

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 years 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 at least .50 FTE or more in year-to-year appointments for at least three of the past four years. Colleges and departments developed promotion criteria and have worked to support Career-Track faculty to achieve 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.

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](#))
  - Tips on Candidate Statements
  - Tips on Teaching Portfolios
  - Tips on Portfolios to Document Impact of Leadership, Extension, Service and Innovation
  - Tips on Documentation of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity
- **Directions on Dossiers** ([page 8](#))
- **Avoiding the Most Common Problems in Dossiers** ([page 14](#))
  - Conflict of Interest ([page 14](#))
- **Promotion Policies** ([page 16](#))
  - The Yearly Promotion Review Schedule
  - The University's Inclusive View of Scholarship
  - The Provost Awards for Innovations in Teaching
  - Evaluation of Teaching
  - Policies on Promotion Review Committees
  - Additions to Dossiers
  - Notifications of Candidates on Recommendations
  - Recognizing Interdisciplinary Collaborations
  - Considering Findings of Professional Misconduct
  - Clinical-track Faculty Promotions

[Guide to the Promotion Process](#) has the link to this guide as well as the dossier templates on the Faculty Affairs website. You may also call Faculty Affairs at 520-626-0202.

#### DOSSIER TEMPLATE

- Section 1: Summary Data Sheet
- Section 2 and 2A: Summary of Candidate's Workload; Pandemic Impact Statement
- 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 GIDP Chair and Committee
- Section 9, 9A, 9B: 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 Acknowledgment and Evaluation of Faculty Participation in GIDPs and other Interdisciplinary Units

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](#).

## **COVID-19 Context**

The global pandemic crisis of COVID-19 created many challenges for faculty. The following are ways in which the pandemic context is considered in the promotion process.

1. ***Student Course Surveys and Peer Observations from Spring 2020 or Fall 2020 are NOT required:***  
Student Course Surveys were not conducted for these semesters and are not required in the dossier. If candidates did conduct their own student evaluations for the given semesters, these can be included in 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 pandemic.
2. ***Section 2A: Pandemic Impact Statement is Required for 2024-2025:***  
This subsection was added to provide faculty an opportunity to describe the impact of the global pandemic on their workload assignment or trajectory of their scholarly activity, teaching, service, clinical activities, extension activities, or administrative roles. [Section 2A: Pandemic Impact Statement](#) provides more details and tips for completing this section.
3. ***External Reviewer and Collaborator Letters Consider Pandemic Context:***  
Guidance remains in the cover letter for external reviewers and collaborators to address the pandemic context and to describe the pandemic statement that is required for all candidates.
4. ***Reviewer Training That Includes Pandemic Considerations:***  
We are dedicated to improving equity in the promotion process. We provide training for review committees, department heads, and deans to consider how the global pandemic may have impacted faculty workload, productivity, and trajectory. We include descriptions of research and reports that document the disproportionate impact of the pandemic on women and underrepresented groups.

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, inclusivity, and accessibility 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 in everyday life that resulted from the pandemic. However, we also acknowledge that unexpected changes in scholarly work, teaching, and service may have led 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 consider these factors in the promotion process for all faculty. Here you can find some articles for more details on the gendered impact of COVID-19 on research and publishing.

1. [\*No Room of One's Own, Early journal submission data suggest COVID-19 is taking women's research productivity \(Inside Higher Ed\)\*](#)
2. [\*Are women publishing less during the pandemic? Here's what the data say \(Nature\)\*](#)
3. [\*Women academics seem to be submitting fewer papers during coronavirus. Never seen anything like it says one editor \(Washington Post\)\*](#)
4. [\*The decline of women's research production during the coronavirus pandemic \(Nature\)\*](#)
5. [\*Who is doing new research in the time of COVID-19? Not the female economists \(Center for Economic Policy Research\)\*](#)
6. [\*Women's research plummets during lockdown – but articles from men increase \(The Guardian\)\*](#)
7. [\*Scientist mothers face extra challenges in the face of COVID-19 \(Scientific American\)\*](#)

## **Advice on Preparing Dossiers**

We encourage all candidates to review the promotion workshops available on-line and attend the in-person workshops. 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. Information on previous workshops, as well as materials and resources can be found on the Faculty Affairs' [Promotion Workshops](#) webpage.

### **Tips on Candidate Statements**

The Candidate Statement is an opportunity to detail your scholarly activity, teaching, and service. Three to five pages (no more) are allotted for the Candidate Statement. [Crafting your Candidate Statement for Promotion, PowerPoint slides](#) are available from the virtual workshop provided by Faculty Affairs on the [Promotion Workshops](#) webpage.

The Candidate Statement includes an overview of the progress and impact of your faculty activity, **including all aspects of your workload distribution.**

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 is one that speaks to the “why your work matters (e.g., to the field, department, university, society)” component of your scholarly activity, teaching, and service. Below are some question prompts that can help you to reflect on your own work and craft a clear and concise statement for both experts in your field as well as university colleagues who are unfamiliar with your disciplinary norms.

#### **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 as evidence of pedagogy or teaching impact, examples may include 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 (please provide specific 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 in which you can share evidence of excellence?

- How can you connect your statement to examples of your teaching in your portfolio?
- What has been your impact and influence with your mentoring of students?

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

- How can you highlight 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 assess 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 during your period in rank?
  - 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 reviewers may look to your Candidate Statement to help them assess the development and significance of your work. 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 professional contributions. To be effective with such readers, 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 integrate aspects of your workload distribution to demonstrate your impact?**

- 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?

**You may wish to draw on the university's "inclusive view of scholarship" to discuss how your work has had a broader impact.** To interpret inclusive scholarship, teaching, and service, as well as to find more resources on this topic please visit [The University's Inclusive View of Scholarship](#).

### **Tips on 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. Include a selection of instructional materials to document instructional innovations, curricular designs, and outcomes assessments. Utilize the [downloadable course list template in Section 6: Teaching Portfolio and Resources](#) for documenting course information. 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 Section 6 of the [Promotion Dossier Template](#).

- The University of Arizona's Center for Assessment, Teaching & Technology (UCATT) has many resources at the following weblinks:
  - [Teaching Resources](#)

- [Mini-courses and workshops](#)
- [Brown University's Teaching Portfolio by Hannelore B. Rodriguez-Farrar](#)
- Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning at Ohio State University
  - [Teaching Portfolio Development](#)
- The University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley Career Engagement provides detailed advice on each aspect of the teaching portfolio.
  - [Teaching Portfolio](#)
- The Chronicle of Higher Education
  - [How to Write a Statement of Teaching Philosophy](#)
- Rubrics for Evaluating Teaching Portfolios
  - [Rubric for Evaluating Teaching Portfolios](#)
  - [Rubric for Composing and Evaluating Statements of Teaching Philosophy](#)
- 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.
  - [UCATT's Equity & Inclusion in Teaching](#)
  - [About Universal Design for Learning](#)

### Mentor Matrix

Candidates should indicate on the [mentor matrix Excel spreadsheet template](#) the students to whom they provided formal mentoring. Please see directions and descriptions of types of mentoring on the template. Please do not include meetings with students during office hours. The intention of this section is to identify significant mentoring and the impact on student outcomes, including, types of training, co-authorship on publications/creative activity, years of funding, and any other outcomes (including but not limited to honors and awards, and graduation dates).

### Student (TCE or SCS) Ratings and Comments

Student evaluative ratings are provided in [Section 6A](#) and comments are provided in [Section 6B](#). Candidates should follow these tutorials ([tutorial for TCE](#) and [tutorial for SCS](#)) to download the ratings and student comments separately. Please provide the abbreviated version of the student ratings; instructions are provided in the tutorial. Student ratings are placed in Section 6A, which is forwarded to all internal review committees. Student comments are downloaded separately and are placed in Section 6B, which remain at the departmental level as supplemental information, unless requested otherwise. Student ratings and comments are referred to as the TCE (Teacher Course Evaluations) prior to 2019; these changed to SCS (Student Course Surveys) from 2020-current.

### Teaching Philosophy

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 students 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. More information on how a teaching philosophy is unique from the Candidate Statement, the Chronicle of Higher Education's [How to Write a Statement of Teaching Philosophy](#) describes the intent of the teaching philosophy statement.

### Peer Teaching Observations

Candidates who have a teaching component in their workload are required to have one summative evaluation conducted at the time of the review. Department Head/Director will identify an appropriate observer and coordinate the observation. The observer should use the appropriate promotion review template provided (in Section 9A: [in-person template](#) and [on-line template](#)). Candidates may also review the template to understand the evaluation rubric and in order to prepare appropriately.

Candidates may choose to include peer observations completed prior to the promotion review that were formative. It is ***not required*** to include formative peer observations.

### Tips on Portfolios to Document Impact in Leadership, Extension, Service and Innovation

If administrative leadership or other service duties make up a significant portion of your workload distribution, 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 teaching, scholarly activity, or clinical activities. This section may include a description and evidence of community and economic impact in extension, position effectiveness 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 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](#). [Section 7](#) contains 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. ***These letters are requested by the department head, not the candidate.***

### Tips on Documentation of Research, Scholarship or Creative Activity

For those faculty who have research/scholarship/creative 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 forthcoming/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:

- National Library of Medicine, Citing Medicine: the NLM Style Guide for Authors, Editors and Publishers: [Chapter 11, Forthcoming \(in press\)](#)

A specific and relevant definition from the link above 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

Candidates are strongly encouraged 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, and indirect and direct funding amounts. Also, please designate for submitted grants if they are pending (under review) or unfunded (not awarded). See more information in [Section 4 – Curriculum Vitae](#).

Please clearly indicate the following for funded grants:

- Your role/title (e.g. PI, Co-PI, consultant) on the grant and % credit
- % FTE funding on the grant
- Title of the grant
- Years of funding and P.I. name(s) (if candidate is not the P.I.)
- Funding Source
- Full funding amount with a breakdown of indirect and direct costs (indicate clearly how much funding comes to the University of Arizona and how much to your department.)

## Inclusive Scholarship

The University of Arizona promotion criteria includes an inclusive view of scholarship. The description and definition of inclusive scholarship can be located at [The University's Inclusive view of Scholarship](#) on the Faculty Affairs webpage.

## Directions on Dossiers

The Office of the Provost annually evaluates more than 50 career-track dossiers, plus track transfers. 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 due to conflict of interest, such as when heads have coauthored or collaborated with candidates, in that case, a surrogate head should be solicited.**

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. While these steps may be taken when candidates have not provided the required information, candidates are responsible for submitting dossier materials by the deadline. We encourage all department heads to attend the promotion review workshop every year for updates.

The [Dossier Template](#) provides checklists of requirements to divide the sections of the 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 Pro](#) (free download with Net ID and password through Adobe Creative Campus.) 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.

### DOSSIER TEMPLATE

- Section 1: Summary Data Sheet
- Section 2; 2A: Summary of Candidate's Workload; Pandemic Impact Statement
- 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 career-track.)
- Section 8, 8A: Membership Graduate or Interdisciplinary Programs for Candidates *and* Graduate or Other Interdisciplinary Program Evaluation by GIDP Chair and Committee
- Section 9, 9A, 9B: 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 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

### 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 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 in terms of number of classes or other teaching expectations.

**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 percentage 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.

Section 2 for career-track candidates includes a row for each year to indicate total FTE for each year, because it may vary.

**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 pandemic beginning in Spring 2020.

Tips for candidates to consider describe how the global pandemic has impacted any of their faculty workload activities. The statement is open-ended so that candidates can best address their own unique situation to provide additional considerations on the impact of the pandemic. We recommend describing the impact of activities identified within your workload assignment. Information of relevance to reviewers 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 the pandemic.

### **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
- Indicate which co-authors may be undergraduate, graduate or post-doc mentees.
- Page numbers and all other publication data should be included
- For publications not in English, please provide English translations of titles
- Peer-reviewed publications should be distinguished from proceedings and other publications that were not peer-reviewed
- Scholarly presentations should be limited to period in rank, up to 10 years
- Distinguish invited from submitted presentations
- List awarded, submitted, pending, or unfunded grants during the period in rank, up to 10 years
- 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 up to 10 years."***

For career-track *assistant or associate professorial rank* please include information up to 10 years in current rank only. [This statement is also included in Section 6 (6A, 6B) and 7 (7A, 7B) dossier template instructions.] If a limit is not specified on the Dossier Template, then the section is not limited to time in rank, e.g., honors/awards, publications, scholarship, or media.

**Section 4A: List of Collaborators**

Collaborators include all individuals whom you have worked closely and directly with in the last five-years or 60 months preceding the submission of this dossier. Collaborators also include individuals who have co-authored books, articles, publications, reports, abstracts, papers or awarded grant proposals and projects. 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. The [Promotion Dossiers](#) website provides more information on determining collaborators.

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 between 3-5 samples of 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.

A cover page is included in this section with a list of the representative work chosen, as well as a brief summary (three-five sentences) describing why each sample was chosen.

**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.

This section also includes a signed attestation statement, ***specific to the candidate's track***.

**Section 6: Teaching Portfolio**

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

**Section 6A: Information on Teaching and Mentoring**

This area is designated for course descriptions, the list of classes for teaching history for the time in rank, student evaluations, formative peer observations (these are observations not conducted specifically for promotion review, and the teaching philosophy. **This documentation is forwarded for college or university reviews.** Please see the [tutorial](#) on how to download the SCS student evaluation summary reports formatted for promotion separately from the student comments (student comments should be placed in Section 6B). To download the TCE reports and student comments, please review this [tutorial](#).

**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 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 the Resource on the scholarship of engagement from the webpage [The University's Inclusive View of 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. Candidates who complete this section are required to also have [Section 8A](#) completed.

**Section 8A: Graduate or Other Interdisciplinary Program Evaluation**

This is an internal review of the candidate's contributions to a GDP program or interdisciplinary program. This section includes evaluations from the GDP or interdisciplinary program Chair and the department or unit promotion review committee. Candidates who have reviews added to this section are required to complete [Section 8](#).

**Section 9: Peer Observation and Nomination for Provost Award**

Section 9 has two parts:

**Section 9A: Peer Observation of Teaching**

The peer observation of teaching for promotion is required to be conducted by a faculty member a rank above the candidate for Career-Track faculty. The peer observation should be conducted during the year before the promotion review of the semester of the promotion review.

Department Heads/Directors will coordinate identifying an appropriate individual to conduct the peer observation. The observation should use the appropriate template for promotion review found on the [Promotion and Tenure Dossier Template webpage](#), in Section 9A. The completed form is submitted by the observer to the Department Head/Director. For additional information on peer observations, please contact Dr. Lisa Elfring in the University Center for Assessment, Teaching & Technology: [elfring@arizona.edu](mailto:elfring@arizona.edu).

**Section 9B: Provost Award for Innovations in Teaching (PAIT) Nomination**

Nomination forms 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 award 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. ***The nomination form is completed by the departmental review committee.***

## Section 10: Letters from Independent External Reviewers and Collaborators

***Committee members or administrators who have a conflict of interest should not be involved in choosing external reviewers.*** In making this decision, we ask you to consider any possible conflicts of interest (significant financial, personal, or other substantial interests with the candidate or their work) or significant collaboration that may require you to recuse yourself as an independent external reviewer. If you fit our definition of a collaborator, we ask that you submit a collaborator letter. We define collaborators as individuals who within the last five years have co-authored books, articles, abstracts, and grant proposals with the candidate. Collaborators also include individuals such as dissertation advisors, mentors, and former coworkers who have worked so closely with a candidate that questions may arise about whether they can offer independent assessments of the candidate's achievements. Co-authors of non-research publications (e.g., review or commentary) are not considered collaborators nor are co-authors of mega-multi-authored publications, unless there has been close and direct collaboration. 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 the [Conflict of Interest](#) section in this Guide. 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 without 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. Please look to department and college criteria on external letter requirements for career-track faculty. For career-track faculty external letters may include letters from those a rank above who are external to their unit, yet still within the University of Arizona.

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

Place solicited letters signed and printed on letterhead from collaborators in this subsection. Sample letters in [Appendix E](#) are used for solicitation.

## 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 and the departmental committee's summary should be included in Section 8A. 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. Committee reviewers at all levels should attend the promotion review training for committee members found at the [Promotion Workshops](#).

While not required, it is recommended that the Chair of the Peer Review Committees encourage members to sign and provide this [Confidentiality Agreement](#) that will be kept by the Chair of the Committee until the end of the promotion cycle.

The department head (or immediate, administrative head) must have a rank superior to the candidate. When reviewing a candidate for promotion to full, the department head must be at full rank. For Career-track candidates, the department head can be from any track. If the department head's rank does not fit these guidelines, an acting head must be chosen to fill the department head's role in the case.

Reviewers should be aware that uploading or sharing content or original concepts from University of Arizona peer review materials (this may include job application reviews, annual reviews, promotion reviews, grant or award applications reviews, contract proposals, or other peer review activity) to online generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools violates the UArizona peer review confidentiality and integrity requirements. Generative AI tools have no guarantee of where data are being sent, saved, viewed, or used in the future. Use of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies (e.g., ChatGPT) for analyzing and formulating internal peer review evaluations for grants, awards, proposals and any other form of peer review activity would violate peer review confidentiality.

## Avoiding the Most Common Problems in Dossiers

When procedures are not followed, dossiers will be returned to departments to repeat the reviews at each level in the process. **Six 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 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. **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.
3. **Are there sufficient independent outside review letters (based on department and college criteria) received to conduct the full review?** 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, or 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. For career-track faculty external reviewer letters could include individuals a rank above who are external to their unit, yet still within the University of Arizona.
4. **Is a recent teaching observation included in Section 9A using the recommended Peer Observation Tool for Promotion Review?** Section 9A requires the summative Peer Observation. A recent peer observation using the recommended Peer Observation form ([in-person teaching form](#) or [online teaching form](#)) for Promotion Review should be included in Section 9A of the dossier. An observation of the candidate's teaching is particularly important with distinct teaching assignments 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 for a separate teaching evaluation memo in Section 9A. 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.

### Conflict of Interest

5. **Were any co-authors and collaborators of candidates included, such as 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.

As with the provisions used by NSF 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, 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 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.

**6. 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 co-authored or collaborated on grants with candidates, a surrogate head must be solicited**, and the head may choose to submit a collaborator letter.

**Conflict of Interest:** It is considered a conflict of interest if you have significant financial, personal, or other substantial interests with the candidate or their work or significant collaboration. We define collaborators as individuals who within the last 5 years have co-authored books, articles, abstracts, and grant proposals with the candidate. Collaborators also include individuals such as dissertation advisors, mentors, and former coworkers who have worked so closely with a candidate that questions may arise about whether they can offer independent assessments of the candidate's achievements. Co-authors of non-research publications (e.g., review or commentary) are not considered collaborators nor are co-authors of mega-multi-authored publications, unless there has been close and direct collaboration. Please consider this guidance from NIH, [NIH Conflict of Interest Rules: Information for Reviewers of NIH Applications and R&D Contract Proposals](#).

Committee members or administrators who have a conflict of interest must recuse themselves to avoid raising concerns about their impartiality. When department heads are under review for promotion, ad hoc committee members and a surrogate head must be appointed by the Dean or delegated Associate Dean.

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 co-authored 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.

**Individuals with any conflict of interest 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.

A candidate has the right to request the exclusion of an individual from serving on their peer review committee or from serving as an independent external reviewer. This request should be made to the candidate's department head (or immediate administrative head) **as soon as** the candidate confirms they will be participating in the review cycle. No reason for this request is needed.

## Promotion Policies

### Yearly Promotion Review Schedule

- ***Career-Track Dossiers are due to the Office of the Provost on or before Friday December 13, 2024;*** 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
The Departmental Committee's Report is written and added to the dossier. Include PAIT nomination form, if appropriate.	Departmental Committee Chair	By mid-September
Department Head or Director's Letter written and added to the dossier	Department Head/Director	September 30 <sup>th</sup>
Dossier delivered to Dean's Office	Dean	October 1 <sup>st</sup>
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 <sup>th</sup>
<b>Dossiers due in the Office of the Provost</b>	<b>Vice Provost</b>	<b>December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2024</b>
<b>Provost's Letters of Decision sent to candidates</b>	<b>University Coordinator, Colleges and Departments</b>	<b>April 25, 2025</b>

## The University's Inclusive View of Scholarship

Candidates and reviewers should consider the resources on the [University's Inclusive View of Scholarship](#)

Our University's Promotion criteria recognizes that research enriches teaching, 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, as former Provost Folks noted:**

*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.*

## Provost Award 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. The [Provost Awards for Innovations in Teaching](#) is to recognize "candidates whose teaching portfolios and instructional effectiveness merit special recognition. This requires a completed form (in [Section 9B](#)) **from the departmental review committee** to nominate the candidate to be considered for this award. More information on making these nominations is included in Dossier Template [Section 9](#), [Section 9B](#) and in the following discussions of the dossier.

A completed form (in Section 9B) addressing the criteria for the Provost Award for Innovations in Teaching is required for candidates to be considered for this special award that is only offered at the time of promotion. This form is completed by the **departmental committee at the time of review**.

## Evaluation of Teaching

Committees should take a holistic perspective that considers multiple aspects of the candidate's Teaching Portfolios, including but not limited to their teaching observations, their assessments of Student evaluations (SCS or TCE), as well as course materials. 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).

The Department Head/Director coordinates the teaching peer observation. The peer observer should use the recommended summative evaluation tools for peer observers to use at promotion. Use either the [in-person teaching form](#), or the [online teaching form](#).

## 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 department heads, 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 co-taught, co-authored 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 3.3.03](#).
- While not required, it is recommended that the Chair of the Peer Review Committees encourage members to sign and provide this [Confidentiality Agreement](#) that will be kept by the Chair of the Committee until the end of the promotion cycle.

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 previous 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:

## 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 facts 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 7, 2025**, unless the request comes from the Provost. After February 7, 2025, 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 of Candidate's Workload Assignment in [Section 2](#) 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 must 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 Kim Rogan in the Provost’s Office at (520) 626-0202 or [facultyaffairs@arizona.edu](mailto:facultyaffairs@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 who 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](mailto:knox@arizona.edu)) or Vice Dean Bruce Coull in the College of Medicine-Tucson ([coullb@arizona.edu](mailto:coullb@arizona.edu)).