



Checklist and Steps for RPT Case Review 2024-25

Department Faculty Affairs Coordinator - Please be sure to review each case carefully for the appropriate [dossier template and guide](#), as well as ***each of the areas*** noted below. Then email this completed checklist to the College FA Lead when you send the case forward to the college level.

Before you begin your review, have you viewed the ***Case Review Training for Departmental Coordinators and Faculty Affairs Leads?*** If not, **STOP** and view that video training first.

FA Department Coordinator / Case Reviewer's Name: _____

Faculty Member's Case Being Reviewed: _____

Faculty Member Track: _____

Date Reviewed: _____

The **optional sections** have been noted as such.

The **critical sections** have been **shaded orange**. If there are issues with the dossier in these areas, a case will likely not be permitted to proceed with a review at the College or University level.

As you work through your case review, if you have any questions or answer "No" to any of the sections not listed as "optional," please work with your department head to investigate further and correct, as appropriate.

Mark if
Completed
or
Not

Applicable **Begin your case departmental review:**

1. On the main, "Case Materials" page, lock **all** the Candidate Sections (#1-8).
2. Verify – was the correct Faculty track template used for this particular faculty member's case? If not, **STOP** and correct before proceeding.

Section-by-Section Review

Check each section against the appropriate template and guide, found on the [Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage](#):

Section 1: Summary Data Sheet

Is every section completed correctly?

Is the information correct? (Verify what's listed in UAccess)

Is all relevant data listed on this form? (It should not refer back to another section in the dossier.)

Section 2 - Workload Assignment

Are all "years in rank" included in the table? (Leave out years prior to current rank.)

Is there a workload summary breakdown (or leave) for EACH year in rank?

Each column MUST equal 100% (regardless of the FTE).

Are all applicable "Requirements to meet departmental expectations..." filled out with non-evaluative language? (Only the requirements should be included, not how this candidate met or did not meet them.) Also, "See Section 3" is not sufficient.

Did the candidate sign the bottom of the page?

Did the department head/director sign at the bottom of the page?

Were the summaries non-evaluative?

If Continuing Status track or Administrative position, is job description attached?

If the candidate has a split/joint position, is the [Appendix A](#) shared appointment form attached?

Section 2A - Pandemic Statement

Make sure there is one. It is required for the 2024-25 cycle, even if only a brief note is included.

Is it no more than 2 pages?

Section 3 - Departmental and College Criteria (One Page)

Is the ONE-PAGE **departmental** promotion criteria included? (Use [Appendix B](#)) (If the department does not have its own criteria, please use college's criteria.)

Is the ONE-PAGE **college** promotion criteria included? (Use [Appendix B](#))

Section 4 - Curriculum Vitae

Was the correct CV format used?

Check to make sure **dates** are included, and the following items are "in rank at the University of Arizona, up to 10 years."

- Service and Outreach
- Conferences and Scholarly Presentations
- **Award Grants**
- Submitted Grants and Contracts

Check **awarded** grants for the required information:

"List grant title, percent credit and percent FTE on grant; role [PI, Co-PI]; all co-PIs; 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.)”

Check **submitted** grants for the required information:

“List grant title, percent credit and FTE funding on grant; role [PI, Co-PI]; all co-PIs; source of funding or agency; full funding amount; indirect and direct funding amounts. Please indicate if ‘pending’ or ‘unawarded’.

Awarded grants are listed in the area above.”

Section 4A – List of Collaborators

Is there a list provided in the Excel format?

Is information provided in each column, including the ***Brief Description of Collaboration*** column?

Section 4B – Representative Work (This is a required section for all candidates *except* Career-Track candidates with predominately teaching workloads.).

Was a cover page included with a list and a summary of why those 3-5 samples of representative work that was accepted or published *in current rank* were chosen?

Make sure there are only 3-5 samples of work included.

Ensure there are no links to drives or folders that permit the owner to track viewership (like DropBox, Google Drive, SharePoint, etc.)

Section 5 – Candidate Statement

Is the statement limited to three to five pages? (The attestation and signature can be on the 6th page)

Is the [correct attestation statement](#) included for the candidate’s track?

Is the candidate’s signature included after the attestation statement?

Section 6A – Information on Teaching and Mentoring

Is the Teaching Philosophy Statement limited to three pages?

Is the information limited to the period in current rank at the University of Arizona (except for teaching awards and teaching grants)?

Is the List of Courses Taught included in the correct [Excel format](#)?

Are the [SCS reports formatted for P&T](#) included and the correct format and legible?

Are the [TCE reports formatted](#) correctly?

Ensure there are NO student open-ended comments in this section. (If there are, move them to Section 6B)

Ensure there are no links to drives or folders that permit the owner to track viewership (like DropBox, Google Drive, SharePoint, etc.)

Section 6B – Supporting Documentation (Optional)

Was a cover page included that provides rationale about why they chose the documents they put in this section?

Check that ALL student names and IDs have been redacted, unless the work is part of a public performance or a student has completed a release form allowing this information to be shared in the dossier.

BEFORE SENDING CASE TO THE COLLEGE LEVEL – change settings in Section 6B to “Administrators Only” (If you only have a college committee, check this before sending forward for the University-level review.)

Ensure there are no links to drives or folders that permit the owner to track viewership (like DropBox, Google Drive, SharePoint, etc.)

Section 7A – Overview Description and Assessment (required for CE/CS candidates)

Is there a brief description of the job position, leadership, extension, service, position effectiveness, or innovation activities included?

Section 7B – Supplementary Documentation (required for CE/CS candidates)

BEFORE SENDING CASE TO THE COLLEGE LEVEL – change settings in Section 7B to “Administrators Only.” (If you only have a college committee, check this setting before sending forward for the University-level review.)

Section 8 - Graduate Interdisciplinary Program Evaluation (GIDP) (Optional)

Confirm that the candidate has included both a summary of their GIDP memberships and an evaluation of their own contributions.

For *each* GIDP description of membership and contributions that the candidate includes in Section 8, verify that there is a corresponding written evaluation from each GIDP chairperson in Section 8A.

Section 8A – Graduate or Other Interdisciplinary Program Evaluation (Optional)

For *each* written evaluation from each GIDP chairperson in Section 8A, verify that there is a corresponding GIDP description of membership and contributions that the candidate includes in Section 8.

Section 9A – Peer Observations for Teaching

Was the evaluative observation conducted during the year before, or semester of the candidate’s review?

Was the correct form used? The observation MUST be on the appropriate UCATT *Peer Observation of Teaching for Promotion and Tenure* form for the 2024-25 cycle, found in [Section 9A](#).

Are all sections of the observation form completed?

Section 9B - Provost Award for Innovations in Teaching (PAIT) Form – (Optional)

Are all fields on the form completed?

Note - the departmental committee is the only group in the University who can make this nomination. This form is only completed if the committee chooses to nominate the candidate for this award.

Section 10 – Letters from Independent External Reviewers and Collaborators

Worksheet for the Selection of Independent External Reviewers – Part 1

Did the Department Head sign this form?

Has all the information been included in this table?

Did no more than ½ the received letters come from reviewers suggested by the candidate?

Are all reviewers at least one rank higher than the current rank of the candidate?

Worksheet for the Selection of Independent External Reviewers – Part 2

Verify this document is included

Is one sample solicitation letter to Independent External Reviewers Included? And does it follow the required format in Appendix D for the correct track, and is it on letterhead and signed by the department head or committee chair?

Is there a Brief Bio included on the provided template for each Independent External Reviewer who provided a letter?

If the Department Head solicited collaboration letters, check the following:

Did the department head sign the ***Worksheet for Solicitation of Collaborators*** form?

Is one sample letter on letterhead and signed by the department head included?

Is a Collaborator Brief Bio included on the provided template for each collaborator who provided a letter?

Section 10A – Independent External Letters

Is there a sufficient number of independent external reviewer letters? There should be a minimum of three letters.

Did you move submitted Independent External Reviewer letters from the “External Evaluator” section into Section 10A? (Check for duplicate letters!)

Are all letters on letterhead?

Are all letters signed?

Remove all Independent External Reviewer CVs (the brief bios in Section 10 are all that are needed.)

Section 10B – Collaborator and Other Letters (Optional)

Did you move submitted Collaborator letters from the “External Evaluator” section into Section 10B? (Check for duplicate letters!)

Are all letters on letterhead?

Are all letters signed?

Remove all Collaborator CVs (the brief bios in Section 10 are all that are needed.)

Verify there are no unsolicited letters

Section 11 – Internal Evaluations

Department Committee Report – Check the Following:

Is the report on letterhead?
Is the NUMERIC vote included (i.e., 2 votes in favor of promotion and tenure, 1 vote against, 1 member absent, and 1 recusal.)
("Unanimously..." is not sufficient.)
Do the signatures listed on the last page add up to the numeric vote?
(All voting committee members must sign the letter.)
If the committee vote is split? If so, is a minority viewpoint or report included?
Are all the committee members at least one rank above the current rank of the candidate?

Department Head Evaluation – Check the Following:

Is the evaluation on letterhead?
Is the evaluation signed?
Is the decision of the department head clear in the evaluation?

Is the Department Head's written notification (email is fine) to the candidate included in this section? Does the department head specify what their recommendation was, and that they forwarded the case to the college?

Check for Conflicts of Interest (COI):

Download the case from RPT into Adobe and perform the OCR text recognition on the PDF. (**Important**- Make sure to save the file to a secure location and do a complete deletion on all case materials saved in your files immediately after the review has ended.)

Review the [track-specific Guide's](#) section on "Conflict of Interest."

Search the PDF to ensure the following:

None of the collaborators are included as Independent External Reviewers.

None of the collaborators are included as the Department Head/Director.

None of the collaborators are included as Department Committee Members.

None of the other potential conflicts listed in the Guide's section on "Conflict of Interest" are found.

If a potential COI is found in the dossier, was the collaboration explained in the letter as to why this wasn't a COI?

Thank you for your review! If you answered "No" to any of the sections above, please work with your department head to investigate further and correct, as appropriate.

Notes (if needed):

When you are ready to forward the case to the College, please email this checklist to your Faculty Affairs Lead at your College. Thank you!

The College Faculty Affairs Lead's checklist starts on the next page.

College-Level Faculty Affairs Lead - Please be sure to review each case carefully for *each of the areas* noted below. Then email this completed checklist to the Kim at rogan@arizona.edu when you send the case forward to the University level.

FA Lead / Case Reviewer's Name: _____

Date Reviewed: _____

Before you begin your review, have you viewed the *Case Review Training for Departmental Coordinators and Faculty Affairs Leads*? If not, **STOP** and view that video training first.

Mark if
Completed
or
Not

Applicable **Begin your case college-level case review:**

Review and verify *all sections* of the completed checklist above.

Verify the RPT case Academic Levels to ensure confidentiality of the case

Section 11 – Internal Sections

College Committee Report – Check the Following:

Is the report on letterhead?
Is the NUMERIC vote included (i.e., 2 votes in favor of promotion and tenure, 1 vote against, 1 member absent, and 1 recusal.)
("Unanimously..." is not sufficient.)
Are college committee members recused from the case, as appropriate?
Do the signatures listed on the last page add up to the numeric vote?
(All voting committee members must sign the report.)
If the committee vote is split, is a minority viewpoint or report included?
Are all the committee members at least one rank above the current rank of the candidate?

Dean's Evaluation – Check the Following:

Is the evaluation on letterhead?
Is the evaluation signed?

Is the Dean's written notice (email is fine) to the candidate included in this section? Does the Dean specify what their recommendation was, and that they forwarded the case to the Provost?

Check for Conflicts of Interest (COI):

Download the case from RPT into Adobe and perform the OCR text recognition on the PDF. (**Important**- Make sure to save the file to a

secure location and do a complete deletion on all case materials saved in your files immediately after the review has ended.)
Review the [track-specific Guide's](#) section on "Conflict of Interest."
Search the PDF to ensure the following:

None of the collaborators are included as Independent External Reviewers.
None of the collaborators are included as the Department Head/Director.
None of the collaborators are included as Department Committee Members.
None of the collaborators are included as the Dean.
None of the collaborators are included as College Committee Members.
None of the other potential conflicts listed in the Guide's section on "Conflict of Interest" are found.

If a potential CIO is found in the dossier, was the collaboration explained in the report/evaluation as to why this wasn't a COI?

Thank you for your review! If you answered "No" to any of the questions above, please work with your Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs to investigate further and correct, as appropriate. Remember – do **NOT** send the case back to the department level if there are external reviews, a College Committee Report or Dean's Evaluation in the case.

Notes (if needed):

When you are ready to forward the case to the Provost, please email this completed checklist to Kim Rogan at rogan@arizona.edu