This *Guide to the Promotion Process* should answer your questions about promotion whether you are a candidate going through the process and or a department head and faculty member mentoring candidates. This Guide offers advice on the promotion processes for faculty and continuing-status professionals. In addition to the process for tenure-track faculty, the University has a parallel process for continuing-status professionals such as librarians, agricultural agents, research scientists, and others with continuing appointments. Useful information is also provided for professors of practice and other nontenure-faculty because nontenure promotion reviews use the same dossier and much the same process.

For candidates, this Guide offers advice on using the promotion process to advance your research agenda, improve your teaching, and integrate your service and outreach into your program of work.

- **Working toward Promotion** (page 2)
  - Annual Performance Reviews (page 2)
  - Probationary or Retention Reviews (generally in the third year) (page 3)
  - Requesting Delays in the Promotion Process (page 4)
  - Strategies for Using the Promotion Process to Achieve Your Career Goals (page 5)
    - Use promotion criteria to develop an action plan.
    - Solicit input from faculty in your department and discipline.
    - Build a clearly defined profile of teaching, service, and research contributions.

- **Directions on Dossiers** (page 6)
  - Advice for Reviewers on the Most Common Problems in Dossiers (page 6)
  - Directions on the Sections of Dossiers (page 7)

- **Dossier Template** (page 7)
  - Section 1: Summary Data Sheet
  - Section 2: Summary of Candidate's Workload Assignment
  - Section 3: Departmental and College Guidelines
  - Section 4: CV and List of Collaborators
  - Section 5: Candidate Statement
  - Section 6: Documentation of Teaching & Advising
  - Section 7: Evaluation of Teaching & Advising
  - Section 8: Documentation for Interdisciplinary Candidates
  - Section 9: Letters from Outside Evaluators
  - Section 10: Recommendations for Promotion

- **Promotion Policies and Related Resources** (page 11)
  - The Yearly Promotion Review Schedule
  - Policies on Promotion Review Committees
  - The Role of University Promotion Committees
  - Additions to Dossiers
  - Notifications of Candidates on Promotion Recommendations
  - Appeals of Promotion Decisions
  - ADVANCE Resources on Mentoring & Promotion

*The University Handbook for Appointed Personnel* (UHAP) explains the policies for the parallel tracks to promotion:
- Tenure and nontenure-track faculty are covered by Chapter 3 in UHAP: [http://uhap.web.arizona.edu/chap3.html](http://uhap.web.arizona.edu/chap3.html)
- Continuing-status professionals should consult Chapter 4 of UHAP: [http://uhap.web.arizona.edu/chap4.html](http://uhap.web.arizona.edu/chap4.html)

This *Guide* and related information is on the Associate Provost’s website: [http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/](http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/)

You may also call the Provost’s Office at 621-0202.
**Working toward Promotion**

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

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

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

**Annual Performance Reviews**

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

**Update Your CV Frequently:** Your CV is central to your Promotion Dossier. Unfortunately, candidates sometimes omit important contributions such as conference presentations or major committee work. To avoid this problem, keep your CV current.

Annual reviews may be considered during promotion reviews, but good annual reviews do not guarantee promotion. As noted in UHAP 3.10.02,

- Annual reviews focus on a single year.
- Annual reviews do not include external reviews.
- As a result, publications are not assessed in as much depth as in promotion reviews.
- Annual reviews do not include assessments from faculty from beyond your discipline.
In your discussions with your head and other senior faculty, here are some questions that you can use to clarify expectations and get feedback on how your work is viewed:

**Research:**
- What do you look for in assessing the impact of research?
- Do the strands in my research program seem to be clearly defined and related?
- Do you see aspects of my research that I should address; for example, do you see that I have “independence” from senior collaborators?

**Teaching:**
- How is teaching effectiveness assessed in our department?
- Will I be able to teach a range of graduate and undergraduate courses?
- How can I align my course assignments with my research interests?
- Will I be able to teach some of the same courses from year to year?

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

**Position Effectiveness** is often a key criterion for continuing-status positions. Use the APR process to clarify how you are to demonstrate the impact of your contributions. Develop a formal assessment plan in collaboration with your colleagues and supervisors to help you build a well documented program of work with clearly defined benchmarks.

**Probationary or Retention Reviews**

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

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

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

In most colleges, Retention Reviews are conducted at the department level, unless a recommendation is made not to renew a candidate. Such recommendations are very rare. If a department head recommends that a candidate not be retained, then the Promotion Dossier is forwarded for college and University reviews along with the assessments of the peer review committee and the head. External reviews are not normally included but may be requested by the dean or Provost. The Provost may decide that nonrenewal is appropriate when a candidate is not making timely progress toward promotion. In such cases, a candidate is given a final terminal year appointment. The Provost may also decide to schedule another Retention Review in the fourth or fifth year. All steps in this process, including the appeal phase, are detailed in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP).
Requesting Delays in the Promotion Process

The University’s policy for delays on the tenure or continuing-status time clock was revised in the spring of 2012 to improve the support for assistant professors and continuing-status professionals. This page is drawn directly from the revisions that were circulated in the spring of 2012, and which the University will be following for the 2012-13 year. Please consult UHAP for any final changes in wording.

The Provost has the sole authority to grant requests to extend the promotion clock for tenure-eligible faculty and continuing-status eligible professionals, based upon good cause shown for either personal reasons or other extenuating circumstances as set forth below. A faculty member should submit a written request for a promotion clock delay as early as possible, but no later than one year after the events or circumstances that form the basis for the request.

The University will not subject a faculty member who has been granted a promotion clock delay under this Section to additional scholarship or service requirements above and beyond those ordinarily required to qualify for retention or promotion. The Provost’s decision is not subject to further review.

1. Birth or Adoption

The Provost will approve and grant timely requests for promotion clock delays based upon the birth or adoption of a faculty member’s child. Faculty members should submit such requests directly to the Provost. Faculty members may be asked to provide supporting documentation.

2. Personal Reasons

The Provost will consider timely requests for promotion clock delays based upon personal reasons that prevent a faculty member from meeting his or her research, teaching, or service obligations. Such personal reasons may include but are not limited to a faculty member's own serious health condition or disability; the assumption of significant and ongoing care responsibilities as a result of the serious health condition or disability of a faculty member's spouse, domestic partner, parent, or child; or the death of the faculty member's child, spouse, or domestic partner.

Faculty members should submit such requests with supporting documentation directly to the Provost. If the request is based upon medical reasons, faculty members may choose to provide supporting medical documentation directly to the Disability Resource Center (DRC), rather than the Provost. Before making a determination on a request based upon medical reasons, the Provost will consult with the DRC.

3. Adverse Professional Circumstances

The Provost will consider timely requests for promotion clock delays based upon exceptionally adverse professional circumstances or impediments that are beyond a faculty member’s control and that prevent a faculty member from meeting his or her research, teaching, or service obligations. Faculty members should submit such requests directly to the faculty member's director or head. Both the appropriate dean and the head or director must support the request, which the dean will then submit to the Provost for consideration.

4. Prestigious External Commitments

The Provost will consider timely requests for promotion clock delays based upon a faculty member's prestigious external commitments that bring credit to the institution but which require inordinate time to perform, provided that the University has authorized such commitments. Faculty members should submit such requests directly to the faculty member's director or head. Both the appropriate dean and the head or director must support the request, which the dean will then submit to the Provost for consideration.
Strategies for Using the Promotion Process to Achieve Your Career Goals

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

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

Translating promotion criteria into annual goals can require some input from your colleagues. What sorts of publications and which journals “count”? How important are conference presentations? What service and outreach roles are expected? These questions are easy to ask, though hard to answer. Talk through your publication plans with your colleagues to align your goals with promotion expectations.

Your annual reports provide an opportunity to reflect upon your goals and achievements, and then get feedback on how you are characterizing them. As with your Candidate Statement, your annual report should clarify your contributions. For example, if you have published coauthored articles with senior people, you will need to articulate your research agenda to help establish that you have an independent program of research and are not simply assisting with others’ research. If you are in a field where research funding is limited, your ability to articulate your research agenda and its impact may be even more important because you may have fewer benchmarks to demonstrate the quality of your research.

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

Build a clearly defined profile of teaching, service, and research contributions. Through your discussions with colleagues and your own reflections, you will learn how to articulate how your teaching, research, and service and outreach contribute to your overall program of work. As you think about how to represent your wide-ranging projects as parts of a coherent program of work, you should also explore how to benchmark the impact of your varied contributions. To some extent, quality speaks for itself in teaching and research, but quality can be harder to benchmark in teaching than in research. With your research, you can cite invited talks, publications, citations, and perhaps funding, but with teaching, about the only quantifiable benchmarks you have are Teacher Course Evaluations (TCEs). Your colleagues may visit a class and review your instructional materials, but you will need to articulate your teaching philosophy and the instructional goals of your courses. Mentoring, advising, and even outreach may be integral to your teaching, but you will need to make those connections for reviewers. If you articulate how your research and teaching are related to your outreach and service, those efforts can play a more important part in promotion reviews. One way to establish such relationships is to characterize your service contributions as a form of leadership. Benchmarking the impact of your efforts is another key consideration that bridges service, research, and teaching efforts. One way to characterize the impact of your service and outreach is to consider how your work addresses important needs in ways that advance the mission of your unit, and the university more generally.
Directions on Dossiers

Advice for Reviewers on the Most Common Problems in Dossiers

Five problems result in most of the decisions to return dossiers to departments.

1. **Coauthors and close collaborators of candidates should not serve as external reviewers, committee members, or administrative reviewers.** The University looks to external reviewers to provide an independent assessment of a candidate, 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 sent back to be re-reviewed by departments and colleges.

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

Committee members or administrators who have coauthored substantial publications or grants with a candidate should recuse themselves to avoid raising concerns about their impartiality. If collaborators serve on review committees or in administrative roles, they may provide a separate letter that describes the independent contributions of the candidate. If recusal is not feasible, for example because of the size of a department, concerns about conflicts of interest must be addressed in the letter reviewing the candidate. Questions about whether a faculty member can serve as a reviewer should be addressed to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.

2. **A Workload Assignment should not praise the achievements of the candidate, but should include 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 use in making independent assessments of candidates’ achievements. While a position description should not use evaluative terms, it should provide enough detail to clarify how many courses are expected and what duties are included in an appointment.

3. **The selection of reviewers must follow prescribed procedures and be fully documented.** Candidates should suggest evaluators to their head. The suggested reviewers should not comprise more than half of the number of external reviewers. Each step in the process of enlisting reviewers should be documented using the checklist in the Dossier Template. The letter sent to reviewers should not deviate from the sample letter without permission of a dean. Changes in the questions asked of reviewers must be approved by the Provost’s Office.

4. **Candidates should work with their heads and committees to document their teaching.** Careful documentation of a candidate’s teaching is essential with unusual teaching assignment such as team-taught classes or residencies. Peer reviews can be vital in assessing a candidate’s teaching. Student assessments such as Teacher-Course Evaluations should be provided along with benchmarks for comparative assessments. Summaries of students’ individual comments should be prepared by committees to ensure the comments are representative.

5. **Only qualified faculty members should serve on committees and vote on candidates.** Individuals should not serve on a review committee or vote on a candidate unless they have a superior rank to the candidate. Only tenured associate professors or associates with continuing status are qualified to vote or serve on committees considering the promotion and tenure or continuing status of assistants, and only full professors and full continuing status professionals are qualified to vote or serve on committees reviewing associates for promotion, tenure or continuing status. Individuals who serve on departmental, college or University committees must recuse themselves from voting on any candidate whom they have already reviewed on a prior committee.
Directions on the Sections of Dossiers

Tenure and continuing-status committees review up to one hundred dossiers each year. Each of those dossiers is read by up to twenty reviewers, including three to eight external reviewers, departmental and college committees, and heads and deans. To avoid time-consuming problems, Promotion Dossiers must use the Dossier Template and follow established procedures. Dossiers are returned to departments each year when required formats and procedures are not followed. As discussed above, most of the problems arise from using evaluative or ill-defined workloads and enlisting collaborators to serve as reviewers.

While heads and committees must follow established procedures, candidates are responsible to submit materials in a timely manner in specified formats. If a dean or college committee determines that a 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 finds that a candidate is disadvantaged because of a poorly prepared dossier, the committee may request that materials be added to the file. This action re-initiates the review at the departmental level.

The Dossier Template provides checklists to divide the sections of Promotion Dossiers. The checklists provide candidates and reviewers with a clear sense of the items to be reviewed in each section, and thereby help to ensure consistency and completeness in dossiers. The checklists also help to save time in each level of the review process.

DOSSIER TEMPLATE

1: Summary Data Sheet
2: Summary of Candidate's Workload Assignment
3: Departmental and College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
4: Curriculum Vitae and List of Collaborators
5: Candidate Statement
6: Documentation of Teaching and Advising
7: Evaluation of Teaching and Advising
8: Documentation for Interdisciplinary Candidates
9: Letters from Outside Evaluators
10: Recommendations for Promotion

Section 1: Summary Data Sheet

Promotion Dossiers are used for a wide range of reviews for different categories of faculty and continuing-status professionals. This sheet helps to ensure that reviews follow the procedures appropriate for the decision to be made. For example, committees cannot divide the decisions on promotion and tenure for assistant professors, or for promotion and continuing status for assistants on the continuing-status track.

Section 2: Summary of Candidate's Workload Assignment

The Workload Assignment is a one-page form filled out by department heads to provide specifics on the candidate’s assigned duties. It should not evaluate the candidate’s contributions. It should specify what a figure such as “40% teaching” generally entails in the unit.

If the candidate’s duties have changed over the period in rank, the changes should be specified. If there was a delay in the promotion time clock, indicate it with TCD in the appropriate Academic Year’s column, in the row labeled Other. To preserve candidates’ privacy rights, the dossier should not state reasons for delays. Simply specify the dates, for example by noting “Approved TCD 2005-06.”

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 have a shared understanding of the appointment, including the teaching load, service expectations, and the constitution of the peer review committee.
Section 3: Departmental and College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Include one-page summary following Appendix B format.

Section 4: Curriculum Vitae and List of Collaborators
For the List of Collaborators, collaborators are defined as individuals who have collaborated with the candidate within the sixty months preceding the submission of the dossier in coauthoring books, articles, abstracts, or papers; submitting grant proposals; or co-editing journals, compendia, or conference proceedings. If the candidate has not collaborated with anyone in the last five years, simply note that fact in the List.
1. Publications should be listed in chronological order.
2. Place an * to left of title of any publication substantially based on work done as a graduate student.
3. Page numbers and all other publication data should be included.
4. For foreign publications, provide English translation of title.
5. Peer-reviewed publications should be clearly distinguished from proceedings and other publications.
6. Scholarly presentations should be limited to period in rank.
7. Distinguish invited from submitted presentations.
8. Only grants that are pending or awarded during the period in rank should be listed.
9. Grants should be organized according to source of funding (federal, industry, foundations).
10. Check list of collaborators to ensure it is accurate.

Section 5: Candidate Statement
Advice to candidates on composing Candidate Statements:
Candidate Statements vary across different disciplines. Some reviewers will read your statement to assess the progress of your research program and its impact. Others will be interested in how your teaching, research, and service combine to define your work as a faculty member and scholar. Most readers will expect you to include at least a brief statement of your teaching philosophy, if teaching is a major part of your assigned duties. In these and other ways, your Candidate Statement should discuss your achievements in the duties that are laid out in your Workload Assignment.

Remember your readers, including the non-specialists. Because external reviewers are asked to assess your research, they may begin by skimming your CV and then look to your Candidate Statement to frame your research program. On the other hand, most internal reviewers will not be specialists in your field and may turn to the Candidate Statement to get a feel for the general significance of your work.

Keep your style simple and be very careful about specialized terminology. Your research is detailed in your publications, so focus on major findings and refer to the publications to provide supporting details. Either way, focus on a few take-away points that your readers can use to assess your work, and its impact.

Section 6: Documentation of Teaching and Advising
Candidates are responsible to provide information and supporting documentation on their teaching and advising. Some departments ask candidates to provide a teaching portfolio with their syllabi and instructional materials. The departmental committee and head will use such materials in their letters, but instructional materials will not be forwarded to college or university level reviews.

Section 7: Evaluation of Teaching and Advising
This section is prepared by the department committee, coordinating with candidates to obtain Teacher-Course Evaluations, observe classes, and review instructional materials. Committee letters should note who observed classes, if a class visit was made. Committees may wish to consult A Short Guide to Evaluating Teaching: http://aer.arizona.edu/AER/teaching/docs/shortGuide.pdf
Section 8: Documentation for Interdisciplinary Candidates

Reviews of candidates who are members of Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs should follow the Guidelines of Acknowledgment and Evaluation of Faculty Participation in Graduate Interdisciplinary Program Activities in the Promotion and Tenure Process (Appendix C). Candidates may also choose to discuss their GIDP participation in their Candidate Statement.

Section 9: Letters from Outside Evaluators

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

For this and other reasons, communications with external reviewers should be fully documented. A sample letter to external reviewers is included as Appendix D. Heads should deviate from the wording of the sample letter only with the permission of their dean; however, changing the content of the questions must be approved by the Office of the Provost. The candidate should suggest possible evaluators to the department head, but no more than half of the evaluators should come from the candidate. If the candidate suggests the same reviewer as the head or committee, the reviewer should be counted as being selected by the candidate.

If candidates have engaged in extensive collaborations, especially with senior faculty, the independent contributions of the candidate may be difficult to ascertain. If so, it is often helpful to request letters from one or more of the collaborators to characterize the extent and nature of the candidate's contributions. Collaborator letters provide an alternative way to articulate the importance of the candidate’s work. They should be solicited separately and do not replace independent reviews.

Section 10: Recommendations for Promotion

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

The criteria for selecting external reviewers should not discourage collaboration, as President Sander stressed in a 2011 memo to campus:

As a university, we value and are recognized nationally for our collaboration among colleagues, both externally and internally. The important aspect of citizenship is embedded within our research and creative activity, as well as across our teaching and community engagement/service endeavors. We are writing to reconfirm that these activities continue to be appropriate considerations as part of the broad range of contributions reviewed in our process for promotion, tenure and continuing status.
## Promotion Policies and Related Resources

### Yearly Promotion Review Schedule

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

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

Each college and department must have a standing committee on faculty status to advise the dean and department head before recommendations on promotion, tenure, and continuing status are forwarded for further review.

- Promotion and tenure committees will be composed of at least three tenured faculty, and continuing-status committees should include three academic professionals with continuing status.
- The committees shall be constituted so that recommendations by committees shall be made only by faculty or continuing-status professionals holding rank superior to the rank of the candidate being considered, except in the case of review for promotion to full professor or full continuing status. In such cases, the committee members must be a full professor or a continuing-status professional with full status.
- In appointing departmental standing committees, please consider potential Affiliate Faculty status of candidate in Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs. In cases of significant participation in a GIDP, appointment of a GIDP faculty of appropriate rank on the standing committee may be advisable.
- Committee members or administrators who have coauthored substantial publications or grants with a candidate should recuse themselves to avoid raising questions about the independence of reviews. If recusing committee members is not feasible, for example because of the size of the department, the committee must address the concerns about conflicts of interest in its letter.
- Individuals who serve concurrently on departmental, college and/or University promotion and tenure committees must recuse themselves from voting on any 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, as noted in UHAP.

The Role of University Promotion Committees

The Provost will appoint University Promotion Committees to review Promotion Dossiers for faculty and Promotion Dossiers for continuing status following the appropriate UHAP. These committees will advise the Provost in all tenure and continuing-status considerations. These committees will 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.

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 conclusion of the process and suggest needed revisions to the appropriate administrators. As part of their responsibilities, department heads are required by UHAP to advise candidates in writing of their recommendations regarding renewal, nonrenewal, promotion, or tenure or continuing status at the time the recommendations are forwarded to the next level in the review process.

Additions to Dossiers

On rare occasions additional pertinent information regarding a candidate’s work becomes available during the review process. For example, a candidate may be receive a major teaching award or grant or have a major piece accepted for publication. Such additions to dossiers must be made following these procedures:

- An administrator or committee chair recommends that the information be added to the dossier.
- The candidate is informed that the materials have been added.
- The expanded dossier must be re-reviewed by all levels of reviewers.
- If the additional materials consist of factual information that might be deleterious to the candidate’s case, the candidate must be given the opportunity to add a response to the dossier.
- A request to amend the dossier must be received by the Office of the Provost by February 1st, unless it comes from the University promotion and tenure committee or the University continuing-status committee.
Notification of Candidates on Promotion Recommendations
As required by UHAP, heads and deans will inform candidate in writing of recommendations on renewals, promotions, tenure, or continuing status when recommendations are forwarded to the next level for review.

Appeals of Promotion Decisions
The Provost decides whether an individual will be renewed, promoted, or granted tenure or continuing status. In the case of the nonrenewal of a tenure-eligible or continuing-status-eligible individual up for review in his/her mandatory year, a terminal contract will be offered for the next appointment period.

Candidates may choose to appeal the outcome of their retention, mandatory, or promotion review by writing a letter to the President within thirty days of the notice of the Provost’s decision. The President’s decision is issued in writing and forwarded to the faculty member involved, along with copies to the Provost and the appropriate dean and department head within ninety days of the notice of appeal. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure may consider allegations of unlawful discrimination or other unconstitutional actions and recommend additional review or action to be taken.

ADVANCE Resources on Mentoring and Promotion
The following resources have been developed by the ADVANCE program, which is committed to advancing “the research and scientific reputation of the University of Arizona by promoting faculty diversity and the equitable treatment of faculty.” The UA ADVANCE program is managed by the Center for Research, Equity and Opportunity (CREO) with funding awarded by the National Science Foundation's ADVANCE IT program.

Mentoring Resources
- Effective Mentoring: http://www.advance.arizona.edu/UA_ADVANCE_Materials/Mentoring1_Effective.pdf
- Mentoring Mosaics: http://www.advance.arizona.edu/UA_ADVANCE_Materials/Mentoring3_Mosaics.pdf
- Benefits of Mentoring: http://www.advance.arizona.edu/UA_ADVANCE_Materials/Mentoring4_Benefits.pdf
- Tips for Effective Mentoring: http://www.advance.arizona.edu/UA_ADVANCE_Materials/Mentoring5_Tips.pdf
- Current UA Mentoring Examples: http://www.advance.arizona.edu/UA_ADVANCE_Materials/Mentoring6_Examples.pdf
- Annotated Bibliography: http://www.advance.arizona.edu/UA_ADVANCE_Materials/Mentoring7_Biblio.pdf

Promotion and Tenure Resources
- Tips For Assistant Professors includes practical advice on a range of topics: http://www.advance.arizona.edu/UA_ADVANCE_Materials/TipsForAssistantProfessors.pdf
  - You’ve Got the Job, Now What?
  - Research and Publishing
  - Teaching
  - Service
  - Collaboration
  - Awards
  - Relationships
  - External Evaluators
  - Preparing Your Dossier
- Advancing from Associate Professor to Full Professor Status: http://www.advance.arizona.edu/UA_ADVANCE_Materials/AdvancingFromAssociateToFull.pdf
- Advice from Others: http://www.advance.arizona.edu/UA_ADVANCE_Materials/AdviceFromOthers.pdf