

School of Government and Public Policy

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Approved by the SGPP Faculty on 3/31/21

I. Philosophy and Principles

The School of Government and Public Policy (SGPP) represents a diversity of scholarly fields, subfields, and disciplines, and it places value on interdisciplinary work. SGPP's promotion and tenure philosophy is supportive of the development of the candidate, inclusive of the different approaches to research, teaching, and service, and based on a respect for this diversity of professional interests.

The philosophy behind SGPP's process for judging promotion and tenure of tenure-track (TT) and promotion of career-track (CT) faculty is based on the principle of deference to the standards of excellence in the candidate's subfield or discipline. To inform this criteria, the School's process places special emphasis on external letters for TT candidates and teaching/service portfolios for CT candidates.

SGPP is also committed to a philosophy of developing the talent and of supporting the work of TT and CT candidates toward promotion with annual mentoring through a transparent and fair process that allows faculty to make the best possible decisions regarding promotion. The expectations of research, teaching, and service are defined by the norms of the subfield (internally and externally) while taking into consideration the candidate's contractual workload. (See the University of Arizona Promotion and Tenure process, as described on the UArizona Faculty Affairs website).

II. Criteria for Retention, Promotion and Tenure for Tenure Track Faculty and Retention and Promotion of Career Track Faculty

The faculty in SGPP acknowledges scholarly output, teaching quality, and service to the University and the public as the primary criteria for recommending TT and CT faculty members for retention, promotion, and awarding of tenure (as applicable). Because of the breadth and diversity of SGPP, the faculty recognizes that objective measurements of performance in any of these areas is difficult to achieve, and that the judgment of the Director and the Promotion Committee must ultimately be somewhat subjective, allowing for individual differences in workload and respect for norms in the candidate's area of specialization. While there is a primary emphasis on research, high quality teaching and service are also necessary parts of a TT candidate's case toward successful promotion. The primary emphasis for CT faculty is teaching and service (though research is recognized in the context of the candidate's area of expertise and goals, and to the degree it is part of a candidate's workload expectations).

The quantity and quality of scholarly performance may take many forms including publication of books, monographs, journal articles, essays, research reports, and awards of grants and prestigious fellowships. In general, peer-reviewed publications are valued higher than non-peer review publications. Typically, evidence of the visibility of research output is also an important factor. For the evaluation of TT faculty, the faculty seeks evidence of intellectual accomplishment and recognition of merit by an impartial peer group from the TT candidate's area of specialization. External letters from prestigious scholars in peer institutions or above are instrumental in the evaluation process.

Promotion from assistant to associate professor requires sustained evidence of high-quality scholarly work and of continuing efforts to do so through works in progress and future research projects. The candidate for promotion from associate professor to professor is expected to have achieved scholarly recognition in their field at the national or international level. The record of the candidate for promotion to full professor should show growing impact of leadership in the subfield and consistent scholarly output.

All faculty are expected to be effective teachers, and teaching effectiveness must be demonstrated for retention, promotion, and awarding of tenure. Assessments of teaching effectiveness are derived, among other means, from student course evaluations, teaching honors and awards, contributions to pedagogy, curriculum development, and student mentoring and advising. Because the SGPP faculty are aware that student evaluations are imperfect measures shaped by course content, difficulty, implicit biases, and other matters, the Promotion Committee and School leadership take into consideration these differential impacts when assessing student evaluations. Course evaluations will be supplemented by a selection of instructional materials from a range of classes to document instructional innovations, curricular designs, and outcome assessments as well as peer observations. Effective teaching is a minimal requirement for retention, promotion, and tenure in the case of TT faculty, but it is of primary importance in the case of CT faculty.

All faculty members are expected to participate in University affairs by serving on appropriate School, College, and University committees and sharing in routine and occasional duties. They are also expected to engage in professional activities. Such activities will be reviewed in considering a candidate for promotion, but they will not be a sufficient basis, of themselves, for promotion. Service may be a critical component of the non-teaching duties of CT faculty and receive more attention during the promotion process depending on workload allocated to service (see the SBS Promotion and Tenure/Continuing Status and Promotion Guidelines, available on the SBS website).

III. Process and Procedures

1. Annual Performance Review (APR)

While annual performance reviews assess accomplishments in rank and are thus substantively different than a review for promotion, they nevertheless offer opportunities to discuss progress toward promotion. In the first term of appointment, the Director will meet with incoming CT and TT faculty to discuss the faculty workload assignment and the promotion criteria of the College and SGPP. In addition, the Director and/or the Associate Director will match the new incoming hire with a faculty mentor as soon as possible.

Faculty will have annual meetings with the Director and with their faculty mentor to discuss their teaching, research, and service performance after receiving the APR report. The meetings provide both summative and formative feedback on areas of strength and those needing improvement and progress in service to promotion. APRs may be considered during promotion reviews, but positive annual reviews do not guarantee promotion. (See the Annual Performance Review guidelines and resources, available on the UArizona Faculty Affairs website).

2. Third-Year Review (probationary or retention review)

The schedule for a TT candidate's probationary or retention reviews will be stated in the offer letter and is generally expected to take place in the third-year of the appointment; candidates should start preparing their materials in the second semester of their second year in anticipation of this review. The third-year review seeks to provide faculty with feedback and clarification on research, teaching, and service expectations for promotion and tenure, and assist faculty in developing action plans to meet those expectations. The third-year review process shall be consistent with University rules. (See the Retention Reviews guidelines and resources, available on the UArizona Faculty Affairs website).

To prepare for the third-year review, candidates should provide all necessary information and documentation for their dossier. The Director will share with the candidate all available resources and the timeline for the third-year review. No external letters shall be solicited at the third-year review stage.

For TT third-year reviews, TT faculty of higher rank will discuss and vote on the report of the third-year review Committee. The vote, which is advisory to the Director, will be by "show of hands." Only faculty present throughout the meeting, physically or virtually, may vote. Faculty are expected to make every effort to attend meetings physically. Virtual participation will be permitted only when physical participation is not possible. The report will be used to clarify the criteria for the candidate to achieve promotion and tenure.

While neither the University nor the College require third-year reviews for CT faculty, any CT faculty wishing to seek promotion should complete a formal review after at least three years of employment. As with TT faculty, a committee of CT and TT faculty of higher rank will be formed to review the candidate's fulfillment of their contract. The committee will take into account the specific workload allocation in the employment contract of the CT faculty. Typically, this includes evaluation of a teaching portfolio consistent with College and University rules and an assessment of the service portfolio.

The objective of the Committee report is to provide feedback to the candidate and to make a recommendation to the Director regarding retention. The Director will review the outcome of the discussions of the faculty and identify areas of strengths and/or weaknesses.

3. SGPP Process of Promotion (For CT and TT Promotion to Associate (with Tenure as applicable) and Full Professor)

SGPP shall comply with the University and College rules for promotion and tenure. (See the University of Arizona Promotion and Tenure process, as described on the UArizona Faculty Affairs website; and the SBS Promotion and Tenure/Continuing Status and Promotion Guidelines, available on the SBS website).

The process for retention, promotion, and tenure evaluation inside the School shall be consistent with the faculty member's workload distribution and a clearly communicated set of expectations for work by the Director and/or Associate Director that is reinforced by yearly mentoring and the faculty member's annual review. The process shall be transparent, inclusive, procedurally correct, and adhere to College timelines. It is the responsibility of the Director and/or Associate Director and mentor to work with eligible faculty members on the process and the timing and preparation of the dossier.

The process internal to the School consists of the formation of a promotion committee, requests for external letters (for TT faculty), the creation of a committee report, a vote of higher ranked

faculty, and the evaluation and recommendation of the Director. The roles of each is to be consistent with University and College guidelines and include the following:

a) Promotion Committee:

The Director and/or Associate Director will form a committee, in consultation with the candidate and the faculty of higher rank, no later than one month prior to the beginning of the College review process. The committee will consist of three members of a rank higher than that of the faculty member eligible for promotion (or at the rank of full in cases of promotion to full). Consistent with the principles and philosophy guiding this document, the committee shall be made up of faculty members with relevant research interests for the candidate. Because some faculty members hold joint appointments and/or do interdisciplinary work, the Director, with the approval of the Dean as required by college promotion guidelines, may appoint faculty members from other departments as long as they have knowledge of the field and its norms for promotion. The candidate will know the names of the members of the committee. The candidate's preferences in the formation of the committee will be taken under consideration, particularly any concerns they have about the appropriateness of a particular committee member for the task of evaluating their work. The candidate's decision to strike a faculty from the committee will be without prejudice to their candidacy.

The Chair of the Committee communicates suggestions about external letter writers to the Director and makes sure that the Committee deliberations are concluded within the timeframe proposed by the College and University deadlines.

The role of the Promotion Committee is to evaluate the candidate under the criteria in this document and must remain consistent with College and University rules. The Committee report consists of a full summary of the assessment of the external letters and, moreover, will conduct an independent review of the record of the candidate.

Because of the diversity of fields in the School, the Committee will apply the norms of the field or sub-discipline when judging quality and quantity of the work. Where appropriate, the

Committee will place major emphasis on the external evaluations by leaders in the field at peer institutions or higher.

The Committee will also offer an independent evaluation of the candidate's record. The Committee will vote and make a formal recommendation to the Director and the faculty of higher rank of the School on the basis of School criteria.

For CT faculty, promotion requires excellent performance and the promise of continued excellence in teaching and service. The candidate will prepare a teaching portfolio in accordance with UArizona guidelines and should include indicators of teaching effectiveness, direct teaching observations, evidence of student mentoring, pedagogical innovations, and other contributions to teaching. The service portfolio mirrors that of the teaching portfolio and includes documentation for the Committee to review. The exact content of service portfolio is dependent on the particular contractual obligations of the candidate. It could involve metrics to assess the growth of a program and/or the expansion of outside partners and collaborators. Research may also be part of the evaluation, using appropriate criteria that align with the candidate's area of expertise and goals. According to UArizona rules, CT faculty do not require external letters. However, when appropriate, the Committee may solicit letters from the UArizona or wider community to evaluate the service component of the CT dossier.

For any questions about the process, CT and TT candidates should approach the Director of the School.

b) External Letters:

For TT faculty, external letters are an important component in the evaluation process. The School's leadership will work with the candidate, under University rules and guidelines, to choose and solicit external evaluations of the candidate's dossier. This should be done by the Director in a timely manner and shall be discussed with the candidate at the beginning of the process. Solicitations for letters should follow the College and University rules and deadlines. The candidate will provide a list of up to six potential external reviewers to the School's

leadership. No more than half of the letters will be provided by the reviewers on the candidate's list. In addition, the candidate has the ability to identify potential reviewers who should not be on the list. The Director and the members of the Promotion committee will also form a separate list of potential reviewers as defined by University rules. Typically, the School looks for six external letters of which no more than half come from the list of the candidate. Timeliness is important to ensure that reviewers are available and willing to write the letter. The Director should work to secure a reasonable number of affirmative responses to the inquiry (e.g., reminders, etc.). After affirmative responses are received, the required sections of the candidate's dossier should be forwarded to the external reviewers to allow plenty of time for a thorough evaluation.

c) The Vote of the Faculty:

The tenured faculty of higher rank in the School shall vote on the promotion case of each TT candidate.; both CT and tenured faculty in rank can vote on CT promotion cases. The vote will be consistent with the rules of the College, University, and by-laws of the School of Government and Public Policy. The Director will run the meeting and is responsible for enforcing all policies and procedures relevant to the promotion process. The Director plays only a procedural role, without substantive contribution to the discussion. The vote on the recommendation contained in the report of the promotion committee will be of faculty members in attendance, physically or virtually, who are of higher rank than the candidate.

The vote will be by "show of hands." Only faculty present throughout the meeting, physically or virtually, may vote. Faculty are expected to make every effort to attend meetings physically. Virtual participation will be permitted only when physical participation is not possible. The vote will be recorded, and the number of "yeas," "nays" and those abstaining shall be reported in the promotion letter of the Director.

d) Letter of the Director:

The Director's letter shall be consistent with College and University rules. The Director's letter shall include an independent assessment of the candidate's dossier as well as summarize the substance of the discussion in the faculty meeting. By policy, candidates are informed of the Director's recommendation in writing (for or against retention or promotion) as soon as the dossier is forwarded to the Dean for further review. No additional information (faculty vote counts, the substance of the deliberations, etc) is reported to the candidate, by College and University policy.

Candidates may choose to appeal the outcome of their retention or promotion review by writing a letter to the President within thirty days of the notice of the Provost's decision. The appeal process is laid out in University Handbook for Appointed Personnel.