ZOOM P&T Workshop

- All participant microphones will be muted during the presentation
- Participant Video is optional
- Please use the “Chat” feature for questions during the presentation
- At the end of the presentation, microphones will be unmuted for additional questions
- The presentation will be recorded
PROMOTION AND TENURE WORKSHOP

DOSSIER PREPARATION

March 2020
Discussion Items

- COM-Tucson Faculty Affairs Office
- Types of Review
- Important Dates
- Dossier Sections and Content/Checklists
- Common problems with Dossiers
- Resources
COM Faculty Affairs Office
Tucson

Anne E. Cress, PhD
Deputy Dean, Research and Academic Affairs
cress@email.Arizona.edu
626-1530

Alice A. Min, MD
Assistant Dean, Faculty Development
amin@aemrc.arizona.edu
520-626-1280

Tina Wixom, DBA
Director, Faculty Policy & Reporting
tinawixom@email.arizona.edu
520-626-4368
Types of Review

- Mandatory Review
  - Mid-cycle Review
  - Promotion & Tenure
- Career Track
  - Educator Scholar
  - Educator Series
  - Research Scholar
  - Research Series
Mandatory Review

• Any review required per the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP)*

• Tenure eligible faculty have two types (noted on Letter of Offer)
  
  o A mandatory mid-cycle retention review during their 3rd year
  
  o A mandatory P&T review in their 6th year

  ✓ If promoted earlier, 6th year review is waived

• Tenure Track faculty can request a “clock stop” year for extenuating circumstances, approved on a case-by-case basis

• No mandatory reviews required for career track/non-tenure faculty
Mid-cycle Review

• The Retention Review serves as a dress rehearsal for your promotion review

• You will use the same Dossier Template, and CV format as the Promotion Dossier
  - Mid-cycle review is internal; does not use external evaluators as a promotion/tenure request does
  - Is submitted to the College AP&T Committee and Dean for their feedback
    - Candidate receives feedback
Levels of Review for Promotion

Faculty Prepares Dossier

External Reviews Contacted (by dept.)

Dept. P&T Review

Dept. Chair Review

College AP&T Review

COM-T Dean Review

UAHS, University and/or Provost Review
During Annual Evaluation

Feedback on your Work

Teaching Assessment

What to Prioritize

Areas of Improvement

Promotion Timeline

Do I have Peer Teaching Evaluations?

Am I on the right Track/Path?
Important Dates

Tenure Track Faculty

Candidate Notifies

Feb.

April June

July Oct.

10/11

1/8

2/1

Late April

Candidate Delivers Dossier to Dept.

Dept. Seeks External Letters & Reviews

Dossier to COM for Review

(Committee & Dean)

Provost & University Review

Final Additions

Decisions are sent

Candidate Notified of COM-T Recommendation

Candidate Notified of Dept. Recommendation
Important Dates
Research & Educator Faculty

Candidate Notifies
Feb.

Mar. April
Candidate Delivers Dossier to Dept.

May July
Dept. Seeks External Letters & Reviews

8/11
Dossier to COM for Review (Committee & Dean)

11/14
Provost & University Review

Late Dec.
Decisions are sent

January 1 Promotion Date

Candidate Notified of COM-T Recommendation

Candidate Notified of Dept. Recommendation
Traditional Promotion Dossier

There are 11 Sections, with “Prepared by” ID’d for each

We’ll focus on these:

1. Summary Data Sheet
2. Candidate’s Workload Assignment
3. Departmental and College Criteria
4. Curriculum Vitae & List of Collaborators
5. Candidate Statement
6. Teaching Portfolio
7. Evaluation of Teaching
8. Service/Outreach & Leadership Portfolio (Optional)
9. Membership in GIPDs
10. Letters from Outside Evaluators and Collaborators
11. Recommendations
Section 2: Workload Assignment  
(Candidate/Dept. Head or Div. Director)

- Critical to evaluating productivity in areas of assignment - informs reviewers of expectations
- Indicate percent time devoted to teaching, research & scholarly activity, and service; may vary by year

### SECTION 2: SUMMARY OF CANDIDATE’S WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENT

#### SUMMARY OF WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENT FOR:

DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL OF:  
FTE:

Duties for the period 2013-2014 through 2020-2021 have been distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Outreach %</td>
<td>Internal and External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Service %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Service %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Activities %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; describe activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock Delays or Leave(s)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Do not include percentages for years in which candidates were on leaves without pay and did not have assigned duties, but do include percentages for years with clock delays to recognize candidates’ assigned duties. Use an asterisk for years with delays.*
Section 4: The CV & List of Collaborators (Candidate)

Follow the CV guidelines precisely

Note: Some sections are restricted to accomplishments in rank

- Education
- Employment
- Honors and Awards
- Service/Outreach
- Publications/Creative Activity
- Works in Progress
- Conferences/Scholarly Presentations
- Awarded Grants and Contracts
- List of Collaborators and their Organizational Affiliations

Notice that there is little in Section 4 related to Teaching – there are separate dossier sections for this work
Who is a Collaborator?

- Collaborators from the past 5 years
  - Any co-authors (not abstracts)
  - PI’s where the candidate is a co-PI or sub-investigator
  - Co-Inventors
  - Listed alphabetically by last name (include institution)

- Former...
  - Supervisors
  - Program directors (residency or fellowships)
  - Dissertation chairs
  - Individuals with close relationships
Section 5: Candidate’s Statement  
(Candidate)

*Use 3-5 pages to tell your story*

- Frame what it is that you do, focusing on **impact**
- Connect the different parts of your workload (e.g., teaching and service; clinician and educator) into one narrative to communicate total impact

*Plus:*
- ✓ Make statement readable/free of jargon
- ✓ Avoid highly technical terms if possible
- ✓ Get input from a range of readers
- ✓ Use 11pt font or bigger
Section 6: The Teaching Portfolio (Candidate)

1) A “Teaching CV,” as it were
- Teaching philosophy statement (maximum of 3 pages)
- List of courses taught and scholarly activities that support teaching
- Teaching awards, grants and course development
- Individual student contacts (i.e., advising, mentoring, internships, faculty advising of clubs, dissertation chair or committee memberships, etc.)
- Additional activities that support teaching (i.e., use of technology, participation in trainings from Office of Instruction and Assessment, etc.)
- Student evaluations & comments

2) A Teaching Portfolio (Video Presentation)
- Syllabi, assignments and tests; grading rubrics
- Awards, kudos, nominations for teaching-related recognition
Section 7: Evaluation of Teaching

(Candidate, Coordinator/Dept. Committee Chair)

An OIA Peer Teaching Evaluation

Peer Teaching Evaluation will be a Dept. designee or a P&T Committee Member

- Uses the OIA format 3-step process
  - Pre-evaluation meeting to decide on assessment items during evaluation
  - Minimum of 2 separate observations
  - Post-evaluation meeting (COM-T Requirement)
  - Both the check-list & a summary letter will be written & reviewed by you (the candidate)
Section 8: Service & Outreach Portfolio
(Candidate, Optional)

• Documents the impact of your leadership on outreach, service, and instructional programs.
  
  o Describe the program or service, its objectives and goals, the needs it is intended to serve
  
  o Describe the assessments developed for the program
  
  o Provide supporting documentation – materials from seminars & workshops, newsletters, etc.
  
  o Document the program’s impact – awards & grants, news reports, letters from collaborators
Section 9: Membership in Interdisciplinary Programs
(Candidate/Coordinator)

• Only required if you have a GIDP appointment
  o If you an active member of a GIDP, without an appointment, you can also complete this section, but it is optional
  o Description of your activities - brief
  o Dept. chair requests written evaluation from the chair of the interdisciplinary program/ad hoc review committee
  o Dept. P&T Committee will provide summary & evaluation
  o Noted in workload assignment & addressed in candidate’s statement and teaching portfolio
Section 10: Letters from Outside Evaluators

(Coordinator/Dept. Head/Candidate)

- Critical to showing regional, national, international reputation
- Letters must be from independent outside evaluators
  - No co-authors or collaborators within last 5 years
  - No former supervisors (program directors, dissertation chairs etc.)
- Candidate may suggest names of possible evaluators but not know who is contacted
  - No more than half of the letters may come from the candidate’s list
Collaborator Letters/Letters of Support
(Candidate & Coordinator)

• Candidates suggests, Dept. Coordinator contacts
  ✓ Collaborator letters speak to the candidate’s contributions to a group or project
  ✓ Letters of support may come from colleagues across the university or from outside

• Both types of letters add to the strength of the dossier
Section 11: Letters of Recommendation

Dept. P&T Committee Recommendation

Dept. Chair Recommendation

College AP&T Committee Assessment

COM-T Dean Recommendation

UAHS, University and/or Provost Decision
Common Problems

• CV not formatted correctly or missing information
• Candidate statement:
  o Jargon or doesn’t connect workload, criteria and CV
• Evaluators aren’t truly independent
  o Getting new letters takes time!
• Dossiers not submitted on time
  o This hurts you!
Resources

• **Department P&T Coordinators** have the most recent documents to guide you:
  - College of Medicine P&T Guidelines
  - Promotion dossier guide sheets
  - COM CV Guidelines
  - Peer Teaching Evaluation forms

• **Advice/Resources**
  - Department P&T Committee Members
  - Department Chair
  - Mentors & other faculty who promoted!
  - College of Medicine [Promotion & Tenure website](#)