



## SBS INFORMATION FOR CAREER-TRACK (NONTENURE) PROMOTION REVIEWS (FOR RANKED FACULTY TITLES of PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE, PROFESSOR (nontenure-eligible) or RESEARCH PROFESSOR)

University of Arizona information regarding promotion reviews is available in [UHAP 3.3.03](#) "Promotion Reviews of Career-Track Eligible Faculty"

- As noted in UHAP, Promotion reviews for Career-Track faculty with "**Professor**" titles follow many of the same steps as the promotion review for Tenure-Track faculty. The information below is intended for this population of faculty.
- SBS practice on Promotion Reviews for Career-track faculty with "**Lecturer**" titles is available in the SBS [Portfolio for Promotion Review](#) guidelines.

**TIMING OF PROMOTION REVIEWS:** Promotion Reviews are generally conducted in the sixth year, though scheduling may vary if a prior university position was held. Since positive promotion reviews conclude with a new title and offer letter, such reviews are best conducted in late Fall and concluded in early Spring, so as to be completed prior to the start of a new academic year. Faculty should start putting together their dossiers in the Fall of their 6<sup>th</sup> year. Here is a [recommended timeline](#) (with a few firm dates).

**HOW TO PREPARE FOR PROMOTION REVIEWS:** Faculty should attend the dossier workshops that are offered by the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs each Spring, and should follow up with a separate meeting with their unit Head or Director to go over the Promotion Dossier. The College of SBS also provides annual reviews, and the Faculty Affairs team in SBS is available for individual appointments.

**PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION REVIEWS:** Promotion reviews for Career-Track faculty with "Professor" titles follow many of the same steps as the promotion review for Tenure-Track faculty.

- Faculty use the same Dossier Template Promotion and Tenure (P&T), and the CV and Candidate Statement should also be in the same format as required in the P&T Dossier.
- Letters from Outside Evaluators, which are required for P&T, are *not* required in Career-Track Promotion cases.
- As with P&T, dossiers should include a Unit committee Report, the Unit Head/Director Recommendation (to include the outcome of a general faculty vote in the unit if appropriate), and the Dean's Recommendation.

*For additional information, including source documents from which some of the content in this document are excerpted, see the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs' [Guide to the Promotion Process](#).*



## SBS CHECKLIST FOR PROMOTION REVIEWS, BY DOSSIER SECTION, FOR CAREER-TRACK FACULTY WITH “PROFESSOR” TITLES

### Dossier Section 1: Summary Data Sheet

- Is the data sheet completed by the Unit Head/Director and affirmed by the faculty member?

### Dossier Section 2: Summary of Candidate's Workload Assignment

- Are all leaves and course releases, which typically affect distribution of effort, accounted for?
- Does the workload statement include information only, not evaluative statements?

### Dossier Section 3: Departmental & College Promotion & Tenure Criteria

- Are both unit level documents and college-level guidelines included?

### Dossier Section 4: Curriculum Vitae & List of Collaborators

- Are the sections ordered and organized precisely according to the instructions for Section 4?
- Is there an ‘\*’ to the left of the title of any publication substantially based on work done as a graduate student?
- For foreign publications, are English translations of the titles provided?
- Do grants and contracts, if any, include percent effort, role (PI or co-PI), source, and amount?
- Are all collaborators identified at the end of CV, where collaborators are defined in accordance of 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.*

Please note: information on accomplishments in TEACHING are featured in Sections 6 and 7 of the Dossier.

### Dossier Section 5: Candidate Statement

- Is the font no smaller than 11pt?
- Is the statement focused on the *quality* and *impact* of combined (or intersecting) teaching and service?  
*Note: if your distribution of effort includes research, that too should be included in your statement*
- Is the statement readable and as free of jargon and highly technical terms as possible?
- Is the statement no longer than 5 pages?  
*Note: the signed statement by the candidate must also fit within those 5 pages*



### Dossier Section 6: Teaching Portfolio

Teaching portfolios are prepared by candidates and reviewed by committees, but only a small portion of what is prepared goes into the actual dossier. Faculty going up for promotion are expected to prepare a selection of teaching accomplishments, with members of the Unit committee serving as evaluators of that portfolio of accomplishments.

Most of what you prepare will go to the Unit committee (see Section 7), rather than into to the promotion dossier. Of the information in the Teaching Portfolio, **only the following** goes into Section 6 of the dossier (note: see Section 6 of the dossier on the Faculty Affairs website for what to include in each category).

- Extent of teaching
- Individual student contact information
- Contributions to Instructional Innovations and Collaborations
- Teaching awards and teaching grants
- Is all of the above limited in period to current rank, as per the requirements?
- PLUS: TCEs, including comments, for the most recent 3-year period.

### Dossier Section 7: Evaluation of Teaching & Advising

Your Teaching Portfolio (Section 6) goes in its entirety to the Unit evaluation committee. Section 7 is their **evaluation** of that portfolio. Section 7 is completed by the promotion evaluation committee; the Head/Director facilitates this process. Unit committees must do **two** things:

- (1) Write an evaluation of your teaching based on your lists and summary, plus supporting documentation you provide, like syllabi and major assignments; TCEs; reports, curricular reviews, and other contributions to scholarship on teaching.
- (2) A member of your committee must observe your teaching to assess effectiveness, including the course design and outcomes assessments. This course can be in-person or online. The Office of Instruction and Assessment has [templates](#) from the committee member and candidate should chose.
- Is the evaluation included in this section **and also** incorporated into the Unit's recommendation letter?

### Dossier Section 8: OPTIONAL Service & Outreach Portfolio

The optional Service & Outreach Portfolio process mirrors that of the Teaching Portfolio in that the documentation is for departmental committees to review. As such **the bulk of what is in portfolio itself will not generally be included** in the dossier. See Section 8 of the dossier on the Faculty Affairs website for types of documentation.

Those choosing to complete this optional section provide the following to the Unit committee to review:

- A brief overview document describing key points of outreach, including a description of the program(s)
- Assessments developed for the program(s), including specific measures/metrics and how they were obtained
- Feedback from collaborators and clients

The committee provides an **evaluative assessment** for inclusion in the dossier.

*Note: this evaluation is also incorporated into the Unit recommendation letter*



**Dossier Section 9: Membership in Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs**

- If applicable, are there letters of evaluation on participation from others in GIDP?

**Dossier Section 10: Letters from Outside Evaluators and Collaborators**

*NOT APPLICABLE in Career-Track PROMOTION REVIEWS*

**Dossier Section 11: Recommendations**

The **Unit committee’s Report** should be printed on letterhead and signed by all unit committee members. As with P&T recommendations, the letter should:

- Be addressed to Unit Head/Director
- Provide an evaluation of candidate in each of the areas of (a) teaching and advising; (b) service, and, if applicable, (c) research, scholarship, and creative activities
- Include a vote count on promotion, clearly indicating recusals, abstentions and absences
- Provide minority viewpoint (if there was a split vote)
- Indicate any collaboration between committee member(s) and candidate, including the nature of the collaboration

The Unit Head or Director’s Recommendation letter should:

- Be printed on letterhead and signed by Unit Head/Director
- Be addressed to Dean
- Express own opinion, views and comments, including analysis of impact of candidate's professional activities and contributions
- Include the outcome of a faculty vote, if applicable
- Include a specific recommendation on promotion
- Indicate any collaboration with candidate and explain nature of collaboration

The Dean then reviews the dossier and makes a recommendation to the Provost, who makes the final determination.