

**TO:** Academic Deans, Directors, Department Heads  
**FROM:** Thomas Miller, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs  
**SUBJECT:** Promotion and Tenure and Continuing Status Reviews for 2009-2010  
**DATE:** April 4, 2009

A workshop concerning the promotion and tenure/continuing status process and preparation of dossiers will be held as follows:

**April 14, 2009**  
**Student Union Gallagher Theatre**  
**3:00-5:00 PM**

**This letter initiates the *continuing status and promotion review process for 2009-2010*.** The University Advisory Committee on Continuing Status annually considers recommendations for continuing status and promotion. It is essential to provide adequate time for the Advisory Committee to conduct its review and to ensure that timely notice of the action taken in approving or denying recommendations can be given to your offices and to the candidates. Chapter 4 of the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel [UHAP] requires that a candidate be given notice when the matter of his/her renewal, nonrenewal, continuing status and/or promotion arises and that the candidate be given opportunity to furnish materials that he/she considers relevant to the decision to be made. It is requested that colleges complete the consideration of candidates for continuing status and/or promotion before the beginning of the spring semester. Bear in mind the time necessary to obtain letters from outside evaluators and to assemble all supporting material; hence, you may wish to begin the process now for candidates to be considered for continuing status and/or promotion during 2009-2010.

To ensure that candidates are fully informed about the nature of the continuing status and promotion process with which they will be involved, department heads and directors must provide each candidate with a copy of this document at the time the process is initiated with respect to that candidate. Candidates applying for continuing status before the year of their mandatory review should be evaluated according to the standard criteria, not according to more rigorous criteria.

The following information is provided to assist candidates with the preparation of their dossiers and as a guide for deans, directors, and department heads for evaluating and preparing final documents.

**Dates for submitting dossiers for college-level review vary among colleges. Please check with your dean's/director's office for deadlines.** Candidates, departments and colleges are required to submit dossiers for review according to established deadlines. This will be closely monitored by the Office of the Provost at the request of the University Advisory Committee on Continuing Status.

**The original hard copy dossier and an electronic copy on CD or flash drive of each dossier should be submitted by the deans to the Office of the Provost, no later than January 15, 2010.** The University Advisory Committee on Continuing Status will deliberate from January 15 to April 15. Decisions will begin to be released about the last week in April.

## Criteria

Each department, college, or other administrative unit having one or more continuing-eligible professionals must have on file clear, concise, and detailed criteria for judging job effectiveness and excellence during reviews for continuing status and promotion. Copies of departmental and college continuing status and promotion criteria relevant to the rank under consideration should be submitted with each dossier to aid the members of the Advisory Committee in their deliberations.

## Job Description

Each unit should develop a specific job description for each continuing-eligible professional as early as possible during that individual's appointment. This job description should be more detailed than the original position advertisement, and must be distinct from the criteria for continuing status and promotion. The job description must be included in the candidate's dossier (Section II). The job description should be signed and dated by both the candidate and the department head at the time of adoption. **If the candidate's job assignments has changed significantly during his/her employment, a new job description should be adopted.** All such job descriptions for the period under consideration should be included in the dossier, providing a clear history of the expectations regarding the candidate's employment. This provides the context for evaluating a candidate's success in meeting expectations for continuing status and promotion.

## Standing Committees

Each department, college, or other administrative unit with three or more academic professionals with continuing status will have a standing committee on continuing status to advise the department head, director, or dean before recommendations are forwarded to higher administrative levels concerning all continuing status or promotion matters. Where a department, college or other administrative unit has less than three academic professionals with continuing status, peers should be identified in other units. Each evaluative committee must include at least one academic professional with continuing status. If tenure-track faculty must be used on peer committees, their rank should be at least equivalent to the rank for which the professional is being considered (e.g., full professor for a candidate for full librarian). In appointing standing committees, please consider potential conflicts of interest with regard to candidates coming forward for review. **The judgment of review committees is to be independent of the judgment of the administrators to whom they report.** Normally standing committees shall meet without the administrator whom they advise (reference: UHAP 4.10.01). If the administrator meets with the committee, this meeting must be justified in the letter of recommendation from the administrator.

The provost will appoint a University Advisory Committee on Continuing Status composed of at least five members, including female and minority members, representing diverse disciplinary areas. The committee shall advise the provost regarding the granting of continuing status (reference: UHAP 4.10.01). The committee shall carefully and systematically review, in accordance with University-level criteria, all pertinent materials provided by departments and colleges to ensure that high standards of accomplishment and professional performance are maintained.

**Occasionally department and/or college continuing status and promotion committees include members whose votes on a given candidate risk the appearance of bias** because committee members are not clearly independent from the candidate or have a relationship to the candidate that might involve conflict of interest (for example, as a co-author or co-principal investigator). In general, such committee members should recuse themselves from the final vote in order not to compromise the objectivity of the entire committee evaluation. This action should be documented in the committee's report (i.e., approve-4, deny-0, abstain (recuse)-1). In some cases, an ad hoc member may need to be substituted for the committee member whose independence from the candidate is in question.

Individuals who serve concurrently on departmental, college and/or University continuing status and promotion committees should recuse themselves from voting on any candidate on whose case they have already voted in a prior committee. Colleges may wish to establish their own protocols to deal with these issues.

Each year all continuing status and promotion committees should discuss standards of expectations in teaching, research and service at the beginning of their deliberations. They should then review these standards at the conclusion of the process. The standards must be consistent with departmental, college, and university policy.

In those instances when it appears that the final decision will go contrary to the recommendation of the dean or vice president, the provost will review the case with the dean or vice-president before a final decision is made.

### **Notification to Candidates**

Department heads and deans are required by UHAP Section 4.17 to advise candidates in writing of their recommendations regarding renewal, nonrenewal, continuing status, or promotion at the time the recommendations are forwarded to the next reviewer.

### **Shared Appointments**

A shared appointment is an appointment of a faculty member whose *budget line* is split between two, or rarely more, units. When an appointment is shared, it is essential that the individual and the heads of the two units holding the line have a clear understanding of all aspects of their appointment (to include teaching load, research, administration, service responsibilities, merit pay, peer evaluation, status and promotion, etc.). When applicable, the *Checklist for Shared Appointments* (Appendix B) should accompany the dossier.

### **Probationary Reviews**

Reappointment in rank following probationary reviews may be made without college or University review unless college policy requires college review. At this stage professionals must be formally evaluated by the department head and the departmental standing committee on continuing status. The reviews should build on the annual performance evaluations required under Board of Regent's policy. These evaluations shall be expressed in writing, identifying any problem areas that may preclude the granting of continuing status, and a copy shall be given to the continuing-eligible professional. It is important that a professional employee receive notice of inadequate performance at the earliest possible point in his/her career (reference: UHAP 4.10.03).

### **Nonrenewal**

When a department head decides that he or she will recommend nonrenewal following the probationary review, a series of steps are to be initiated resulting in the preparation of a dossier containing the following elements: (1) an updated curriculum vitae; (2) annual performance evaluations for all years the candidate has been associated with the University of Arizona as a continuing-eligible professional; (3) any previous probationary reviews; (4) detailed critiques, prepared independently by the departmental standing committee and the department head, evaluating the quality of the candidate's contributions in teaching, research, and service; (5) departmental and college continuing status and promotion guidelines; and (6) statements prepared by both the departmental standing committee and the department head, describing the likelihood that the candidate would be recommended for continuing status and promotion during a six-year review, given progress to date. These materials, combined with all other materials assembled, are to be forwarded by the department head to the dean, and are to serve as the basis for evaluation by the college committee, the dean, the University Advisory Committee, and the provost. Letters from outside evaluators are not required.

### **Appeal Procedure**

Candidates for continuing status and/or promotion and candidates recommended for nonrenewal following a probationary review may appeal negative decisions to the president upon official notification of such decisions from the Office of the Provost. Such appeals must be filed in writing with the Office of the President within 30 days after notice of the provost's decision (reference: UHAP 4.16).

## **INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE CANDIDATE AND DEPARTMENT**

### **Preparation of Dossiers**

It is foremost the responsibility of each department and each candidate to ensure that the dossier is prepared in as full compliance with the attached guidelines as is possible, in light of the candidate's position responsibilities. All materials must be included in the dossier when it is submitted to the dean's office.

If the college standing committee or dean determine that the dossier is missing certain essential elements, the evaluation process should be halted pending the securing of such materials. Under some circumstances, when the dossier is found wanting, it may be necessary for the dean to re-initiate the department-level review. Likewise, if the University Advisory Committee on Continuing Status finds that a candidate is disadvantaged because of a poorly prepared dossier, the committee may request that additional materials be added to the file. This action would re-initiate the review at the departmental level.

On rare occasions, substantial additional pertinent information regarding the candidate becomes available from second-party sources during the review process (for example, the candidate is awarded a significant grant, receives a major professional award, or has a major piece accepted for publication). If a review committee or administrative reviewer recommends that this information be added to the candidate's dossier, the relevant materials may be appended to the dossier. In such a case, the candidate must be informed of the nature of the materials to be added to the dossier, and 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 (e.g., poor student evaluations from fall courses), the candidate shall be given the opportunity to add a response to the dossier. A request to append additional information must be received by the Office of the Provost by February 1, unless it is a request for additional information from the University Advisory Committee on Continuing Status.

### **Dossier Checklists**

The attached guidelines/checklists are to be included in the dossiers. The guidelines/checklists: provide clarification to candidates, departments, and colleges of the substance upon which the review is based; assist the candidate, department, and college in compiling a complete dossier before forwarding it to the Office of the Provost; increase the efficiency and timeliness of review by the Advisory Committee; and serve as the format for cover sheets that will subdivide the contents of each dossier, thus assuring uniformity of internal organization of the many dossiers submitted for review.

The dossier should be divided into sections as follows:

- Section I: Summary Data Sheet
- Section II: Job Description
- Section III: Departmental and College Continuing Status and Promotion Criteria
- Section IV: Curriculum Vitae and Candidate Statement
- Section VA: Evaluation of Teaching and Advising (if applicable)
- Section VB: Evaluation of Educational Outreach (if applicable)
- Section VI: Documentation of Interdisciplinary Work (optional)
- Section VII: Letters of Outside Evaluators
- Section VIII: Recommendations for Continuing Status and/or Promotion
- Appendix A: A Sample Letter to Professional Client or User Evaluator
- Appendix B: Checklist for Shared Appointments

**Sections I-VIII and Appendix A&B may be downloaded from the Associate Provost's Continuing Status webpage: <http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/c&p>**