

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

SECTION 11: INTERNAL EVALUATIONS FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

Promotion reviews are based on assessments of the candidate's assigned teaching, service, research, and other duties according to benchmarks set out in department, college and university criteria. In making such assessments, internal reviewers should follow the policies in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel for [Promotion and Tenure](#), along with the University's Statement on Professional Conduct in [UHAP 7.01.01](#). That Statement sets out the expectation that all faculty are accountable and must be fair 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.

Department Heads/Directors or committee members who have a conflict of interest must recuse themselves to avoid raising concerns about their impartiality. Deans or delegated associate deans can appoint a surrogate outside of the department to conduct the review to mitigate any conflict of interest. Individuals with a conflict of interest may be requested to submit collaborator letters.

Conflict of Interest: It is considered a conflict of interest if you have significant financial, personal, or other substantial interests with the candidate, their work, or a significant collaboration. We define collaborators as individuals who, within the last five years, have co-authored books, articles, abstracts, or grants with the candidate. Co-instructors are considered co-authors of non-research publications (e.g., review or commentary) and are not considered collaborators. Editors of books or journals are not considered collaborators, nor are co-authors of mega-multi-authored publications, unless there has been close and direct collaboration. Please consider this guidance from NIH, [NIH Conflict of Interest Rules: Information for Reviewers of NIH Applications and R&D Contract Proposals](#). There is no time limit on the conflict of interest for dissertation advisors or mentors, who will always be considered as having a conflict of interest. **Any questions regarding conflict of interest should be discussed with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs before moving forward with reviews.** Questions on these procedures should be directed to facultyaffairs@arizona.edu.

When department heads are under review for promotion, ad hoc committee members and a surrogate head must be appointed by the dean or delegated associate dean.

Confidentiality: Members of Peer Review Committees who have been selected to serve, do so with the expectation that everything discussed is confidential and cannot be shared with anyone outside the committee. This confidentiality continues after the review cycle concludes and applies *even in cases where the outcome was unanimously positive*. ***Confidentiality is fundamental to maintaining the integrity and fairness of this process.***

- Members must not contact candidates regarding their cases under any circumstances, nor should they share any information related to case materials, discussions, deliberations, or outcomes with anyone outside of the formal review process.
- Never reveal votes or comments shared during deliberation.
- Votes are never linked with names.
- Never share internal or external letters of recommendation.
- Do not discuss evaluations with anyone outside of the committee.
- Never reveal external review identity or content of letters or decisions.
- Do not engage in evaluative discussion or voting over email. Email is considered public record.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

SECTION 11: INTERNAL EVALUATIONS FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

- Please destroy any confidential information after the reviews are completed.
- Do not use AI in any aspect of the review.

Department Committee's Report

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

- **Vote count on promotion and/or tenure, 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 (this material from the candidate will move forward to the college level);
 - Evaluation and summary of content in the supporting documentation (**this material from the candidate does NOT move to the college level; therefore, this summary is the source for next level evaluations**);
- Evaluation of service and/or outreach activities;
- Summary and discussion of external reviewer recommendations and comments;
- **Minority viewpoint** (if there was a split vote on the decision); and
- Explanation of any committee members' collaboration with the 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 at which a candidate can be nominated for a *Provost Award for Innovations in Teaching* (PAIT). See [Section 9B](#) for information and the nomination form.

Department Head or Director's Evaluation

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

- **Recommendation on promotion and/or tenure;**
- Independent assessment of candidate's teaching and advising, service, and research, scholarship, or creative activities;
- 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 the dean on letterhead with the signatures of all committee members, including the following content:

- **Vote count on promotion and/or tenure, including recusals, abstentions and absences;**
- Evaluation of teaching and advising, service, and research, scholarship, or creative activities;
(Supporting documentation from the candidate's teaching and/or service portfolios can be requested if necessary.)
- Indicate workload percentages;
- Summary and discussion of prior external and internal reviews;
- **Minority viewpoint** (if there was a split vote); and

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

SECTION 11: INTERNAL EVALUATIONS FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

- Explanation of any committee members' collaboration with the candidate that has already been deemed not to be a conflict of interest.

Dean's Evaluation

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

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