

This *Guide* provides an overview of continuing-status and tenure reviews for candidates, heads, and mentors.

- **From Hiring to Promotion** ([page 2](#))
 - Annual Performance Reviews
 - Probationary Reviews (often in the third year)
 - Requesting Delays in the Promotion Process
 - Using Promotion to Achieve Your Career Goals
 - ✓ Use promotion criteria to develop an action plan.
 - ✓ Solicit input from faculty.
 - ✓ Build a clearly defined profile of teaching, service, and research contributions.

- **Promotion Policies** ([page 5](#))
 - 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

- **Additional Advice on Preparing Dossiers** ([page 9](#))
 - Advice on Candidate Statements
 - Creating Teaching Portfolios
 - Using Service and Outreach Portfolios to Document Impact

- **Directions on Dossiers** ([page 11](#))

- **Avoiding the Most Common Problems in Dossiers** ([page 14](#))

DOSSIER TEMPLATE

- Section 1: Summary Data Sheet
- Section 2: Summary of Candidate's Workload
- Section 3: Departmental and College Guidelines
- Section 4: CV and List of Collaborators
- Section 5: Candidate Statement
- Section 6: Teaching Portfolio Resources
- Section 7: Evaluation of Teaching and Teaching Portfolios
- Section 8: Service and Outreach Portfolio (Optional for P&T Reviews)
- Section 9: Membership in Graduate and Other Interdisciplinary Programs
- Section 10: Letters from Outside Evaluators and Collaborators
- Section 11: Recommendations for Promotion
- Appendix A: Checklist for Shared Appointments
- Appendix B: Sample of Department Criteria
- Appendix C: Guidelines for Acknowledgment and Evaluation of Participation in GIDPs and other Interdisciplinary Units
- Appendix D: Sample Letter to Outside Evaluators
- Appendix E: Sample Letters to Research Collaborators and Professional, Community, or Client Collaborators

This *Guide* and related information are on the Vice Provost's website:

<http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/promotion>

You may also call the Provost's Office at 626.0202.

The [University Handbook for Appointed Personnel \(UHAP\)](#) provides policies for personnel procedures.

Promotion procedures for tenure-track faculty are covered by [Chapter 3.3](#) in UHAP, while continuing-status professionals should consult [Chapter 4A.3](#).

From Hiring to Promotion

In your first year, you should schedule a meeting with your head or program director to discuss your workload assignment and the promotion criteria for your college and unit. Your head or director should provide you with a copy or a link to your unit's and college's criteria for promotion. Your workload assignment establishes the basic expectations that will be used to evaluate your achievements. You should use the questions that are included below to specify your job duties and explore how they line up with the criteria for promotion. For example, will you be teaching graduate courses and other courses that line up with your research interests? Should you teach a range of courses to prepare for promotion, or can you concentrate on several courses to improve your effectiveness and save time by reusing course materials?

You should use your meetings with your head and other senior faculty to discuss your duties and related resources, including any mentoring support that may be available. These meetings are crucial opportunities to clarify expectations for teaching, scholarship, service, outreach, and position effectiveness. You should use these discussions to review your department's experience with candidates going through promotion. In these discussions, you should realize that some questions about promotion cannot be answered with specifics. For example, no one will be able to specify how many articles are expected because quality is more important than quantity.

From your first year, you should seek out multiple perspectives, though you should not be surprised if you get differing assessments. Multiple viewpoints come into play in the process of reviewing Dossiers. Dossiers are read by about twenty reviewers, including three to eight external reviewers, departmental and college committees, heads and deans, the University Committee, and senior administrators and the Provost, who makes the final decision on promotions. Your best sources of information will be recently promoted colleagues and senior colleagues who have recent experience reviewing Promotion Dossiers.

Annual reviews may be considered during promotion reviews, but good annual reviews do not guarantee promotion because

- Annual reviews focus on one year.
- Annual reviews do not include external reviews.
- As a result, publications are not assessed in as much depth as in promotion reviews.
- Annual reviews do not include assessments from faculty from beyond your discipline.

Annual Performance Reviews

At the end of your first year, and every year thereafter, you will prepare an annual report for the Annual Performance Review (APR). Your teaching, research, service, and professional performance will be reviewed by a peer committee who makes a recommendation to your head, who then makes the final assessment. Your head should meet with you to discuss your work and your progress. Beyond these basic requirements, the procedures for APRs vary across departments. The annual review process will provide you with feedback on your progress toward promotion, and you will also be able to get feedback on the documentation that will be used in your Promotion Dossier. For example, you should prepare your curriculum vitae according to the format required for the dossier, and the report you write on your research, teaching, service, and position effectiveness is a shorter version of the Candidate Statement that will be a key part of your dossier. You will use both documents to outline your program of work and characterize its significance.

Use annual review meetings to get as much specific feedback as possible:

- Get assessments of your teaching.
- Use input on your annual report to prepare the Candidate Statement.
- Get input on your upcoming plans.
- Welcome frank assessments to get suggestions on how to improve.

For more information on the Annual Performance Reviews, visit the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs website: <http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/annual-performance-review>

For more information on mentoring, visit the Faculty Mentoring & Resources on the Diversity and Inclusion website: <http://diversity.arizona.edu/mentoring-resources>

Here are some questions to clarify expectations and get feedback from mentors:

Research and Scholarship:

- How do you assess the *impact* of my scholarship?
- Do the strands in my research program seem to be clearly defined and related?
- Do you have concerns about my research? For example, do you see that I have “independence” from senior collaborators?

Teaching:

- How is teaching effectiveness assessed in our department?
- Will I be able to teach a range of graduate and undergraduate courses?
- Will my mentoring, clinical and other instructional work be assessed?

Service:

- What service commitments are most highly valued in our department?
- What committee assignments do you think will help me to learn more about our department?
- How can I align my service expectations with my professional interests?
- What sorts of professional service will help me learn more about our field?

Position Effectiveness:

- How should you prioritize your duties?
- How is your impact to be assessed?
- What outcomes are expected?

Probationary or Retention Reviews

Retention Reviews are generally conducted in the third year. The scheduling may vary if you held a prior university position before coming here. The schedule of your Retention Review should be in your offer letter. The Retention Review serves as a dress rehearsal for your promotion review. You will use the same Dossier Template, and CV format as the Promotion Dossier.

You should begin preparing for your retention review in meetings on your annual reviews. You should follow up with a separate meeting to go over the parts of the Promotion Dossier. You should also attend the dossier workshops that are offered by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs each spring. If you begin preparing your dossier in the spring after your annual review, you will have time over the summer to get feedback on your Candidate Statement, teaching materials, and other parts of the Dossier before it is due in the fall.

The Retention Review follows some of the same steps as the promotion review. Most Retention Reviews conclude with a meeting with your head, though some departments also include the chair of the peer review committee. You should receive a written evaluation of any problems that are noted.

In some colleges, Retention Reviews are conducted at the department level, while in other colleges your dean and a college committee may also be part of the process. In a very few cases, a head may recommend that a candidate not be renewed. In such cases, the dossier must be forwarded from the department for college and university reviews. External reviews are not normally included but may be requested by the dean or Provost. The Provost may decide that a nonrenewal is appropriate when a candidate is not making timely progress toward promotion. In such cases, a candidate is given a terminal year appointment. In some cases another Retention Review may be scheduled in the fourth or fifth year. All steps in this process are detailed in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP).

Requesting Delays in the Promotion Process

The University Handbook for Appointed Personnel covers the policies and procedures for requesting delays in promotion reviews for tenure-track faculty in [3.3.01](#) and for continuing-status in [4A.3.01](#). Delays can be requested for the birth or adoption of a child, personal reasons such as a health problem for a candidate or family member, bereavement over the loss of a child or partner, adverse professional circumstances that are beyond a candidate’s control, or a prestigious external commitment that detracts from a candidate’s research.

Using the Promotion Process to Advance Your Career Goals

Getting promoted is a career milestone, and you should use the process to reflect upon how you can advance your program of work in strategic ways.

Use promotion criteria to develop an action plan. Department and college criteria play the major role in the promotion process because university criteria have to be general enough to address varied forms of research, scholarship, and creative achievements and assess the effectiveness of diverse positions. Your colleagues have developed promotion criteria as a guide for assessing the quality and impact of your work. You should translate those criteria into benchmarks for assessing your annual progress and discussing your work with senior faculty.

Translating promotion criteria into annual goals can require some input from your colleagues. What sorts of publications and which journals are most highly valued? How important are conference presentations? What service and outreach roles are expected? These questions are easier to ask than they are to answer. Talk through your publication plans with your colleagues to align your goals with promotion expectations.

Your annual reports provide an opportunity to reflect upon your goals and achievements, and then get feedback on how to characterize them. As with your Candidate Statement, your annual report should characterize your contributions. For example, if you have published coauthored articles with senior people, you will need to articulate your research contributions to help establish that you have an independent program of research and are not simply assisting with others' research. If you are in a field where research funding is limited, your ability to articulate your research agenda and its impact may be even more important because you may have fewer benchmarks to demonstrate the impact of your research. What are your research expectations if you are in a continuing-status position and only have a small percentage of your workload assignment devoted to scholarship?

Solicit input from faculty in your department and discipline. If your work bridges disciplines or contributes to cutting-edge trends, you will need to talk with colleagues in your department and related fields about how to characterize your work in ways that value your contributions in terms that will make sense to reviewers. Talking about your work with your colleagues is vital to learning how to represent your work. The feedback you receive will help you assess how best to characterize your contributions in your annual reports and in the Candidate Statement that frames your Promotion Dossier.

Share Your Work with Colleagues.

- Talk with colleagues about your research, teaching and service.
- Keep an eye out for external reviewers.
- Share your writing with colleagues in your department and elsewhere.
- Talk to senior faculty about how they assess impact and quality.

Build a clearly defined profile of your teaching, service, and research and scholarly contributions. Through your discussions with colleagues, you will learn how to talk about the impact of your teaching, research, and service and outreach. If you are on the continuing-status, you will want to learn as much as you can about how to document your position effectiveness. All faculty will find it easier to document the quality your scholarship than your teaching, especially if you teach in clinical settings and offer workshops without standard assessments. With your research, you can cite invited talks, publications, citations, and perhaps grants, but with classroom teaching, about the only quantifiable benchmarks are Teacher Course Evaluations (TCEs). Research has shown that student evaluations can be affected by various extrinsic factors, including the gender and ethnicity of instructors. To avoid an undue emphasis on student evaluations, we require peer reviews of teaching and instructional materials for all candidates. You should consider enlisting peers to observe your workshops and other instructional work to help document your effectiveness. Mentoring, advising, and even outreach may be integral to your teaching, but you will need to make those connections for reviewers of your dossier. You should use your candidate statement to articulate how your research and teaching are related to your outreach and service. One way to establish such relationships is to characterize your service contributions as a form of leadership. Another way to characterize the impact of your service and outreach is to consider how your work advances the mission of your unit and the university. It can also be effective to cite related research, national trends, and best practices in your field of study.

Promotion Policies

Yearly Promotion Review Schedule

- **All Dossiers are due to the Provost's Office on January 15;** however, departments and colleges may deviate from the other dates suggested in this schedule.
- **When Dossiers are forwarded from the department to the college, and then to the university committee, candidates must be notified of the recommendation that is being made.**

Action	Point Person	Due Date
Candidates are notified of their upcoming review	Department Head/Director	April
Annual Workshop: Instructions on the Process and Preparation of Dossiers for Promotion & Tenure and Continuing Status & Promotion	Vice Provost	Mid-April each year
Final Preparation of Dossier by Candidate	Candidate	April– June
Candidate provides list of potential Outside Evaluators to Department Head or Director	Department Head/Director	May– June
Candidate delivers dossier to Department	Department Head/Director	May– June
Letters requesting review are sent to Outside Evaluators	Department Head, Director, or Committee Chair	By mid-July
Departmental Committee review, letter written and added to dossier	Departmental Committee Chair	August 16 th – September 14 th
Department Head or Director review, letter written and added to dossier	Department Head/Director	September 15 th – October 14 th
Dossier delivered to Dean's Office	Dean	October 15 th
College Committee review, letter written and added to dossier	Chair of College Committee	October 16 th – December 14 th
Dean's review, letter written and added to dossier	Dean	December 15 th – January 13 th
Dossiers due in Office of the Provost	Provost	January 15th
University Committee review, letter written and added to dossier	Chair of University Committee	January 15 th – April 15 th
Provost's letters of decision sent to candidates		Last week of April
Appeal of Provost's decision sent to President	President	Within 30 days of Provost's decision

The University's Inclusive View of Scholarship

Candidates and reviewers should consider the “inclusive view of scholarship.” Our University's Promotion criteria recognize 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 an Hispanic-serving institution, as Provost Goldberg noted in his memo launching promotion reviews in 2018:

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 an HSI, we need to ensure that we recognize HSI-related activities in teaching, outreach, and research in our promotion reviews.

Candidates and reviewers should consult the resources on the University's “inclusive view of scholarship”:

<http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/promoting-inclusive-view-scholarship>

Provost Awards for Innovations in Teaching

The [Criteria for Peer Reviews of Teaching](#) provide the benchmarks that committees should use in nominating candidates with outstanding teaching records. Provost Jeff Goldberg established the [Provost Awards for Innovations in Teaching](#) to recognize “candidates whose teaching portfolios and instructional effectiveness merit special recognition. More information on making these nominations is included in Dossier Template Section 7 and in the following discussions of the Dossier.

Peer Reviews of Student Evaluations

Committees should consider research on student evaluations in making peer reviews of teaching to complete Dossier Section 7. For this section, committees submit a memo based on their reviews of the candidate's Teaching Portfolios, their teaching observations, their assessments of Teacher-Course Evaluations (TCEs), and their responses to candidates' self-assessments of their teaching. The University uses this multimodal assessment of teaching to avoid an excessive reliance on TCEs because research shows that student evaluations can be biased by faculty members' gender, ethnicity, national origin, disability, and sexual orientation and identity as well as by a range of extraneous factors such as the modality or type of course. For further information, see Linse's [“Interpreting and using student ratings data: Guidance for faculty serving as administrators and on evaluation committees”](#) (2017). Research on student evaluations underlines the fact that they are not measures of student learning but student perceptions of instructors' effectiveness. As such, they can be useful data to consider as part of a multimodal peer review of teaching. To conduct such reviews, committees should use the OIA's [Review of Teaching Protocol](#) and the [Criteria for Peer Reviews of Teaching](#) and Nominations for [Provost Awards for Innovations in Teaching](#).

Policies on Promotion Review Committees

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

- Promotion and tenure committees will include at least three tenured faculty, and continuing-status committees should include at least three academic professionals with continuing status.

- 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 full professors or a full continuing-status professional.
- In appointing departmental committees, consideration should be given to candidates' involvement in GIDPs and other interdisciplinary units. When that involvement is significant, an outside faculty should be appointed to the committee.
- Committee members or administrators who have coauthored substantial publications or grants with a candidate within the last five years should 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 and tenure committees must recuse themselves from voting on any case they have voted on in a prior 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. As part of their responsibilities, **heads are required to advise candidates in writing of their recommendations on renewal, nonrenewal, promotion, or tenure or continuing status when the recommendation is forwarded to the next level in the process.**

The Provost will appoint University Promotion Committees to review Promotion Dossiers for faculty and Promotion Dossiers for continuing status following the appropriate UHAP provisions. These committees will advise the Provost in all tenure and continuing-status considerations. In accordance with university-level criteria, these committees will carefully and systematically review all pertinent materials provided by departments and colleges to ensure that high standards of accomplishment and professional performance are maintained.

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:

- Candidates notify a committee chair, head or other administrators of a recent development.
- The administrator or committee chair decides that the information is significant enough to be added to the dossier.
- The candidate is informed that the materials will be added.
- The expanded dossier must be re-reviewed by all levels of reviewers.
- 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.
- A request to amend the dossier must be received by the Office of the Provost by February 1st, unless the request comes from the University P&T or continuing-status committee. After February 1st, reassessments of dossiers will only be made for exceptional achievements and not for the acceptance of a single article or grant, especially if such work is already listed in candidates' CVs as being under review.

Notification of 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 recommendations are forwarded to the next level for review.

Recognizing Candidates' Interdisciplinary Collaborations

As noted in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel criteria for promotion in [3.3.02](#) and [4A.3.02](#), "the University values collaboration among colleagues, both externally and internally, and the candidate's

contributions to such collaborations will be considered in promotion and tenure 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 9](#), 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 and tenure are set out in University Handbook for Appointed Personnel 3.3, while the policies for continuing status and promotion are set out in UHAP 4.3. 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 3.3.02.B, reviewers may decide to consider annual reviews when reviewing candidates who have been formally reprimanded for research and other forms of 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@email.arizona.edu

Appeals of Promotion Decisions

The Provost decides whether an individual will be renewed, promoted, or granted tenure or continuing status. Upon receiving the notice that they will not be promoted and/or nonrenewed, candidates may request the reasons for the decision. In the case of the nonrenewal of a tenure-eligible or continuing-status-eligible individual up for review in his/her mandatory year, a terminal contract will be offered for the next appointment period.

Candidates may choose to appeal the outcome of their retention, mandatory, or promotion review by writing a letter to the President within thirty days of the notice of the Provost's decision, following the provisions in UHAP 3.3.02.E 4A.3.02.E. The President's decision will be sent to the faculty member, along with copies to the Provost and the appropriate dean and department head within ninety days of the notice of appeal. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure may consider allegations of unlawful discrimination or other unconstitutional actions such as the violation of due process and recommend that an additional review or action be taken.

Additional Advice on Preparing Dossiers

Advice on Candidate Statements

If research is a major part of your duties, you should use the Candidate Statement to detail your research and relate it to your teaching and service. In addition to providing an overview of the progress and impact of your research, the Candidate Statement provides an opportunity for you to set out the principles that guide the teaching and service contributions detailed in your Teaching Portfolio and your Service and Outreach Portfolio. If your workload assignment includes significant service and outreach duties, you are to submit a Service and Outreach Portfolio. You may request that external reviewers receive copies of your Teaching and Service and Outreach Portfolios. In most cases, your teaching and service materials will only be made available to your departmental reviewers. If you are in a continuing-status position, then your Candidate Statement should discuss your position effectiveness.

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

- How can you highlight your achievements in ways that relate them to promotion expectations, especially your departmental and college criteria?
- 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 you inform specialist reviewers, and also convey the importance of your work to non-specialists?

- Given that your external reviewers will establish the baseline assessments of your research and professional performance, 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 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 or other teams 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?

How can you 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.”

Remember your readers will include non-specialists as well as experts. Your external reviewers may skim your CV and then 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.

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 may also want to refer to related research to show how your teaching is informed by best practices in the field. You should include a selection of instructional materials from a range of classes to document instructional innovations, curricular designs, and outcomes assessments. A full list of possible materials is included in the [Promotion Dossier Template](#). You should consult with your head or the chair of your review committee on formats.

- [The Teaching Portfolio](#) from the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching at Ohio State University is a good introductory page that provides an accessible overview of the basics.
- [The Teaching Portfolio](#) by Hanna Rodriguez-Farrar provides an overview of the basics of a teaching portfolio and step-by-step advice on how to create one.
- Rubric for Evaluating Teaching Portfolios from the University of Indiana: http://medsci.indiana.edu/m620/sotl_08/teaching_portfolio_rubric.pdf

If you do not include a substantive discussion of your teaching in your Candidate Statement, you should discuss your teaching philosophy, course goals, and student populations in your Teaching Portfolio, as noted in Section 6 of the Dossier Template. These materials help to provide reviewers with a better sense of the contexts in which you teach. Reviewers and candidates can both find advice on the [Peer Review of Teaching Protocol](#) webpage developed by Dr. Ingrid Novodvorsky in the Office of Instruction and Assessment.

Using Service and Outreach Portfolios to Document Impact

If service and outreach duties make up a significant portion of your assigned duties, you should submit Section 8: The Portfolio to Document Leadership in Service and Outreach. This portfolio provides an opportunity to document the scope, quality and impact of your contributions, including your community and economic impact. This portfolio can also be used to document administrative service, especially if you have developed important programs and initiatives. A template letter is provided in Appendix E for requesting letters to document your collaborations with business and community partners, including underserved groups, schools, other state agencies, and collaborators on commercialization activities and tech transfer.

Directions on Dossiers

UA tenure and continuing-status committees evaluate about one hundred Dossiers each year. Every dossier is read by over twenty reviewers, including external reviewers, departmental and college committees, and heads and deans. To avoid time-consuming 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 from using workload descriptions to praise contributions and enlisting collaborators to serve as reviewers. When heads have coauthored with candidates, a surrogate head should be solicited, and the head should submit a collaborator letter, which comes right after external reviews in dossiers and has a comparable impact on all subsequent reviews.**

Candidates 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 required information, candidates are responsible for submitting complete dossiers by deadlines.

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 in each level of the review process.

Section 1: Summary Data Sheet

This sheet helps to ensure that reviews follow the appropriate procedures for the candidates track. For example, with reviews for assistant, committees cannot divide the decisions on promotion and tenure.

Section 2: Summary of Candidate's Workload Assignment

This one-page form is filled out by heads 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 the time in rank, the changes should be specified. 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 row labeled *Other*. To preserve candidates' privacy rights, the dossier should not state reasons for delays. Simply specify the dates, for example by noting "Approved TCD 2009-10."

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

DOSSIER TEMPLATE

- Section 1: Summary Data Sheet
- Section 2: Summary of Candidate's Workload
- Section 3: Departmental and College Guidelines
- Section 4: CV and List of Collaborators
- Section 5: Candidate Statement
- Section 6: Teaching Portfolio
- Section 7: Evaluation of Teaching & Teaching Portfolio (Includes memo reviewing teaching)
- Section 8: Service and Outreach Portfolio (Optional for P&T Reviews)
- Section 9: Documentation for Interdisciplinary Candidates
- Section 10: Letters from Outside Evaluators
- Section 11: Recommendations for Promotion
- Appendix A: Checklist for Shared Appointments
- Appendix B: Sample of Department Criteria
- Appendix C: Guidelines for Acknowledgment and Evaluation of Faculty Participation in GIDPs and other Interdisciplinary Units
- Appendix D: Sample Letter to Evaluators
- Appendix E: Sample Letters to Research Collaborators and Professional, Community, or Client Collaborators

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 3: Departmental and College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

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

Section 4: Curriculum Vitae and List of Collaborators

The List of Collaborators should include all individuals who have collaborated with the candidate within the sixty months preceding the submission of the dossier. Such collaborations include coauthoring books, articles, abstracts, papers, or grant proposals or co-editing journals, compendia, or conference proceedings. If the candidate has not collaborated with anyone in the last five years, simply note that fact in the List.

- Publications should be listed in chronological order.
- Place an * 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 foreign publications, 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 only pending or funded grants during the period in rank.
- Grants should be organized according to source of funding (federal, industry, foundations).
- Check list of collaborators to ensure it is accurate.

Section 5: Candidate Statement

Candidate Statements vary across disciplines and types of positions. Some reviewers will specifically focus on assessing candidates' scholarship or position effectiveness while others will be more broadly interested in candidate's overall program of work. Candidates should speak with heads and committee chairs on such points.

Section 6: Teaching Portfolio

Candidates are responsible to provide information and supporting documentation on their teaching and advising. Syllabi, assignments, and other supporting documentation are for reviews by departmental committees and heads. **These instructional materials will not be forwarded for college or university reviews.**

Section 7: Evaluation of Teaching and Teaching Portfolio

In addition to their recommendation on promotion, departmental committees should submit a separate memo with an assessment of the candidate's Teaching Portfolio, an observation of the candidate's teaching and a review of the candidate's student evaluations. This memo may be prepared by someone not on the committee. The teaching observation should be conducted following Office of Instruction and Assessment's [Review of Teaching Protocol](#) developed by Dr. Ingrid Novodvorsky, who is prepared to consult with candidates and committees (novod@email.arizona.edu).

Evaluations of teaching should use the [Criteria for Peer Reviews of Teaching](#) and [Nominations for 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 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 8: Portfolio to Document Leadership in Service and Outreach

This section should be used by candidates whose outreach and service duties are a major part of their assigned duties. The Leadership Portfolio has two parts: an Overview of the candidate's service or outreach efforts and Supplementary Documentation that provides evidence and assessments 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. Collaborator letters should be included after external review letters.

S Section 9: Documentation for Interdisciplinary Candidates

Reviews of candidates who are active 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 10: Letters from Outside Evaluators

Dossiers are required to include three to eight signed letters from similar academic departments outside the University of Arizona. All letters must be from independent, outside evaluators who are not collaborators of the candidate. Collaborators are defined as individuals who have coauthored books, articles, abstracts, or grant proposals within the five years before the submission of a dossier. Collaborators also include individuals who have been a candidate's dissertation advisor, supervisor, or close coworker in a lab, department, or residency program, even if this relationship occurred more than five years prior to the review. To ensure the independence of outside reviews, candidate may not influence or attempt to influence the assessments of outside evaluators.

All communications with external reviewers should be fully documented. A sample letter to external reviewers is included as [Appendix D](#). **Heads should 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 head, **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 11: Recommendations for Promotion

Administrators and committee members should not have collaborated with the candidate in a **substantial and ongoing** way. 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 the 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 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 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 and what duties are included in the appointment.

2. Were no more than half of the external reviewers suggested by the candidate, and did the process follow the prescribed procedures, including the required 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.

3. Were any coauthors and collaborators of candidates included as external reviewers, committee members, or administrative reviewers? 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.

As with the provisions used by NSF and other groups to ensure the impartiality of reviews, collaborators are defined as individuals who have coauthored books, articles, abstracts, or grant proposals within the last five years. Collaborators also include individuals who have been a candidate's dissertation advisor, supervisor, or close coworker in a lab, department, or residency program, even if this occurred more than five years prior to the review.

Committee members or administrators who have coauthored 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. Collaborator letters are placed immediately after external review letters and have a comparable impact. If recusal is not feasible, for example because of the size of a department, concerns about conflicts of interest must be addressed in the letter reviewing the candidate. Questions about this matter should be directed to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

4. Is a separate teaching review provided by the department committee following the Office of Instruction and Assessment's [Peer Review Protocol](#)? This memo should be included in section seven of the dossier. Detailed assessments of candidates' teaching are particularly essential with unusual teaching assignments such as team-taught classes or residencies. If Teacher-Course Evaluations are not available, student assessments should be provided along with benchmarks for comparative assessments. Summaries of students' individual comments should be prepared by committees to ensure the comments are representative. Dossiers that do not have reviews of teaching ([Section 7](#)) should be returned by college offices to departments to avoid creating subsequent delays.