

ARTS, SCIENCES and ENGINEERING

3rd Year Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines

This document, which is intended for internal use only, offers guidance to faculty and departments on the preparation of reappointment, tenure and promotion cases.

3rd Year Reappointment Guidelines

There is a formal obligation to review the progress of an Assistant Professor no later than one year before the end of the first term of appointment.

The review serves two purposes.

1. To establish whether the candidate's progress warrants an additional period of commitment from the University.
2. To provide the candidate with a formal and detailed assessment of career progress to date, and advice about steps that will promote continued and/or improved progress.

The reappointment review is the most formal of what should be regular annual reviews that provide junior faculty members with feedback about progress and advice about how to strengthen performance.

A positive recommendation for reappointment implies confidence that the candidate is, or can be, on a trajectory toward a successful tenure case within three years. The department should not recommend reappointment if there is serious doubt about that.

The reappointment review may be undertaken by a committee appointed by the chair, or by the tenured faculty acting as a committee of the whole. External letters are not required for the review (if the committee thinks that letters might be helpful, the dean should be consulted before any are sought), but otherwise the elements to be considered are the same as those for a tenure case:

- An up-to-date C.V. that includes information about types of publications (refereed, invited, reviewed, etc.), talks (and whether invited), grant support (agency, dates, amount), formal teaching, graduate students in training, departmental and professional service. For faculty in the creative and performing arts, the C.V. should provide information about types of exhibitions (solo, group, juried).
- COVID statement (no more than 1 page). This statement will help the committee to understand any obstacles that faculty have faced due to the pandemic and how they navigated through them. Reappointment portfolios are internal to the department and school deans' office. For reappointment, this statement would only be seen by the department faculty and the school dean's office. For tenure and promotion, this statement would be seen by the department faculty, the school dean's office, and the Provost's ad hoc committee. This statement should include any impact the pandemic has had on research, teaching, service, infrastructure or financial constraints, and obligations including child and elder care.

- Research and Scholarship Portfolio
 - Research and Scholarship Statement (3-5 pages): this document should describe the research/scholarly projects undertaken during your time at the University of Rochester. Include any broader impacts that your research has had, including connections to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
 - Research and Scholarship Plans (1-2 pages): describe your plans for future research/scholarly projects during the next 5 years.
 - Research and Scholarship Support: provide a list of all funding applications, including successful, unsuccessful and pending. For those that have been awarded, include faculty role, dollar amount, and time period. Including unsuccessful funding applications enables the reviewers to both understand the level of activity and to provide feedback with the goal of helping the faculty member to be successful in the future.
 - Copies of relevant publications or works (for fields involving artistic production, these may be prints, slides or electronic media). In the case of books not yet in print, the manuscript plus publisher's reader reviews (when available) should be provided.
- Teaching Portfolio
 - Pedagogical Statement (2-3 pages): this document should include a description of your approach to pedagogy, with an emphasis on innovation in education (e.g., course development, re-design, inclusive teaching practices, creating student research opportunities, etc.). If relevant, please also discuss how your work intersects with other departments/schools within the university. Include a discussion of any ways in which your practices promote inclusive teaching, learning, and mentoring.
 - Provide a list of undergraduate and graduate students directed.
 - Teaching Evaluations: include numerical curriculum evaluations as well as any student comments, observational evaluations by peers, the department chair or departmental P&T committee chair. The teaching portfolio can include letters of evaluation by peers, the department chair or departmental P&T committee chair.
 - Syllabi for each course taught.
- Service Statement (1-3 pages). This statement should contain a discussion of internal (department, School, University) and external (field, community) service contributions, including those that promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The committee should evaluate the quality of the contributions in research or creative works, the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching, and the significance of service to the department and, where relevant, to the University and the profession at large. In evaluating progress in research, the committee should pay special attention to assessing the candidate's trajectory in establishing an independent scholarly or creative profile, and to discerning contributions to any collaborative work. The committee should comment on areas of exceptional achievement, or areas of concern, and on steps that would help strengthen the candidate's work following a successful reappointment. If the review has been undertaken by a committee of fewer than all tenured

faculty, its findings and recommendation should be discussed by all tenured faculty, and the vote should include all tenured faculty.

The evaluation and recommendation should be fully laid out in a written report sent to the dean together with the candidate's full dossier (see process below). If the department's recommendation is positive, the chair may verbally inform the candidate that the case has been sent to the relevant dean with a favorable recommendation. If the department's recommendation is negative, the chair should not communicate the department's recommendation to the candidate until the dean has reviewed the dossier. In cases where the decision may be negative, the dean should be apprised, through discussions and prior written documentation (e.g., chair evaluations of faculty) well in advance that this might be a possible outcome.

At the time of a positive department outcome of the review, the chair should prepare a reappointment letter for discussion with the candidate that covers all significant points in the larger review: it should draw attention to any positive aspects of the person's accomplishments as well as concerns about progress and advice about how the candidate might best strengthen performance going forward. The letter should also include specific dates for reappointment and tenure review for the candidate. **The Dean must review and approve a draft of this letter before it is finalized.**

Once finalized, the chair should discuss (in person) the findings of the review and the recommendations in the letter. For the School of Arts and Sciences, the SAS Associate Dean will take part in this meeting.

PROCESS for reappointment material submission, review and notification

1. A BOX folder will be created by the Faculty Affairs Director by the beginning of the fall semester for each department. The folder will contain a list of the faculty who will need to be reviewed for reappointment. This folder will be shared with the relevant dean, department chair and department administrator.
2. The department uploads materials for reappointment IN PDF FORMAT to the folders created by the deans' office no later than March 1. Documents should be saved without dashes (-), spaces or special characters in the names. **See the AS&E Reappointment and Promotion Cover Sheet for uniform naming.**
3. If a case is favorable, the department chair drafts the reappointment letter from the chair to the faculty member, with the components described above, to include reappointment dates and the timeline for the faculty member for tenure review. The department uploads this as part of the materials that the relevant school dean reviews. The dean will review this document and either provide feedback with suggested edits or approve as submitted.
4. Following dean review and approval of the reappointment, the Director of Faculty Affairs will provide the faculty member with both a reappointment confirmation letter from the dean as well as the approved department chair reappointment letter. The department chair will be copied on this email and should at this time set up a meeting to discuss the reappointment feedback with the faculty member. The Associate Dean of Arts & Sciences will join this meeting for Arts and Sciences Departments.

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Initial Appointment as, or Promotion to, Associate Professor with Tenure

A decision about tenure is immensely important both for the faculty member and the University. From the University's perspective, the award of tenure is an acknowledgement that the faculty member has a distinguished record of scholarly achievement and is recognized for it and is a demonstrably accomplished teacher. But it is also much more than that: it is an assertion that this is as strong an academic appointment as we can make, that we have every reason to believe that the individual will become a leader in the field, and that the outstanding work that the individual has accomplished up to the present will be continued after the award of tenure.

The key domains in which the candidate must be assessed are research and scholarship or creative work, teaching, and service. We expect faculty to have contributed to the life of their departments and the University more generally. The tenure case prepared by the department should constitute a thorough and *disinterested* assessment of strengths and weaknesses in these domains, leading to a recommendation.

A tenure case originates in the department in which the faculty member has (or will have) a primary appointment. In the case of a joint appointment, one department will have been identified as the primary department and is the prospective tenure home. Although a successful case will have gone through several stages of review (the department, the dean, the ad hoc committee, the provost, the board) the most critical and rigorous should be the first, where expert faculty judgment is brought to bear. *Where there is reasonable doubt about the candidate's distinction or future accomplishments, the department should not make a positive recommendation.*

For a candidate who already holds an untenured appointment in the department, the department's obligation is deeper and starts long before the formal tenure review. Annual reviews of performance should have given both the department and the candidate clear signals about progress. The third-year reappointment review is an especially important milestone. If these reviews suggest that the department would be unlikely to make a positive tenure recommendation, the chair should discuss this with the faculty member as early as possible, and the faculty member and the chair together should consider whether it is advisable to proceed to a formal review. Where there is a strong presumption of an unfavorable outcome, the faculty member may be ill-served by a formal review. The dean should be advised by the chair well in advance if there are concerns about whether a case will be put forth.

When a Case Should be Prepared

Internal Candidates. University regulations require that tenure-track faculty be notified one year in advance of the expiration of their current appointment whether or not we intend to renew that appointment. For those faculty who must be reviewed, departments will be alerted at least 9 months in advance of the required notification date. Cases are due in the Deans' Office no less than 6 months in advance of the notification date (typically January 1 201x for a June 30, 201x notification).

When an untenured faculty member has made exceptional early progress, the department may consider early promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. “Early promotion” specifically means a promotion case expected to conclude more than a year before the end of the faculty member’s tenure clock, including any extensions to that clock. The standards and procedures are exactly the same as in other tenure cases, and reviews will typically be undertaken on the normal cycle during the academic year. The department chair should discuss such a case formally with the dean before beginning a preliminary review and reach a consensus that the case for early promotion is strong. If tenure review is unsuccessful and there is time left on the candidate’s tenure clock, the faculty member will be eligible to be reviewed for tenure a second time at a later date. Promotion to Associate Professor without tenure will not be considered as an alternate outcome of an unsuccessful review for Promotion to Associate with Tenure.

External Candidates

Faculty candidates new to the University may be reviewed for tenure in one of the following ways:

1. Candidates may be hired pending a tenure review. The department should start work on the case as soon as it is clear that we expect to offer the candidate a position. These cases may or may not be completed and approved before the expected start date.
2. Candidates may be hired into a senior position for a designated period of service as associate or full professor. Review for tenure would be required in the appropriate timeline so the candidate receives notification of tenure one year before their appointment end date.
3. External candidates at the level of associate or full professor may be reviewed for tenure upon initial appointment. Specific guidelines and procedure as adopted by AS&E Faculty Council and the University Committee on Tenure and Privileges follow here:

Guidelines for Tenure Upon Appointment

Appointments made from outside the University to tenured positions require review by an ad hoc committee in precisely the same way as promotions within the University; this process may be initiated before the appointment begins or after a designated period of service as professor (associate or full) without tenure. If a position is not advertised to include the possibility of tenure upon appointment, the same process and supporting information is required as promotion with tenure within the university, to include teaching evaluations and external reviewer letters.

Departments within Arts, Sciences, and Engineering may offer the option of tenure upon initial appointment at the rank of associate or full professor for candidates who are identified and vetted through a faculty search approved by the relevant school dean and advertised as either:

1. An open-rank search where senior candidates whose achievements would make it appropriate to award them with tenure are identified. The search would be advertised as tenure upon appointment for qualified senior candidates.

OR

2. A senior level search advertised with the intent to hire a faculty member at the associate or full professor rank with tenure. The search would be advertised as tenure upon appointment for qualified candidates.

Only individuals already tenured at comparable institutions of higher learning or with commensurate credentials would be eligible for appointment with tenure. These candidates will be required to submit materials documenting their credentials upon application.

Applicants who apply to an open-rank search and are identified as senior level candidates during the review process will be asked to submit supporting materials upon invitation from the search committee.

Requests for evaluation of candidates from any individual or group external to the University of Rochester requires permission from the candidate.

Candidate application files will be made available for review to the appropriate faculty members in the department where tenure will reside. Those tenured faculty will then vote on the suitability of candidate(s) based on their having a distinguished record and qualities that indicate future success as a faculty member. For candidates being considered for the rank of full professor, beyond the vote for tenure taken by all tenured faculty, a separate vote is required by full professors on the level of the appointment. Where fewer than three faculty would be eligible to participate in a vote in the appropriate department, the department chair should consult with the relevant school dean for guidance in appointing committee members at the appropriate rank from outside the department. A candidate who fails to receive the support of the majority of the tenured faculty (at the appropriate rank) will be removed from the short list of candidates invited to campus.

Following campus visit and interviews, when the top candidate(s) has/have been selected, each of the tenured voting members of the department in which the candidate is seeking tenure will submit a letter that appraises the candidate's overall record and addresses the question of whether or not the candidate merits tenure, specifying reasons for the recommendation. When an offer is being requested for a full professor, letters from full professors (or from faculty of the appropriate rank outside the department if appointed to the committee) should additionally address the suitability of the candidate being appointed at the rank of full professor. These letters will be included in the candidate's dossier.

The dossier should be uploaded into the Box folder created by the director of faculty affairs for AS&E, for review by the relevant dean.

The dossier will consist of the following materials:

1. Candidate's application materials.
2. Letters from the AS&E tenured faculty at the appropriate rank in the department tenure would be granted in.
3. A narrative from the department chair in the hiring/tenuring department to capture the review process and recommendation of the faculty.
4. Because this process bypasses the standard evaluation using outside letters, this dossier must detail the manner in which suitability for a tenured appointment (using the criteria of scholarship, teaching and service) is demonstrated without obtaining outside letters. Both the letters from faculty and the chair's narrative should address this point. In addition, the chair's narrative should justify the choice not to follow the standard practice

of requesting outside letters. These justifications will be important considerations in the subsequent consideration of the Dean and should guide the deliberations of the Provost's ad hoc committee.

If the dean agrees with the recommendation that the candidate is tenurable on appointment and is otherwise acceptable, the candidate's dossier will be forwarded to the provost with a written recommendation from the relevant dean.

If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean will meet with the appropriate faculty body to discuss the candidate's readiness for tenure and general merit of the tenure case. In the event that the dean and the department fail to agree that the candidate merits appointment and tenure, the candidate will not be appointed to the position.

In the event that the dean and the department initially disagree although come to an agreement that the candidate merits appointment with tenure, the candidate's dossier will be forwarded to the provost. If the provost has reservations whether the candidate is tenurable or otherwise unacceptable, the provost and relevant dean will discuss the case in detail. If the provost and dean agree to proceed, the dean will suggest to the provost the names of individuals who might be asked to serve on an ad hoc committee to review the matter following normal procedures. The committee provides a written recommendation to the president and provost, who review this response and subsequently pass their own recommendation (when positive) to the Board of Trustees for final action at their next available meeting. If an offer is extended to the candidate after the provost and president's positive recommendation but before the Board of Trustees meet, the letter should indicate "pending approval at the next Board of Trustees meeting."

Postponement of Review

University family-friendly policies outlined in the Faculty Handbook provide for the automatic postponement of promotion or tenure review by a year if a faculty member becomes a new parent. New parent is defined as the father, mother, or legal guardian of a newborn or adopted child up to the age of 18 years at the time of adoption. If an individual becomes a new parent for a second time, a second one-year postponement of the review will automatically be given for a maximum of two one-year postponements. Should the faculty member wish to waive the automatic postponement, the individual should notify the department chair as soon as possible in writing.

While the postponement is automatic, it is essential that the department chair be informed by the faculty member of such a postponement, and that the chair notify the deans' office. The deans' office also needs to be informed if a faculty member opts not to postpone the review.

A faculty member may also request a postponement of promotion or tenure review by one year if health or personal problems impose severe burdens on their progress. Requests need to be considered within one year of the occurrence of the special circumstance. These requests are made through the department chair, to the dean and then the provost for decision.

Due to uncertainties in teaching and limitations on scholarship and research activities resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, the Provost in consultation with the Deans has approved an automatic one-year tenure clock extension for pre-tenure faculty, who were employed at the University of Rochester as of Fall 2021. Due to the extenuating circumstances of the pandemic, this one-year tenure extension will be allowed in addition to time allotted for family friendly or health or personal problems.

Preliminary Review of the Case

The case should be developed by a formally constituted *ad hoc* committee appointed by the department chair from among the tenured members of the department, or by the tenured faculty acting as a committee of the whole. An *ad hoc* committee should generally not include faculty members with whom the candidate has collaborated or been especially closely associated. Where fewer than three faculty would be eligible for service, the chair should consult the dean about the possible appointment of committee members from outside the department. When the faculty member holds a joint appointment in another department or program, or another school of the University, the committee should ensure that an assessment from that unit is part of the dossier and is discussed in its report. The assessment should evaluate the contributions made by the faculty member to the other department or program.

The committee should obtain:

- An up-to-date C.V. that includes information about types of publications (refereed, invited, reviewed, etc.), talks (and whether invited), grant support (agency, dates, amount), formal teaching, graduate students in training, departmental and professional service. For faculty in the creative and performing arts, the C.V. should provide information about types of exhibitions (solo, group, juried).
- COVID statement (no more than 1 page). This statement will help the committee to understand any obstacles that faculty have faced due to the pandemic and how they navigated through them. Reappointment portfolios are internal to the department and school deans' office. For reappointment, this statement would only be seen by the department faculty and the school dean's office. For tenure and promotion, this statement would be seen by the department faculty, the school dean's office, and the Provost's ad hoc committee. This statement should include any impact the pandemic has had on research, teaching, service, infrastructure or financial constraints, and obligations including child and elder care.
- Research and Scholarship Portfolio
 - Research and Scholarship Statement (3-5 pages): this document should describe the research/scholarly projects undertaken during your time at the University of Rochester. Include any broader impacts that your research has had, including connections to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
 - Research and Scholarship Plans (1-2 pages): describe your plans for future research/scholarly projects during the next 5 years.
 - Research and Scholarship Support: provide a list of all funding applications, including successful and pending. For those that have been awarded, include faculty role, dollar amount, and time period.
 - Copies of relevant publications or works (for fields involving artistic production, these may be prints, slides or electronic media). In the case of books not yet in print, the manuscript plus publisher's reader reviews (when available) should be provided.
- Teaching Portfolio
 - Pedagogical Statement (2-3 pages): this document should include a description of your approach to pedagogy, with an emphasis on innovation in education (e.g.,

course development, re-design, inclusive teaching practices, creating student research opportunities, etc.). If relevant, please also discuss how your work intersects with other departments/schools within the university. Include a discussion of any ways in which your practices promote inclusive teaching, learning, and mentoring.

- Provide a list of undergraduate and graduate students directed.
- Teaching Evaluations: include numerical curriculum evaluations as well as any student comments, observational evaluations by peers, the department chair or departmental P&T committee chair. The teaching portfolio can include letters of evaluation by peers, the department chair or departmental P&T committee chair.
- Syllabi for each course taught.
- Service Statement (1-3 pages). This statement should contain a discussion of internal (department, School, University) and external (field, community) service contributions, including those that promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- (For internal candidates) A copy of the reappointment review. This is the letter provided to the faculty member from the department chair at the time of his/her reappointment review. This is not required for promotion to the rank of full professor.
- If the faculty candidate has a joint appointment in another department within or outside AS&E, the chair of the primary department needs to request a letter from the joint appointment chair/director to express support of promotion to the next rank in that department. This will allow faculty appointments to remain in alignment when possible.

If a provisional review of the documents suggests there might be a case for tenure, the committee (if not a committee of the whole) should indicate to the chair that it is prepared to obtain outside evaluations from distinguished referees, and the chair should decide if a meeting of tenured faculty is necessary before letters are sought.

If the committee recommends against proceeding with further consideration of tenure, it should prepare a report that explains its recommendation, and this should be brought to the tenured faculty for discussion and vote (see below).

External Letters

The principal purpose of the letters is to establish the importance and impact of the candidate's contributions to the field, and the standing of the candidate among their peers. It is therefore vitally important that this assessment be impartial and informed. Letters from six to eight qualified referees will generally be sufficient.

To maximize the value of the letters:

- The committee should identify a core set of referees. This set should be large enough to yield six to eight letters. The candidate should not be consulted in forming this list.
- The candidate should be invited to provide a list of referees considered best qualified to review the case. The committee may add to its core set as many new names from the candidate's list as it considers appropriate, though it is not obliged to add any. Letters obtained from referees not in the core set should be clearly identified.

- The candidate should be asked if there are individuals who are considered inappropriate to consult because of a potential conflict of interest. If individuals are identified, reasons should be given. The committee is not obliged to follow a veto recommendation it considers inappropriate.
- Letters should generally be sought from distinguished senior figures in the field, and generally from research universities or academic institutions of comparable standing (e.g., research or arts institutes, conservatories) in this country or abroad. In Engineering, one or two letters may be provided from industry. Those asked to write should represent a broad enough sampling of the discipline that the committee can assess the larger significance of the candidate's work in the discipline as a whole. Letters should not be sought from persons of more junior rank than the candidate, and generally not from persons recently tenured.
- Letters should generally not be sought from persons with whom the candidate is connected in a way that might lead to the appearance of conflict of interest; this includes graduate and postdoctoral mentors. Where the committee considers it valuable that letters be obtained from collaborators (for example, to help understand the contribution made by the candidate to a collaboration) it may seek additional letters (beyond the core of six to eight). Any such letters should be clearly distinguished from the others.
- Case materials should include a detailed summary table of external referees contacted for external letters, including if they were suggested by the candidate, and their relationship to the candidate either current or past (if any), as well as the reason a referee was unable to provide a letter if applicable. A template table is provided for departments on the AS&E Intranet.

The invitation to evaluate a candidate should be phrased carefully:

- It should make clear our standards for a tenured appointment.
- It should invite comment on specific strengths and weaknesses, and on the impact of the candidate's work in the field.
- It should invite explicit comparison of the candidate with individuals in the same field at similar stages in their careers.
- It should invite comment on the candidate's suitability for promotion to *tenure*. **It should not reference the possibility of promotion without tenure.** The department may ultimately recommend promotion without tenure, but external reviewers should not be asked to comment on it.
- It should not contain language that suggests a preferred outcome, or that the department has a position on the candidate's case.
- It should invite reviewers to comment on the quality of the candidate's teaching if they know about it. Reviewers should not be provided with our internal teaching assessments or be asked to comment on them.

Evaluators should be provided with copies of the material the department uses for its assessment, with the exception of teaching evaluations. Evaluators should always receive the candidate's full

C.V., the report on career to date and plans for the future, and copies of (or a link to) relevant published works. Each evaluator should be asked to provide their own C.V.

A model letter is provided as an Appendix to this document. **No letter seeking comment on a promotion or tenure case should be sent to an external referee without the text having been approved by the relevant dean.** Effective fall 2020, the external letter template contains an addendum to include possible impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.

If an external referee is found to have, or identifies himself or herself as having, a conflict of interest, the reference letter should be included in the dossier with an explanatory note. If this results in fewer than six letters being available, additional letter(s) should be sought.

Assessment

The committee should evaluate the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching, the quality of the contributions in research or creative works, and the significance of service to the department, the University, and the profession at large.

Scholarship. The case should answer whether, in national (or potentially international) comparison with individuals at similar points in their careers, the candidate is among the strongest in their field. The committee should comment on productivity in relation to norms for the field, but most of all should provide a disinterested analysis of the quality of the candidate's work and its impact on the field. External letters will provide crucial information on this. Where work is published in journals or books, the committee should comment on the standing of the journals or book publishers. Where relevant, the committee should assess the candidate's success in securing grants in relation to norms for the field. Where the candidate's work involves substantial collaboration with others, the committee should assess the weight of the candidate's contribution to the work. The committee should also comment on any broader impacts of the candidate's work, including connections to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Teaching. The committee should review and summarize contributions to teaching, analyzing strengths and weaknesses in undergraduate and (where relevant) graduate courses, and providing an overall assessment of the candidate's contributions to the department's programs as a whole. Where weaknesses are identified, the committee should comment on what steps have been taken to remedy them. The committee should also comment on the candidate's mentoring of undergraduates in independent study, and on their performance as a graduate advisor as well as any practices that promote inclusive teaching, learning, and mentoring.

Service. The committee should comment on the candidate's general service to the department, their willingness to share the departmental workload, and the assumption of any special responsibility. Where the candidate has provided distinctive service elsewhere in the University or to the profession outside the University, this should also be discussed. The committee should also comment on any broader impacts of the candidate's service, including those that promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The committee's primary task is to assess the case for promotion to *tenure*. If the committee establishes that (for an internal candidate) there is not yet a sufficiently strong case for tenure, but that the trajectory is strong, that a little more time will probably result in a strong case for promotion to tenure, and that *extenuating factors account for unusually slow progress*, it may consider recommending promotion to associate professor without tenure.

Recommendation and Department Vote

The department's examination of the case should lead to a formal written report and recommendation to the dean. The report should provide the assessment described above and should also discuss the outside evaluators (who was asked to write and why, who declined to write and why), comment on their distinction in the field, and provide CVs or biographical information.

If the case has been examined by an *ad hoc* committee, the committee should make its recommendation in a formal written report that will be discussed and voted on by all tenured faculty in the department. The full report, together with the material on which it is based, should be available for inspection and read by the tenured faculty before the discussion and vote. The case should be discussed fully at a meeting of the tenured faculty. Faculty members who have reservations about, or expect to dissent from, the recommendation of the committee should be encouraged to discuss their views openly.

If the case has been examined by a committee of all tenured faculty, the report may be prepared by the chair after the faculty have discussed the case and taken a vote. The report should capture the spectrum of faculty opinion on the case.

The department's vote should be taken by secret ballot. Tenured members of the faculty who are unable to participate in the discussion should review the dossier and vote separately. Every eligible faculty member should also comment individually on the case in a letter to the chair that will be forwarded to the dean. The letter should make clear which elements of the case the faculty member thought important in reaching their decision.

Where the report of an *ad hoc* committee forms the foundation of the department's recommendation to the dean, the chair should summarize the subsequent faculty discussion and vote in a letter when forwarding the full dossier to the dean. If any eligible faculty members have not voted on a case, this should be explained. If not already explicit in the committee's report, the chair's letter should discuss the standards to be exceeded by a successful tenure case in the discipline. This should particularly explain the context for evaluation of scholarship and comment on any practices that are special to the discipline. The chair's letter should also explain how the department weighs contributions in teaching, scholarship and service, and should make clear how the case exceeds or falls short of the standard in each area and overall. The chair's personal evaluation should be conveyed in a separate letter, or clearly delimited within the chair's letter from the departmental processes and summary. The chair's letter need not provide verbatim quotes from the external referees, or replicate information from elsewhere in the dossier.

Promotion and tenure materials are uploaded to a department/faculty member folder created by the Deans' office and shared within BOX. When the department completes upload of the materials, the Deans' office will remove departmental access so that the dean may review and further advance (if favorable) the case to the Provost's office for organization of an *ad hoc* committee or standing committee (for cases without tenure) for review. In the case of promotion from associate professor with tenure to full professor with tenure, the Provost will review following dean approval (without an *ad hoc* committee).

If the department's recommendation is positive, the chair may verbally inform the candidate that the case has been sent to the relevant dean with a favorable recommendation. If the department's recommendation is negative, the chair should not communicate the department's recommendation to the candidate until the dean has reviewed the dossier. In cases where the

decision may be negative, the dean should be apprised, through discussions and prior written documentation (e.g., CEF-chair evaluation of faculty) well in advance that this might be a possible outcome.

Initial Appointment as, or Promotion to, Professor

The University's standard for appointment as Professor is that a tenured faculty member has become “a senior authority in the country, a valuable teacher and an important contributor to the school or University or both.”

The case for initial appointment as Professor for someone from outside the University is prepared exactly as would be a case for tenure (above) unless the process described (above) for initial appointment with tenure is followed.

- Requests for letters should make appropriate reference to our standards for appointment (model letter provided in the appendix).
- Beyond the vote on tenure (taken by all tenured faculty) a separate vote is required by Professors on the level of the appointment.

The case for an internal promotion to Professor is also developed in the same way, except that:

- Only Professors may be involved in the assessment.

Appendix: Model Letters

The following four model letters cover the principal cases for which it is important to secure external letters: promotion of an internal candidate to Associate Professor with tenure; appointing an external candidate to Associate Professor with tenure; promotion of an internal candidate to Professor; appointing an external candidate to Professor with tenure.

Associate Professor with Tenure [internal candidate]

Dear _____:

_____, currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of _____, is being considered for promotion and tenure. I am writing to ask your help in assessing Professor XXX's contributions to the field.

Evaluations by distinguished scholars outside the University are an indispensable part of the review, and I would be very grateful for your frank analysis of the candidate's research and scholarly achievements, their impact, and your prediction of future contributions to the field. Within Arts, Sciences and Engineering, the awarding of tenure affirms that we expect the individual to become a leader in their field, and that outstanding work that the individual has accomplished up to the present will be continued after tenure.

If you are able to advise us, it would be especially helpful if your letter could address the following, commenting on both strengths and weaknesses:

- The originality and impact of Professor XXX's scholarship and research, and their productivity.
- The standing of Professor XXX in relation to other individuals of comparable standing in their careers in the same field.
- A judgment on whether Professor XXX would be likely to receive tenure in a leading department in their field.

The internal tenure review will also include discussion of teaching and service. If you know about Professor XXX's service to the profession, or about their teaching, I would welcome your comments on these.

If you know Professor XXX, please indicate in your letter how long you have known them and in what capacity.

I enclose Professor XXX's *curriculum vitae* with a list of publications, a summary of current research and future plans, and selected publications. If you would like copies of any other of their published or unpublished works, please let me know.

The tenure regulations of Arts, Sciences & Engineering at the University of Rochester provide for review for promotion during or before the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor. The actual timing may vary depending on personal circumstances, including possible extensions of the tenure clock due to family or medical leave, however the criteria for promotion and tenure remain the same for all faculty regardless of their length of service.

Your evaluation should consider the quality of the work and the impact on the field rather than the quantity, rate, or timeliness of the accomplishments - particularly given the COVID-19 pandemic effects (refer to the addendum below).

I realize that this request may be an imposition on your time, but, as you know, assessments of the kind we hope you will be able to provide are essential components of a proper tenure review.

I thank you in advance for your willingness to help us and hope you will be able to reply by _____. Your reply will, of course, remain confidential within our review process.

Please acknowledge receipt of this correspondence. If for any reason you are unable to provide an evaluation letter for Professor XXX's tenure case, please let me know. The promotion record will be noted to reflect your response.

In preparing a tenure review the department is expected to provide biographical information about referees. If a comprehensive curriculum vitae is not available on your institutional website, I would be very grateful if you could send one by email with your letter.

Sincerely,

XXXX

Addendum:

There are many possible impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic that began in 2020, including but not limited to the following examples. We ask that you consider these when providing evaluation of the faculty candidate being reviewed.

- Research labs at the University of Rochester were shut down in March 2020 and re-opened with limited capacity beginning (approximately) June 2020.
- There has been an absence of conference invitations and reduced ability for faculty to give symposia and other types of scholarly and research presentations.
- There have been restrictions on travel, preventing field research.
- At the beginning of the pandemic, faculty startup funds and equipment orders were frozen; lab renovations were put on hold; and restrictions were placed on Human Subjects Research.
- Libraries were shut down from March 2020 through June 2020; they opened with limited service beginning June 2020.
- There was a need for on-line delivery of classes during the 2020-21 and 2021-22 academic years, which was time consuming.
- K-12 schools in Rochester, NY pivoted to distance learning from March 2020 through the end of the spring; in fall 2020, some K-12 schools in the Rochester, NY region were fully remote and some operated in a hybrid mode, with between 2 and 4 days a week in person and the remaining days remote.
- Many childcare centers were shut down from March 2020; they slowly reopened during the summer of 2020.
- Faculty dealt with family and health issues throughout the pandemic.

Associate Professor with Tenure [external candidate]

Dear _____:

The Department of XXXX at the University of Rochester is in the process of searching for a colleague who has strengths in XXXXXX. The intent is to fill the position at the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure.

_____, currently a {rank} of X at Y University, is being considered as a candidate for this position. I am writing to ask your help in assessing Professor XXX's contributions to the field. Evaluations by distinguished scholars outside the University are an indispensable part of the review, and I would be very grateful for your frank analysis of the candidate's research and scholarly achievements, their impact, and your prediction of future contributions to the field. Within Arts, Sciences and Engineering, the awarding of tenure affirms that we expect the individual to become a leader in their field, and that outstanding work that the individual has accomplished up to the present will be continued after tenure.

If you are able to advise us, it would be especially helpful if your letter could address the following, commenting on both strengths and weaknesses:

- The originality and impact of Professor XXX's scholarship and research, and their productivity.
- The standing of Professor XXX in relation to other individuals of comparable standing in their careers in the same field.
- A judgment on whether Professor XXX would be likely to receive tenure in a leading department in their field.

The internal tenure review will also include discussion of teaching and service. If you know about Professor XXX's service to the profession, or about Professor XXX's teaching, I would welcome your comments on these.

If you know Professor XXX, please indicate in your letter how long you have known them and in what capacity.

I enclose Professor XXX's *curriculum vitae* with a list of publications, a summary of current research and future plans, and selected publications. If you would like copies of any other published or unpublished works, please let me know.

I realize that this request may be an imposition on your time, but, as you know, assessments of the kind we hope you will be able to provide are essential components of a proper tenure review.

Please acknowledge receipt of this correspondence. If for any reason you are unable to provide an evaluation letter for Professor XXX's tenure case, please let me know. The promotion record will be noted to reflect your response.

I thank you in advance for your willingness to help us and hope you will be able to reply by _____. Your reply will, of course, remain confidential within our review process.

In preparing a tenure review the department is expected to provide biographical information about referees. If a comprehensive curriculum vitae is not available on your institutional website, I would be very grateful if you could send one by email with your letter.

Sincerely,

XXXX

Professor [internal candidate]

Dear _____:

_____, currently an Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of ____, is being considered for promotion to Professor. I am writing to ask your help in assessing Professor XXX's contributions to the field. Evaluations by distinguished scholars outside the University are an indispensable part of the review, and I would be very grateful for your frank analysis of the candidate's research and scholarly achievements, their impact, and your prediction of future contributions to the field. Within Arts, Sciences and Engineering, promotion to Professor acknowledges that the individual has an established record of outstanding work and has become a leading authority in their field.

If you are able to advise us, it would be especially helpful if your letter could address the following, commenting on both strengths and weaknesses:

- The originality and impact of Professor XXX's scholarship, research, and productivity.
- The standing of Professor XXX in relation to other individuals of comparable standing in their careers in the same field.
- A judgment on whether Professor XXX would be a strong candidate for appointment as Professor in a leading department in their field.

The internal review will also include discussion of teaching and service. If you know about Professor XXX's service to the profession, or about Professor XXX's teaching, I would welcome your comments on these.

If you know Professor XXX, please indicate in your letter how long you have known them and in what capacity.

I enclose Professor XXX's *curriculum vitae* with a list of publications, a summary of current research and future plans, and selected publications. If you would like copies of any other published or unpublished works, please let me know.

Your evaluation should consider the quality of the work and the impact on the field rather than the quantity, rate, or timeliness of the accomplishments - particularly given the COVID-19 pandemic effects (refer to addendum below).

I realize that this request may be an imposition, on your time but, as you know, assessments of the kind we hope you will be able to provide are essential components of a proper review.

Please acknowledge receipt of this correspondence. If for any reason you are unable to provide an evaluation letter for Professor XXX's promotion case, please let me know. The promotion record will be noted to reflect your response.

I thank you in advance for your willingness to help us and hope you will be able to reply by _____. Your reply will, of course, remain confidential within our review process.

In preparing a case for review the department is expected to provide biographical information about referees. If a comprehensive curriculum vitae is not available on your institutional website, I would be very grateful if you could send one by email with your letter.

Sincerely,

XXXX

Addendum:

There are many possible impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic that began in 2020, including but not limited to the following examples. We ask that you consider these when providing evaluation of the faculty candidate being reviewed.

- Research labs at the University of Rochester were shut down in March 2020 and re-opened with limited capacity beginning (approximately) June 2020.
- There has been an absence of conference invitations and reduced ability for faculty to give symposia and other types of scholarly and research presentations.
- There have been restrictions on travel, preventing field research.
- At the beginning of the pandemic, faculty startup funds and equipment orders were frozen; lab renovations were put on hold; and restrictions were placed on Human Subjects Research.
- Libraries were shut down from March 2020 through June 2020; they opened with limited service beginning June 2020.
- There was a need for on-line delivery of classes during the 2020-21 and 2021-22 academic years, which was time consuming.
- K-12 schools in Rochester, NY pivoted to distance learning from March 2020 through the end of the spring; in fall 2020, some K-12 schools in the Rochester, NY region were fully remote and some operated in a hybrid mode, with between 2 and 4 days a week in person and the remaining days remote.
- Many childcare centers were shut down from March 2020; they slowly reopened during the summer of 2020.
- Faculty dealt with family and health issues throughout the pandemic.

Professor [external candidate]

Dear _____:

The Department of XXXX at the University of Rochester is in the process of searching for a colleague who has strengths in XXXXXX. The intent is to fill the position at the rank of Professor with Tenure.

_____, currently a {rank} of X at Y University, is being considered as a candidate for this position. I am writing to ask your help in assessing Professor XXX's contributions to the field. Evaluations by distinguished scholars outside the University are an indispensable part of the review, and I would be very grateful for your frank analysis of the candidate's research and scholarly achievements, their impact, and your prediction of future contributions to the field. Within Arts, Sciences and Engineering, promotion to Professor acknowledges that the individual has an established record of outstanding work and has become a leading authority in their field.

If you are able to advise us, it would be especially helpful if your letter could address the following, commenting on both strengths and weaknesses:

- The originality and impact of Professor XXX's scholarship, research, and productivity.
- The standing of Professor XXX in relation to other individuals of comparable standing in their careers in the same field.
- A judgment on whether Professor XXX would be a strong candidate for appointment as Professor in a leading department in their field.

The internal review will also include discussion of teaching and service. If you know about Professor XXX's service to the profession, or about their teaching, I would welcome your comments on these.

If you know Professor XXX, please indicate in your letter how long you have known them and in what capacity.

I enclose Professor XXX's *curriculum vitae* with a list of publications, a summary of current research and future plans, and selected publications. If you would like copies of any other published or unpublished works, please let me know.

I realize that this request may be an imposition on your time, but, as you know, assessments of the kind we hope you will be able to provide are essential components of a proper review.

Please acknowledge receipt of this correspondence. If for any reason you are unable to provide an evaluation letter for Professor XXX's promotion case, please let me know. The promotion record will be noted to reflect your response.

I thank you in advance for your willingness to help us and hope you will be able to reply by _____. Your reply will, of course, remain confidential within our review process.

In preparing a case for review the department is expected to provide biographical information about referees. If a comprehensive curriculum vitae is not available on your institutional website, I would be very grateful if you could send one by email with your letter.

Sincerely,

XXXX