



SBS INFORMATION FOR RETENTION (3rd Year) REVIEWS

GOALS OF RETENTION REVIEWS: Retention Reviews serve as dress rehearsals for promotion reviews. They are intended to provide faculty clarification on teaching, research, and service/outreach expectations, and help faculty develop action plans to best position themselves to meet those expectations.

TIMING OF RETENTION REVIEWS: Retention Reviews are generally conducted in the third year, though scheduling may vary if a prior university position was held. The schedule of the Retention Review should be in the offer letter.

HOW TO PREPARE FOR RETENTION REVIEWS: Faculty should begin preparing for the Retention Review in each meeting for annual performance review. Ask for as much specific feedback as possible in (a) assessments of teaching, (b) input on upcoming plans, and (c) frank suggestions on how to improve.

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 department head to go over the Promotion Dossier. The SBS team for Faculty Affairs and Inclusion is also available to meet with faculty.

Calendar timelines for Retention Reviews follow those for Promotion and Tenure.

PROCEDURES FOR RETENTION REVIEWS: The retention review follows many of the same steps as the promotion review.

- In SBS, Retention Reviews are conducted at the department level
- Faculty use the same Dossier Template as for P&T or CS&P, and the CV and Candidate Statement should also be in the same format as in the Promotion Dossier
- Most Retention Reviews conclude with a meeting with the unit head

OUTCOMES OF RETENTION REVIEWS: At the conclusion of the Retention Review, assistant professors can be recommended for reappointment as assistant professor or recommended for a nonrenewal at the expiration of the fourth year of service in rank.

In the rare case that a head recommends that a candidate not be renewed, the dossier is forwarded from the department for College and University reviews. External reviews are not normally included but may be requested by the Dean or Provost. The Provost may decide that a nonrenewal is appropriate when a candidate is not making timely progress toward promotion. In such cases, a candidate is given a terminal year appointment. The Provost may also decide to schedule another Retention Review in the fourth or fifth year. All steps in this process are detailed in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP).

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 at <http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/promotion>

**SBS CHECKLIST FOR RETENTION (3rd Year) REVIEWS BY DOSSIER SECTION****Dossier Section 1: Summary Data Sheet**

- Is the data sheet completed by the unit head 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 the unit level P&T/CS&P 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 publications substantially based on work done as a graduate student?
- For foreign publications, is an English translation of the titles provided?
- Are peer-reviewed publications distinguished from proceedings and other publications, and are invited presentations distinguished from submitted presentations?
- 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 per the below, in accordance with 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.

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) research, teaching, and service?
- Is the statement readable and free of jargon and highly technical terms if 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. Imagine this as the equivalent of the scholarship that is sent to external reviewers in P&T; in this case, what is prepared is a selection of teaching accomplishments, and the reviewers are the members of department committee.

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?

Dossier Section 7: Evaluation of Teaching & Advising

Your Teaching Portfolio (Section 6) goes in its entirety to the department evaluation committee. Section 7 is the **evaluation** of that portfolio. **Section 7 is completed by the evaluation committee.**

- Has the committee evaluated the supporting documentation provided by the candidate? (i.e. syllabi and major assignments; TCEs; reports, curricular reviews, and other contributions to scholarship on teaching)
- Has the committee observed the candidate's teaching to assess effectiveness, including the course design and outcomes assessments?
- Is the teaching evaluation included in this section **and also** incorporated into the departmental 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 reviews, and as such **the 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.

The faculty member provides the following to the Committee as part of the portfolio:

- A brief overview document describing key points, 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 departmental 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 3rd Year Reviews

Dossier Section 11: Recommendations

The **Department Committee’s Report** is typically not seen by candidates, though in some departments the practice is to provide the candidate a copy. Recommendations should be printed on letterhead and signed by all voting Department Committee members. As with P&T recommendations, the letter should:

- Be addressed to Department Head/Director
- Provide an evaluation of candidate in each of the areas of (a) teaching and advising; (b) research, scholarship, and creative activities, including a summary and discussion of the opinion of any other reviewers; and (c) service.
- Include a vote count on retention, 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

TO WHOM SHOULD A LETTER BE SENT AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE REVIEW?

In Promotion & Tenure or Continuing Status & Promotion cases, the Department Head’s Recommendation is addressed to the Dean.

In the case of Retention Reviews, **the letter is addressed to the candidate**, with a copy to the Dean for review before delivery to the candidate.

The letter to the candidate should indicate opinions, views and comments, including analysis of impact of the candidate's professional activities and contributions in each of teaching, research, and service. It should also include substantive, actionable feedback and instructive statements to help candidates develop plans and timelines moving forward, particularly around quality, coherence, and independence of research.