

This *Guide* provides candidates, heads, and mentors with an overview of the procedures for reviews of career-track faculty with lecturer, professor of practice, clinical or research professor titles. The University has made considerable progress with clarifying promotion criteria and procedures for career-track faculty in the year since the Faculty Senate recommended the change from non-tenure to career-track titles and expanded voting rights to career-track faculty who have been working at the university full time for at least three years. Colleges and departments have reviewed and revised their procedures, and career-track faculty now have a better sense of how to go up for promotion. This *Guide* contributes to these ongoing efforts by providing advice for candidates, reviewers, and administrators. College criteria are available on the Career-Track Faculty page: <http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/career-track-faculty>.

Career-track professors have more extensive reviews than lecturers. Promotion reviews for senior or principal lecturers are conducted by departmental committees and heads or directors with the approval of their dean, as noted in section 3.3.03 of the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel* (UHAP). Career-track professors are reviewed by a department committee, a head or director, a college committee, a dean, and the Provost, as noted in UHAP 3.3.03C. College procedures vary. Some colleges require external reviews for career-track professors. In the College of Medicine-Phoenix and College of Medicine-Tucson, professors on the clinical track or with clinical series titles are reviewed only at the department and college levels.

Table of Contents

- **COVID-19 Context** ([page 2](#))
- **Advice on Preparing Dossiers** ([page 3](#))
 - Advice on Candidate Statements
 - Advice on Teaching Portfolios
 - Tips on Research Documentation
 - Using Service and Outreach Portfolios to Document Impact
- **Directions on Dossiers** ([page 6](#))
- **Avoiding the Most Common Problems in Dossiers** ([page 10](#))
- **Promotion Policies** ([page 11](#))
 - The Yearly Promotion Review Schedule
 - The University's Inclusive View of Scholarship
 - The Provost Awards for Innovations in Teaching
 - Reviews of Student Evaluations
 - Policies on Promotion Review Committees
 - Additions to Dossiers
 - Notifications of Candidates on Recommendations
 - Recognizing Interdisciplinary Collaborations
 - Considering Findings of Professional Misconduct
 - Appeals of Promotion Decisions

This *Guide* and related information on career-track reviews are on the Vice Provost's website: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/career-track-faculty>.

The [University Handbook for Appointed Personnel \(UHAP\)](#) provides policies for personnel procedures. Promotion procedures for career-track faculty are covered in UHAP [Chapter 3.3.03](#).

DOSSIER TEMPLATE

- Section 1: Summary Data Sheet
- Section 2: Summary of Candidate's Workload
- Section 3: Departmental and College Guidelines
- Section 4, 4A, 4B: CV, List of Collaborators, Representative Work
- Section 5: Candidate Statement
- Section 6, 6A, 6B: Teaching Portfolio
- Section 7, 7A, 7B: Leadership, Extension, Service and Innovation Portfolio (Optional for tenure-track, required for continuing track.)
- Section 8, 8A: Membership Graduate or Interdisciplinary Programs for Candidates *and* Graduate or Other Interdisciplinary Program Evaluation by GDP Chair and Committee
- Section 9: Peer Observation and Nomination for Provost Award for Innovations in Teaching
- Section 10, 10A, 10B: Letters from Independent External Reviewers and Collaborators
- Section 11: Internal Evaluations for Promotion
- Appendix A: Checklist for Shared Appointments
- Appendix B: Sample of Department Criteria
- Appendix C: Guidelines for

COVID-19 Context

The global pandemic crisis of COVID-19 has created many challenges for faculty. Following are some updates on changes in the promotion process during 2021-2022 as impacted by the global pandemic.

1. **Deadlines** for 2021-2022 Career-track promotion dossiers to the university level for review are due **Monday, December 6, 2021.**
2. **Student Course Surveys and Peer Observations during Spring 2020 and Fall 2020:** Given the unexpected changes in teaching format these semesters and the stay of releasing Student Course Surveys, if candidates did conduct their own student evaluations for the given semesters, these can be included in the section 6A. There will be no penalty to candidates if student evaluations are not provided for the semesters in 2020. Department and unit committees need to keep in mind the university did not release or require teaching observations or student evaluations to be conducted due to the pandemics.
3. **Section 2A: Pandemic Impact Statement is Required for 2021-2022:** This subsection was initially added last year to provide faculty an opportunity to describe the impact of the global pandemics on their workload assignment or trajectory of their scholarly activity, teaching, service, clinical activities, extension activities, or administrative roles. Please see link [here](#) for more details and tips for completing this new section.
4. **Revisions to the Required Template Letter to Independent External Reviewers (if applicable for review).** Changes have been made to the cover letter for external reviewers to address the pandemic context and to describe the pandemic statement that is now required for all candidates.
5. We are dedicated to improving **Equity** in the promotion process. We will work with review committees, department heads, and deans to consider how the global pandemic may have disproportionately impacted women and minorities. We will be adding new information on this topic into our training for department heads and promotion review committees.

Given growing evidence that COVID-19 has had a disproportionate impact on women, underrepresented ethnic/racial/sexual groups, family caregivers, and those with health risks, we recognize that more than ever it is critical to acknowledge and consider issues of equity, diversity and inclusivity in the review of promotion materials. Moreover, individuals should not be penalized for adjusted work schedules, modified duties, or changes to research and creative momentum due to the extraordinary obstacles to everyday life that have resulted from the pandemic. However, we also acknowledge that unexpected changes in scholarly work, teaching, and service may lead to new and unexpected innovations and breakthroughs that have significant societal impact and which should be viewed in the light of the context of COVID-19, even if they do not follow a traditional pathway. As such, we call on all administrative leaders and review committees to not only recognize and mitigate these concerns, but also to proactively seek opportunities for resource reallocation and infrastructure investments to support the professional development and promotion process for all faculty. Here you can find some recent articles for more details on the gendered impact of COVID-19 on research and publishing. These findings are important for review committees to consider:

1. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/04/21/early-journal-submission-data-suggest-covid-19-tanking-womens-research-productivity>
2. <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-01294-9>
3. <https://www.thelily.com/women-academics-seem-to-be-submitting-fewer-papers-during-coronavirus-never-seen-anything-like-it-says-one-editor/>
4. <https://www.natureindex.com/news-blog/decline-women-scientist-research-publishing-production-coronavirus-pandemic>
5. <https://voxeu.org/article/who-doing-new-research-time-covid-19-not-female-economists>
6. <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2020/may/12/womens-research-plummets-during-lockdown-but-articles-from-men-increase>

7. <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/voices/scientist-mothers-face-extra-challenges-in-the-face-of-covid-19/>

Advice on Preparing Dossiers

Faculty Affairs offers workshops in the early Spring on dossier preparation for candidates of all tracks as well as review committees, department heads, chairs or directors. Please see our link [here](#) for information on previous workshops, as well as materials and resources: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/promotion-workshops>

Advice on Candidate Statements

The Candidate Statement is an opportunity to detail your scholarly activity, teaching and service. There is no more than five pages allotted for the Candidate Statement. Please see the link [here](#) to review the full power point slides from the Candidate Statement workshop provided by Faculty Affairs.

The Candidate Statement includes an overview of the progress and impact of your scholarly activity, as well as the principles that guide the teaching and service contributions detailed in your Teaching Portfolio and your Service and Outreach Portfolio.

The Candidate Statement is an opportunity to tell the story of your work over your period in rank; as such, it is much more than a laundry list of the activities that are already indicated in the curriculum vitae. However, highlighting certain activities with sufficient explanation and detail will provide evidence and strength to back up broader statements about your work. The statement is an excellent opportunity to position your work within your field or between interdisciplinary fields. As such, clarity about benchmarks and norms in your field or associated fields can help reviewers better understand the quality and quantity of your work. A hallmark of successful statements are those that speak to the “why your work matters (e.g. to the field, department, university, society)” component of your scholarly activity, teaching, and service.

How can you use your Candidate Statement to help reviewers understand your work?

- How can you highlight your achievements in ways to relate them to promotion expectations, especially within your departmental and college criteria?
 - *Highlight your most prominent and impactful work*, rather than trying to discuss every component of your work in detail.
- How can you relate your research, teaching, and service to the duties in your workload assignment to demonstrate your professional performance?
- How can you use your major achievements to demonstrate the progress and impact of your overall program of work and your professional effectiveness?

How can your statement represent evidence of your teaching excellence?

- What sources of assessment and impact can you provide evidence of to support statements about your pedagogy or teaching impact, such as in-class student feedback, peer observations, TCE/SCS reports, letters from students, or other broader impacts of your teaching on the university, your discipline, or community beyond academia?
- What innovative or evidence-based pedagogical methods have you utilized with success (give examples of success), such as curricular design, modes of instruction, context, management, technology, collaborative learning spaces, experiential learning, service learning, etc.?
- What types of goals (e.g. learning outcomes, student engagement, or interpersonal dynamics) have you prioritized in your teaching and mentoring, and that you can provide examples or evidence of excellence?
- How can you connect your statement to examples of your teaching in your portfolio?

How can you inform specialist reviewers, and also convey the importance of your work to non-specialists?

- How can you set out your program of work to demonstrate its impact?
 - What are the problems, terms, and concepts that will be of most interest to expert readers?
 - How can you help less specialized readers assessment by providing definitions and examples?
 - Can you benchmark the importance of your contributions, perhaps by noting invitations to present your work, the standing of your publication venues, or adoptions of your innovations?
- How can you benchmark the progress and impact of your program of work?
 - How has your research, scholarship and creative work advanced since your dissertation?
 - If you work on research teams or with senior colleagues, how can you demonstrate your independent contributions to those collaborations?
 - Where is your work headed? What will its impact be, and how will you achieve it?

Remember your readers will include non-specialists as well as experts. Your external reviewers may look to your Candidate Statement to help them assess the development and significance of your research and position effectiveness. Your research and scholarship are detailed in your publications so focus on major findings and contributions and refer to your publications for specifics. Remember that most of your internal reviewers will not be specialists in your field. They will generally be more broadly concerned with how your work matters. They may also be interested in the broader impact of your scholarship and other professional contributions. To be effective with such readers, you should avoid overloading sentences with complex terminology. Use your Candidate Statement to discuss the overall program of work that is detailed in your CV.

How can you integrally relate your research and scholarship to your teaching and service to demonstrate your impact?

- Has your research improved your teaching or position effectiveness? For example, have you worked with more graduate students or residents or helped collaborators in new ways?
- How does your work contribute to the missions of your department and the university, for example, through the creation of internships, research opportunities, or partnerships?
- What is the broader social and economic impact of your program of work?
- Could the Service and Outreach Portfolio help you document your leadership and impact?

In addition to discussing your research contributions, you may wish to draw on the university’s “inclusive view of scholarship” to discuss how your work has had a broader impact on teaching, institutional effectiveness, and outreach. Our “inclusive view of scholarship” recognizes “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.” Go to our website to learn more about how to interpret inclusive scholarship, teaching, and service, as well as to find more resources on this topic: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship>

Tips on Creating Teaching Portfolios

Teaching Portfolios are required in all dossiers for candidates with assigned teaching duties. A Teaching Portfolio is a collection of selected instructional materials to support the discussion of teaching in the Candidate Statement. You will want to situate your teaching within best practices in the field. You should include a selection of instructional materials to document instructional innovations, curricular designs, and outcomes assessments. A downloadable template for documenting course information can be found [here](#). Additionally, by providing information about specific course goals, and student populations in your Teaching Portfolio, you can provide reviewers with a better sense of the contexts in which you teach.

A full list of possible materials is included in the [Promotion Dossier Template](#).

- The University of Arizona’s Office of Instructional Assessment has many resources at the following weblinks:
 - Teaching (<https://oia.arizona.edu/content/7>)
 - Webinars & Classes (<https://oia.arizona.edu/content/8>)
- [Brown University’s Teaching Portfolio by Hannelore B. Rodriguez-Farrar](#)
- University Center for the Advancement of Teaching at Ohio State University’s Teaching Portfolio Resources: <http://ucat.osu.edu/read/teaching-portfolio>
- The University of California, Berkeley provides detailed advice on each aspect of the teaching portfolio. <https://career.berkeley.edu/PhDs/PhDportfolio>
- [How to Write a Statement of Teaching Philosophy](#) by The Chronicle of Higher Education
- Rubric for Evaluating Teaching Portfolios from the University of Indiana: http://medsci.indiana.edu/m620/sotl_08/teaching_portfolio_rubric.pdf
- [Inclusive Curricula and Classrooms Classroom observations,](#) Candidate Statements, and other aspects of Teaching Portfolios should demonstrate that candidates are utilizing evidence-based methods such as universal design principles to meet the needs of all learners, including those from traditionally unrepresented backgrounds. Further information on inclusive pedagogies is available at <https://diversity.arizona.edu/creating-inclusive-classrooms>

In addition to discussion of their teaching outcomes and description of evidence in the Candidate Statement, candidates should include a **teaching philosophy** statement in the Teaching Portfolio. The teaching philosophy is distinct because it is less focused on demonstrating evidence of excellence and rather allows the candidate to focus more on their philosophical approach to pedagogy and how that informs the development of their classes. In this section faculty may choose to clarify how they use evidence-based approaches to developing syllabi, classroom activities, or evaluation of students. In this section faculty may describe how their classes link to the broader curriculum and education of student within a discipline or for specific future jobs or advanced study. In particular, this section may include additional information about strategies to implement collaborative learning space activities, technological advances, experiential learning, community-engaged activities, service-learning activities, on-line activities or other pedagogical innovations. To find more information on how a teaching philosophy is unique from the Candidate Statement, see this link from the Chronicle of Higher Education that describes the intent of the teaching philosophy statement: <https://www.chronicle.com/article/How-to-Write-a-Statement-of/45133>. Candidates may choose to include peer observations completed prior to the promotion review.

Tips on Using Leadership and Service Portfolios to Document Impact and Innovation

If extension, position effectiveness administrative leadership or other service duties make up a significant portion of your assigned duties, you should submit Section 7: The Portfolio to Document Leadership, Extension, Service and Innovation. This portfolio provides an opportunity to document the scope, quality, and impact of your contributions in areas that are beyond the traditional academic community. This section may include description and evidence of community and economic impact in extension, position effectiveness for information professionals or innovations in translational or applied research and/or patent inventions. This portfolio can also be used to document administrative service. One example of administrative impact may be shown through the development of new programs and initiatives, by including not only a description, as well as evidence of growth and impact. Given that this section is a portfolio it is common that candidates will provide examples of their work in this area. Candidates should consult our [resource page](#) on the Inclusive View of Scholarship. Also, view the link [here](#) for a brief, not exhaustive, list of types of materials that are well-suited to include in this section.

A template letter is provided in Appendix E for requesting letters to document collaborations with business or community partners, including schools, other state agencies, or collaborators on commercialization activities and tech transfer.

Tips on Documentation of Scholarship or Creative Activity

For those faculty who have research/scholarly activity as a portion of their workload, they will need to document the extent, quality and impact of their scholarly activity. Each discipline has its own norms to represent scholarship or creative activity; thus, the first step for candidates is to work closely with mentors within their department and mentors across the nation/globe within their field.

Publications

We strongly encourage candidates to clearly distinguish between work that is already published, work that is currently in press, work that is under review, and work that is in progress (not submitted yet). We encourage everyone to read and follow the advice from the following websites:

- Inside Higher Education: <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2012/12/03/essay-how-list-scholarship-hasnt-been-published-yet>
- National Institutes of Health: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK7240/>

A specific and relevant definition on forthcoming material and in press is provided here for clarity:

“Forthcoming material consists of journal articles or books accepted for publication but not yet published. “Forthcoming” has replaced the former “in press” because changes in the publishing industry make the latter term obsolete.

Do not include as forthcoming those articles that have been submitted for publication but have not yet been accepted for publication. Note that some publishers will not accept references to any form of unpublished items in a reference list.”

Grants

We strongly encourage candidates to clearly distinguish between grants that are awarded, or submitted. We require candidates to clarify the following information when reporting grants: grant title, percent effort on grant, role (PI, Co-PI, Consultant, Collaborator), source of funding or agency, full funding amount, indirect and direct funding amounts. Also, please designate for submitted grants, if pending (under review) or unfunded (not awarded). See more information in [Section 4 – Curriculum Vitae](#).

Directions on Dossiers

The Office of the Provost annually evaluates 50 or more career-track dossiers, plus an additional 30 or more dossiers for transitioning from lecturer to a professorial title or another faculty track. Every dossier is read by over twenty reviewers, including external reviewers, departmental and college committees, and heads and deans. To avoid problems, Promotion Dossiers must follow the Dossier Template and established procedures. Dossiers are returned to departments when required formats and procedures are not followed. **As noted in the [Most Common Problems](#) section, most problems arise when heads have coauthored or collaborated with candidates, a surrogate head should be solicited.**

Conflict of Interest: Committee members or administrators who have coauthored substantial publications or grants with a candidate 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 issues of mentoring, internal collaborations, or questions of maintaining a balanced review process. **When heads have coauthored with candidates, a surrogate head should be solicited**, and the head should submit a collaborator letter. Questions about this matter should be directed to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Please consider this guidance from NIH, https://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/NIH_Conflict_of_Interest_Rules.pdf.

Collaborators should not participate in any part of the process of suggestion or selection of the independent external reviewers. Rather than serving on review committees or in administrative roles, collaborators should provide a separate letter that describes the independent contributions of the candidate. Collaborator letters are placed in Section 10B after the external review letters.

Candidates and departments/units are responsible for following procedures and submitting materials in a timely manner. If a dean or college committee determines a dossier is missing essential elements, the evaluation process may be halted until materials are secured. In some circumstances, a dean may choose to re-initiate the department-level review. Likewise, if the University Advisory Committee finds that reviews have been affected by a poor dossier, the committee may request that materials be revised or added. This action re-initiates the review at the departmental level. While these steps may be taken when candidates have not provided the required information, candidates are responsible for submitting dossier materials by the deadline.

The Dossier Template provides checklists of requirements to divide the sections of Promotion Dossiers. The checklists note the items to be reviewed in each section, and thereby help to ensure consistency and completeness in Dossiers. The checklists also help to save time at each level of the review process.

The dossier materials should be in a searchable PDF format. Candidates can create or edit existing documents to a searchable PDF format using the [Adobe Acrobat DC Pro](https://adobe-portal.apps.uits.arizona.edu/products) (free download with Net ID and password through Adobe Creative Campus, <https://adobe-portal.apps.uits.arizona.edu/products>). Department and unit coordinators or personnel can review the RPT Administrator Training slides (see [Promotion Workshops](#)) for information on how to use Adobe Acrobat DC Pro to edit documents to searchable PDF format.

Section 1: Summary Data Sheet

This sheet helps to ensure that reviews follow the appropriate procedures for the candidate's track.

Section 2: Summary of Candidate's Workload Assignment

This a one page form is filled out by heads/chairs/directors to provide specifics on assigned duties. ***It should not praise contributions.*** It should specify what a figure such as "40% teaching" generally entails in the candidate's unit.

If the candidate's duties have changed over time in rank, the changes should be specified. The workload of the candidate for each year on the table should equal 100% even if the FTE is less than 1.00 for the position. The percent indicated for the year helps external/internal reviewers to have a clear understanding of the candidate's workload expectation and percentage within the FTE of the position. The FTE of the candidate is included on the workload summary form, near the top. If there were changes in FTE for the position, this should be explained. Additional pages are allowed in this section.

If there was a time clock delay (TCD) in the promotion process, indicate it with "TCD" in the appropriate Academic Year's column, in the labeled row. To preserve candidates' privacy rights, the dossier should not state the reasons for delays.

Workload assignments should note shared appointments. *Shared appointments* are defined as those where candidates' budget lines are split between two or more units. The Promotion Dossiers for split appointments should include the *Checklist for Shared Appointments* ([Appendix A](#)). This form helps to ensure that the heads of the units and the individuals all agree upon the terms of the appointment, including the teaching load, service expectations, and the constitution of the peer-review committee. For candidates with shared appointments, department heads may collaborate on a single recommendation letter, or they may decide to submit separate recommendations.

Section 2A: Pandemic Impact Statement

This is a *required* two-page narrative completed by the candidate to document any changes to their workload or activities as a result of the pandemics beginning in Spring 2020.

Tips for candidates to consider is describing how the global pandemic has impacted any of their activities. It is open-ended so that candidates can best address their own unique situation to provide additional considerations on the impact of the pandemics. We recommend writing the impact of activities identified within your workload assignment. Information of relevance to reviewers that may provide additional understanding to review their curriculum vitae, teaching portfolio, or service portfolio. Additional information that may be useful to reviewers may include a slowdown in research due to lab access, data collection with human subjects, lack of access to work with collaborators impacted by the virus, abrupt changes in workload expectations, challenges with remote teaching, or abrupt changes in research topics or directions as a result of pandemics.

Section 3: Departmental and College Promotion Guidelines

Include a one-page summary following [Appendix B](#) format.

Section 4: Curriculum Vitae

- Publications should be listed in chronological order.
- Place an asterisk (*) to the left of the title of any publication substantially based on work done as a graduate student.
- Page numbers and all other publication data should be included.
- For publications that are not in English, please provide English translations of titles.
- Peer-reviewed publications should be distinguished from proceedings and other publications.
- Scholarly presentations should be limited to period in rank.
- Distinguish invited from submitted presentations.
- List awarded, submitted, pending, or unfunded grants during the period in rank.
- Grants should be organized according to source of funding (federal, industry, private/foundations).
- Checklist of collaborators to ensure it is accurate.

Meaning of "Limit to period in current rank or last five years in current rank."

For career-track *assistant or associate professorial rank with less than five-years*, please include information limited to period in current rank. If *assistant or associate professorial rank with more than five-years*, please include information from the last five-years in current rank. (This statement is also in Section 6 (6A, 6B) and 7 (7A, 7B) dossier template instructions.)

Section 4A: List of Collaborators

Collaborators include all individuals whom you have worked closely and directly within the last five-years or 60 months preceding the submission of this dossier. Individuals who have co-authored on books, articles, publications, reports, abstracts, papers or awarded grant proposals and projects.

A template table is provided for input of information regarding close collaborators, which includes the Collaboration Description. For example, if a collaborator is a co-author (for the collaboration type) a description detail is, but not limited to book, journal article, manuscript, volume, paper, chapter, or abstract.

Section 4B: Representative Publications, Scholarship and/or Creative Activities

Please follow the guidance from the college, department or unit to upload the representative work *accepted* and/or *published* during the current rank. This can include but is not limited to articles, abstracts, chapters, manuscripts, publications, and recordings.

Section 5: Candidate Statement

Candidate Statements vary across disciplines and types of positions. Candidates should receive guidance from mentors and heads/chairs/directors on what is common in their field and how to prioritize content for the five pages that are available.

Section 6: Teaching Portfolio

Candidates are responsible to provide information and supporting documentation on their teaching and advising for the time in current rank.

Section 6A: Information on Teaching and Advising

This area is designated for course descriptions, the list of classes for teaching history for the time in rank, student evaluations, peer observations not conducted for promotion review, and the teaching philosophy. **This documentation is forwarded for college or university reviews.**

Section 6B: Supporting Documentation

Syllabi, assignments, and other supporting documentation are for review by departmental committees and heads. **These instructional materials will not be forwarded for college or university reviews.**

Section 7: Portfolio to Document Leadership, Extension, Service and Innovation

This section should be used by candidates whose duties are outside the scope of traditional appointments for continuing or tenure track faculty. The Leadership Portfolio has two parts:

Section 7A: Overview and Assessment

Description and assessment of the service, position effectiveness, innovation, or administrative leadership efforts.

Section 7B: Supplementary Documentation

This subsection is for evidence of the candidate's impact. The Overview is forwarded for reviews at the college and university levels, while the Supplementary Documentation is for departmental reviews and will not generally be forwarded for subsequent reviews. Candidates who have significant service and outreach duties may request that external reviewers receive their portfolios.

New letters from collaborators should be solicited by the department head or director and included in Section 10B Collaborator or Other Letters. If the candidate would like to submit archived letters received during the time in rank from stakeholders, these can be included in Section 7B Supplementary Documentation.

For guidance on preparing these portfolios, candidates should consult our resource page on the scholarship of engagement: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship>.

Section 8: Membership in Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs

Reviews of candidates who are actively contributing in Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs and other interdisciplinary units should follow the *Guidelines for Acknowledgment and Evaluation of Faculty Participation in GIDPS and Other Interdisciplinary Units* ([Appendix C](#)). Candidates should discuss their interdisciplinary contributions in their Candidate Statement.

Section 8A: Graduate or Other Interdisciplinary Program Evaluation

This is an internal review of the candidate's contributions to a GIDP program or interdisciplinary program. This section includes evaluations from the GIDP or interdisciplinary program Chair and the department or unit promotion review committee.

Section 9: Peer Observation and Nomination for Provost Award

It is **preferred** for a member of the departmental review committee to conduct at least one peer observation of teaching during the year before or semester of the promotion review. Observations of teaching for candidates undergoing a promotion review will use the [Classroom Observation Tool](#) or the [Online Course](#)

[Review Tool](#) from the Office of Instruction and Assessment (OIA). **Please include the report and letter from the classroom or online class observation conducted for promotion review in this section.** For assistance with peer observations, please contact Dr. Ingrid Novodvorsky in the Office of Instruction and Assessment: novod@email.arizona.edu. It is recommended that units choose 10 items (out of the 82 possible) to guide the observation; the unit may choose the items based on the specific course or overall unit teaching philosophy. A pre-observation meeting can be conducted with the candidate. There is no need to meet with the candidate after completing the observation for the promotion review.

Nomination memos should use the [Criteria for Peer Reviews of Teaching](#) for recommending candidates for the [Provost Awards for Innovations in Teaching](#). These criteria are to be used for assessing candidates' teaching and deciding whether to nominate them for the awards that former Interim Provost Goldberg established to provide special recognition to candidates with outstanding records of teaching. Decisions on these awards will be based on the nominations of peer review committees.

Section 10: Letters from Independent External Reviewers and Collaborators

Committee members or administrators who have co-authored substantial publications or grants with a candidate should recuse themselves to avoid raising concerns about their impartiality. Rather than serving on review committees or in administrative roles, collaborators should provide a separate letter that describes the independent contributions of the candidate. Questions about this matter should be directed to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

Please pay special attention to potential conflicts of interest at this stage. Supervisors who have collaborated with the candidate in the last five years must recuse themselves from the selection process of external reviewers and the promotion review. Please also confirm that all external reviewers do not have a conflict of interest, for more information see here. 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.

All communications with external reviewers should be fully documented. A sample letter to external reviewers is included as [Appendix D](#). **Heads should not deviate from the exact wording of the sample letter only with the permission of their dean, and substantive changes must be approved by the Office of the Provost.** While candidates should suggest evaluators to their heads, **no more than half of the evaluators can come from these suggestions.** If the candidate suggests the same reviewer as the head or committee, the reviewer should be counted as being from the candidate.

Section 10A: Independent External Letters

Place solicited letters from independent external reviewers in this subsection. Use the **required** template letter in Appendix D to solicit letters, [Appendix D Template Letter](#)

Three to eight (*minimum of three, however, five are strongly encouraged*) letters signed and printed on letterhead from independent, external reviewers who are NOT collaborators of the candidate.

Letters that may be identified as coming from collaborators, as defined below, will not be considered among independent external letters. They will be placed in the section for collaborator letters. Letters must be solicited and received during the current promotion cycle.

Section 10B: Collaborator and Other Letters

Solicited letters signed and printed on letterhead from collaborators. Sample letters in Appendix E are used for solicitation, [Appendix E Letter Template](#)

Section 11: Internal Evaluations for Promotion

Administrators and committee members should not have collaborated with the candidate in a **substantial** and **ongoing** way. Please see the Most Common Problems section of this guide to review the complete recommendations about how to distinguish collaborators. In such occurrences, they should recuse themselves and, in the case of a department head, appoint a surrogate head. If recusing committee members is not feasible, for example, because of the size of the department, the committee letters must address the concerns about the independence of collaborators. If these concerns are not addressed, Dossiers may be returned to departments to provide committees with the opportunity to do so. If the candidate is active in a GIDP, an evaluation from the GIDP Chair should be included in Section 8. The positive and negative comments of the outside reviewers should be fairly and fully represented in the letters of the departmental committee and/or department head.

Avoiding the Most Common Problems in Dossiers

When procedures are not followed, Dossiers have to be returned to departments to repeat the reviews at each level in the process. **Four problems result in most of the returns of Career-Track Dossiers to departments.** All Dossiers should be reviewed to check on these problems to avoid delays.

1. **Does the Workload Assignment describe the candidate's duties in non-evaluative terms that provide adequate details on the candidate's teaching load and any split appointments?** As the first document in the dossier, the Workload Assignment provides the baseline for reviewers to make independent assessments of candidates' achievements, so the workload description should be an objective description of expectations for the percentage workload allotted in each section. It should NOT praise the candidates' contributions. While a position description should not use evaluative terms, it should provide enough detail to clarify how many courses are expected or what typical duties are included in the appointment for the unit.

2. **Is a recent teaching observation included in Section 9 using the Classroom Observation Tool through Office of Instruction and Assessment (OIA)?** Section 7 only requires the Peer Observation and optional nomination memo for the Provost Award. A recent teaching observation using the [Classroom Observation Tool](#) should be included in section seven of the dossier, preferable conducted by a review committee member at the department or unit. An observation of the candidate's teaching is particularly important with unusual teaching assignment such as team-taught classes or residencies.

a. **Is there a sufficient discussion and analysis of the teaching portfolio?** There is no longer a requirement of a separate teaching evaluation memo in Section 7. It is expected that an in-depth evaluation and analysis of the multiple components of the teaching portfolio will be included in the departmental committee report in Section 11. If the portion of the report on teaching is too brief and does not address teaching in a holistic manner represented by multiple components, the packet will be returned to the departmental committee for revision and re-review at all internal levels.

3. **It is strongly suggested that career-track promotion dossier submissions include internal reviewers of the dossier who are outside of the department for all levels of review. Some reviews may also include reviewers who are external to the university. In those cases, it is imperative to consider the following issues.**

a. **Were no more than half of the external reviewers suggested by the candidate, and did the process follow the prescribed procedures, including the required letter template?** No more than half of the reviewers can come from the candidate's suggestions. Each step in the process should be documented using the checklist in the Dossier Template. Any changes in the letter to reviewers must be approved by the Provost's Office.

b. **Were any coauthors and collaborators of candidates included such as internal reviewers, external reviewers, committee members, or administrators?** The University looks to external reviewers to provide an independent assessment, and their impartiality is called into question when they have collaborated with a candidate. Collaborators should not serve as external or internal reviewers. Questions about the independence of reviewers can lead to Dossiers being returned to departments and colleges.

c. **Are there sufficient independent external review letters according to the promotion criteria of the unit or college?** A search of the dossier materials in electronic form (PDF) is necessary to ensure that all requested and solicited letters from outside reviewers are truly independent from the candidate. If it is found that outside reviewers are close friends, former co-workers, mentors, mentees of the candidate, then they will not be considered as external reviewers. If letters are deemed to not be independent and the total is less than three, then additional independent letters must be solicited to continue with the internal review of the dossier.

4. **Is the department head/chair/director a collaborator? Have they been involved with soliciting external reviewers or creating the departmental committee?** Deans and delegated Associate Deans can appoint a

surrogate outside of the department to conduct the review to mitigate any issues of mentoring, internal collaborations, or questions of maintaining a balanced process. **When heads have coauthored or collaborated on grants with candidates, a surrogate head must be solicited**, and the head may choose to submit a collaborator letter.

Promotion Policies

Yearly Promotion Review Schedule

- ***Career-Track Dossiers are due to the Office of the Provost on or before December 6, 2021***; however, departments and colleges may deviate from the other dates suggested in this schedule.
- **When Dossiers are forwarded from the administrating head or director to the college *and* from the college dean or unit administrator to the university level, candidates must be notified of the recommendation that is being made.**

Action	Point Person	Due Date
Candidate and Department Head Discuss for Submission Timeline	Department Head/Director	At least one year prior to Submission Due Date
Candidates are notified of their upcoming review.	Department Head/Director	January-March
Annual Workshops: Instructions on the Process and Preparation of Dossiers for Promotion	Vice Provost	January – March every year
Final preparation of Dossier by Candidate	Candidate	April - June
The candidate provides a list of potential Independent Evaluators to Department Head or Director	Department Head/Director	May - June
Final Submission of Dossier by Candidate	Department Head/Director	May – July
Letters requesting review are sent to External Evaluators	Department Head, Director, or Committee Chair	By mid-July
Departmental Committee's report is written and added to the dossier	Departmental Committee Chair	By mid-September
Department Head or Director's letter written and added to the dossier	Department Head/Director	September 30 th
Dossier delivered to Dean's Office	Dean	October 1 st
College Committee's report is written and added to the dossier	Chair of College Committee	By mid-November
Dean's letter is written and added to the dossier	Dean	November 30 th
Dossiers due in the Office of the Provost	Vice Provost	December 6th

Provost's letters of decision sent to candidates	University Coordinator, Colleges and Departments	April 29, 2022
--	--	----------------

The University's Inclusive View of Scholarship

Candidates and reviewers should consider the resources on the University's Inclusive View of Scholarship <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship>:

Our University's Promotion criteria recognizes that research enriches teach, service, and outreach in ways that are vital to our mission as a student-centered land-grant university. Our criteria specify that promotion, tenure, or continuing status requires:

excellent performance and the promise of continued excellence in 1) teaching, 2) service, and 3) research, creative work, and scholarship. The University values an inclusive view of scholarship in the recognition that knowledge is acquired and advanced through discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Given this perspective, promotion and tenure reviews, as detailed in the criteria of individual departments and colleges, will recognize 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.

Our inclusive view of scholarship has taken on new significance with the university's transition to becoming a Hispanic Serving Institution, and an established American Indian and Alaska Native-Serving Institution as Provost Folks notes:

Our inclusive view of scholarship has taken on new meaning now that we have become an Hispanic Serving institution (HSI). . . . Our integrated vision of research, outreach, and teaching has helped us recognize faculty contributions to our 100% student engagement initiative, our expansion of online and global offerings, and our wide-ranging outreach and bridge programs. . . . As we take up the work of being a HSI and AINSI, we need to ensure that we recognize HSI/AINSI-related activities in teaching, outreach, and research in our promotion reviews.

Evaluation of Teaching

Committees should take a holistic perspective that considers multiple aspects of the candidate's Teaching Portfolios, their teaching observations, their assessments of Student Course Surveys (SCS) (formerly Teacher-Course Evaluations, TCEs), and their responses to candidates' self-assessments of their teaching. The University uses this multimodal assessment of teaching to provide multiple methods of information gathering that demonstrate a more complete presentation of the quality of teaching. For further information on interpreting student assessments, see Linse's ["Interpreting and using student ratings data: Guidance for faculty serving as administrators and on evaluation committees"](#) (2017). To conduct teaching observations, the committee uses the OIA's [Classroom Observation Tool](#) or the [Online Course Review Tool](#).

Policies on Promotion Review Committees

Each college and department must have a standing committee to advise the dean and department head.

- Career-track promotion committees may include faculty from other tracks, as noted in UHAP 3.3.03.A, but **career-track faculty should generally be a majority of the members of the committee**. At least three faculty members must serve on the committee to conduct the promotion review.
- **All committee members and external reviewers must have a rank superior to the candidate**. When reviewing candidates for promotion to full, committee members and reviewers must be at the full rank.

- **Committee members or administrators who have coauthored substantial publications or grants with a candidate within the last five years should generally recuse themselves** to avoid raising questions about the independence of reviews. If recusing committee members is not feasible, for example because of the size of the department, the committee must address the concerns about conflicts of interest in its letter.
- **Individuals who serve concurrently** on departmental, college and/or University promotion committees must recuse themselves from voting on any case they provided a vote in an earlier committee.
- **Review committees' assessments are to be independent of the administrators** whom they advise. Standing committees normally will meet without the administrator whom they advise, as noted in UHAP.

As required in UHAP, review committees should begin their deliberations by reviewing department and college promotion criteria for research, teaching, and service and outreach. Committees should also review these standards at the end of the process and suggest revisions to their administrators. This requirement is important for career-track committees because of recent University changes in career-track promotion reviews.

Departments that do not have criteria for reviews of career-track lecturers and professors may use their college criteria, the university optional promotion criteria for lecturers and professors, or create their own criteria and arrange for departmental review, vote and approval by the dean and provost before the review. All approved criteria and resources are available on the Career-Track Promotion page: <https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/career-track-faculty>.

Additions to Dossiers

On *rare occasions*, information on a candidate's work becomes available during the review process. For example, a candidate receives an award, grant or publication. Such information may be added using these procedures:

1. Candidates notify a committee chair, head or other administrators of a recent development.
2. The administrator or committee chair decides that the information is significant enough to be added to the dossier.
3. The candidate is informed that the materials will be added.
4. ***The expanded dossier must be re-reviewed by all levels.***
5. If the additional materials consist of factual information that might be deleterious to the candidate's case, the candidate must be given the opportunity to add a response to the dossier.
6. If the dossier is under review by the Office of the Provost, a request to amend the dossier must be received no later than February 1, 2022 unless the request comes from the Provost. After February 1, 2022 reassessments of dossiers will only be made for exceptional and unique achievements and not for the acceptance of a single article or grant, *especially if such work is already listed in candidates' CVs as being a work in progress or under review.*

Notification to Candidates on Promotion Recommendations

As required by UHAP, heads and deans will inform candidates in writing of recommendations on renewals, promotions, tenure, or continuing status when dossiers are forwarded to the next level for review. Notifications only note the recommendation of the administrator (head, director, or dean) and not of external reviewers or committees.

Recognizing Candidates' Interdisciplinary Collaborations

As noted in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel criteria for promotion in [3.3.03](#), "the University values collaboration among colleagues, both externally and internally, and the candidate's contributions to such collaborations will be considered in promotion reviews." The University's commitment to interdisciplinary collaborations was reinforced in 2014-15 by a series of Heads Up forums on improving support for faculty with multidisciplinary appointments in annual and promotion reviews. To help ensure that such collaborations are fully

acknowledged in promotion reviews, Promotion Dossiers include several elements to document candidates' collaborative contributions and enable committees to assess them:

- Shared appointments (those involving a split FTE) are to be acknowledged in the Summary Data Sheet in [Section 1](#) and in [Section 4](#) on the candidate's curriculum vitae.
- Such appointments are to be detailed by heads of both departments in [Appendix A](#): Checklist for Shared Appointments, which is also to be used in drawing up such appointments.
- [Appendix C](#) should be used to acknowledge and evaluate faculty involvement in Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs and other interdisciplinary units such as the BIO5 Institute.
- If a candidate is involved in a GIDP or other interdisciplinary unit, an evaluation letter should be solicited from the GIDP chairperson or unit director and included in [Section 8A](#), and the departmental review committee should note and evaluate the candidate's interdisciplinary contributions.
- The departmental review committee for a candidate with a shared appointment must include at least one member from the cooperating department. Outside committee members should also be included from GIDPs or other interdisciplinary units if a candidate's research, teaching, and service have a strong interdisciplinary component ([Appendix C](#)).
- Department heads for shared appointments may collaborate upon a single letter, or letters may be submitted by both department heads.

Considering Findings of Professional Misconduct

The policies governing promotion are set out in [University Handbook on Appointed Personnel \(UHAP\) 3.3.03.B](#). Those policies specify that

the University expects the highest standards of professional conduct, as detailed in the Statement on Professional Conduct in UHAP [7.01.01](#). This Statement sets out the expectation that faculty will uphold scholarly standards, maintain intellectual honesty, and 'respect the dignity of others,' including their 'right to express differing opinions.' In assessing professional conduct, reviewers may consider documented violations of other University's policies, such as those on Research Integrity, Nondiscrimination and Anti-Harassment, Misuse of University Assets, and Workplace Violence.

As noted in the UHAP [3.3.03.B](#), reviewers may decide to consider annual reviews when reviewing candidates who have been reprimanded for professional misconduct. If annual reviews are considered, then consideration should also be given to any written response or appeal that may have been submitted by the faculty member.

Promotion committee members, department heads, and deans should understand that the UHAP provisions on considering professional misconduct clearly distinguish general concerns about candidate's collegiality from violations of university policies and reprimands for behaviors that directly affect candidates' teaching, research and service. As noted in the American Association of University Professionals' [On Collegiality as a Criterion in Evaluations](#), "collegiality is not a distinct capacity to be assessed independently of the traditional triumvirate of teaching, scholarship, and service. It is rather a quality whose value is expressed in the successful execution of these three functions." Violations of professional conduct should be assessed against how they affect a candidate's effectiveness in working with students, fellow researchers, and external and internal collaborators to achieve the goals set out in their assigned duties.

Questions on this policy and related procedures should be address to Asya Roberts in the Provost's Office at 626-0202 or asya@arizona.edu.

Clinical-Track Faculty Promotions

Provisions in UHAP [Chapter 3.3.03](#) were made for promotion reviews of faculty in the Colleges of Medicine in Tucson and Phoenix with clinical series and clinical scholar titles. These provisions are being used on a provision basis pending final approval from the President. Such clinical faculty use a Clinical Dossier Template that aligns with their

clinical duties. Clinical faculty reviews include reviews by departmental committees, heads, college committees, and the appropriate dean. Appeals of deans' decisions may be made to the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences.

Questions on these provisions should be directed to Associate Dean Kenneth Knox at the College of Medicine, Phoenix (knox@arizona.edu) or Vice Dean Bruce Coull in the College of Medicine, Tucson (coullb@arizona.edu).