



COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

Date: December 1995
Revised April 1996 (UHAP Compliance)
Revised March 2000 (Section 2.4 “Special Cases”)
Revised to comply with University Criteria February 2014 by the Dean’s Advisory Council (changes in boldface italics)
Revised July 2014 to comply with University revisions

Authors: Dean’s Advisory Committee

1. INTRODUCTION

Immediately upon assuming their duties, all newly-hired tenured or tenure-eligible faculty members, regardless of rank, will receive from their respective department heads copies of three sets of promotion and tenure materials:

- 1.1. The promotion and tenure guidelines adopted by their respective departments
- 1.2. The *College of Humanities Promotion and Tenure Criteria*, together with the *College of Humanities Promotion and Tenure Timetable*
- 1.3. All relevant university promotion and tenure documents

Department heads will also provide copies of these promotion and tenure documents, where appropriate, to all candidates for hire into tenured or tenurable positions.

The specific qualifications required for tenure and/or promotion are discussed in full in the departmental promotion and tenure documents and in the *College of Humanities Promotion and Tenure Criteria*. What follows herein pertains only to the “procedures” to be followed in conducting tenure and/or promotion reviews.

2. APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

The procedures to be followed in the College of Humanities for the constitution of promotion and tenure committees must conform to those regulations which, by regental authority, are binding upon the university as a whole. We therefore note the following governing paragraphs from the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP, 2014, 3.3.02 [a]):

2.1. STANDING COMMITTEES

“Provided there are sufficient faculty members to warrant such a committee, each college, department, or unit will have a Standing Advisory Committee on Faculty Status to advise the dean and immediate administrative head before recommendations on reviews for tenure, promotion, and nonrenewal are forwarded to higher levels. Each such committee will include at least three tenured faculty members from the unit. If a unit does not have sufficient faculty members to constitute such a committee, then the faculty

and administrative head will consult with the appropriate dean on forming such a committee from other units. In promotion or tenure matters, the advisory committees will be so constituted that recommendations will be made only by faculty members holding rank superior to the rank of the candidate being considered, except in the case of full professors where the committee members will each be a full professor. Standing Advisory Committees generally will meet without the administrator whom they advise.”

2.2. THE COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE (A.K.A. THE DEAN’S COMMITTEE)

2.2.1. Each year the dean will appoint a College of Humanities promotion and tenure committee and will name its chairperson. The committee will be charged to act in the best interest of the College of Humanities as a whole.

2.2.2. The dean will make appointments to the College of Humanities promotion and tenure committee in such a way as to ensure compliance with the equitable gender and minority representation requirements of federal and state anti-discrimination laws and with the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) and university policies and rules against discrimination. No one who is otherwise qualified shall be barred from service on promotion and tenure committees on the basis of religion, race, color, national origin, physical disability, or sexual orientation.

2.2.3. The committee will consist of no fewer than four members. Those members will be from different departments of the College of Humanities; one will be from departments or programs in other colleges. Appointments will be for one or two years.

2.2.4. The dean will appoint to this committee only faculty members who have met the current criteria by which the candidates under consideration are being judged. Members of the committee from units other than the College of Humanities shall be those who have met the current criteria for promotion to full or associate professor in their respective fields. Associate professors may serve when there is no candidate for promotion to the rank of full professor.

2.2.5. The committee will be presented with a detailed statement of the university’s affirmative action policies and guidelines, which will be explained by a representative of the Affirmative Action Office. Also, it will be explained to the whole committee at their first meeting that, should there arise in the course of deliberation any questions regarding race, gender or other sorts of bias, then, at the request of one or more members, the committee will consult with a representative of the university’s Affirmative Action Office for advice and guidance in such matters.

2.2.6. In any given year, it is likely that the committee will include members from departments that are presenting candidates. It is therefore stipulated that a committee member may not participate in discussions concerning candidates from his or her own department, that he or she must leave the room during such discussions, and that he or she must abstain from voting on those cases.

2.2.7. The membership of this committee will be considered public information, and the dean will announce the names of its members at the beginning of each academic year.

2.2.8. Faculty under review for possible promotion and tenure are to have no direct or indirect contact with the committee or its members regarding their own cases.

2.2.9. UHAP 3.3.02 [c.]: “At the time a recommendation regarding renewal, nonrenewal, promotion or continuing status is transmitted by the immediate administrative head, the dean or division administrator to the next administrative level, the faculty member involved should be advised in writing of the nature of the recommendation. The faculty member is not entitled to a statement of the reasons for the recommendation.”

2.3. DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEES

Membership on standing or ad hoc departmental promotion and tenure committees is by appointment. In each department, it is the department head who appoints the members of that department's promotion and tenure committee, after thorough consultation with the department faculty. However, a department head's discretion in this matter is subject to the following constraints:

2.3.1. In accordance with UHAP regulations, a standing departmental promotion and tenure committee "will include at least three tenured faculty members."

2.3.2. Department heads will make their appointments to the promotion and tenure committees in such a way as to ensure compliance with university affirmative action and non-discrimination guidelines and policy. To this end, whenever feasible and appropriate, department heads may appoint to their committees tenured faculty from other departments and programs who are qualified to evaluate the candidates' work. No one who is otherwise qualified shall be barred from service on promotion and tenure committees on the basis of religion, race, color, national origin, physical disability, or sexual orientation.

2.3.3. Whenever possible, the departmental promotion and tenure committee will include at least one member with expertise in the candidate's particular field. The committee should also include as many members as possible conversant with the candidate's general area of specialization.

2.3.4. The committee will be presented with a detailed statement of the university's affirmative action policies and guidelines, which will be explained by a representative of the Affirmative Action Office. Also, it will be explained to the whole committee at their first meeting that, should there arise in course of deliberation any questions regarding race, gender or other sorts of bias, then, at the request of one or more members, the committee will consult with a representative of the university's Affirmative Action Office for advice and guidance in such matters.

2.3.5. Each candidate, in consultation with the head, will compile a list of five University of Arizona faculty members with the rank and expertise necessary to evaluate the candidate. The list may include former or present members of the departmental standing promotion and tenure committee. The department head will select from this list two persons who, if they are not already members of the standing promotion committee, will join it as ad hoc members to participate in discussion of, and to vote upon, that particular candidate's case. Appointment of such additional, ad hoc members is also subject to the qualifications listed immediately above (2.3.1., 2.3.2, 2.3.3).

2.3.6. Whenever the department's workload so demands, a department head may appoint more than one promotion and tenure committee.

2.3.7. Members of the promotion and tenure committee are not permitted to discuss the candidate's evaluation with her/him, unless the committee as a whole should formally request such a discussion. Any such request on the part of a committee must be communicated to the candidate through the department head. Likewise, any questions the candidate may have regarding the committee's procedures must also be directed to the department head.

2.3.8. UHAP 3.3.02 [c.]: "At the time a recommendation regarding renewal, nonrenewal, promotion or continuing status is transmitted by the immediate administrative head, the dean or division administrator to the next administrative level, the faculty member involved should be advised in writing of the nature of the recommendation. The faculty member is not entitled to a statement of the reasons for the recommendation."

2.4. SPECIAL CASES

There are at least two cases, both involving promotion to full professor, that are not addressed specifically by the UHAP and College of Humanities procedural guidelines:

2.4.1. The head/director of a unit is an associate professor who seeks promotion to full professor. In such a case, the head/director cannot serve as the head vis a vis the promotion committee.

2.4.2. A unit does not have enough full professors to constitute a promotion committee (which must be composed of at least three full professors).

In the first case, in which the head of a department or director of a program is an associate professor who seeks promotion to full professor, the dean, after thorough consultation with the faculty of the unit, will appoint a surrogate promotion head or director (SPH/D) who holds the rank of full professor.

If circumstances permit, the SPH/D will be a tenured member of the unit; otherwise the dean will consult with the unit and appoint, from within the College of Humanities, an SPH/D whose teaching and research activities are as closely related as possible to those of the unit.

If circumstances permit the appointment of a committee from within the unit, the SPH/D will then appoint the required number of Full Professors to serve as an ad hoc Promotion Committee - with the proviso that, if the unit has a standing promotion committee, all full professors on the committee will be eligible for, but will not automatically be appointed to, the ad hoc promotion committee. The ad hoc committee will be independently appointed by the SPH/D in consultation with the faculty of the unit.

If the circumstances do not permit the appointment of a committee from within the unit, the procedure spelled out below is to be followed.

In the second case, in which a unit does not have enough full professors to constitute a promotion committee, the dean of the college will consult with the head or director and with the faculty of the unit and will appoint as many additional, ad hoc members who are full professors from other College of Humanities units to the promotion committee as are required to reach the three members required by UHAP policy.

In cases where committee members must be chosen from another College of Humanities unit, the same considerations that govern the appointment of a SPH/D are to be taken into account. The dean will appoint committee members whose teaching and research activities are as closely related as possible to those of the unit.

3. PREPARING THE PROMOTION AND TENURE FILE

The following procedures are to be understood as subordinate to and governed by the procedures outlined in the document issued every spring by the Provost's Office (hereinafter referred to as the current Provost's Guidelines) which deals with continuing status and promotion process and preparation of dossiers. This document, which must be studied carefully by all involved in the promotion and tenure process, is subject to change. Changes that it may undergo in the future may necessitate changes in the College of Humanities procedures and thus may require alteration of the directions given below.

3.1. IDENTIFICATION AND NOTIFICATION OF CANDIDATES

By March 1 of each year department heads will write to all members of their departments who are eligible for tenure and/or promotion, inviting candidates for mandatory or optional review to submit their

candidacies to the department head and the chairperson of the departmental promotion and tenure committee. For dates of all subsequent steps, see the most recent *College of Humanities Promotion and Tenure Timetable*.

3.2. PROPER FORMAT FOR THE PREPARATION OF DOSSIERS

3.2.1. Dossiers must be prepared using the outline form (headings and subheadings) from the most recent version of *the Provost's Guidelines for Preparing Promotion and Tenure Cases* issued each spring by the Provost. ***Such dossiers must include a Teaching Portfolio and should, in some cases, if mandated by the position description of the candidate or agreed on between the candidate and his/her department head, include a Service and Outreach Portfolio, both compiled according to the Provost's Guidelines.***

3.2.2. All published or forthcoming works listed in a dossier must be cited according to the complete citation form, i.e., all citations must include title, publisher, place and date of publication, and page numbers.

3.2.3. In the event that a candidate for promotion and tenure presents published (or soon to be published) materials which cannot be given adequate critical evaluation because they are written in a language insufficiently known to members of the departmental or the college committee, the chairperson of either committee may request that the candidate prepare an English translation of selected portions of the materials (or a précis of them) that would permit the committee to make an informed evaluation. In certain cases it may be deemed necessary to invite a consultant, fluent in the language in question, to participate in the committee's discussions (but not to vote).

3.3. REFEREES AND LETTERS OF EVALUATION

3.3.1. Each candidate may submit up to ten names of potential reviewers from outside the University of Arizona, but in so doing must take care to nominate only those persons whose objectivity will not be put in question (for example, by previous close association with the candidate as a research collaborator, co-editor, or dissertation adviser).

3.3.2. To the list of possible reviewers nominated by the candidate the department head will add the names of other persons of his or her own choosing who are knowledgeable in the candidate's field.

3.3.3. The full list of potential reviewers, i.e., the list of all those whom the candidate has suggested together with all others whom the head is considering, will be discussed with the candidate who will be given the opportunity to present compelling and legitimate reasons for removing any person(s) from the list. A list of all potential reviewers to whom the candidate has objected will be kept as a part of the official promotion and tenure file.

3.3.4. The final decision as to which persons will serve as reviewers will be made by the department head, in consultation with the departmental promotion and tenure committee - this in accordance with the current Provost's Guidelines, which specify that candidates may suggest names, but the department head or review committee should select the individuals to be contacted. It is understood, however, that in any case in which a candidate has presented compelling reason for removing a particular person from the list of potential reviewers, the department head will respect the candidate's wishes and not solicit a reference from that person.

3.3.5. Some (but no more than half) of those finally selected to serve as reviewers will be from the candidate's list of nominees.

3.3.6. The names of all reviewers finally chosen, including those suggested by the candidate, will be kept confidential. At no point in the process will the candidate contact, either directly or indirectly, external reviewers or potential reviewers regarding the tenure and/or promotion review. If contacted by a

reviewer, the candidate shall refrain from responding to questions about the promotion and tenure case and, instead, shall direct the reviewer to the department head or the chairperson of the departmental promotion and tenure committee for any required information or directions.

3.3.7. By the date established in the current *College of Humanities Promotion and Tenure Timetable*, the department head or chair of the department promotion and tenure committee will write a standard letter to all outside reviewers requesting an evaluation of the candidate (a sample letter is usually provided in the current Provost's Guidelines). Referees will be assured that their letters of reference will be held in strictest confidentiality, within the limits of applicable law, ABOR policy and university regulations. The letters to all reviewers must be substantively identical.

3.3.8. At least three of the letters of reference included in any promotion and tenure file must be recent.

3.3.9. In the department head's letter to the dean, the department head shall call attention to letters that are not in accordance with federal and state antidiscrimination laws, or with ABOR and university policies and rules against discrimination.

3.3.10. For further information on outside reviewers, consult the current version of the Provost's Guidelines. ***These Guidelines additionally include, where appropriate to the description of the candidate's position, the following documentations of scholarly and service or outreach impact:***

- ***letters from academic, community, or business collaborators***
- ***letters from University collaborators noting the impact and rigor of the candidate's work***
- ***verifiable news or media reports on service contributions***
- ***grants secured, whether for research, teaching, or service contributions***
- ***contracts for external contributions or translational research***
- ***adoptions of programs and materials by other institutions***

3.4. COLLECTION OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

3.4.1. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide a copy, offprint, or preprint of each work published or accepted for publication. Each manuscript accepted for publication but not yet actually published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher, journal editor, or other responsible person indicating its acceptance.

3.4.2. A candidate's teaching record must be documented, not merely asserted, ***by way of a Teaching Portfolio compiled according to Provost Guidelines***. It is the responsibility of the department head and the candidate to provide an evaluation of teaching and advising, as directed in the current Provost's Guidelines.

3.4.3. Proof of professional honors or recognition and proof of professional service, both within and without the university, is the responsibility of the candidate. He or she should submit all pertinent documentation when citing such honors, awards, or service, e.g., letters of appointment to committees; letters of recognition from local, regional, national organizations; etc. ***These can, and in some cases should, be submitted within a Service and Outreach Portfolio***.

3.4.4. In any case in which a professional honor or award is cited, the candidate should also provide some information or documentation about the award or honor.

3.4.5. The candidate should discuss with the department head submission of any other documents that may be deemed pertinent to promotion or tenure action.

3.4.6. Significant new materials may be added to the candidate packet during the review process in accordance with the procedures described in the current Provost's Guidelines.

3.4.7. The department head shall ensure that the candidate's file remain intact and the identical file as was reviewed at the department level be forwarded intact to the dean's level.

4. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND SERVICE

4.1. EVALUATION OF RESEARCH

4.1.1. As noted above, the candidate must provide copies of all her or his published and soon to be published works. The candidate should also provide copies of any published reviews of those works which he or she wishes the committees to consider.

4.1.2. It is possible that an external reviewer's initial letter will prompt further questions on the part of the department head or the departmental committee. In such cases the department head may request a second letter of reference from the reviewer, asking him or her to provide clarification of points in the initial letter or requesting additional information. All such follow-up requests, and all responses to them, must be in writing. Referees will again be assured that all such correspondence will be held in the strictest confidentiality within the limits of applicable law.

4.1.3. The departmental committee will summarize the content of all available reviews of the candidate's publications.

4.1.4. The departmental committee will evaluate anthologies, books, and journals in which the candidate's works have appeared or will appear, and will summarize their relative standing in the candidate's field.

4.1.5. The departmental committee will summarize and evaluate invited and volunteered conference papers, talks, poetry readings, performances, etc. that the candidate has given, while also assessing the relative importance of the meetings (conferences, colloquia, etc.) at which the contributions were made.

4.1.6. The departmental committee will summarize the relative importance of the candidate's scholarly and creative production. If the candidate is said to have national or international standing ***or his/her research is found to have community, business, or international impact beyond academia***, this claim must be substantiated.

4.1.7. In addition to judging the quality of the candidate's individual contributions, the departmental committee will also assess the coherence, quality, development, and potential value of the candidate's overall research program and will assess the relevance to that general program of all individual research products, ***including evidence of translational research***.

4.1.8. Scholarly editing, where it can be shown to require sustained research and original or critical activity, may be offered as another example of scholarly activity. In most instances, however, journal editing or similar activity will be understood as "professional service."

4.2. EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A full statement of what information to provide on teaching, and what not to provide, is contained in the current Provost's Guidelines, ***which mandates the compilation of a Teaching Portfolio***. The following procedural points are for use by the candidate, the department head, and the promotion and tenure committees in implementing those guidelines.

4.2.1. The committees will evaluate local, regional, national awards or recognition the candidate may have won for teaching, and determine their importance.

4.2.2. The departmental committee will appoint qualified individuals to provide peer review of the candidate's teaching. This may include actual classroom visits arranged in consultation with the candidate.

4.2.3. The head will provide summary statements of the results of teaching evaluations conducted since the candidate's last formal promotion evaluation, or for at least the three years preceding the year of the current review. The departmental committee will evaluate and comment on the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

4.2.4. The departmental committee will include any other pertinent information concerning the quality of the candidate's teaching.

4.3. EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The committees will evaluate and summarize all evidence provided by the candidate concerning service to the department, university, region, and/or profession – in some cases, based on a Service and Outreach Portfolio, and will carefully weigh all claims made about the significance of such service.

5. SUPPLEMENTARY PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED IN CONSIDERING THE TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION OF FACULTY ENGAGED IN INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS (SEE CURRENT PROVOST'S GUIDELINES, APPENDIX C.)

Participation in the activities of interdisciplinary programs *or collaborations with community, international, or business partners*, may comprise an ongoing and integral part of a faculty member's professional activities. To the extent that this is so, these efforts should be recognized, alongside other relevant activities, in the evaluation procedures for promotion and tenure.

If the candidate's formal workload includes a significant portion within graduate and/or undergraduate interdisciplinary programs, then it shall be evaluated according to the procedures outlined below, consistent with current Graduate College procedures. Moreover, if the candidate, in consultation with the department head, considers his or her informal or "overload" participation in teaching, research, or service within the framework of an interdisciplinary program *or within a university or external collaboration* to constitute a significant portion of his or her workload, the head of the home department shall seek a written evaluation of the candidate's performance from the director of the interdisciplinary program *or the chief executive of a collaborative enterprise (or his/her designee)* according to the procedures outlined below. These procedures are to be followed in addition to, not in place of, all the other procedures prescribed above.

5.1. The candidate will be asked to include, as part of her or his promotion and tenure dossier, a detailed statement of all teaching, research, and service activities that she or he has undertaken as a participant in the relevant interdisciplinary program.

5.2. The head of the candidate's home department shall request from the director or chairperson of the relevant interdisciplinary program an evaluation of the degree and quality of the candidate's contributions to the interdisciplinary program.

5.3. This evaluation will be written by the director or chairperson of the interdisciplinary program in consultation with an ad hoc committee comprising three tenured faculty of appropriate rank. The

evaluation document will be sent to the head of the candidate's home department for inclusion in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

5.4. Ordinarily, membership on such an ad hoc committee will be drawn from the interdisciplinary program's executive council and will include the director or chairperson of the interdisciplinary program. However, in the case of a candidate being considered for promotion to full professor in an interdisciplinary program the director or chairperson of which is not a full professor, that director or chairperson will join the ad hoc committee as a non-voting member (that is to say, he or she will participate in the discussion of the candidate's case but will not vote), and an additional full professor shall be added to the committee.

5.5. In cases in which the ad hoc committee mechanism appears unnecessary or redundant (e.g., when the candidate's involvement in the interdisciplinary program's activities is minimal, or when there is a large overlap between the membership of the home department's promotion and tenure committee and the interdisciplinary program's ad hoc committee), one or more tenured members of the interdisciplinary program's executive council may be invited by the head of the home department to serve as pro tempore and ad hoc voting members of the home department's promotion and tenure committee.

5.6. In the case of a member of a graduate interdisciplinary program, additional input may be solicited from the university's director of graduate interdepartmental programs whenever this is deemed appropriate by the candidate, by the head of the home department, or by the director or chairperson of the interdisciplinary program.

5.7. Once documentation of a candidate's interdisciplinary program activities has been incorporated into the candidate's dossier it will be considered - at all stages of review and by all reviewers - as integral to the evaluation of the candidate.

6. APPEALS

Should a candidate feel that procedures have not been followed at the departmental committee level; a written appeal may be directed to the department head. Should a candidate feel that procedures have not been followed at the level of the department head or of the College of Humanities promotion and tenure committee, a written appeal may be directed to the dean. For further information concerning the appeal process as stipulated in the University Handbook of Appointed Personnel, see UHAP 3.3.02 [e].

Throughout this document, the terms "publication," "publisher," and "published" shall be understood to refer both to work available in printed form (books, articles, etc.) and to work available in electronic media (computer programs, software, etc.).