

**Swanson School of Engineering
University of Pittsburgh**

**APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND
GUIDELINES ¹**

Tenure and Tenure Stream (TS) Faculty Preamble

The University of Pittsburgh [Faculty Handbook](#) states the following “minimum criteria” for promotion in the tenure-stream:

4.4 Criteria for Associate Professor. *An associate professor should possess a doctorate or appropriate professional degree and have substantial experience in teaching and research or applicable professional experience. The person should show a capacity and will to maintain teaching effectiveness and the ability for continuing growth as a teacher, scholar, and member of his or her profession. He or she should also have progressed in attaining eminence in a scholarly or professional field. An associate professor must display consistently mature performance in course and curriculum planning in guiding and counseling students and junior faculty members, and in participating in the activities of the University.*

[Note: During Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Recommendation Committee (APTRC) review of those seeking promotion to associate professor, the APTRC has typically found that while “*guiding and counseling students*” is a substantial and essential component of the dossier at all ranks, “*guiding and counseling ... junior faculty members*” is typically not a substantial portion of a TS assistant professor's portfolio because assistant professors do not commonly guide and counsel other assistant professors.]

4.5 Criteria for 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 his or her field through research, writing, professional practice, or leadership in professional and learned organizations, as well as having exceeded the standards described for ranks shown above.*

[Note: In determining whether the candidate has met the criteria for promotion to Professor, the SSoE APTRC shall consider the candidate's *cumulative record* and demonstration of impact. External letters of recommendation by leaders in the candidate's field, as well as the candidate's cumulative record of scholarly contributions, are crucial in assessing the candidate's “attainment of authoritative knowledge and reputation” and “superior stature” in their field.]

Consistent with these minimum criteria, the most important criterion for promotion in SSoE is the individual's stature in their professional community. In particular, the candidate's record of scholarly attainment, as evidenced by the quality of publications and funded research, and the candidate's teaching performance, as evidenced by teaching evaluations and PhD/postdoctoral mentorship, are essential factors when considering promotion. Professional and service activities are also important considerations.

¹ August 26, 2016. Updated June 17, 2020. Updated May 15, 2023, per review of the 2022-23 APTRC. Updated April 19, 2024 (MBS – combined TS/AS with grammatical changes with additional improvements by the 2023-24 APTRC Committee). Updated May 15, 2025 (PJL – collaborator letters now optional, not required; reorganized TS preamble, minor edits throughout guidelines; clarification on external letters and APTRC COIs; added link to Faculty Union CBA). Revised May 31, 2025 to incorporate SSOE promotion criteria for AS faculty into the Preamble (italics), and adhere to new Provost guidelines re: file naming convention of submitted dossier content (C.6).

However, we recognize that not all candidates fit a single mold. It is up to the Department Chair (or advocate) to document how the candidate has satisfied the scholarship, teaching, and service criteria and meets the Department's and the School's strategic needs. This is especially true with the growth of interdisciplinary, collaborative research, the introduction of innovative methods of classroom instruction, and the increase in non-classroom teaching opportunities (e.g., mentoring post-graduate fellows and undergraduate research assistants).

Required documentation, as enumerated below, includes:

Scholarly Activity/Research – Demonstrate an appropriate and sustained level of publications in peer-reviewed literature, externally funded research (including peer-reviewed), graduate student support and production, and support of postdoctoral fellows or other trainees, as appropriate.

Teaching – Demonstrated continuing teaching effectiveness and other contributions to education. Effectiveness is how the candidate's teaching successfully promotes our students' learning. Documentation includes, but is not limited to, course evaluation surveys for at least the five previous years, departmental evaluations, and documentation of other contributions to the School's educational mission.

Service/Leadership – Demonstrated continuing service to the Department, School, University, and professional community; contributed to the School's diversity initiatives.

Intellectual property - Although not a requirement, the creation of intellectual property, particularly patents, should be considered an essential aspect of scholarship. Because the patent process goes through a series of steps with increasing levels of stringency (disclosure, provisional patent application, non-provisional patent application, issued patent, and issued license), patent status should be considered in the evaluation process. The dossier must document the status of the patent created and its level of innovation and impact. In addition, entrepreneurial activities such as startup businesses (including competitive SBIR or similar grants obtained) and the commercialization of discoveries should be considered part of the promotion process for advancing all academic ranks, both tenure and non-tenure streams.

Additional important information relevant to faculty promotion is provided in the [Office of the Provost Promotion Guidelines](#).

The Faculty Union Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) is available via the [Office of the Provost Faculty Resources webpage](#).

Appointment Stream (AS) Faculty Preamble

AS faculty will be subject to appointment, review, and promotion criteria similar to those used for tenure-stream faculty with the exception that the focus will be directed at the individual's primary area and secondary area. Hence, AS faculty will be evaluated primarily relative to the contributions related to their primary area as defined by Table 1. The evaluation will also include an assessment of the performance of the AS faculty member in their secondary area of responsibility, as defined by Table 1. Note the difference between expectations for the promotion of the Education Stream versus the Research Stream and the different promotion levels (e.g., Lecturer, Associate Professor, etc.). The APTRC also recognizes that Research Stream faculty do not receive start-up packages in the same manner as TS faculty.

The Swanson School of Engineering established the following criteria for the ranks of AS Associate Professor and AS Professor:

*Promotion criteria from AS Assistant Professor to **AS Associate Professor** must include exemplar-documented accomplishments from their primary functional area (i.e., either education or education-service if Education Track, or research or research-service if Research Track) and a secondary functional area determined and delineated in their appointment letters and annual review letters (examples are delineated in Table 1).*

*Promotion criteria from AS Associate Professor to **AS Professor** must include exemplar-documented accomplishments from their primary functional area (i.e., either education or education-service if Education Track, or research or research-service if Research Track) and a secondary functional area determined and delineated in their appointment letters and annual review letters (examples are delineated in Table 1). At the level of Professor, the individual should demonstrate being a national leader in their primary area and recognized in their secondary area.*

The full professor must exceed the standard of an associate professor. As such, the individual should possess a doctorate or appropriate professional degree and have substantial experience in their primary functional area, as well as their secondary area. Further, the person should show a capacity and will to maintain their effectiveness and the ability for continuing growth in their primary and secondary areas, as well as a member of their profession.

It is up to the Department Chair (or Advocate) to clearly document the terms of the Appointment Stream Faculty's contract and specifically state the details of their primary and secondary functional areas (e.g., required teaching load, research expectations (funding/publications/partnership establishments, etc., service responsibilities)). The Department Chair (or Advocate) must justify differences in teaching loads, research, and service expectations for Appointment Stream Faculty within the same Department. The Department Chair (or Advocate) must document how the candidate has satisfied the terms of their contract regarding their primary and secondary functional areas and has met the strategic needs of the Department and the School. Table 1 contains achievements relevant to the primary and secondary areas associated with the AS candidate.

Table 1. Functional Area Descriptions

Functional Area	Description (Examples)
Education	Instruct courses; deliver courses with evidence-based pedagogy; develop new or redesign existing courses; introduce creative instructional methods to the classroom; engage in educational scholarship (e.g., textbooks, archival education publications, conference proceedings, book chapters, invited talks)
Education Service	Advise undergraduates; participate in recruitment and retention activities; serve on appropriate faculty committees; participate in K12 and community outreach in community and outreach activities that highlight Pitt engineering; engage in educational scholarship; serve as a program coordinator (undergrad or graduate); prepare and maintain program ABET documentation; provide educational assessment services; provide coursework development services; serve in educational leadership roles in professional societies; mentor other faculty in the use of new or existing software or electronic classroom tools.

Functional Area	Description (Examples)
Research	Participate and work on proposals as a Co-PI or Senior Personnel; propose and secure sponsored research (PI or Co-PI); conduct sponsored research either as a sole PI, PI or Co-PI; engage in research scholarship (e.g., archival publications as a co-author, or preferably directing author or first author, conference proceedings, book chapters, invited talks); and mentorship (e.g., mentorship of graduate students that are advised by other faculty; advising of graduate students as co-advisor or sole advisor after joining the graduate faculty; undergraduate students and visiting professors and scientists); creation of intellectual property (patents)
Research Service	Mentor graduate students in thesis and dissertation work; assist others in obtaining funded research (e.g., provide services for the proposal processes, writing of proposals); mentor postdocs and visiting professors; direct (or assist in directing) and operate laboratories and centers; assist faculty in the construction and testing and operation of major equipment; serve on research related committees; serve on Ph.D. qualifier committees, serve on Ph.D. and MS committees; serve on professional national committees; hold professional society leadership positions; serve in leadership roles in professional societies or consortia (e.g., organize conferences or sessions); serve as a reviewer of research scholarship or be a leader of research scholarship (e.g., associate or editor of a journal, serve on the review board of a journal); lead or mentor efforts to translate innovative research into the commercial marketplace.

Although not a requirement, creating intellectual property, particularly patents, should be considered an important aspect of scholarship. Because the patent process goes through a series of steps with increasing levels of stringency (disclosure, provisional patent application, non-provisional patent application, issued patent, and issued license), patent status should be considered in the evaluation process. The dossier must document the status of the patent created and its level of innovation and impact. In addition, entrepreneurial activities such as startup businesses (including competitive SBIR or similar grants obtained) and the commercialization of discoveries should be considered part of the promotion process for advancing all academic ranks, both tenure and appointment stream.

Additional important information relevant to faculty promotion is provided in the [Office of the Provost Promotion Guidelines](#).

The Faculty Union Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) is available via the [Office of the Provost Faculty Resources webpage](#).

The SSoE Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Recommendation Committee's (APTRC) purpose is to thoroughly review the candidate's credentials and achievements and then recommend them to the Dean. In doing this, the APTRC will consider the candidate's dossier and all departmental recommendations. This Committee will ensure the uniform application of the School's established quality standards. The APTRC will base its review on the dossier's reflection of the primary and secondary areas of responsibility. If a candidate's dossier also presents content related to a third area, the APTRC will not diminish their expectations of excellence for the candidate's primary and secondary areas of responsibility (i.e., the APTRC recommends that the candidate excel in their primary and secondary areas before making "extra" contributions to a third area; achievements in a third area will not be considered as

a means of compensating for deficiencies in the candidate's assigned primary and secondary areas of responsibility).

A. Annual Faculty Review Process

- A.1. Each faculty member will provide an annual report of their activity, in the format required by the School and the University, to their Department Chair.
- A.2. The Department Chair will review each faculty member annually. The review results are to be communicated to each faculty member both orally and in a letter, with a copy included in the faculty member's promotion file. This review is based on the Provost's Guidelines and the Faculty Union CBA. (Faculty salary information is provided separately from the Annual review letter.)

B. Initiation of Promotion Process

- B.1. The Department Chair is typically responsible for initiating the promotion process, excepting the circumstances described in B.2. The Department Chair informs the Dean of the individuals who will be considered for promotion, generally in April of the calendar year the promotion process is initiated. Suppose the Chair and candidate agree to delay the promotion process (i.e., family medical leave, disruptive circumstances such as COVID-19). In that case, the Chair notifies the Dean, and the Chair provides a concise explanation of the delay in the nomination letter when it is eventually submitted. *Note that any such extensions of the promotion timeline must follow all University policies and procedures, including the deadlines for making such requests.*
- B.2. The faculty member can initiate this process under exceptional circumstances. If the Department Chair does not support a promotion review (or if the Department Chair is ineligible to support promotion because the Chair is at a rank lower than the rank the candidate is seeking, for example, a candidate seeking promotion to full professor in a department chaired by an Associate Professor), but the majority of the faculty is supportive; the candidate and the Dean are so informed. The candidate may select an advocate from among the Department's full-time professors, or they can ask the Dean to appoint an advocate from another department. The Advocate's responsibility is to produce a generally supportive case for promotion. *If the majority of the Department faculty and the Department Chair are not supportive*, the case will not go forward unless the candidate explicitly requests the Dean to proceed with the case. Such requests must come within a week of the candidate being notified of the lack of support by the department chair. In this case, it is the Advocate's responsibility first to attempt to obtain Department faculty (and possibly Chair) support for advancing the case for APTRC review. However, if the majority of faculty support remains absent, the review can proceed upon the candidate's request. The Advocate will be responsible for soliciting external letters and preparing the appropriate dossier, including a summary of the faculty's recommendation and that of the external evaluators concerning the candidate's promotion. If there is an Advocate, the Advocate (not the Chair) is the last person to review the dossier that includes all letters (i.e., external, internal, and Chair) as the Advocate prepares their memo of recommendation (i.e., nomination letter).
- B.3. In all cases, the Chair is expected to prepare a review letter for the dossier, recognizing that s/he is uniquely positioned to evaluate the candidate. That letter should discuss the circumstances that influenced the Chair's decision, including annual reviews, faculty input, and their

evaluation of the dossier and external letters. That letter should be considered privileged correspondence shared with the Committee and the Advocate. (If the chair is not the advocate for the candidate, the chair's letter must be given to the advocate while the advocate is preparing the dossier. The advocate will then include the chair's letter in the dossier.)

- B.4. After a departmental review, the APTRC will review prospective faculty candidates in an expedited fashion.

C. Preparation of Dossier

It is the *responsibility of the Department Chair* (or advocate) to ensure that the candidate's dossier conforms with the School's accepted, published guidelines and satisfies the documentation requirements established by the University (see **Appendix A** of this document for the standard SSOE dossier format that should be used by all candidates). Should the APTRC require additional information about the candidate's qualifications, or if the APTRC determines that the dossier has not been appropriately prepared, the APTRC Chair shall inform the Dean. The Dean or APTRC chair will then bring the Committee's concerns to the candidate's Department Chair (or advocate) and inform them of the steps necessary to rectify the deficiencies in the candidate's dossier. *Since improper dossier preparation will delay APTRC review of the candidate's qualifications for promotion, Chairs should ensure that dossiers conform in content and format to SSOE requirements.*

- C.1. The Department Chair (or Advocate) provides the candidate with the standard format for the dossier (Appendix A) and oversees its preparation. The candidate is responsible for preparing Section II (Curriculum Vitae), Section III (Self Evaluation), and Section VIII (Dossier Appendix) of the dossier as enumerated in the guidelines. The Department Chair (or Advocate) is responsible for Section I (Memorandum of Recommendation), Section IV (Letters from Eligible Departmental Faculty), Section V (Letters from External Scholars), Section VI (Letters from Senior Collaborators), and Section VII (Annual Review Letters).

- C.2. The Department Chair (or Advocate) solicits referee letters as follows:

- a. External referee letters

- i. TS candidates:*** Letters should be sought from well-regarded scholars in similar or related fields. **Template SSOE letters must be used by the Chair or advocate to solicit these letters for TTS appointments. These templates (one for those seeking promotion to Associate Professor and one for those seeking promotion to Full Professor) are available to Chairs via a sharepoint website link provided by the Dean's office.**

Eight substantive letters constitute a minimum (see Appendix B for the number of letters required by the Provost for various levels of promotion; note that the School usually submits more letters than the minimum number required by the Provost). A maximum of ten letters can be included in the dossier. However, if additional letter(s) beyond the maximum are received, they must be included in the dossier with an explanation of why letters above the maximum were obtained.

- ii. AS candidates:*** Letters should be sought from well-regarded individuals in similar or related fields. If the referee is from academia, the individual should possess the same or higher rank the candidate seeks. These individuals may be TS or AS faculty, research organizations, or industry members. **Template SSOE letters must be used by the Chair or advocate to solicit these letters for AS appointments. These two templates (one for those seeking promotion to Associate Professor and one for those seeking**

promotion to Full Professor) are available to Chairs via a sharepoint website link provided by the Dean's office.

Six substantive letters constitute a minimum (see Appendix B for the number of letters required by the Provost for various levels of promotion; note that the School usually submits more letters than the minimum number required by the Provost). A maximum of eight letters can be included in the dossier. However, if additional letter(s) beyond the maximum are received, they must be included in the dossier with an explanation of why letters above the maximum were obtained. Note: For Lecturer being reviewed for promotion to Assistant Professor: a minimum of three letters is required.

The candidate should suggest five external referees to the Chair/Advocate. A maximum of three letters can be requested from persons on the candidate's list; the referees on the candidate's list not solicited for letters should not be solicited as part of the chair's/advocate's list. A table indicating the name, position, and person identifying the referee should preface the letters in the dossier (see Table 2).

A maximum of three letters in the dossier may be from referees who have previously worked with the candidate, e.g., doctoral or postdoc supervisor, co-principal investigator, or co-author on a major project. In the case of a candidate for professor, at least two letters (and no more than four) in the dossier should be from highly qualified international referees who can attest to the level and impact of the individual's scholarship.

In the case of an Associate Professor candidate, the dossier does not require a letter from highly qualified international referees who can attest to the level and impact of the individual's scholarship. However, if international letter writers are considered, no more than four international letters should be included in the dossier for one seeking promotion to Associate Professor.

Lastly, the APTRC recommends that only one external letter be sent per institution. The Chair or Advocate's letter should include Table 2, listing all individuals who were requested to provide a letter of evaluation.

Table 2. List of Referees

#	Who recommend ed referee	Name, Institution, and email address	Relationship to the candidate	Internation al? Yes or No	Response to invitation Yes, No, No reply	If No, explain why not (if known)	Was the letter received? Yes or No
1	Candidate						
2	Candidate						
3	Candidate						
4	Chair						
5	Chair						
6	Chair						
7	Chair						
8	Chair						
9	Chair						
10	Chair						

- b. The referees receive the candidate's curriculum vitae (including teaching record and evaluation scores), self-evaluation, and five selected publications. (***For AS candidates***, if publications are relevant to either the primary or secondary areas of responsibility, they should be provided to referees; otherwise, no papers need to be included).
- c. The Chair or Advocate may contact the referees in advance to determine if they will submit a letter promptly and ensure that the dossier contains eight to ten letters for TS and six to eight letters for AS. The candidate should not be told who the referees are.
- d. The dossier should include all letters or emails received, including communications from those declining to review the candidate. The preceding table summarizes these communications.

The letters should be shared only with those faculty involved in promoting/hiring recommendations. A high level of confidentiality should be maintained. The content should not be shared with the candidate except as required in an appeal process. Faculty must appreciate that the School's integrity connects with its ability to assure referees that their responses are confidential. The SSoE templates will inform the external letter writers that their letters are held in confidence, except if disclosure is compelled during legal proceedings.

- e. For external hires involving promotion to a position above that of an assistant professor, it may be necessary to discuss the specific names of the referees with the candidate to protect the confidentiality of the candidate's application.
- f. If a candidate is not promoted to full professor, and if there was (were) concern(s) related to research, scholarship, leadership, community visibility, teaching, or service, then new referee letters evaluating the subsequent dossier submitted during the candidate's next attempt to be promoted should be solicited.

There may be times when new referee letters could be omitted in the new dossier for the subsequent attempt for promotion to full professor. In such cases, the Dean may, in writing to the Chair/Advocate and APTRC, instruct the Chair/Advocate not to solicit new letters and to use prior letters. In this case, the Dean and APTRC must consider all other issues (e.g., research, scholarship, leadership, professional service) as satisfactorily adjudicated in the prior round.

- C.3. Senior collaborator letters (**OPTIONAL**) - ***For TS candidates*** seeking promotion to associate professor, the Department Chair or advocate may, at their discretion, request letters from senior faculty (within the University of Pittsburgh or from outside) who have collaborated significantly with the candidate (see sec. VI). For example, in cases where the candidate has multiple grants as co-I with a senior colleague as PI. The purpose of these letters is to describe the candidate's contributions to the collaborative effort, especially in independent scientific and intellectual contributions, proposal preparation, archival and conference publications, supervision of graduate students, and other facets of scholarly activity. These letters are not a review of the candidate's teaching, research, and service contributions, and should not include a judgement on the merits for promotion.

For AS candidates seeking promotion to associate professor, the Department Chair or advocate, at their discretion, may request letters from those faculty of any rank (within the University of Pittsburgh or from outside) who have collaborated significantly with the candidate. These letters should describe the candidate's contributions to the collaborative

teaching, research, or service effort. These letters are not a review of the candidate's teaching, research, and service contributions, and should not include a judgement on the merits for promotion.

- C.4. Internal letters - The Department Chair or Advocate asks all tenured, departmental faculty of rank equal to or higher than the candidate's proposed rank to review a dossier consisting of the candidate's curriculum vitae, self-appraisal, letters from external referees, and (optional) letters from senior collaborators. Each departmental reviewer must provide a letter of recommendation that explicitly states their vote on the promotion: support, do not support, or (under rare circumstances) abstain from voting on the application. An abstention vote must be accompanied by explaining a conflict of interest. Note: collaboration does not constitute a conflict of interest, but should be noted in the letter of recommendation.
- C.5. Memorandum of Recommendation - The Department Chair or advocate prepares a Memorandum of Recommendation summarizing the case details. This Memorandum of Recommendation should include, at a minimum, the following.

For TS candidates:

- a. A table that summarizes the candidate's research funding with the following headers: Title, Source, Dates, Role, Total Amount, Role Amount (if applicable)
- b. A table of teaching summary for the past five years with the following headers: Course (e.g., ECE 2097), Course Name, Credits, Term, Number of students, OMET score
- c. A table that summarizes the sources of external letters and (optional) senior collaborator letters with headers: External/Sr Collaborator, Name, Institution, candidate suggestion, invited, and response.
- d. A summary of the departmental faculty recommendations (voting).

For AS candidates:

- a. A summary of the candidate's primary area (i.e., education or education service if teaching appointed; research or research service if research appointed) and secondary area (i.e., any of the three other areas that are not the primary area)
- b. A table that summarizes the candidate's research funding (if applicable) with the following headers: Title, Source, Dates, Role, Total Amount, Role Amount (if applicable)
- c. A table of teaching summary for the past five years with the following headers: Course (e.g., ECE 2097), Course Name, Credits, Term, Number of students, OMET scores
- d. A table that summarizes the sources of external letters and (optional) senior collaborator letters with headers: External/Sr Collaborator, Name, Institution, candidate suggestion, invited, and response.
- e. A summary of the departmental faculty recommendations (voting).

If the Chair does not support the candidate's promotion, the candidate and the Dean must be informed, and the appointed Advocate should prepare a separate Memorandum of Recommendation, to be included in the final dossier. (The Chair provides a summary letter explaining their perspective on the dossier.)

- C.6. The Department Chair or Advocate combines the material from items C.1 through C.5 into the completed dossier, adding the candidate's Annual Review letters and teaching evaluations. When the candidate has been substantially involved in collaborative research (including inter-departmental, -School, or -Institution), the completed dossier must clearly describe the candidate's contributions to those endeavors. Further, where the candidate has made essential contributions to non-classroom teaching, those contributions must also be documented (**for AS,**

i.e., education service or research service). The completed dossier with full documentation must be transmitted to the Dean by October 1 of the year when the candidate will be evaluated. The dossier submission should be labeled and organized as follows (per Office of the Provost).

- 0 LastName-FirstName_Cover Page
- 1 LastName-FirstName_Chair Recommendation Letter *
- 2 LastName-FirstName_CV
- 3 LastName-FirstName_Self Evaluation
- 4a LastName-FirstName_External LOR
- 4b LastName-FirstName_External LOR_Collaborators (optional)
- 5 LastName-FirstName_Internal LOR
- 6 LastName-FirstName_Annual Review Letters
- 7 LastName-FirstName_Representative Publications
- 8 LastName-FirstName_OMET Evaluations

* In the event where the Chair is not supportive of promotion, an additional item to be submitted is the letter from the Advocate, to be labeled “1b LastName-FirstName_Advocate Recommendation Letter”, with the Chair’s letter then labeled as “1a LastName-FirstName_Chair Recommendation Letter”. In the event where the Chair is unable to provide a letter because they are at a rank lower than the rank for which the candidate is being considered, then only the Advocate’s letter is necessary (labeled as “1 LastName-FirstName_Advocate Recommendation Letter”).

Per the Office of the Provost, these items should be submitted as separate pdf files.

If an external letter is received after the APTRC review, an addendum memorandum with the attached letter should be provided to the Dean or Provost, making the Dean or Provost aware that the Committee's review, discussion, and deliberation did not include the external letter. The Dean or Provost may then consider the letter in their promotion decision.

- C.7. For external hires, the search committee should also prepare a letter of endorsement that assesses whether the desired rank of the candidate (the rank that is desired by the Chair who is recruiting the external faculty member) is merited based on a review of teaching, research, and service as guided by this document. Letters from individual eligible faculty are required, as in C4.

D. School of Engineering Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Recommendation Committee (APTRC)

D.1. Constitution of APTRC Committee

- a. To maximize departmental representation in every promotion case, the APTRC shall consist of 2 tenured full professors from each Department, nominated by the Department Chair and appointed by the Dean (if there is only 1 tenured full professor in the Department, then the Chair will nominate that 1 tenured full professor, and 1 tenured associate professor. If there are no tenured full professors in the Department, then the Chair will nominate 2 tenured associate professors). The Committee will also include one Appointment Stream (AS) full professor from each Department nominated by the Department Chair and appointed by the Dean (if there is no AS full professor in a department, then an AS Associate Professor will be selected). The Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs or the Senior Associate Dean for Research is an ex-officio (non-voting) member of the Committee. The Dean may attend these

meetings and participate in discussions but will not vote. Committee members are appointed for three years and may be reappointed. The Dean selects the Committee Chair annually and may be reappointed.

- b. The ex-officio member of the Committee will neither vote nor enter discussions related to the merits of promotion. They ensure that the university and SSOE guidelines and procedures are followed, help the APTRC gather information missing from the dossier, and count the secret ballots.
- c. The appointment to the Committee shall be for three years; reappointments are at the discretion of the Dean and Department Chair.
- d. Appointments should be staggered across the six departments, e.g., two to three new appointments each year.
- e. The Dean appoints the APTRC Chair for a one-year term. The Dean may elect to retain the current Chair or select a new Chair at his or her discretion.
- f. All members of the APTRC, including the Ex Officio member, should complete bias training and conduct a refresher course.
- g. Conflicts of Interest (COI) Policy: All APTRC activities (discussions, votes, letter writing, and letter signing) follow COI guidelines.
 - 1. Members of the candidate's primary Department will remain present during the discussion of the candidate, to provide contextual feedback if requested during deliberations by the rest of the APTRC on how the candidate contributes to the priorities of the Department's pursuit of excellence. Members of the candidate's primary department should not advocate for the candidate during this meeting; their dossier letter delineates their advocacy. Further, the candidate's primary department members may not vote, be informed of the vote results, or have access to the final APTRC letter.
 - 2. Appointment Stream (AS) members are excluded from TS cases.
 - 3. Associate professors are excluded from full-professor discussions.
 - 4. This policy applies to all APTRC members, including the Chair and ex officio.
 - 5. APTRC members may declare other COIs to the Chair (e.g., a family relationship). Note that collaboration does not in and of itself constitute a COI, but should be disclosed during the APTRC review process. All APTRC members should vote on every case for which they are eligible to vote, either in support of or against promotion. Abstentions should only be cast in the case of an identified COI.
 - 6. The APTRC chair or Dean will appoint a replacement chair for cases in which the APTRC chair has a COI. An APTRC member may recuse themselves from APTRC deliberations or abstain from a vote only if they believe that there is a clear COI that may not be covered by 1-5 above. For example, the candidate may have been a co-PI on numerous proposals and publications.

D.2. APTRC Process

- a. At the beginning of each academic year, the Dean meets with the full APTRC to charge the committee. New committee members will receive an introductory session to set expectations regarding creating review letters and protocols for candidate discussions. The Dean and Committee chair should be present to train new committee members.

- b. Typically, a three-member sub-committee facilitates a detailed candidate evaluation. Each sub-committee consists of members from three different departments, where logistically possible, and the sub-committee chair should have at least one year of experience being on the APTRC. The sub-committee evaluation is presented to all eligible voting members of the APTRC for each candidate. The full APTRC (i.e., each eligible member) must review every case and cast their vote secretly (with votes counted by the ex officio, the APTRC chair, or Dean if the ex officio member has a COI). All committee members must vote for or against; an abstention is reserved for an identified COI. Committee members inform the Chair or ex officio of the COI in the review process before the vote (see D.1.g.5 above).
- c. The Department Chair/Advocate does not formally present the candidate's case in person (or virtually). If questions arise during APTRC evaluation of a candidate's dossier, the APTRC Chair shall email the Department Chair (or Advocate) for clarification/answers to the questions.

In the case of an Advocate nominating the candidate, the APTRC Chair emails the Advocate to clarify outstanding questions concerning the dossier; the APTRC committee may also invite the Department Chair to answer questions of fact or clarification only concerning the Department Chair's letter in the dossier.

- d. For candidate cases going up for promotion a second time where the first request for promotion was denied, the prior APTRC recommendation letter is made available to the current APTRC to provide an accurate history of the previous Committee's deliberations and recommendation.
- e. The APTRC writes a detailed letter of recommendation to the Dean for each case. The ex officio member (or APTRC chair if there was a COI with the ex officio member) provides the vote for each case. The letter includes evaluative comments regarding Teaching, Research, Service, Internal Letters, External Letters, etc. In the case of split decisions, both points of view are represented in an unbiased manner. All eligible committee members sign each letter, but the signatures do NOT indicate the member's vote. Instead, the signature means that the members concur that the APTRC letter fairly and accurately conveys the deliberations of the discussions for that case. A "Mentorship Advice" section may be added at the end of the candidate's letter to provide collective APTRC faculty development suggestions for the candidate's next career phase.
- f. It is recognized that faculty teaching assignments vary across departments. The APTRC cannot comment on course assignments, type of courses, enrollment, etc. Rather, the APTRC evaluation of teaching addresses the candidate's teaching quality and effectiveness, and curriculum development and innovation as appropriate.
- g. All APTRC proceedings and artifacts are confidential. Except for the meeting with the Department Chair or Advocate mentioned above, all communication between the APTRC and the Department must go through the Dean's office.
- h. Each sub-committee completes its letter one week after the committee reviews the case. This provides proper time to obtain signatures, provide letters to the Dean, and schedule additional meetings for cases with split votes. This is particularly important for individuals going up for tenure (TS Assistant to Associate). Where possible, the committee should discuss TS Assistant to Associate candidates first. The APTRC Chair submits the final recommendation

letter to the Dean by no later than December 15. Dean-approved dossiers are due at the Provost's office by February 1.

E. Dean's Decision Process

- E.1. At the end of the review process, the Dean may discuss the Committee's recommendations with the APTRC. However, if the Dean participates in the APTRC deliberations, this debriefing may not occur.
- E.2. The Dean reviews their decision with each candidate directly regardless of the outcome (positive or negative) for promotion. Suppose the decision to be promoted to full professor is unfavorable. In that case, the Dean will inform the candidate, the APTRC, and chair/advocate whether portion(s) of the dossier *need not be* modified for re-consideration at a future date (e.g., no external letters required, only in the case described in C.2.f).
- E.3 The Dean will inform the APTRC committee if their promotion decision differs from the APTRC's voting outcome based on the Committee's candidate review.
- E.3 The Dean will then meet with the department chair/advocate of every case (whether promotion is accepted or denied). After the Provost's decision, the Chair of the APTRC will then read the entire APTRC letter with the chair/advocate upon the Chair or Advocate's request. The chair/advocate is free to discuss this letter with the APTRC chair; however, they may receive a written copy of only the "Mentorship Advice" section of the document. The department chair/advocate and candidate may ask the APTRC chair to see this letter together at any time(s) in the future, which is an advisable course of action if a candidate who was denied promotion to full professor wants to be re-considered for that promotion in future years. The candidate will be given the APTRC's letter as it serves as an essential guide for that individual's future development and can convey the Committee's valuable suggestions for the candidate's next career phase. Sharing the letter with the candidate also fosters a culture of transparency and mutual respect. However, the portions of the letter that pertain to the contents of the external and internal letters will be removed to protect the confidentiality of the letter-writers. Further, only the chair/advocate may be informed of or read the contents of the APTRC letter that refer to internal or external letters; the candidate may not be present during this part of the discussion between the APTRC chair and the chair/advocate to maintain the confidentiality of these letters.
- E.4 The Dean sends all positive recommendations to the Provost with the complete dossier and all other necessary documentation.

F. Appeals Panel

- F.1 The SSOE Appeals Panel for TS cases will comprise one full TS professor from each Department selected by the dean and department chair. The Appeals Panel member must be active in teaching, research (including PhD mentorship), and service, and the full professor must not have been a member of the APTRC when the candidate's dossier(s) was(were) reviewed by APTRC. An Appeals Panel member from the same Department as the candidate filing the appeal cannot serve on the SSOE Appeals Committee for that candidate. The Department Chair can select either a TS full professor or an AS full professor for AS cases. If there are no AS full professors, then an AS associate professor can be selected for appeals where the promotion is to associate professor but not promoted to full professor.

APPENDIX A

Promotion Dossier Contents:

The APTRC carefully checks for the inclusion of every section of the dossier provided in this Appendix. Deficiencies in dossier preparation will delay APTRC review. Accordingly, ***the chair/advocate should ensure the proper formatting and content of the dossier*** as outlined in this Appendix.

Per the Provost's office's requirements, an **Employee Cover Page** must be submitted as part of the dossier package. The contents of the cover page include the following information.

- a. Employee Name
- b. Employee Number
- c. School: Swanson School of Engineering
- d. Department
- e. Proposed Action
- f. Effective Date

I. Memorandum of Recommendation

Written by the Department Chair (or advocate), this Memorandum presents the case details.

For TSS candidates: the Memorandum must address, in separate sections, the candidate's contributions to the teaching, scholarship, and service/leadership missions of the Department, the SSoE, and the University. The candidate's teaching effectiveness will be reviewed based on classroom performance, collaborative teaching, non-classroom contributions, and teaching innovations. A review of scholarship should describe the level of attainment commensurate with the level of promotion (e.g., associate or full). A review of service should be broadly inclusive (i.e., contributions to the Department, SSoE, university, academe, and the public).

For AS candidates: The Memorandum must address, in separate sections, the AS candidate's contributions to their primary, as well as to the secondary (i.e., education, education-service, research, or research-service) mission areas of the Department, the SSOE, and the University. Those contributions must be documented where the candidate has substantially participated in collaborative, including interdisciplinary research. Similarly, if the candidate has significantly contributed to non-classroom teaching or has introduced teaching innovations, those contributions must also be documented.

The Memorandum should also assess the candidate's role in the context of the Department's plans. Further, it should summarize the results of the senior faculty's voting. If the Chair does not support the promotion, they must inform the candidate and the Dean, and the appointed Advocate should provide a second Memorandum.

The Memorandum of Recommendation should **exclude** the mention of retention issues. It is not the role of the APTRC to consider retention during its deliberations—instead, the APTRC bases its decisions solely on reviewing the dossier. (Retention issues are essential, but they are directed to the Dean, not the APTRC, via a promotion dossier.)

II. Curriculum Vitae (CV) Note that during its deliberations (which typically extend into the late Fall term), the APTRC will accept revised CVs that reflect significant changes (e.g., new research grants, summer term teaching scores, publications, invited presentations, awards, etc.) Information will not be accepted or considered after the APTRC has voted, which will occur late in the Fall Term. In no case will

teaching scores from the Fall Term during which the APTRC is deliberating be accepted. The APTRC Chair informs the Department Chair/Advocate of the voting dates.

The CV must contain the following sections and detailed information:

- A. Education - including degrees, dates, and institutions.
- B. Professional positions held - with inclusive dates; and
- C. Publications – Provide a complete listing. Provide the h-index, i-index, and date obtained from Google Scholar or another reputable source.

1. Refereed Publications sub-divided as shown.

- (i) **Refereed journal papers:** Include co-authors' names (the author list should be exactly as it appears in the published paper), publication dates, volume/issue numbers, and inclusive page numbers. The candidate should indicate author relationships (e.g., advisor, graduate student). The most recent publications should have the highest paper number. Please use the following example format.

47. Devon, F.¹; Harper, K.², Jenkins, G.³, Herbert', H.⁴, Jones, A. "Effect of temperature changes on mass flux," Journal of mass flux and momentum mayhem, 2021, 34(3), 227-229, IF 5.6, 35 citations

- 1 PhD student mentored by Jones
- 2 Postdoc mentored by Jones
- 3 MS student mentored by Jones
- 4 Undergrad mentored by Jones
- ' Corresponding author
- IF Journal Impact factor

Citation data as of 1-23-2023 from Google Scholar (or some other source)

- (ii) **Books and monographs**, including co-authors' names (if any), publication dates, and publishers. Use the same notations for authors as described for Refereed journal papers.

- (iii) **Edited books and chapters** in edited books, including names of co-authors and co-editors (if any), publication dates, and publishers. Use the same notations for authors as described for Refereed journal papers.

- (iv) Papers in **fully refereed conference proceedings**, including names of co-authors, name and date(s) of the conference and sponsoring organization(s), and inclusive page numbers. Use the same notations for authors as described for Refereed journal papers.

- (v) List the h-index, i-index, total citations, total citations in the past five years, the source of the citation data, and the date assessed.

- (vi) **Papers submitted for peer review in journals or conference proceedings.** For each paper or proceeding that has been submitted or re-submitted for publication. In this section, publications must state the journal or conference proceedings to which the paper has been submitted, a submission date, and a descriptor such as “submitted” or “in revision.” Use the same notations for authors as described for Refereed journal papers. If accepted for

publication, provide the letter/email from the editor). Do not list planned papers or papers in preparation in the CV. An exemplar is as follows:

Devon, F.¹, Jones, A.⁵. “Diffusivity of acetone in natural rubber,” Journal of mass flux and momentum, submitted December 2021

2. Non-refereed Publications are subdivided as follows:

- (i) Papers in non-refereed conference proceedings and conference proceedings edited, the author list should be as it appears in the publication, name(s) and date(s) of the conference(s) and sponsoring organization(s), and inclusive page numbers
- (ii) Patents and other intellectual property created. If a patent has been granted, provide the patent title, inventor name(s), patent number and date, and country of patent origin; please delete information regarding the prior patent application and the patent history. If the patent has not yet been granted, please aggregate all information concerning the patent history (e.g., disclosures, applications, etc.) as a single entry.
- (iii) Invited presentations, including titles, dates and locations
- (iv) Presentations at conferences without any associated publications

D. Research

This section pertains to all TS candidates and AS candidates who have “research” or “research service” as their primary or secondary area(s) of responsibility (refer to Table 1 for examples of research service contributions and achievements).

Externally Funded Research Proposals are divided into two categories: (i.) Peer-reviewed proposals and (ii) non-peer-reviewed proposals. For each proposal in each category, use the following template(s) to include names of agencies, organizations, or companies, levels and periods of support, and the roles of the candidate (PI, co-PI, or Senior Investigator). Names of all co-PIs must be included, except for large equipment grants where many co-investigators typically occur. For each proposal, a summary of the nature and aim of the proposed work is needed. Proposals submitted and still under consideration can be included.

List awarded proposals chronologically, with the most recent submission listed first and the oldest submission listed last. List proposals/awards in the following manner: 1. Funded Peer-Reviewed, 2. Funded Non-Peer Reviewed, 3. Proposals Under Review, and 4. Not funded. Use the appropriate formats listed below.

Template A1. Format For Awarded Peer-Reviewed Proposals

Proposal name	
Agency	
Review process	Peer-reviewed
Status	Awarded
PI.	Include name, Department, and university or other organization name for PI
Co-PI/Co-I	If applicable, include name(s), Department, and university or organization name for each co-PI
Senior Personnel/Investigator	If applicable, include name(s), Department, and university or organization name for each co-PI

The total amount of funding from the agency	
The portion of the total apportioned to the candidate	Provide both the \$ amount and the % of the total
Start date	Actual start date if awarded or estimated start date if under review
End date	Actual end date if awarded or estimated start date if under review
Role of the candidate	1-2 sentence explanation of the responsibilities/activities of the candidate

Template A2. Format for Non-Peer-reviewed Awarded Proposals

Proposal name	
Agency	
Review process	Non-Peer reviewed. The candidate is encouraged to explain the process of review/approval of this grant to the best of their knowledge in one sentence.
Status	Awarded
PI.	include name, Department, and university or other organization name for PI
Co-PI/Co-I	If applicable, include name(s), Department, and university or organization name for each co-PI
Senior Personnel/Investigator	if applicable, include name(s), Department, and university or organization name for each co-PI
The total amount of funding from the agency	
The portion of the total apportioned to the candidate	Provide both the \$ amount and the % of the total
Start date	Actual start date if awarded or estimated start date if under review
End date	Actual end date if awarded or estimated start date if under review
Role of the candidate	1-2 sentence explanation of the responsibilities/activities of the candidate

Template A3. Format for Proposals Under Review

Proposal name	
Agency	
Review process	Peer-reviewed or Non-peer-reviewed. Note the candidate is encouraged to explain the process of review/approval of this grant to the best of their knowledge in one sentence.
Status	Under review
PI.	Include the name, Department, university, or other organization's name for PI.
Co-PI/Co-I	If applicable, include name(s), Department, and university or organization name for each co-PI
Senior Personnel/Investigator	If applicable, include name(s), Department, and university or organization name for each co-PI
The total amount of funding from the agency	
The portion of the total apportioned to the candidate	Provide both the \$ amount and the % of the total
Date submitted for review	For proposals that have been submitted and are pending (under review)
Start date	Actual start date if awarded or estimated start date if under review
End date	Actual end date if awarded or estimated start date if under review
Role of the candidate	1-2 sentence explanation of the responsibilities/activities of the candidate

Proposals that were submitted but rejected should be listed in the next section. This section is strongly recommended for those seeking promotion to associate professor and is optional for

those seeking promotion to full professor. Candidate may provide ratings (e.g., for an NIH proposal, “20th percentile, but not funded”).

Template A4. Rejected Proposals

Proposal name	
Agency	
Review process	Peer-reviewed or Non-peer-reviewed.
Status	Rejected; the candidate is encouraged to mention the ratings received by the declined projects.
PI.	Include the name, Department, university, or other organization's name for PI.
Co-PI/Co-I	If applicable, include name(s), Department, and university or organization name for each co-PI
Senior Personnel/Investigator	If applicable, include name(s), Department, and university or organization name for each co-PI
Total amount of funding from the agency	
The portion of the total apportioned to the candidate	Provide both the \$ amount and the % of the total
Rejection date	
Start date	Actual start date if awarded or estimated start date if under review
End date	Actual end date if awarded or estimated start date if under review
Role of the candidate	1-2 sentence explanation of the responsibilities/activities of the candidate

E. Contributions to Teaching

This section pertains to all TS candidates, and AS candidates who have “education” or “education service” as their primary or secondary area(s) of responsibility (AS candidates refer to Table 1 for examples of education service contributions and achievements).

1. **Courses taught over the past five years.** Please use Table A1 (example template and table footnotes) to summarize classes taught over the past five years, including core/elective, level of study, number of students, and total student credit hours taught by the candidate (number of students times, number of credit hours of the course). The table should either be in chronological order or reverse chronological order. Additional information (e.g., a new class, incorporated new content, classroom pedagogical innovations) should be indicated as footnotes to the table referring to the number. The candidate is free to include any information about the courses they think will benefit the APTRC.

Table A1. Example Table of Courses Taught Over the Past 5 Years

#	Term	Course number (credits)	Type of course	% of course taught by the candidate	Course title	Enrollment	Total student credit hours for candidate	OTE OMET rating (number of respondents)
1	Fall 2020	CHE 1032 (3) X-Listed as MEMS 1032 (3)	Lecture	100	Surfactants and Wetting	12	36	4.12 (11)
2	Fall 2020	PETE 1023 (3)	Lecture	100	Surfactants and Wetting	4	12	Insufficient enrollment
3	Spring 2021	CHE 2825 (3)	Lecture	50	Chemical Thermodynamics	7	10.5	4.81 (7)

#	Term	Course number (credits)	Type of course	% of course taught by the candidate	Course title	Enrollment	Total student credit hours for candidate	OTE OMET rating (number of respondents)
4	Summer 2021	CHE 0401 (1)	Lecture	100	Kinetics Lab	12	12	4.10 (10)
5	Fall 2022	CHE 2110 (3)	Lecture	33	Professional Issues	21	21	3.89 (18)

1. CHE 1032 (cross-listed as MEMS 1032) was a new course developed by Dr. Jones and taught by Dr. Jones for the second time.

3. CHE 2825 in Spring 2021 was co-taught with Prof. Lincoln, with Jones' contribution being 50% of the course content.

4. CHE 0401 is a 1-credit lab class taught by Dr. Jones; it complements the concurrent 3-credit CHE 0400 course that Dr. Jones does not instruct.

5. CHE 2110 in Spring 2022 was taught as a flipped classroom course; the instructors included Dr. Jones, Dr. Abraham, and Dr. Lincoln.

2. Candidates should expound on significant course improvements (e.g., changed or improved content, new pedagogies, etc.) and new courses in their teaching philosophy/narrative. This suggestion is essential for **AS candidates** with "education" or "educational service" in their primary or secondary area.
3. Candidates should indicate new programs and certificates developed and how many students have graduated (or in progress, if new).
4. Contributions to non-classroom teaching
5. Other measures/evidence of teaching effectiveness that the candidate wishes to include may be presented and encouraged (e.g., letters from former students that provide insight into the candidate's teaching and mentorship impact)>
6. The Section VIII Dossier Appendix should provide **complete OMET reports, including student comments**, for the courses listed in Table A1.

F. Graduate Students, Trainees, Postdoctoral Fellows –

This section pertains to **all TS and AS candidates** who mentor graduate students, trainees, or postdocs.

Please provide a complete list of MS and Ph.D. students and postdocs who are advised or in progress (as the major advisor or co-advisor). Include the source of support for each student and the term in which the student started and finished. Students for whom the applicant served as a committee member should not be included in the following list. Also, include a list of other trainees or postdoctoral fellows supported or mentored by the candidate. Mention, as appropriate, exceptional circumstances that affected the student's progress (e.g., major illness, change of advisors). An example format follows.

- John Johnson, Ph.D. Chemical Engineering, "Enhancing efficiency of solar cells."
 - Support: Startup funds, ACS-PRF, NSF.
 - Ph.D. started Sept. 2018; completed Ph.D. in Sept. 2022.
 - Dr. Johnson now works at ABC Corp, a healthcare products company.
- Serena Smith, Ph.D. Chemical Engineering, in progress, "Using carbon nanotubes as permanent adhesives."
 - Support: Startup, NSF.
 - Ph.D. started Sept. 2019; Expected completion in Fall 2025.

- Ms. Smith's PhD progress has been delayed, first by the COVID shutdown and then by an internship at Oakridge National Lab, supported by an NSF supplement.
- Michael Mayer, MS Mechanical Engineering, "Mechanics of synthetic skin"
 - Support: NIH
 - MS started Jan. 2022; Expected completion in Fall 2023.
- Jack Frost, Postdoc
 - Support: NSF, Resilient city transportation infrastructure
 - Ph.D. Princeton, Civil Engineering, May 2022
 - August 2022 – Present

The candidate may include students for whom the candidate served merely as a committee member as a separate table in the following format.

Dissertation committee member

Charles Carter	PhD, Chemistry	2020
Dominic Darcy	PhD, Materials Science	in progress
Elizabeth Eaton	MS, Chemical Engineering	2022

For AS candidates, include responsibilities associated with advising and mentoring undergraduate students.

G. Honors and Awards

H. Professional Service & Leadership Activities – a detailed listing including:

1. Department, SSoE, and University committees on which the applicant served in a position of leadership (e.g., Chair, Vice Chair, Program Coordinator);
2. Positions of leadership (committee chair, local section chair, etc.) in professional and other technical or scientific society committees;
3. Conference(s) organized and/or chaired, including title(s), name(s) of sponsoring organization(s), and date(s);
4. Journal editorships or journal editorial board service;
5. New curricula developed or university-wide centers lead
6. Interdisciplinary proposals lead as PI or Co-PI.

I. Contributions to Diversity in teaching, research, or service. Contributions to Diversity can include those made at the university, within the scientific community, or in the community.

J. Consulting Activities

K. Contributions to Innovation This section should detail any contributions to innovation demonstrated by the candidate (e.g., spin-off companies based on the candidate's technologies, licensing of patents, new software products, changes in company operations, manufacturing materials based on their research, new product designs, new technologies) associated with the candidate's research, teaching, or service.

III. Self-Evaluation

The candidate must prepare a self-evaluation of five to eight pages in length that expands upon and clarifies information in the CV regarding research, service, and teaching (**if TSS candidate**) or primary

and secondary functional areas (*if AS candidate*); if a third area exists, indicate this as such recognizing that it is above and beyond the primary and secondary functional areas.

Contributions to Diversity should be incorporated in the appropriate section(s). The report should summarize the teaching evaluation results since the last promotion. The self-evaluation should also be consistent with the descriptions of the desired rank (associate or full professor) provided in the Provosts' Office Faculty Handbook and quoted earlier in these guidelines.

IV. Letters from Eligible Departmental Faculty

The Chair requests each TS or AS department member at rank equal to or higher than the proposed rank to write a letter of recommendation. Each departmental reviewer must provide a letter that explicitly states their vote on the candidate's promotion. These letters are essential; the Department Chair should ensure all eligible faculty provide written input. ***For AS candidates***, the letters should describe their contribution to the collaborative effort, especially in terms of their contributions to the primary and secondary functional areas for which the candidate's appointment was designed. A high level of confidentiality should be maintained. The letters are not shared with other faculty or the candidate except as required in an appeal process.

V. Letters from External Scholars

The Department Chair should briefly describe each external referee, why they are exceptionally qualified to evaluate the candidate, and any prior interactions with the candidate, such as Ph.D. advisor, post-doc advisor, collaborator, etc. A minimum of eight letters are required for ***TS candidates***, with no more than three letters from close collaborators or PhD/post-doc advisors. No more than ten letters should be provided, with the caveat that all external letters received must be included in the dossier (and an explanation for why additional letters beyond the maximum are included). For ***AS candidates***, a minimum of six letters are required, with no more than two letters from close collaborators or PhD/post-doc advisors. No more than eight letters should be provided for AS candidates, with the caveat that all external letters received must be included in the dossier (and an explanation for why additional letters beyond the maximum are included).

VI. Letters from Senior Collaborators (Optional)

The Department Chair or Advocate may, at their discretion, request letters from senior faculty (within the University of Pittsburgh or from outside) who have collaborated significantly with candidates seeking promotion to Associate Professor. For example, in cases where the candidate has multiple grants as co-I with a senior colleague as PI. These letters are not a review of the candidate's teaching, research, and service contributions, and should not include a judgement on the merits for promotion. Rather, the purpose of these letters is for the Senior Collaborator to describe the candidate's contributions to the collaborative effort, especially in independent scientific and intellectual contributions, proposal preparation, archival and conference publications, supervision of graduate students, and other facets of scholarly activity. **An SSoE template for a letter soliciting input from the senior collaborator is available in the sharepoint site provided by the Dean's office.**

VII. Annual Review Letters

The Department Chair will add copies of the candidate's annual review letters for the past five years.

VIII. Dossier Appendix

This second volume should include additional materials, such as:

- A. Reprints of five representative, refereed publications.
- B. Copies of all teaching evaluation forms (as described in II. CV, Section E) from all courses taught during at least the past five years, including student comments.
- C. ***For AS candidates***, any materials the candidate believes provide demonstrations of their contributions as an Appointment Stream faculty member, such as:
 - Attendance at teaching workshops, local, regional, or national (e.g., those offered by the Engineering Education Research Center or University Center for Teaching and Learning).
 - Examples of educational innovations were introduced.
 - Teaching awards or other teaching-related honors.
 - Peer reviews of teaching.
 - Contributions to running a center for the SSOE or the university.
 - Continual dialogue and interaction with the students throughout a semester (with emails, newsgroups, and Web pages being valid mechanisms for such interactions).
 - Journal or conference articles addressing questions of pedagogy.
 - Letters from former students describing the long-term impact of the candidate.
 - Successful incorporation of new technologies into the classroom.
 - Educational papers presented at national meetings (e.g., ASEE, FIE, IEEE, etc.)

APPENDIX B
Documentation Requirements for Faculty Personnel Actions Office of the Provost
Revised June 17, 2020, to include AS Notation

Documentation Requirements for Faculty Personnel Actions
Office of the Provost

ACTION¹	DEAN'S LETTER	CHAIR LETTER	COMMITTEE REPORTS²	EXTERNAL LETTERS	ANNUAL REVIEW	TEACHING EVALUATION	AA/ SEARCH
Tenure Stream or Tenure Actions:							
Request to Negotiate: Instructor or Assistant Prof (TS)	X	X	X	3 minimum			X
Request to Negotiate: Associate, Professor, or Distinguished Prof (TS/Probationary/Tenure)	X	X	X	6 minimum		X	X
New Appointment: Instructor or Assistant Prof (TS)	X	X	X	3 minimum			X
New Appointment: Associate or Professor (TS/Probationary/Tenure)	X	X	X	6 minimum		X	X
Appointment/Promotion: Distinguished/Named/Endowed Prof	X	X	X	10-12		X	
Promotion: Instructor → Assistant Prof (TS)	X	X			X	X	
Promotion: Assistant → Associate Prof (TS)	X	X	X	6 minimum	X	X	
Promotion: Assistant → Associate Prof/Associate → Professor (with Tenure)	X	X	X	6 minimum	X	X	
Conferral of Tenure	X	X	X	6 minimum	X	X	
Reappointment: All TS Ranks	X	X	X		X	X	
Non-Tenure Stream (Full-time only) Actions:							
Requests to Negotiate: All Faculty Ranks & Librarians	X	X	X	3 minimum			X
Appointment: Instructor or Assistant Prof (AS – formerly NTS)	X	X	X	3 minimum			X
Appointment: Associate or Professor (AS – formerly NTS)	X	X	X	6 minimum		X	X
Promotion: Instructor/Assistant Prof AS – formerly (NTS)	X	X	X	3 minimum	X	X	
Promotion: Associate or Professor (AS – formerly NTS)	X	X	X	6 minimum	X	X	
Reappointment: All AS (formerly NTS) Ranks & Librarians	X	X	X		X	X	
Other Actions:							
Type A Transfer/Type B Removal (TS only)	X	X	X				
Leaves and Sabbaticals ³	X	X					
Administrative Appointments (Internal)	X						

NOTES:

¹All actions require a current *curriculum vitae* and a signed, updated Employee Record form. In actions recommending the award of tenure, ER forms must be signed by the Dean/Regional Campus President.

²Reports from School/Campus/Department Committees: Search, Appointment, Promotion, and/or Tenure Committees, as appropriate.

³Leaves (with/without pay) include: sabbaticals, academic, and family/medical.

The Provost's Office substantively reviews the following Faculty Personnel Actions (including Faculty Librarians):

- Requests to Negotiate (Provost's Area Schools only; excludes "Visiting");
- Affirmative Action and Search Procedures (Provost's Area Schools only)
- Faculty/Librarian Appointments (all ranks, TS/Probationary, Tenure and AS (formerly NTS); excludes "Visiting")
- Faculty & Librarian Reappointments (All F-T & P-T TS; F-T AS (formerly NTS) and Visiting Provost's Area only)
- Conferrals of Tenure
- All Faculty Leaves
- Type A Transfers and Type B Removals
- Academic Administrative Appointments (e.g., Associate/Assistant Deans; Chairs/Directors (Interim/Acting))
- Graduate Faculty Membership

For further information and complete policies, procedures and deadlines, please refer to the following documents (available from the Provost's Office and online at <http://www.pitt.edu/~provost/>):

- Memorandum from Provost Donald M. Henderson, *Recruitment: Faculty and Academic/Administrative Positions*, May 12, 1992.
- Memorandum from Provost James V. Maher, *Faculty Recruitment Requests, Rosters, and Position Numbers*, issued annually (with attachment, *Procedures for Faculty Recruitment*, Revised).
- Memorandum from Provost James V. Maher, *Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Nonrenewals, Promotions, and Conferrals of Tenure*, January 14, 1998.
- Office of the Chancellor, *Policy and Procedure Governing Appointments to Distinguished Professorships*, July 4, 2000.
- Memorandum from James V. Maher, *Faculty Diversity*, March 29, 2002.

Other reference sources:

- *Faculty Handbook*, latest edition online.
- University of Pittsburgh, *Policies and Procedures online*.

APPENDIX C
Policy on Appointment Stream Faculty within the Swanson School of Engineering: Part-time Faculty

Original Date: June 24, 2016
Revised: June 17, 2020
Revised: 1/29/2024 for grammar

Part-time Faculty

- (1) Depending on qualifications, the Department Chair may hire part-time teaching faculty as a Lecturer or Senior Lecturer and part-time research faculty as a Research Associate or Senior Research Associate. These entry-level, part-time faculty appointments *do not require* a review by the APTRC Committee.
- (2) Depending on qualifications, individuals with significant experience and expertise may be hired as part-time faculty at senior academic levels (Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, or Adjunct Professor). These appointment categories apply to both part-time teaching and part-time research faculty. According to University of Pittsburgh policy, the prefix Adjunct implies:

“One whose primary employment is outside an academic unit of the University, but who is fully-qualified professionally and who performs, on a part-time basis, duties which would otherwise be assigned to members of the full-time faculty.”

Typically, these individuals would have previously held academic appointments at one or more of these academic levels at another institution or have attained a high-level position in industry or government. The Department Chair will provide the Dean with a letter of recommendation for a particular academic level and the candidate’s CV. The Dean will then ask the Chair of the APTRC to review these documents and advise the Dean on the appropriateness of the proposed appointment. A similar process follows for part-time faculty who wish to be promoted. However, part-time faculty converted to full-time must be reviewed similarly to a new full-time AS faculty appointment described in the “Policy on Appointment Stream Faculty within the Swanson School of Engineering: Full-time Faculty” document.

Note that the Adjunct prefix is not required when the part-time faculty has no other outside employment and their appointment is for at least half-time.