

SECTION 11: INTERNAL EVALUATIONS FOR CAREER-TRACK PROMOTION

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

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

Committee members or administrators who have coauthored substantial publications or grants with a candidate, or have significant financial, personal, or other substantial interests with the candidate or their work, must recuse themselves to avoid raising concerns about their impartiality.

Any questions regarding whether committee members, heads or deans are independent reviewers or collaborators should be discussed with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs before the committee meets. Questions on these procedures should be directed to facultyaffairs@arizona.edu.

While not required, it is recommended that the Chair of the Peer Review Committees encourage members to sign and provide this [Confidentiality Agreement](#) that will be kept by the Chair of the Committee until the end of the promotion cycle.

Department Committee's Report

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

- **Vote count on promotion, including recusals, abstentions and absences;**
- Indicate workload percentages;
- Evaluation of research, scholarship, or creative activities;
- Evaluation of teaching and advising with a thorough discussion of the candidate's teaching portfolio considering the following criteria:
 - Evaluation and summary of content in the section on teaching and advising
 - Evaluation and summary of content in the supporting documentation
- Evaluation of service and/or outreach activities;
- Summary and discussion of external reviewer recommendations and comments;
- **Minority viewpoint** (if there was a split vote on the decision); and
- Explanation of any committee members' collaboration with candidate that has already been deemed not to be a conflict of interest.
- REMINDER – The department committee review is the only stage of the process that a candidate can be nominated for a *Provost Award for Innovations in Teaching* (PAIT). See [Section 9B](#) for information and the nomination form.

SECTION 11: INTERNAL EVALUATIONS FOR CAREER-TRACK PROMOTION

Department Head or Director's Evaluation

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

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

College Committee's Report

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

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

Dean's Evaluation

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

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