CURRICULUM VITAE – ALL TRACKS

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/or Courtesy Appointments at UArizona.

Honors and Awards*
- Service/Outreach limit to period in current rank at the University of Arizona, up to 10 years.
  - Local/State Outreach
  - National/International Outreach
- National/International Outreach
- Departmental Committee(s)
- University Committee(s)
- Other Committees (Internal or External)

Publications/Creative Activity* (Published or Accepted in Chronological Order)
- Scholarly books and monographs (distinguish scholarly works from textbooks)
- Chapters in scholarly books and monographs
- Refereed journal articles, published or accepted in final form
- Other peer-reviewed publications

Other Scholarship*
- Abstracts
- Patents
- Conference Proceedings
- Professional Pamphlets
- Bibliographies
- Computer Programs
- Other
- Policy Briefs
- Research Projects

Works in Progress*
- Media
  - Performances
  - Exhibits
  - Shows
  - Recordings (audio/video)
- Expert Interviews
- Colloquia
- Seminars
- Symposia
- Conferences

Community Presentations Related to Your Research or Teaching
- Limit to period in current rank at UArizona, up to 10 years.
  - This may include, for example, informal presentations not part of a planned educational program.

Awarded Grants and Contracts
- Limit to period in current rank at UArizona, up to 10 years. List grant title, percent credit and percent FTE on grant; role (PI, Co-PI, all co-Pi); source of funding or agency; years of funding; full funding amount with a breakdown of indirect and direct costs (Indicate clearly how much funding comes to the University of Arizona and how much to your department.)
- Federal
- State
- Industry
- Private Foundation

Submitted Grants/Contracts
- Limit to period in current rank at UArizona, up to 10 years. List grant title, percent credit and FTE funding on grant; role (PI, Co-PI, all co-Pi); source of funding or agency; funding amount; indirect and direct funding amounts. Please indicate if "pending" or "unawarded". Awarded grants are listed in the area above.
- Federal
- State
- Industry
- Private Foundation

*If a limit is not specified, the section is not limited to time in rank.

Reviewed and revised 2/23/2024
Prepared by the Candidate
Sections 4: CV Documenting Your Activities

Follow the required CV format exactly.

Certain areas of CV are limited to period in rank (no more than 10 years)

Publications/Creative Activity
- * indicate work done as a grad student
- ° indicate co-authors who were students or post-docs
- Include DOIs, hyperlinks ok too
- Please use Forthcoming instead of In Press – when accepted but not published yet
- Do not use forthcoming for work that has been submitted but not accepted
- For more info: NIH or Inside Higher Ed

Awarded Grants & Contracts
Please clearly indicate the following for funded grants:
- Your role/title on the grant, % credit, and % FTE
- Title of the grant and years of funding and P.I. names (if candidate is not the P.I.), and all Co-PIs
- Grant funder - Promotion Guidelines 2024-2025
- Total costs and direct costs (Indicate clearly how much funding comes to the University of Arizona and how much to your department
Inclusive Scholarship Considerations

- Include patents & tech transfer
- Research funded by community partners, foundations, government, or similar
- Community-responsive or community-based research or inquiry funded by community partner
- Research or inquiry that generates new knowledge to address practical problems
- Original creations of literary, fine, performing or applied arts or other expressions or activities of creative disciplines or fields that are made available to or generated in collaboration with a public (non-university) audience
- Expert interviews – media

For more information: facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship
Section 4A: List of Collaborators

All individuals who you worked closely and directly with in the past FIVE years

• Co-authors of books, articles, publications, reports, abstracts, papers, awarded grants, or other projects
• Co-instructors
• Collaborators on tech transfer, start-up companies, other entrepreneurial activities
• Advisors (thesis, dissertation or post-doctoral), mentors or sponsors

This does not necessarily include all co-authors of mega-multi-authored publications unless there is a close working relationship.

This does not include editors of journals or books.

Use the Worksheet Template.
Section 4B: Representative Work

- This is sent to external reviewers

- No more than 3-5 items that are accepted or published during the current rank
  - May include articles, abstracts, brochures, chapters, manuals, publications, slides, or recordings

- Cover Page
  - Brief summary of why you chose to highlight this work
  - List of items chosen (include full citation)

- Student work is FERPA Protected – do not include faces/names unless it was part of a public performance

- Representative Work
  - Limit of 100 MB for each file
  - PDF is the preferred format
  - YouTube or Vimeo videos via URL can be included. See guidance in dossier template about how to add videos to your packet. (Do not include links to platforms or folders that track viewership – DropBox, GoogleDrive, etc.)
Section 5:
Candidate Statement
Tell the Story of Your Achievements and Impact

Watch the Promotion Workshop Specifically on the Candidate Statement

Reflect on what you do and how you do it to help characterize your work

Connect across all areas of workload

Impact & Significance of Work

Be aware of audience
• External reviewers, department committee, department head, college committee, dean, University Committee, Provost

What might they need to know that is not clear in your CV and teaching portfolio?

First paragraph and last paragraph matter

Position your work and key things that you are known for

NO MORE THAN 5 PAGES
In Section 5 You MUST sign the attestation statement (this can go after the 5\textsuperscript{th} page). It must be for the correct track (!).

\textit{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:

\textit{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

Section 6A: Information on Teaching & Advising - *goes to all levels of review*

Section 6B: Supporting Documentation – *stays at department level review*

Tutorials for correctly downloading SCS and TCE

Additional Resources on how to CURATE 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](#)
- [University of California, Berkeley provides detailed advice on each aspect of the teaching portfolio](#)
- [How to Write a Statement of Teaching Philosophy by The Chronicle of Higher Education](#)
- [Rubric for Evaluating Teaching Portfolios from the University of Indiana](#)
- More information is available at the University of Arizona’s [Inclusive Teaching Practices](#) and the Yale Poorvu Center for Teaching and Learning’s [Inclusive Teaching Strategies](#)
SCS Dashboard in UAccess Analytics
Printable SCS Summary Report
What Do SCSs/TCEs Measure?

- Student experiences, perceptions, feelings, self-reflections on their effort and learning, self-assessment on performance and expected grade, self-efficacy, etc.
- SCSs/TCEs can measure students’ perceptions of instructor and course effectiveness in support of their program completion and perceived learning.

Limitations of SCS and TCE

- Student learning and grades.
- Research has found that the gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation of faculty have been associated with student evaluations.
- Student open-ended comments are summarized by departmental committee and not forwarded beyond the department.
SECTION 6A: INFORMATION ON TEACHING AND MENTORING

(FORWARD with the dossier for college and university review)

*Please limit to the period in current rank at the University of Arizona except for teaching awards and teaching grants.

**Please do not include links to drives or folders that permit the track viewership activity (e.g., Dropbox, Google Drive, SharePoint, etc.)

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

**Extent of Teaching

List of courses taught (use the linked Excel table template provided)

• Note the format(s) in which each course was taught: online, in person, or describe other modality.

*Course Descriptions

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

*Student Feedback

Candidates, departments or units should provide reports in the teaching portfolio. See here for more information.

Teacher Course Evaluation (TCE) Comparison Reports (only for courses before Fall 2019)

Student Course Survey (SCS) Responses (for courses in Fall 2019 and thereafter)**

**Student Course Surveys are not required in the promotion dossier from Spring or Fall of 2020

• Please note, you must use the SCS Dashboard in UAccess Analytics to download Student Course Survey reports formatted for the P&T dossiers.
  o Please view the brief video tutorial that details how to download the Student Course Surveys (SCS) reports formatted for P&T dossiers. Please note, this Analytics dashboard is new for the 2024-25 review cycle.
  o Please view the brief video tutorial that details how to download the Teacher Course Evaluations (TCE) reports collected before Fall 2019.
  o Please ensure that the students’ open-ended responses are NOT included in this section.

*Individual Student Contact:

Collaborations with undergraduates and graduates on research projects Mentoring

(Use the linked Excel Monitoring table template provided) 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, and year of graduation Dissertations directed and in progress, and year of graduation Service on other dissertation and graduate committees

*Contributions to Instructional Innovations and Collaborations

Teaching workshops attended or delivered

Development of new course materials and/or revision to new teaching format

Collaborations on curricular and outcome-assessment committees

Scholarship/Research on curriculum and pedagogy that contributes to the candidate’s or others' improved teaching and learning

Please embed Course Spreadsheet and Mentor Matrix within PDF rather than as separate documents.
<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 Semesters Taught</th>
<th>Student Enrollment # Last Semester 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>2023-24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's Last Name</td>
<td>Student's First Name</td>
<td>Undergraduate, Graduate or Post Doc</td>
<td>Home Department</td>
<td>Semester/Year Start</td>
<td>Type of Mentoring</td>
<td>Your Role (primary advisor, mentor in specific area, etc.)</td>
<td>Student or Postdoc Role (participant in research lab, teaching assistant, etc.)</td>
<td># of Publications/Creative Scholarship As Co-Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office hours for classes should **not** be listed.

Only include more formal mentoring relationships, such as:

- **Mentor** – shares disciplinary and institutional knowledge, and provides individualized guidance.
- **Sponsor** – expands mentee’s visibility, advocates for them, nominates and promotes mentee for awards.
- **Coach** – provides guidance and helps mentees reach their full potential.
- **Advisor** – offers value by giving specific feedback about specific questions.
- **Role Model** – serves as an example whose behaviors or successes are looked up to and imitated.
- **Confidant** – someone mentees can trust and feel free to be their authentic self with, who appreciates and motivates the mentees, who provides unconditional support and who will tell the truth (even when it is hard to hear).
- **Ally** – advocates for mentees, gives credit for achievements, and actively partners with the mentees.
Section 6B: Optional
Supporting Documentation Teaching Portfolio

Cover Page
- List all attached documents and brief rationale for including each one

Considerations
- Selected syllabi
- Selected major assignments
- Rubrics for assessment
- Curricular reviews or other contributions to scholarship of teaching
- Open-ended comments from SCS and TEC
  - How to download comments here
  - Student letters about the courses
  - Selected samples of student products (names/IDs removed) No faces or identifying information if including photos or videos

Do NOT include: Links to drives or folders that allow tracking of viewership (e.g. Dropbox, Google Drive, SharePoint, etc.)
SECTION 7 PORTFOLIO (optional)
(stays at departmental level)

• Complete this section if a significant portion of your workload is dedicated to administrator or service

• Complete this section if you have made significant contributions or impact in the areas of service or innovation

• Document impact, effectiveness, examples of work, evaluations of work, leadership activities

• Start with a cover page that describes content and rationale for inclusion

• Include job descriptions or leadership roles
Full Assessment plan with metrics and longitudinal data where appropriate
News reports on the program and related contributions
Grants secured to support or build on the program.
Related service contributions
Contracts to support contributions
Adoptions of programs and materials by other institutions or groups
Section 7B: Supplementary Documentation (not forwarded)
Examples of Evidence

- Leadership activities in any area of workload (description or evidence of new programs or scaling up/uptake of programs created).
- Collaborations with business and community partners
- Tech transfer
- Commercialization activities
- Translational research
- New technology, websites, apps
- Instructional guides, guides, binding guides, assessment reports
- Documentation of use and impact of materials

- Exhibits, companion pieces, companion guides
- Resources for community, businesses, or disciplinary associations
- Newsletters, pamphlets, articles for popular or special interest publications
- Technical reports or presentations
- Articles for instructional materials
- Media/news reports

- Community-engaged activities representing your expert role
- Speaker at community events on your field/discipline
- Serving on advisory boards for local groups to represent your field/discipline
- Technical assistance
- Expert testimony
- Service learning outside of credit-bearing courses
- Patient, clinical, diagnostic services
Section 8 and 8A *(optional)*
Membership in GIDP

Section 8: Brief description of GIDP membership and interdisciplinary programs/initiatives prepared by the candidate

Section 8A: Evaluations of GIDP membership contributions prepared by the Chairperson of the GIDP (solicited and added by Department Head – not candidate)

Both sections 8 and 8A are *required* if this section is included.
Section 9A: Evaluative Peer Observation of Teaching

Coordinated by the department head

At least one evaluative peer observation of teaching

Completed during the year before promotion cycle or semester of the promotion review

Completed by a faculty member of the same track and at least one rank above the candidate
Section 9A: Peer Observation of Teaching for Promotion and Tenure Review
In Person Teaching

Peer Observation of Teaching is coordinated by the candidate’s Department Head/Director. They will identify an observer of the appropriate rank and title and request and observation in the Spring or Fall semester of the submission of the packet. The Department Head will pass on relevant information and class materials to the observer. The observer will use this template to complete their review and submit it to the Department Head/Director by the date set in order to include it in the review by the Departmental Review Committee. Similar to the Student Course Survey, this form includes review criteria in four key areas: Instruction, Assessment, Learning, and Student Instructor Interactions. These items are based on best practices for promoting student learning. We recommend that reviewers cite specific evidence for all the criteria. If you have any questions about the peer observation of teaching, please contact Dr. Lisa Elfring with UCATT at elfring@arizona.edu.

Name of Observer:
Title and Rank of Observer:
Department:
College:

Name of Candidate Under Review:
Title and Rank of Candidate:
Department:
College:

Class Observation Details
Title of Class:
Class Catalog Number:
Brief Description of Class:
Class Enrollment:
Number of Students in Attendance on Day of Observation:
Date of Observation(s):

Catalog Modality for the Class:
☐ In Person
☐ Hybrid/Blended
☐ Other (please specify):

Catalog Characterization for the Class:
☐ Colloquium ☐ Discussion ☐ Lecture
☐ Independent Study ☐ Studio
☐ Laboratory ☐ Workshop
☐ Other (Please specify):

Materials Reviewed for this observation:
☐ Course ☐ Presentation Slides ☐ Other (Please specify):
☐ D2L Site (Candidate should provide "Guest" access) ☐ Student Projects/Assignments
☐ Handouts ☐ Syllabus
☐ Other (Please specify):

☐ Worksheets

☐ Other (Please specify):

☐ Other (Please specify):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories and Criteria</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The course D2L site is organized to promote learning and course navigation. For example, there should be clear organization of course materials; clear and consistent due dates for assignments/ quizzes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear expectations for course policies and procedures provided in syllabus and other course documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provided opportunities for students to apply content during the class (e.g., problems, case studies, practice with feedback provided).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asked students to generate their own explanations and explain their thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asked questions that required varying levels of thinking (recall, comprehension, application, analysis, evaluation, synthesis).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When appropriate, encouraged students to move to higher levels of thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Syllabus shows that the course includes frequent, low-stakes assessments throughout the term in addition to higher-stakes assessments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning goals for the class session were explicit and well aligned with class activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students were encouraged to analyze and/or apply the concepts and skills taught in the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-class activities helped students connect concepts and skills to the world around them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-Instructor Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The instructor treated students with respect, demonstrating flexibility and compassion during the class session.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Created opportunities for all students to ask questions or participate in class activities, projects, or assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide a brief summary of 500 words or less, of your overall assessment of the candidate's quality of teaching for promotion or tenure review. Consider the following prompts to guide your response; formal responses are not required for each prompt:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What were the instructor’s major teaching strengths demonstrated in this class session?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What did the instructor do during the class session to engage students in learning important content?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What did the instructor do during the class session to assess students’ learning of important content (informally or formally)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 9B: NOMINATION FORM FOR THE PROVOST AWARD FOR INNOVATIONS IN TEACHING

Departmental committees complete this form to nominate a candidate 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 form. This award is only available for candidates going through the promotion process. (Retention review [aka "third year review"] candidates are not eligible.)

Criteria for nomination that can be highlighted in the nomination form 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 evaluation 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.

Candidate’s name: ________________________________

Nomination form is being competed by: __________________________________________

Why are you nominating this individual? (Cite criteria in box below)
Section 10:

External Reviewers and Collaborators

Organized by Department Head
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 for purposes of appeal 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.*

Information on Appeals to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure found [here](#)
Evaluation & Committee Review Considerations
Evaluation Considerations

Workload Distribution
• Alignment of workload to weighting of expectations for evidence and evaluation
• Candidates may have workload changes over the past 5-6 years

Pandemic Statement

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

University Criteria for Promotion
• Inclusive Scholarship
Committee Review

Full and complete dossier
• All aspects, including teaching observation & external reviewers

Workload

Promotion Criteria

Section 6B & 7B stay at department level – summarized in their letter
• Department Committee completes form for Provost Award for Innovation in Teaching
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research funding</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Prototypes</td>
<td>Citations</td>
<td>Health/Well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>License Income</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Datasets</td>
<td>Uptake of Devices, Instruments</td>
<td>Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patents, Products, Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Companies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Quality Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibition/Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Better Decision Making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morgan (2014) Science
## Evaluation of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Service to profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service to region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service to university, college, department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact

### Leadership roles

### Quality & Quantity
Evaluation of Teaching Quality

- Student feedback
- Peer observation
- Self-reflection
- Learning outcomes
- Other evidence

Teaching quality framework, University of Colorado
https://www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework
Words from the University Advisory Committees

UACPT (Promotion and Tenure) – Committee of 12 faculty representing all Colleges across UArizona

“[it is] a privilege and a distinct pleasure to learn about all of your amazing accomplishments! Good luck!”

In terms of 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
External evaluators
- UACPT/UACCSP relies on external letters comments!
- Be informed about the process

Pay attention to procedural issues
- Arms-length
- No collaborators
- No conflict of interest
Ten Tips for Successful P&T
Viswesh V, Hassell K, Coyne L, Erstad BL. AJPE 2021;85:Article 8414

- Track Achievements in Detail in the Format Required for Promotion and Tenure Application
- Seek Out Faculty Guidance on Promotion and Tenure and Look at Examples of Dossiers
- Identify One or More Mentors and Meet with Them Regularly
- Ensure Your Personal Statement Emphasizes Your Achievements and Explains Gaps
- Seek Feedback and Have Your Dossier Reviewed by Senior Colleagues
The Faculty Affairs Team

Dr. Andrea Romero
Vice Provost

Jennifer Martin
Interim Assoc. Vice Provost

Tara Chandler
Assist. Director

Kim Rogan
Program Manager

Dr. Adrián Arroyo Pérez
Assoc. Director

Susana Arreola
Admin. Associate