P&T Criteria Working Group

Convened by Dr. Andrea Romero, UArizona
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Fall 2021

Faculty Affairs

Mission

▲ ▲ ▲

Our mission in Faculty Affairs is to cultivate and connect institutional structures for faculty advancement across the career lifespan in alignment with the overarching mission and role of the University of Arizona. We take an ecosystem equity approach across all system levels that considers (1) recruitment, (2) professional advancement, (3) retention, and (4) policies. Our work is grounded in an affirming, transparent, and inclusive approach to supporting faculty. You can find more details and information on each key area of our work:

- Equity
- Recruitment
- Professional Advancement
- Retention

Vision

▲ ▲ ▲

We aspire to maintain high levels of accountability, efficiency, and transparency in all areas of faculty affairs. We adhere to the fundamental values of our land grant institution and R1 status. We believe that a humanistic approach to faculty activity will foster excellence, equity, and impact. We aim to promote understanding of the role and contributions of faculty in teaching, research, service, extension, creative activity, and clinical work.

Table of Contents

P&T Criteria Working Group convened by Dr. Andrea Romero, UArizona Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Fall 2021

Goal: Review (and potentially update) UArizona Promotion & Tenure Criteria

Activities: The working group convened on Mondays in Fall 2021. Weekly discussion topics were assigned by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and included open scholarship, innovation and entrepreneurship, service & invisible labor, HSI, patents, community-engaged work, large scale data and multiple authors/collaborators, mentoring of students, and societal impacts.

Working group members reviewed existing P&T criteria, suggested ancillary readings, and led weekly discussions from which the **following recommendations** emerged:

Suggested Revisions to the P&T Process
- Mandatory training for committees and unit heads (college and department) every three years
- Improved onboarding of new candidates
- Mentoring of all candidates (mentoring for community engaged work, HSI scholarship, etc.), plus local mentoring that is discipline specific
- Expand definition of inclusive scholarship
- **Don't add too much to the dossier**

Suggested Revisions to the P & T Documentation
- Collaborator letter template and perhaps also instructions for improved use and understanding
- Revise instructions to external letter writers – especially revisit guidelines about who is a collaborator and who is not
- Suggest that the order of CV better aligns with institutional priorities
- Internal letter of evaluation for specialized review committee
- Make space in the personal statement (up to 1 more page) for HSI-relevant scholarship
- Provide opportunity to descript open scholarship in Section 7

Other Recommendations
- Conduct a university-wide service audit
- Holistic review considering variable workload

Brief Summaries from Subcommittees on Key Topics

Topic #1 Collaborative Activities and P&T

Interdisciplinarity and collaboration (I&C) are valued at the University, but not necessarily well-supported by policies and practices.

There are different aspects of this issue:
- Multi-authored papers (which can be hundreds/thousands or just a few authors) – how to value the paper and the author's contribution to it.
- Collaboration that spans units, disciplines, and institutions – how to identify letter writers with knowledge and no conflict of interest.
- Overall, the guidelines for assessing I&C work are not clear.

Different disciplines have different challenges and approaches – as evidenced by the cases in MIS and Particle Physics. The article that was shared (Klein & Falk-Krzesinski, 2017) offers some starting points for thinking about the practices and policies. In addition, Andrea referred to the NIH guidelines regarding collaboration and conflicts of interest as a source of input for policies and procedures.

Four key themes arose from the discussion:

1. Guidelines and coaching regarding the preparation of the statement.
   Could we provide a template and/or guidelines for writing the statement, depending on where someone 'falls' on the I&C continuum (e.g., 100+ authors, multi-disciplinary work). How might we design a workshop or general coaching for individuals regarding statement preparation to highlight their contributions to the work and from the work?

2. Leverage collaborator letters
   Could/should we leverage collaborator letters? If so, how do we move them from being ignored to being used in a meaningful manner? Could the development of a set of guiding questions for collaborators help here?

3. Training committee members
   Training individuals who sit on committees could be an avenue for moving forward with a cultural change around I&C in P&T, as well as helping committee members understand their role. For example, moving away from "legalistic nit-picking" toward higher level assessment would help to shift the culture. There was also some discussion around working with unit committees to help understand the nature of I&C in the local units (e.g., college or department). Andrea shared that there is some training in the works that could be on Edge Learning and eventually required of committee members.

4. Revisit the instructions for external reviewers

   It has been some time since external invitations have been revised (except for the recent revisions around Covid). Would it be possible to provide different/better instructions that would communicate the university's values around I&C and help external reviewers to assess this work in a manner consistent with our values? There appear to be some constraints in terms of word/character limits in the RPT system, so we would have to be creative.

Topic #2 Inclusive View of Scholarship

Proposal: To expand the University of Arizona's Inclusive View of Scholarship, as well as Teaching, and Service rubrics to include contributions that help the University fulfill its Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) designation, as well as its aspirations to be a Native American Serving Institution. Under this modification of the existing Inclusive View of Scholarship, candidates for promotion, tenure, continuing status, and career track would be formally recognized and rewarded for their leadership in advancing the University of Arizona's HSI designation and aspiring Native American Serving Institution.

Justification I: The literature in higher education on the barriers and outcomes for underrepresented students is clear: sustainable equity will only be achieved once institutional change and support is prioritized. The University of Arizona's recent HSI designation and support by leadership represents a unique opportunity to make such a commitment. HSI expert Dr. Gina Garcia has found that transitioning from being an institution that simply enrolls a large amount of Hispanic students (at least 25%) to one that fosters their success hinges on centering what she calls "servingness." This includes fostering student opportunities to engage with faculty, staff, and peers in meaningful and cross-racial/ethnic ways. A more expansive view of scholarship can facilitate such engagement in ways that are organic to the candidate's work and in ways that advance success for all students.

Justification II: The University of Arizona was at the forefront of recognizing the diversity of ways that knowledge is acquired and advanced through its Inclusive View of Scholarship. The proposed modification would help strengthen Pillars 3 and 5 of the Strategic Plan, the Arizona Advantage and Institutional Excellence, by once again positioning the University of Arizona as a national leader by formally integrating its institutional identity and priorities as a public land grant research intensive university, a Hispanic Serving Institution, and an aspiring Native American Serving Institution.

HSI and aspiring Native American Serving Institution Inclusive View of Scholarship

Candidates and reviewers should consider how the University's HSI status is reflected and advanced through the "inclusive view of scholarship" in the University's Promotion criteria, which specify that promotion, tenure or continuing status are based on:

Excellent performance and the promise of continued excellence in 1) teaching, 2) service, and 3) research, creative work, and scholarship. The University values an inclusive view of scholarship in the recognition that knowledge is acquired and advanced through discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Moreover, the University recognizes that the HSI designation opens new opportunities for the University of Arizona's research mission. Given these parallel perspectives, promotion and tenure reviews, as detailed in the criteria of individual departments and colleges, will recognize original research contributions in peer-reviewed publications as well as integrative and applied forms of scholarship that involve cross-

cutting collaborations with business and community partners, including translational research, commercialization activities, and patents, as well as those forms of scholarship that advance the University of Arizona's HSI status and impact.

Inclusive View of Service and Teaching Proposal

Candidates and reviewers should consider the "inclusive view of teaching and service" in the University's Promotion criteria, which specify that promotion, tenure, continuing status, and career track are based on: *excellent performance and the promise of continued excellence in 1) teaching, 2) service, and 3) research, creative work, and scholarship.* The University values an inclusive view of teaching and service acknowledges the importance of culturally responsive pedagogy, as well as of mentoring as a strategy to promote the success of students, faculty, and staff. ***Given this perspective, promotion and tenure reviews, as detailed in the criteria of individual departments and colleges, mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students, as well as of faculty, will be recognized and rewarded in the evaluation of a candidate's service and teaching.***

Topic #3 Overview of the proposed integration of open scholarship into UA promotion and tenure/continuing status (P&T/CS) criteria and processes

*This framing was sent in advance of the discussion:

<u>**Rationale**</u>

As a public, land grant, Hispanic Serving Institution, the University of Arizona has a fundamental interest in promoting and facilitating unfettered global access to the scholarship of its faculty members to ensure maximum impact of their individual work and the institution at large. Open scholarship modalities can provide this level of access and impact in ways that benefit the faculty member as well as academic colleagues, private individuals, businesses, non-profits, research funders, and governmental agencies.

The COVID-19 pandemic has vividly illustrated why the removal of barriers to the free flow of information in fields such as health sciences, economics, and education is in the shared interests of these stakeholders, and that recognition should extend across fields of research and academic inquiry. Pandemic-related trends in higher education, including the growth of online learning and greater awareness of the financial challenges faced by many students, also reinforce the importance making high quality scholarship freely available online.

By making an institutional commitment to the importance of open scholarship in its P&T/CS criteria and processes, the UA would clearly signal to its faculty that the openness of their work and the resulting impacts are valued and rewarded. This commitment would position the UA as a leader in open scholarship, while also raising awareness of the need to establish more equitable and open knowledge-sharing systems that broaden participation to accelerate progress and discovery on a global scale.

<u>**Open Scholarship Definitions**</u>

- Open scholarship, which encompasses open access, open data, open educational resources, and all other forms of openness in the scholarly and research environment, is changing how knowledge is created and shared. ([ARL](#))

  - Open access is the free, immediate, online availability of research articles combined with the rights to use these articles fully in the digital environment. ([SPARC](#))
  - Open access books, freely distributed across the Web, can provide a way for academics and non-academics alike to engage with scholarly material without the obstacles presented by price, location or copyright (other than the limitations imposed by chosen licenses). ([Higher Education Funding Council for England](#))
  - Open data are freely available on the internet; permit any user to download, copy, analyze, re-process, pass to software or use for any

other purpose; and is without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. (SPARC)

- o Open educational resources (OER) are teaching, learning, and research resources that are free of cost and access barriers, and which also carry legal permission for open use. (SPARC)
- o Open source software is code that is designed to be publicly accessible— anyone can see, modify, and distribute the code as they see fit. (Red Hat)

Examples of Open Scholarship

- Publishing in a peer-reviewed open access journal.

- Publishing in a peer-reviewed subscription journal, while also making a version openly available by depositing it in an institutional repository (such as the UA Campus Repository), funder repository (such as PubMed), or disciplinary repository (such as SocArXiv).

- Making pre-prints of articles or other works openly available through a repository such as ArXiv (Physics, mathematics, computer science, quantitative biology, quantitative finance, statistics, economics, electrical engineering, astronomy and systems science).

- Publishing open monographs through platforms such as OAPen.

- Making research data openly available through platforms such as the UA Research Data Repository (ReDATA) or DataONE (Earth and environmental data).

- Creating open educational resources, including open textbooks, that enable these resources to be openly available for use in teaching and learning through platforms such as the Open Textbook Library.

- Creating open source software code that is made freely available through platforms such as GitHub.

*Major themes of the open scholarship discussion on 9/27/21:

- Introductory remarks by Shan Sutton included:

  - o A reminder that there are many ways through which a faculty member can make their work openly accessible besides publishing in an open access journal, as outlined in the framing information sent in advance of this discussion.
  - o There is an underlying expectation that candidates are generating high quality work validated by peer review and other processes in conjunction with the mechanisms of making their work open.

- One potential strategy for integrating open scholarship into P&T/CS processes involves adding an **optional** open scholarship section to the candidate dossier template that would provide a dedicated place for candidates to describe their open scholarship activities/outputs/impacts. Candidates could also be invited to use an **optional** standard "open" symbol to indicate on their CV which works are openly available.

- Several questions were raised on potential implications of an optional open scholarship section in the candidate dossier, including:

  - Would the university-level committee and/or dept.-level committee look negatively on candidates who don't use the optional open scholarship section? A related point is that a faculty member may choose not to utilize open access methods for reasons that can include classified research, corporate-sponsored research, culturally sensitive subject matter, and patent or intellectual property considerations.
  - Would junior faculty be distracted from prestigious non-open access journals in their fields in which they are expected to publish?
  - Are optional sections in the dossier template frequently used by candidates and/or valued by reviewers, and would there be sufficient uptake to warrant adding a new section?

- There was also interest in potential alternative models for integrating open scholarship into P&T/CS processes, including

  - Using Section 7 to also provide an opportunity for candidates to describe distinctive aspects of their research and publication activities, which may include open scholarship, classified research, HSI involvement, involvement in new publishing or research initiatives, etc.
  - Combining open scholarship with related concepts such as HSI-engaged research and community-engaged research in revisiting the definition of "inclusive scholarship."
    - Note: As a follow-up to this idea, Shan Sutton, Judy Marquez Kiyama, and Ron Trosper are collaborating to explore how open scholarship, HSI-engaged research, and community-engaged research may be referenced in revising the UA's "Inclusive View of Scholarship," and how that revised definition could impact P&T/CS criteria and processes.

Topic #4: Community Engagement in the Promotion & Tenure Process

> **UArizona P & T criteria specify that promotion, tenure, or continuing status require:**
>
> *Excellent performance and the promise of continued excellence in 1) teaching, 2) service, and 3) research, creative work, and scholarship. The University values an inclusive view of scholarship in the recognition that knowledge is acquired and advanced through discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Given this perspective, promotion and tenure reviews, as detailed in the criteria of individual departments and colleges, will recognize original research contributions in peer-reviewed publications as well as **integrative and applied forms of scholarship that involve <u>cross-cutting collaborations</u> <u>with business and community partners</u>**, including translational research, commercialization activities, and patents.*
>
> https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship

Discussion questions:

1. Using this language, what can departments and colleges do to establish criteria that "recognize collaboration with community partners" in the evaluation of faculty performance?

2. What do faculty members need to do to document contributions of work with community partners which contribute to teaching, research and service?

3. Does the criteria statement need additional language to clarify activities that particularly apply to work with communities?

Here are some suggestions from the literature:

Characteristics of Quality Community-Engaged Scholarship (Jordan et al.)
- Clear academic and community change goals
- Adequate preparation in content area and grounding in the community
- Appropriate methods: rigor and community engagement
- Significant results: impact on the field and the community
- Effective presentation/dissemination to academic and community audiences
- Reflective critique: lessons learned to improve the scholarship and community engagement
- Leadership and personal contribution
- Consistently ethical behavior: socially responsible conduct of research and teaching

Observations for the Future of Community-Engaged Scholarship (Seifer et al.)
- We need to be clear about how we define terms – and to hold each other accountable for the terms we use.
- Faculty development does not start when a faculty member is preparing his or her portfolio for promotion.
- Meaningful roles for community partners in academic faculty development, promotion, and tenure need to be developed further.
- Significant attention needs to be paid to community partner capacity building and professional development.
- Sustaining institutional commitment to community-engaged scholarship takes top-down, bottom-up, inside-out, and outside-in approaches.

Suggested Readings:

- Jordan et al. *Characteristics of Quality Community-Engaged Scholarship*, **pages 77-79, italicized criteria**. In: The Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion, and Tenure Package.
- Seifer et al. *Observations for the Future of Community-Engaged Scholarship*, **pages 14-16.** J Higher Ed Outreach, 2012.
- Foster K. *Taking a Stand: Community-Engaged Scholarship on the Tenure Track* http://jces.ua.edu/taking-a-stand-community-engaged-scholarship-on-the-tenure-track/

Topic #5: HSI Overview

Section 3.1B of the University's Strategic Initiatives focuses on increasing faculty capacity around its HSI designation. The overall goal of Strategic Initiative 3.1B: Institutionalize Commitment to Hispanic Advancement, is to build institutional capacity for excellence and HSI servingness in the areas of: faculty recruitment, hiring, retention and promotion; research; teaching, and service. Judy Marquez Kiyama's role supports faculty in their HSI servingness efforts across scholarship, teaching, and service.

The concept of servingness is understood as engaging Latina/o/x and under-served students through culturally enhancing, equitable approaches that offer transformative experiences leading to both academic and non-academic outcomes (Garcia & Koren, 2020). Gonzales (2015) suggests possibilities for for moving forward with reimagining evaluation of what is valued and legitimized in HSI teaching, service and research. For instance, in considering our HSI designation and the ways in which faculty integrate HSI efforts into their scholarship we should ask:

> o Who is the focus of the scholarship? (e.g. participants, communities, etc) Who does the scholarship benefit? How are research problems identified (e.g. community-engaged scholarship)? How are faculty reputations understood and measured (local, regional, national, international)?

> o Where is it published?

> o How is it funded?

> o What methodologies are used?

We should also consider how to align evaluation practices, such as determining how activities are categorized along service, teaching, and research and continue to examine how candidates will be evaluated on serving Hispanic / Latinx students and under-served students by reviewers – internally and externally.

o Prepare internal committees to be in alignment with how admin/leadership/this committee may be viewing HSI servingness efforts.

·We must continue to examine what it means to do and advance HSI work at UArizona across relationships, practices, scholarship, teaching, etc. and who feels supported in doing the work and in pursuing resources to engage in the work.

For more information on current University of Arizona Promotion and Tenure Materials and Policy:

- UA Faculty Affairs Promotion Materials & Guidance
  https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/about-promotion

- Background material on inclusive scholarship:
  https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship

- Chapter 3 Current Policy for Tenure-track faculty
  https://policy.arizona.edu/employment-human-resources/promotion-and-tenure

- Chapter 4 for Continuing Status Faculty
  https://policy.arizona.edu/employment-human-resources/promotion-and-continuing-status

Topic #6: Summary of discussion November 8 on P&T and P&C procedures for contributions in the area of innovation, entrepreneurship, and technology transfer.

George Rieke

Faculty activities in the area of IETT (Innovation, Entrepreneurship, and Technology Transfer) are a growing area, in part due to increased emphasis on universities doing relevant work for direct overall societal benefit and also because new sources of research support are available in this area. In this broad view, the situation has some analogies with other areas of endeavor, such as many of the outreach programs we discussed when we considered our role as a Hispanic Serving Institution. Some of the challenges for updating our P&T and P&C procedures in these two apparently dissimilar areas are actually similar.

Appropriate approaches to encourage IETT can increase the societal impact of the university and also enlarge its footprint in research. A few universities (e.g., the University of Minnesota) have gone so far as to encourage arrangements where a company can sponsor research at the university under a pre-paid fee and can receive an exclusive worldwide license with royalties taking effect only in cases of significant commercial success. It is likely that arrangements along these lines will become more common and we should anticipate the University of Arizona doing something similar.

However, this style of activity is not within the conventional "ivory tower" view of a university, and one of the obstacles to having it fairly considered in P&T and P&C is that many faculty do not put a high priority on it. This is made clear by the results of a survey obtained at Oregon State University as part of a NSF-funded study of these issues. Two thirds of the respondents at Research 1 universities were indifferent to faculty efforts to prepare students for careers in IETT, and a similar fraction were indifferent to considering such efforts in P&T. Thus, improving the P&T and P&C procedures is important, but it needs to be done along with a general change in culture if we are to be fully effective in such activities.

Andrea nicely summarized the challenge for P&T and P&C: "We need to determine how to do quality reviews for promotion where traditional metrics are not applicable." There was considerable discussion of this issue:

1. We need to make it clear to candidates for promotion that such activities are valued and should be discussed centrally in their dossiers and statements of accomplishments, if appropriate.
2. We should carefully define what kinds of metrics they should emphasize – the items should represent specific, significant accomplishments (e.g., license revenue, not license applications, awards for technology transfer, industry research grants and projects, etc. It is important to have areas listed that are subject to objective evaluation.
3. As appropriate, the university needs to brief P&T and P&C committees on the importance of and approach to such work.

4. The individual committees will need to draw membership across campus as needed to have the relevant expertise.
5. We considered favorably the possibility of an advisory committee to be set up at the request of a candidate that might have a standing core but would be augmented by relevant experts, some of whom might be drawn from non-faculty resources, e.g., with help from the Arizona Technology Council. However, getting this right will be complex and how to do it requires further discussion.
6. Strict arms-length evaluation letters may by themselves not be adequate. Collaborator letters should be elevated in importance, but at the same time guidelines need to be provided to collaborator letter writers to emphasize quantitative assessments of accomplishments rather than qualitative praise.

These measures should be considered in the broad university context (e.g., the aforementioned HSI activities) to have as uniform an approach as possible.

Background Reading Material

Brown-Glaude, W.R. (2009). Doing Diversity in Higher Education: Faculty Leaders Share Challenges and Strategies. Rutgers University Press: New Jersey,

Cardel, M. I., Dhurandhar, E., Yarar-Fisher, C., Foster, M., Hidalgo, B., McClure, L. A., ... & Angelini, C. (2020). Turning chutes into ladders for women faculty: A review and roadmap for equity in academia. *Journal of Women's Health*, *29*(5), 721-733.

Carter, R. G., Mundorff, K., Risien, J., Bouwma-Gearhart, J., Bratsch-Prince, D., Brown, S. A., Campbell, A., Hartman, J.C., Hasemann, C.A., Hollenbeck, P.J., Lupiani, B., McCarty, O.J.T., McClure, I.D., Mealey, K., Mimura, C., Romero, A.J., Szatjn, P. & Van Egeren, L. (2021). Innovation, entrepreneurship, promotion, and tenure. *Science*, *373*(6561), 1312-1314.

Foster, K. M. (2010). Taking a stand: Community-engaged scholarship on the tenure track. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*, *3*(2), 3.

Jordan, C. M., Joosten, Y. A., Leugers, R. C., & Shields, S. L. (2009). The community-engaged scholarship review, promotion, and tenure package: A guide for faculty and committee members. *Metropolitan Universities*, *20*(2), 66-86.

Lincoln, A. E., Pincus, S., Koster, J. B., & Leboy, P. S. (2012). The Matilda Effect in science: Awards and prizes in the US, 1990s and 2000s. *Social studies of science*, *42*(2), 307-320.

Matthew, P.A. (2016). Written/Unwritten: Diversity and the Hidden Truths of Tenure. The University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, NC.

Perez, P.A. (2019). The Tenure-track Process for Chicana and Latina Faculty: Experiences of Resisting and Persisting in the Academy. Routledge Press: New York, NY.

Rockquemore, K.A. & Laszloffy, T. (2008). The Black Academic's Guide to Winning Tenure – Without Losing Your Soul. Lynne Rienner Publishers: Boulder, CO.

Sandlin, J. A., O'Malley, M. P., & Burdick, J. (2011). Mapping the complexity of public pedagogy scholarship: 1894–2010. *Review of educational research*, *81*(3), 338-375.

Seifer, S. D., Blanchard, L. W., Jordan, C., Gelmon, S., & McGinley, P. (2012). Faculty for the engaged campus: Advancing community-engaged careers in the academy. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *16*(1), 5-20.

Stewart, A.J. & Valian, V. (2018). An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence. The MIT Press. Cambridge MA.

- University of Michigan
  https://report.dei.umich.edu/action_items/consideration-of-diversity-equity-and-inclusion-contributions-in-promotion-and-tenure-review/

- Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI)
  https://news.iu.edu/stories/2021/05/iupui/releases/10-promotion-tenure-pathway-enhancing-diversity-equity-inclusion.html

- Harvard, School of Medicine
  https://fa.hms.harvard.edu/files/hmsofa/files/ssa_dei.aug2021.pdf

- JEDI case for promotion:
  https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2021/05/14/iupui-creates-path-promotion-and-tenure-based-dei-work?utm_source=Inside+Higher+Ed&utm_campaign=e722cc5bd3-DNU_2021_COPY_02&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_1fcbc04421-e722cc5bd3-234651705&mc_cid=e722cc5bd3&mc_eid=604b060109

- https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/circular-background-description-integrative-dei-case-for-IFC_3_12.pdf

- Innovation & Entrepreneurship
  https://ptie.org/

- Make tenure letters public? How where? Democratic approach?
  https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/03/13/tenure-and-promotion-process-must-be-revised-especially-historically-marginalized

- Michigan State University Community-engaged work principles
  https://engage.msu.edu/upload/documents-reports/pod_2009ed.pdf

- Gender Equity and COVID-19
  https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2010636117

- Public Scholarship
  https://imaginingamerica.org/scholarship-in-public-knowledge-creation-and-tenure-policy-in-the-engaged-university-a-resource-on-promotion-and-tenure-in-the-arts-humanities-and-design/#:~:text=The%20Imagining%20America%20Tenure%20Team,civic%20professionalism%20in%20many%20spheres.

Notes from Vice Provost Romero about content and committee composition

The Promotion and Tenure Criteria committee was convened in Fall 2021 in order to consolidate discussions and proposals that were coming forward in relation to promotion and tenure criteria at the University of Arizona. The individuals invited to participate represent those who were leading proposals and discussions on these topics on campus. One set of discussions emerged from the racial equity discussions that were led by the Research, Innovation, and Impact Office in the Summer of 2020. A subgroup of the racial equity series met weekly to discuss racial equity issues within promotion and tenure. The individuals who participated in the racial equity discussion sessions were invited to be on the Promotion and Tenure Criteria committee. The general report from the racial equity series meeting sessions is included below.

Racial Equity Series Brief Report
The Promotion and Tenure discussion subgroup of the Racial Equity Series met for discussion July 7th, 14th, 23rd, and 30th, 2020. During that period there were 12 distinct attendees who participated for the one-hour sessions. The content themes focused on the value of service, need for mentors, managing collaborative work, retention, hiring, innovation and entrepreneurship. The issue of service was a dominant topic that was revisited several times and noted of great concern for women and BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) groups. Another dominant theme was that of the lack of mentoring for women and BIPOC groups for promotion and tenure development. Following are the themes identified based on the discussions in Summer 2020:

Establish diversity:
- •How to change culture within academia where we are focused more on individual research-
- •Societal impacts is a wonderful opportunity to diversify
Collaboration:
- •How to document individual work to be more specific with contributions-
- •How to create a Metrix on broader impacts-
How to recruit faculty of color
- •Create a pipeline-
- •Confronting people with data-
- •Challenge program to partner with more diverse institutions to advance both interested parties-
- •Demonstrate that we are making visual progress to have people come here.

Working Group Members:

- Melanie Hingle, Associate Professor, Nutritional Science Wellness, CALS
- George Rieke, Professor, Astronomy, College of Science
- Shan Sutton, Dean, University Libraries
- Elliott Cheu, Professor, Physics, College of Science, Associate Vice President, University Research Institutes
- Maurice Magaña, Assistant Professor, Mexican American Studies, College of Social and Behavioral Science
- Sue Brown, Professor, Department Head, Management Information Systems, Eller College
- Ronald Trosper, Professor, American Indian Studies
- Dominic McGrath, Professor, Chemistry and Biochemistry, College of Science
- Jessica Summers, Professor, Teaching/Learning and Sociocultural Studies, College of Education
- Maribel Alvarez, Associate Research Social Scientist, Southwest Center, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Brad Story, Professor, Speech, Language and Hearing, Associate Dean, College of Science
- Andrew Curley, Assistant Professor, School of Geography and Development, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Judy Marquez Kiyama, Professor, Educational Policy Studies and Practice, College of Education, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Development, Office of the Provost
- George Rieke, Professor, Astronomy, College of Science
- Katrina Miranda, Associate Professor, Chemistry and Biochemistry, College of Science