

Components of the Dossier for Retention, Promotion and/or Tenure

- The Provost's checklist/guidelines

The checklist/guidelines provide clarification to candidates, departments, and reviewers of what is to be included in the dossier, and provides the format for the contents of each dossier, thus assuring uniformity of organization of dossiers. The *Guide to the Promotion Process* provides greater detail as to the requirements for the dossier as well as advice on various issues, including how to avoid common problems in the preparation of dossiers.

- Section 1: Summary Data Sheet

The department will provide information regarding the candidate's current rank and position, the action requested, and history of faculty service both at the UA and elsewhere.

- Section 2: Summary of Candidate's Workload Assignment

The department head will summarize the candidate's workload for the period under review. Please outline the relative time commitment assigned to teaching, research and service/outreach for the time period and discuss the candidate's activities in relationship to the department's mission and strategic plan. This **neutral** summary of responsibilities provides the context for unbiased evaluation of a candidate's success in meeting performance expectations for promotion and/or tenure. Signature of the candidate indicating agreement with the summary is required, or, if a disagreement exists, an explanation of differences should be prepared and signed by the candidate. Please note: the Workload Assignment **should not include** evaluative statements. Requirements for administrative service should be described in the section for "Requirements for additional workload assignment". Information describing the candidate's participation in interdisciplinary graduate programs should also be reported in the Candidate's Workload Assignment.

- Section 3: Department and College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Include the entire description of the appropriate titles series from the *COM Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure* so that reviewers may better evaluate the candidate's level of development and accomplishment. Please also include the appendices, which provide examples of many kinds of scholarship and help reviewers maintain a broader, more inclusive view of scholarship.

- Section 4: Candidate's CV.

The CV should be formatted following the Provost's guidelines (http://medicine.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/form_pdf/CVGuidelines-COMAnnotations-030315.pdf), using the appropriate headings as applicable. This section should include a full list of the candidate's creative activity/publications. For foreign publications, an English translation of the title is required. Any publications substantially based on work done as a graduate student should be identified with an asterisk to the left of the title. Percent effort or Person Months, candidate's role (PI, co-PI); and source and amount should be indicated for grants and contracts. A signed statement by the candidate on the last page of her/his

curriculum vitae is required. Note: The curriculum vitae should not normally include abstracts, research reports, or conference proceedings.

Electronic publication is an appropriate means of scholarly, artistic and professional communication, as are other means of presentation such as print and performance.

- Section 5: Candidate Statement of Accomplishments and Objectives in Research Teaching and Service/Outreach

Detailed advice on preparing the Candidate Statement may be found on p. 10 of the *Guide to the Promotion Process*. Information describing the candidate's participation in interdisciplinary graduate programs should be included in the Candidate's Statement (Section 5, last item).

- Section 6: Teaching Portfolio

Provide information on teaching and advising activities, using the appropriate headings from the guide sheet for Section 6.

- Section 7: Evaluation of teaching and advising

Do not include individual copies of student evaluations. Instead, the candidate's department should provide objective data (i.e., clear tables or graphs) and a 1-2 page summary documenting the candidate's teaching effectiveness. The Office of Instructional Technology is available to assist departments in preparing these summaries. **Peer review** of the candidate's teaching is now mandatory, and at least one such review per year in rank should be included in the dossier.

In addition, the department P&T committee is now required to provide a review of the candidate's teaching portfolio which must be included in this section and also incorporated into the departmental recommendation letter.

- Section 8: Service and Outreach Portfolio (optional)

This section is optional for candidates whose outreach and service is integral to their programs of work. The Service and Outreach Portfolio provides candidates with an opportunity to describe and provide supporting documentation on any program they have developed and may also be sent to outside evaluators.

- Section 9: Memberships in Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs (GIDPs)

Faculty involved in GIDPs must describe their relevant activities in the GIDP.

The department P&T committee chair should request an evaluation of the candidate's contributions from the chair of the GIDP.

The department P&T committee must briefly summarize and evaluate the candidate's contributions to the GIDP(s).

- Section 10: Letters from Outside Evaluators

The most common hold up in timely review of dossiers is 1) delay in requesting letters of recommendation or 2) failure to use the appropriate template in requesting the letters. Deviation from the wording of the sample letter requires permission of the Dean. All content of the sample letter must be included in your letter unless you have permission from the Provost to eliminate selected questions.

Department heads are asked to summarize the method used to select reviewers and must list the names of all reviewers contacted, whether or not they agreed to serve as referees. Use the worksheets provided with the dossier to provide this information. A brief statement on each reviewer's national or international standing is required. The candidate may submit names of possible evaluators to the department head. However, no more than half of the total evaluators contacted may be from the candidate's list and no more than half of the letters received may come from evaluators suggested by the candidate. Letters must ensure that external reviewers address both promotion and tenure, if tenure is applicable. The Provost recommends that more than three independent letters be sought. All letters received from outside evaluators must be included in the dossier.

- Section 11: Recommendations for Promotion and/or Tenure

Letter from the departmental promotion and tenure committee letter.

The letter must record a numerical vote, i.e., approved 5-1, opposed 4-2. If a candidate is being considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, these issues shall not be separated in the vote or in the recommendation of reviewers. If a candidate is being considered for tenure and promotion to Professor, these issues may be separated in the vote and in the recommendation of reviewers. For instance, the department P&T committee may recommend the award of tenure but not recommend promotion at the current time. Both votes must be recorded. On any split vote, a minority view must be provided. All committee members present for the vote must sign the letter. The letter should address any unusual aspects in the dossier, i.e. conflicting opinions of reviewers. Letters from the department committee must also include information about the peer review of teaching, as described in Section 7 above.

Letter from department head recommending promotion, retention at rank or nonrenewal.

The letter should justify the head's recommendation. In particular, differences of opinion among reviewers or committee members must be specifically addressed.

- The Checklist for Shared Appointments (Appendix A) must accompany dossiers of candidates having shared appointments (appointments where the budget line is split between two or more academic departments).
- If a review committee or an administrative reviewer recommends that additional pertinent information regarding the candidate, (a significant new grant, a major teaching award, or a major publication) be added to the candidate's dossier, the relevant materials may be appended to the dossier. In such a case the candidate must be informed of the nature of the materials to be added to the dossier, and the expanded dossier must be re-reviewed by all levels of reviewers. If the additional materials consist of factual information that might be deleterious to the candidate's case, the candidate shall be given the opportunity to add a

response to the packet. A request from the candidate or department to append additional information must be received by the Provost's office by February 1st for tenure track faculty.