

Office of the Associate Provost
for Faculty Affairs



512 Administration
P.O. Box 210066
Tucson, AZ 85721-0066
(520) 621-1856
FAX: (520) 621-9118

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 promotion and tenure review process for 2009-2010. 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. To ensure that candidates are fully informed about the nature of the promotion and tenure process, department heads and directors must provide each candidate with a copy of this document when the process is initiated with the candidate.

The University Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure is called upon each year to consider about one hundred dossiers. It is essential to provide adequate time for the Advisory Committee to conduct its review and provide timely notice of decisions to your offices and to the candidates.

Dates for submitting dossiers for college-level review vary among colleges. Please check with your dean'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 Promotion and Tenure.

An 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 Promotion and Tenure will deliberate from January 15 to April 15. Decisions will begin to be released about the last week in April.

Chapter 3 of the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP)* requires that candidates be given notice when the matter of their renewal, nonrenewal, tenure and/or promotion arises and that candidate be given the opportunity to furnish materials that they consider relevant to the decision to be made. It is requested that colleges complete the consideration of candidates for promotion and/or tenure before the beginning of each spring semester. Bear in mind the time necessary to obtain letters from outside evaluators and to assemble all supporting materials. You should thus begin the process now for candidates to be considered for promotion and/or tenure during 2009-2010.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR DEANS, DIRECTORS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

Criteria

Each department and college office has copies of the criteria used by each department and college in making its recommendations.

Copies of relevant parts of departmental and college promotion and tenure criteria should be summarized in a **one-page format** (see Appendix B) and submitted with each dossier to aid the members of the University Advisory Committee in their deliberations.

Standing Committees

Each college and department shall have a standing committee on faculty status to advise the dean and department head before recommendations are forwarded to higher administrative levels concerning all promotion and tenure matters.

- Each committee shall be composed of at least three tenured members of the faculty.
- The committees shall be constituted so that recommendations by committees shall be made only by faculty holding rank superior to the rank of the candidate being considered, except in the case of full professors where the committee members shall each be a full professor. (This same provision also applies to department heads and other administrators who are involved in selecting external reviewers and assessing dossiers.)
- In appointing standing committees, please consider potential conflicts of interest with regard to candidates coming forward for review. A committee member or administrator who has coauthored substantial publications or grants with a candidate should recuse himself or herself to avoid raising concerns about a potential conflict of interest. If recusing committee members is not feasible, for example because of the size of the department, the committee should address the concerns about conflicts of interest in its letter. Concerns about conflicts of interest may hurt a candidate by raising questions about the credibility of evaluations, and such concerns may result in dossiers being sent back to be re-reviewed by departments and colleges. Individuals who collaborate closely in an ongoing way with a candidate should generally recuse themselves and provide separate letters of recommendation that include specific details on the contributions of their collaborators.
- Individuals who serve concurrently on departmental, college and/or University promotion and tenure committees should recuse themselves from voting on any candidate on whose case they have already voted in a prior committee.

The judgment of review committees is to be independent of the judgment of the administrators to whom they report. Standing committees normally will meet without the administrator whom they advise (reference: UHAP 3.11.01). 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 standing committee on faculty status (University Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure) composed of at least nine members, including female and minority members, representing diverse disciplines. The committee shall advise the provost in all promotion and tenure considerations. 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 (reference: UHAP 3.11.01).

Each year all promotion and tenure committees should discuss standards of expectations in research, teaching, 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.

Notification to Candidates

Department heads are required by UHAP 3.15 to advise candidates in writing of their recommendations regarding renewal, nonrenewal, promotion, or tenure at the time the recommendations are forwarded to the next reviewer.

Interdisciplinary Candidates

The University recognizes that interdisciplinary scholarship often occurs in areas of study that lie at the boundaries of academic departments. Those faculty members who are involved in interdisciplinary activities should be recognized for their varied contributions when they are considered for promotion and/or tenure. To ensure such recognition, reviews of candidates who are members of interdisciplinary programs must include the elements identified in the *Guidelines of Acknowledgment and Evaluation of Faculty Participation in Graduate Interdisciplinary Program Activities in the Promotion and Tenure Process* (Appendix C). Information describing the candidate's participation in interdisciplinary programs should appear in Section II, Summary of Candidate's Workload Assignment and in Section IV, Candidate's Statement (last item).

Shared Appointments

A shared appointment is an appointment of a faculty member whose budget line is split between two, or rarely more, units. Shared appointments must be defined and documented to specify the implications for the workload assignments and promotion and tenure expectations for candidates. 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 the appointment (including teaching load, research, administration, service responsibilities, merit pay, peer evaluation, status and promotion, etc.). When applicable, the *Checklist for Shared Appointments* (Appendix A) should accompany the dossier.

Probationary (Retention) Reviews

The probationary (retention) reviews of tenure-eligible faculty members are carried out by the departmental standing committee and department head without college or university review unless college policy requires college review. These evaluations shall be expressed in writing to the faculty member, identifying any problem areas that may preclude the granting of tenure (reference: UHAP 3.12.04).

When a department head decides that he/she will recommend nonretention following a 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) a summary of the candidate's workload assignment prepared by the department head and candidate; (3) annual performance evaluations for all years the candidate has been associated with The University of Arizona as an assistant professor; (4) any previous probationary or retention reviews; (5) departmental and college promotion and tenure guidelines; (6) 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/outreach; and (7) interpretations prepared by both the departmental standing committee and the department head describing the likelihood that the candidate would be recommended for promotion and tenure during a six-year review, given progress to date. This packet should include all components of a regular P&T packet except the external letters. 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 normally required.

Appeal Procedure

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure and candidates recommended for nonretention following a probationary review may appeal negative decisions to the president upon official notification of such decisions from the Office of the Provost (reference: UHAP 3.12.08).

Preparation of Dossiers

A copy of the guidelines/checklist to be used by the candidate, department, and college in preparing the promotion and tenure dossier is attached.

It is foremost the responsibility of each department and each candidate to ensure that the dossier is prepared in full compliance with the attached guidelines. If the college committee or dean determines that the dossier is missing essential elements, the evaluation process should be halted until materials are secured. In some circumstances, a dean may have to re-initiate the department-level review. Likewise, if the University Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure 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 teaching award, or has a major piece accepted for publication). If a review committee or an 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 (for example, 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 by the University Advisory Committee for additional information.

Checklist

The attached guidelines checklist is to be included in the dossier. The checklist provides clarification to candidates, departments, and colleges of the substance upon which the review is based. The checklist also helps a candidate, department, and college to assure completeness of the dossier before forwarding to the Office of the Provost. The checklist also helps to increase the efficiency and timeliness of the review by the University Advisory Committee. **The checklist provides 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.** Finally, the checklist also includes guidelines that note some of the most common reasons why dossiers are returned to departments and colleges to be re-evaluated, for example because a workload description praises the candidate's contributions rather than simply describing the assigned duties in neutral terms.

The dossiers should be divided into sections as follows:

- Section I: Summary Data Sheet**
- Section II: Summary of Candidate's Workload Assignment**
- Section III: Departmental and College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**
- Section IV: Curriculum Vitae Prepared by Candidate**
- Section V: Evaluation of Teaching and Advising**
- Section VI: Documentation for Interdisciplinary Candidates**
- Section VII: Letters from Outside Evaluators**
- Section VIII: Recommendations for Promotion and/or Tenure**

Do **not** attach articles published, manuscripts or manuals.

You can find this document and these attachments on the Associate Provost's Promotion and Tenure webpage: <http://academicaffairs.arizona.edu/p&t>