

# University of Pittsburgh

## Department of Geology & Environmental Science

### General Criteria and Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion

#### Contents

General Criteria and Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion .....	2
Associate Professor .....	2
1.0 Required Dossier Materials.....	2
2.0 Benchmarks for promotion .....	5
3.0 Mentoring committee.....	6
4.0 Periodic Review .....	6
5.0 Tenure Policies .....	7
Professor .....	8
1.0 Required Dossier Materials .....	8
2.0 Benchmarks for promotion .....	10
3.0 Assistance of Senior Colleagues; Decisions on Appointment and Promotion .....	11
4.0 Length of time to promotion .....	12
5.0 Periodic Review .....	12

# General Criteria and Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion

The Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences and the University have established the following minimum criteria for each of the tenure-stream ranks. The Department of Geology and Environmental Science builds on those criteria and guidelines in this document. Faculty must demonstrate the ability to meet program needs and fulfill their share of program needs and fulfilling their share of department responsibilities.

## Associate Professor

In accordance with University guidelines, a candidate for promotion to associate professor will have substantial experience in teaching and research and show a capacity and will to maintain teaching effectiveness and the ability for continuing growth as a teacher, scholar, and member of their profession. They should also have progressed in attaining eminence in their field. Tenure is awarded for demonstrated excellence together with the promise of continued excellence in scholarship. An associate professor must display consistently excellent performance in course and curriculum planning, in guiding and counseling students and junior faculty members, and in participating in the activities of the University.

An Assistant Professor is initially appointed to a three-year appointment. After a positive third-year review, the faculty member is appointed for an additional 3 years. By the sixth year of the Tenure Clock, the faculty member must be evaluated for tenure. There are numerous modifications to this timeline detailed in the faculty handbook. In general, the clock is extended rather than shortened. Faculty members seeking an earlier tenure decision should carefully consider this decision with their mentoring committee, the Department Chair, and tenured faculty.

## 1.0 Required Dossier Materials

As indicated in the DSAS document “*Department Guide for Preparing Internal Promotion Dossiers*”, the dossier is compiled by the Candidate and the Department Chair with assistance from the Department Coordinator.

### 1.1 Dossier Items provided by the faculty member:

1. *Curriculum Vitae*: The CV includes: education, professional appointments, publication list, conference abstracts, sponsored projects, honors and awards, courses taught, PhD and Masters students advised, undergraduate students supervised, service on department, university and professional organizations, and other indications of professional service.
2. *Personal Statement*: The Personal statement (5-8 pages) is a document that describes the faculty's professional interests, accomplishments, goals in research, teaching, and service, including widening participation in the geosciences. It should include scholarly contributions and directions of future scholarship. It should also address specific details in teaching accomplishments and future teaching plans. It may also include the translational/societal impact of the research/scholarship/creative activity, particularly

efforts to address the continued lack of diversity in geoscience communities. The goal of the research portion of this statement is to express the questions driving the candidate's research and outline what the candidate perceives as their fundamental research contributions. How are they advancing their field of study, and why? The statement should be written in language that is understandable by non-experts. Please note this personal statement can be organized as the Candidate wishes, for example broken into a Research Statement and a Teaching Statement.

3. *List of 5-10 published manuscripts included in the dossier that best reflect the quality and impact of their research for the period under review.* Provide electronic copies of each of these.
4. *List of all manuscripts submitted for publication (i.e., in review):* Provide electronic copies of each of these.
5. *List of 6 recommended letter writers:* The annotated list must include: 1) Name; 2) Title; 3) Institution; 4) Brief summary of expertise; 5) Why they were selected; 6) Marks of distinction; 7) Arm's length status, with brief explanation of professional links or working relationship to candidate.
6. *List of biased letter writers (optional):* The candidate can identify individuals who they believe will not provide an unbiased evaluation of their work.
7. *List of Grant Support for the period under review:* While this document will be duplicative of material that should be included in the CV, the candidate should provide both to eliminate any potential for confusion by letter writers, ad hoc committee members, and/or Dean/Provost level decision makers.
8. *OMETs:* All OMET reports for the period under review, including comments and summary sheets, should be compiled into a single PDF document and included in the dossier.
9. *Response to Student and Peer Evaluations (optional):* Assessment is imperfect and often reflects dimensions not central to scholarly content and teaching effectiveness. If there are issues important to the candidate's evaluations (e.g., the demonstrated underscoring for women/under-represented minority instructors). This document is an opportunity to formally address these issues and document perceived bias, etc.
10. *Teaching materials:* Candidates should include syllabi and example teaching materials for each course taught while an assistant professor at the university. At least one of these courses should be a graduate course. Likewise, one of these courses should be an undergraduate course.

### 1.2 Promotion dossier materials provided by the Department Chair:

1. *Department Chair's Cover letter:* The letter should be a summary of the case for non-specialists such as the members of the *ad hoc* Review Committee. It includes 1) a statement as to whether tenure timelines have been accelerated or extended, 2) a clear sense of candidate's scholarly contribution and impact on future scholarship focusing on what is new/significant, 3) specifics regarding the nature of the candidate's impact on their scholarly field, 4) description of the candidate's research specialty area and how it fits into the department's teaching and research programs and long-term goals, 5) an explanation for all negative or abstaining votes by the faculty (if known), 6) acknowledgement and evaluation of every significant critique or shortcoming that is pointed out by external reviewers or faculty members, along with a statement of why the chair/faculty either disagrees with the critique or finds it appropriate but not a deterrent to the promotion, 7) the candidate's achievements in pedagogy (active learning, scaffolding, skill building, etc.) and evaluations (OMETs, peer evaluations etc.), 8) candidate's service contribution, particularly focused on quality (not only its quantity), 9)

documentation of the candidate's progress and the feedback they received with the aid of the Chair's annual letters of evaluation, 10) brief summary and/or excerpts from the external review letters, 11) the numerical vote by the faculty, 12) a summary of faculty deliberations and conclusions concerning the candidate's performance, 13) the Chair's personal recommendation regarding tenure.

2. *Course Enrollment sheet*: The department will request teaching sheets from the data team directly.
3. *Department Guidelines on Tenure*
4. *Annual Evaluations*: A copy of all annual evaluation letters received by the candidate for the period under review.
5. *Third Year Review Letter*: A copy of the third year review letter sent to the candidate.
6. *Letter of Solicitation to External Referees*: A template of the letter sent to external referees must be included in the dossier.
7. *Full External referee list*: The annotated list must include: 1) Name; 2) Title; 3) Institution; 4) Brief summary of expertise; 5) Why they were selected; 6) Marks of distinction; 7) By whom they were selected (candidate or department); 8) Arm's length status, including brief explanation of professional links or working relationship to candidate (e.g. Professional acquaintance, Collaborator/Co-Investigator/Co-Author, (Former) Mentor/Advisor, Dissertation Committee Chair/Member, etc.). 9) Any additional insight for selection as an external reviewer (e.g., Editor-in-Chief, distinguished faculty in discipline, university administrator, center director, AAAS fellow, National Academies of Sciences....) should be included.
8. *External Referee Letters*: The selection of external referees is extremely important to the strength of a department's recommendation concerning promotion and tenure. The selection process should be objective and fair, and it should be well documented. Letters of external review should be solicited from scholars who are arms-length from the candidate, excluding former advisors, co-authors/co-editors, research collaborators, and current/former colleagues. When this is not possible or feasible as, for example, in a new or emerging field of study, an explanation should be provided in the dossier. At least six letters of recommendation from external referees are required, however in most DSAS disciplines nine to twelve letters may be required to build an effective dossier. GES typically requests 12-18 letters to ensure enough are received. All requests sent out must detail the response (yes/no/why not) or lack of response.
9. *Documentation of teaching effectiveness*: A minimum of three peer instruction review letters written in separate academic years. Ideally these will be from at least two different faculty peers, though a series of reviews by the same person can help to assess improvement. Letters from students have not been a part of recent GES candidate dossiers. If these become part of the dossier in the future, the solicitation should be systematic (e.g., all graduate students from a given course) and, if current students are included, the anonymity of the students must be protected. *Under no circumstances should the candidate solicit letters from their students.*
10. *Ballots/Faculty Vote*: All promotions must be put to a vote by the departmental faculty. Eligible faculty members who are not able to attend a particular meeting may vote as long as they have reviewed the dossier and been informed of the deliberations of the faculty. The individual votes must be anonymous within the department, regardless of the format used to vote (paper vs. electronic). However, Dean requires knowledge of the votes in order to assess any negative votes or abstentions. GES will use a voting system with ballots that are uniquely numbered in advance, and a key will be sent to the Chair and the Dean's Office.

## 2.0 Benchmarks for promotion

Tenure is based on evaluation of scholarship, teaching, and service by outside letter writers, department colleagues, and *ad hoc* committees at both the Dietrich school and University level that make recommendations to the Dean and Provost, respectively. Quantitative measures of productivity and popularity, however useful, are no substitutes for qualitative judgments. Evaluations of the candidate's record of achievement will be used primarily to judge future promise. Because of this, there is no checklist of tasks that can guarantee tenure. However, there are benchmarks that if met, help tenure candidates to solidify their experience and recognition in their respective fields.

### *Funding*

Successful candidates for tenure in GES between 2012 and 2023 acquired at least one peer reviewed grant (NSF, NASA, DOE). Funding from diverse sources is considered beneficial. It is critical that the candidate demonstrates the ability to sustain external funding to support their research program and the students they advise, particularly PhD students.

### *Publications*

Candidates for tenure are expected to show they have established their own research portfolio by publications in prominent journals that are increasingly independent of graduate and postdoctoral work (i.e., based on work performed at Pitt by the candidate's research mentees with funding secured by the candidate). There is no specific minimum number of publications or H-index that is required because these metrics are different in different subfields. However, relevant benchmarks to consider (i.e., ranges for successful GES tenure candidates between 2012 and 2023) are 15-35 total publications in prominent journals in their field with an h-index of ~12 on e.g., Google Scholar. Scholarly manuscripts, and their recognition in the field (i.e., number of citations) are directly related to the ability of outside letter writers to recognize the quality, importance, and impact of a tenure candidate's scholarly work in comparison to the work of others in their discipline at a comparable stage in career. Steady publication rates in highly respected journals, ideally increasing in the proportion of papers/year that resulted from the research program established at Pitt rather than from previous positions indicate a strong research program that is likely to continue.

### *Graduate student mentorship*

The success of the graduate students a tenure candidate has trained is a direct measure of their success. The department has clear expectations for graduate students and their advisors that are summarized in the department graduate student handbook. Successful GES tenure candidates between 2012 and 2023 typically had at least one student that had reached PhD candidate status (i.e., passed their comprehensive overview) and several additional graduate students in their research group. Graduate students in the candidate's research group with lead author publications is also looked upon favorably as a hallmark of mentoring excellence.

### *Undergraduate student mentorship*

Undergraduate mentorship, and undergraduate authors on publications are viewed positively by the department, external letter writers, and DSAS *ad hoc* committee members.

### *Service*

Junior faculty in the Department of Geology & Environmental Science are generally expected to spend approximately 10% of their work effort on service to the Department, College, University, and Discipline/Professional Organizations. The category of service can include the advising and mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students outside the classroom (e.g., directed studies, honors theses, PhD dissertations, comprehensive exams, undergraduate research projects not part of a faculty member's normal research).

### *External Review Letters*

Evaluation of these criteria at the school and university level tends to rely heavily upon external review letters. Letter requests are drawn from lists generated by both the candidate and the department. In general, a stronger tenure case will have the vast majority of letter requests fulfilled with positive evaluations of the Candidate's research program. Typically, roughly twice the minimum number of letters required are requested with the majority of the requests from the department list of reviewers. As noted in the DSAS criteria for promotion, care should be taken to establish achievement expectations for tenure for candidates whose work is interdisciplinary, collaborative, multidisciplinary or translational in character, or whose intellectual contributions and innovation are registered in part through significant societal impact, and evaluation processes should take account of unusual aspects of those expectations. For some cases, departmental tenure evaluation committees may need to bring in additional expertise and/or calibrate expectations for external references to ensure that a candidate's full breadth of achievements is evaluated.

## **3.0 Mentoring committee**

New faculty hires are assigned a mentoring committee of two senior faculty colleagues who can best aid the faculty member with evaluating and reaching benchmarks needed to successfully achieve tenure. The mentoring committee has a formal meeting with the faculty member at least annually, but more frequent informal conversations regarding research and teaching goals are strongly encouraged.

Organic mentoring relationships are often very effective for young faculty. Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek out and cultivate mentorship from senior colleagues both in the department and beyond. These relationships should be developed in addition to the formally assigned mentors.

Invited talks at other academic institutions and conferences are great opportunities to build one's reputation as a scholar, build collaborations, have in-depth scientific conversations with potential letter writers and demonstrate recognition in one's field of study. Faculty members approaching tenure can reach out to colleagues at key institutions to indicate their willingness to give department seminars. In addition, it is recommended that the faculty member will give a GES department colloquium early in the fall semester that their tenure package is evaluated.

## **4.0 Periodic Review**

All faculty members submit a self-evaluation to the Department Chair at the end of each academic year. The Chair uses this and other materials to write a formal review of the faculty members' performance. For junior faculty, this is an opportunity to have the Department Chair review academic progress and goals and provide feedback during their initial 3-year appointment, and prior to the appointment renewal. The Chair also provides both encouragement and recommendations for the candidate as they progress towards tenure.

The initial three-year contract is followed by a formal review by the tenured faculty in the faculty member's third year, and if this review is positive, a second three-year appointment will be offered to the candidate. A decision to recommend a three-year contract normally means that the expectations that were developed at the time of hire are being fulfilled. Based on the evidence at hand, the tenured faculty members of the department have concluded that the individual is on a trajectory in teaching and research that is consistent with normal progress toward tenure.

It is not necessary or expected that outside reference letters be collected for the third-year review, but this review should otherwise take into account all factors upon which the faculty member will eventually be evaluated for tenure. The Chair's cover letter concerning reappointment should summarize the candidate's professional development as well as their teaching and scholarly contributions, along with the department's assessment of their quality and quantity in comparison with departmental standards as described above, and the process of evaluation. The formal review should be conducted and voted on by the entire tenured faculty of the department. The results of the evaluation, and especially any criticism and suggestions for corrective action, must be communicated clearly to the candidate in a meeting with the Department Chair, followed by a letter. The Chair's cover letter should include an anonymized tally of the faculty vote.

The faculty member will be advised of the timeline when decisions concerning renewal and tenure are to be made and submit material so as to assure adequate consideration of questions of renewal and tenure.

## 5.0 Tenure Policies

Conferral of tenure is made by the Chancellor and Chief Executive Officer. The Chancellor and Chief Executive Officer takes into account recommendations of the Provost. The University shall send to each new Member of the Faculty a letter setting forth the terms and conditions of his or her appointment.

Each newly-appointed Assistant Professor shall receive a copy of the department's *Guidelines on Tenure* (this document).

Faculty members are referred to the DSAS guidelines for appealing tenure decisions should they wish to do so.



## Professor

The rank of professor recognizes the attainment of authoritative knowledge and reputation in a recognized field of learning and the achievement of effective teaching skill. The professor should have attained superior stature in their field through research, writing, professional practice, or leadership in professional and learned organizations, as well as having exceeded the standards described for associate professor.

### 1.0 Required Dossier Materials

As indicated in the “*Department Guide for Preparing Internal Promotion Dossiers*”, the dossier is compiled by the Candidate and the Department Chair with assistance from the Department Coordinator.

#### 1.1 Dossier Items provided by the faculty member:

1. *Curriculum Vitae*: The CV includes: education, professional appointments, publication list, conference abstracts, sponsored projects, honors and awards, courses taught, PhD and Masters students advised, undergraduate students supervised, service on department, university and professional organizations, and other indications of professional service.
2. *Personal Statement*: The personal statement (5-8 pages) is a document that describes the faculty's professional interests, accomplishments, goals in research, teaching, and service, including widening participation in the geosciences. It should include scholarly contributions and directions of future scholarship. It should also address specific details in teaching accomplishments and future teaching plans. It may also include the translational/societal impact of the research/scholarship/creative activity, particularly efforts to address the continued lack of diversity in geoscience communities. The goal of the research portion of this statement is to express the questions driving the candidate's research and outline what the candidate perceives as their fundamental research contributions. How are they advancing their field of study? and why? The statement should be written in language that is understandable by non-experts. Please note this personal statement can be organized as the Candidate wishes, for example broken into a Research Statement and a Teaching Statement.
3. *List of 5-10 published manuscripts included in the dossier that best reflect the quality and impact of their research for the period under review*: Provide electronic copies of each of these.
4. *List of all manuscripts submitted for publication (i.e., in review)*: Provide electronic copies of each of these.
5. *List of 6 recommended letter writers*: The annotated list must include: 1) Name; 2) Title; 3) Institution; 4) Brief summary of expertise; 5) Why they were selected; 6) Marks of distinction; 7) Arm's length status, with brief explanation of professional links or working relationship to candidate.
6. *List of biased letter writers* (optional): The candidate can identify individuals who they believe will not provide an unbiased evaluation of their work.
7. *List of Grant Support for the period under review*: While this document will be duplicative of material that should be included in the CV, the candidate should



- provide both to eliminate any potential for confusion by letter writers, ad hoc committee members, and/or Dean/Provost level decision makers.
8. *OMETs*: At least three years of OMET reports for the period under review, including comments and summary sheets, should be compiled into a single PDF document and included in the dossier.
  9. *Response to Student and Peer Evaluations* (optional): Assessment is imperfect and often reflects dimensions not central to scholarly content and teaching effectiveness. If there are issues important to the candidate's evaluations (e.g., the demonstrated underscoring for women/under-represented minority instructors), this document is an opportunity to formally address these issues and document perceived bias, etc.
  10. *Teaching materials*: Candidates should include syllabi and example teaching materials for each course taught while an associate professor at the university. These should include both graduate and undergraduate courses.

### *1.2 Promotion dossier materials provided by the Department Chair:*

1. *Department Chair's Cover letter*: The letter should be a summary of the case for non-specialists such as the members of the *ad hoc* Review Committee. It includes:
  1. a statement as to whether promotion timelines have been accelerated or extended,
  2. a clear sense of candidate's scholarly contribution since the last promotion and impact on future scholarship focusing on what is new/significant,
  3. specifics regarding the nature of the candidate's impact on their scholarly field,
  4. description of the candidate's research specialty area and how it fits into the department's teaching and research programs and long-term goals,
  5. an explanation for all negative or abstaining votes by the faculty (if known),
  6. acknowledgement and evaluation of every significant critique or shortcoming that is pointed out by external reviewers or faculty members, along with a statement of why the chair/faculty either disagrees with the critique or finds it appropriate but not a deterrent to the promotion,
  7. the candidate's achievements in pedagogy (active learning, scaffolding, skill building, etc.) and evaluations (OMETs, peer evaluations, etc.),
  8. candidate's service contribution, particularly focused on quality (not only its quantity),
  9. documentation of the candidate's progress and the feedback they received with the aid of the Chair's annual letters of evaluation,
  10. Brief summary of, and/or excerpts from, the external review letters,
  11. the numerical vote by the faculty,
  12. a summary of faculty deliberations and conclusions concerning the candidate's performance,
  13. the Chair's personal recommendation regarding promotion and tenure.
2. *Course Enrollment sheet*: The department will request teaching sheets from the data team directly.
3. *Department Guidelines on Promotion*
4. *Annual Evaluations*: A copy of all annual evaluation letters received by the candidate for the period under review.
5. *Letter of Solicitation to External Referees*: A template of the letter sent to external referees must be included in the dossier.
6. *Full External referee list*: The annotated list must include: 1) Name; 2) Title; 3) Institution; 4) Brief summary of expertise; 5) Why they were selected; 6) Marks of distinction; 7) By whom they were selected (candidate or department); 8) Arm's

- length status, including brief explanation of professional links or working relationship to candidate (e.g. Professional acquaintance, Collaborator/Co-Investigator/Co-Author, (Former) Mentor/Advisor, Dissertation Committee Chair/Member, etc.). 9) Any additional insight for selection as an external reviewer (e.g., Editor-in-Chief, distinguished faculty in discipline, university administrator, center director, AAAS fellow, National Academies of Sciences....) should be included.
7. *External Referee Letters*: The selection of external referees is extremely important to the strength of a department's recommendation concerning promotion and tenure. The selection process should be objective and fair, and it should be well documented. Letters of external review should be solicited from scholars who are arms-length from the candidate, excluding former advisors, co-authors/co-editors, research collaborators, and current/former colleagues. When this is not possible or feasible as, for example, in a new or emerging field of study, an explanation should be provided in the dossier. At least six letters of recommendation from external referees are required, however in most DSAS disciplines nine to twelve letters may be required to build an effective dossier. GES typically requests 12-18 letters to ensure enough are received. All requests sent out must detail the response (yes/no/why not) or lack of response.
  9. *Documentation of teaching effectiveness*: A minimum of three peer instruction review letters written in separate academic years. Ideally these will be from at least two different faculty peers, though we note that repeated reviews by the same person can help to assess improvement. Letters from students have not been a part of recent GES candidate dossiers. If these become part of the dossier in the future, the solicitation should be systematic (e.g., all graduate students from a given course) and, if current students are included, the anonymity of the students must be protected. *Under no circumstances should the candidate solicit letters from their students.*
  10. *Ballots/Faculty Vote*: All promotions must be put to a vote by the departmental faculty. In cases of promotion to professor, only professors may vote. Eligible faculty members who are not able to attend a particular meeting may vote as long as they have reviewed the dossier and been informed of the deliberations of the faculty. The individual votes must be anonymous within the department regardless of the format used to vote (paper vs. electronic). However, the Dean requires knowledge of the votes in order to assess any negative votes or abstentions. GES will use a voting system with ballots that are uniquely numbered in advance, and a key will be sent to the Chair and the Dean's Office.

## 2.0 Benchmarks for promotion

### *Funding*

Successful candidates for promotion in GES between 2012 and 2023 acquired at least one peer reviewed grant (NSF, NASA, DOE) following tenure, typically more than one. They demonstrated the ability to support PhD students through both peer reviewed and other granting agencies (government, non-profit, foundations etc.). As with promotion to tenure, funding from diverse sources is considered beneficial. Similarly, a record of consistent funding over time is considered a strength.

### *Publications*

Faculty members should show both a continuation of impactful scholarship through publications in prominent journals and a continued increase in the number of citations. While publication metrics vary in different sub-fields, a recommended benchmark for number of publications post tenure is one that is equal or greater than the number of published manuscripts pre-tenure (e.g., n=30-50). Successful GES promotion candidates between 2012 and 2023 had a google scholar h-index of 20-35 with recent publications (post tenure) led by them or their students being in their top 20 cited publications.

### *Graduate student mentorship*

The success of the graduate students a faculty member has trained is a direct measure of their success. The department has clear expectations for graduate students and their advisors that are summarized in the department graduate student handbook. Successful GES candidates for promotion to full professor between 2012 and 2023 typically had multiple students graduate with PhDs and continued to have dynamic research groups comprised of graduate students, post-docs, research assistant professors and undergraduates. Former and potentially current graduate students from the candidate's research group will have lead author publications.

### *Undergraduate student mentorship*

Undergraduate mentorship, and undergraduate authors on publications are viewed positively by the department, external letter writers, and DSAS *ad hoc* committee members.

### *Service*

Tenured faculty in the Department of Geology & Environmental Science are generally expected to spend approximately 20% of their work effort on service to the Department, College, University, and Discipline/Professional Organizations. The category of service can include the advising and mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students outside the classroom (e.g., directed studies, honors theses, PhD dissertations, comprehensive exams, undergraduate research projects not part of a faculty member's normal research). Service to professional organizations and journals will naturally increase the international recognition of the faculty member and their scholarship. Faculty should look for opportunities to be journal editors. They should also be available to serve in elected or appointed positions in the American Geophysical Union, Geological Society of America, or other Geologic/Environmental Science Professional Organizations.

## **3.0 Assistance of Senior Colleagues; Decisions on Appointment and Promotion**

The mentoring committee assigned at initial hire will continue to aid the faculty member with evaluating and reaching benchmarks needed to successfully advance in their career. In addition, faculty members should seek advice and assistance from other senior colleagues; the ability of senior colleagues to advise, assist, and ultimately to make a sound decision on promotion to full professor will be enhanced by an opportunity for regular review of the qualifications of their colleague.

## 4.0 Length of time to promotion

The length of time to promotion of faculty member from associate to full professor is generally 6 years. In the GES department this time window has ranged from 4 to 24 years (or 12-30 years following the first appointment as an assistant professor). Faculty have the option to petition to the Chair to go up for promotion in writing, and that the Chair send the request to all full professors in the department for a preliminary vote on whether to start the case. Unlike the tenure timescale, there is no length of time requirement before the next promotion to professor, however unusually short windows of time (<4 years) or long windows of time (>10 years) requires justification of why the time timeline is markedly different from the department norm of ~6 years. Longer windows of time post tenure may come with the expectation of continued productivity (i.e., the same number of publications, grants and students is viewed differently if spread over 5 or 15 years). DSAS *ad hoc* committees focused on the department's bylaws and culture of promotion particularly with respect to cases where promotion is early or late.

## 5.0 Periodic Review

All faculty members submit a self-evaluation to the Department Chair at the end of the academic year. The Chair uses this and other materials to write a formal review of the faculty members' performance. The faculty member will be advised of the time when decisions concerning promotion are to be made and submit material to assure adequate consideration of questions of renewal and tenure.