

## Section E: Faculty Affairs

### E07.0 PROMOTION CRITERIA, POLICY AND PROCEDURES

The College of Science Promotion Policy is an official supplement to the Institute [Policy E6.0 POLICIES ON FACULTY RANK AND PROMOTION](#). This document contains: a general overview of the promotion process details of the formation and responsibilities of the COS Promotion Review Committee (PRC); the COS Criteria for Promotion, including the nomination process; details of the required documentation; and the timeline of the process. *The promotion from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor typically occurs at the same time as tenure evaluation, and is covered exclusively in E5.0 Policies on Tenure.*

#### Promotion Process Overview



The process for promotion of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty is summarized graphically in this section. The process begins with a nomination for promotion. The candidate then prepares a portfolio and assembles required supporting documentation. These documents are then reviewed by faculty from the candidate's Academic Unit, including the Academic Unit Head. For tenure-track faculty seeking promotion, portions of the documentation related to scholarship are reviewed by experts external to RIT; those documents may be required soon after nomination in order to obtain the external letters for the review. The College of Science Promotion Review Committee (PRC) reviews all documentation, including the internal and external letters, and generates an independent assessment of the candidate. The PRC forwards all recommendations and documentation to the Dean of the College of Science. The Dean makes a separate assessment of the candidate, and forwards this and all other documentation for review by the Provost and President. Upon the receipt of the recommendation from the Dean, the Provost and the President will work together to formulate recommendations for or against promotion. All final promotion decisions are made by the President. Notification regarding the promotion decision will be sent by the Provost to the candidate by May 1.

## COS Promotion Review Committee (PRC)

The PRC reviews the candidate based on the COS Promotion Criteria (below), the candidate's documentation, and all internal and external letters of review or evaluation<sup>1</sup>. The PRC is responsible for soliciting letters from faculty within the candidate's Academic Unit, from faculty of appropriate rank from any programs to which the candidate belongs as Program Faculty, and from external reviewers. The PRC makes a recommendation for approval or denial of promotion that is separate from the Academic Unit Head (AUH) and COS Dean.

### *PRC Composition*

The PRC will consist of four subcommittees in order to review candidates seeking promotion to Professor and various ranks within the non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty. The faculty elected to serve on these committees will serve two-year terms<sup>2</sup>, though not all of the subcommittees may be needed each year. These subcommittees and their membership are indicated in the table below.

Subcommittee	Composition	Notes
Associate Professors' Review	Six Professors	One Professor elected from and by each academic unit that has at least four eligible faculty at the rank of Professor. At-large members are elected by the college faculty to ensure there are six Professors. Professors are ineligible to serve this subcommittee if they served on the Tenure Review Committee within the past five years.
Principal Lecturers' Review	Three tenured faculty plus three Principal Lecturers	One of the tenured members shall be a Professor who also serves on the subcommittee for evaluating Associate Professors. The rest of the subcommittee are at-large members elected by the college faculty.
Senior Lecturers' Review	Three tenured faculty plus three Senior Lecturers or Principal Lecturers	One of the tenured members shall be a Professor who also serves on the subcommittee for evaluating Associate Professors. The rest of the subcommittee are at-large members elected by the college faculty.
NTT Research Faculty Review	Three tenured faculty plus three NTT Research Faculty, if they exist in the college	One of the tenured members shall be a Professor who also serves on the subcommittee for evaluating Associate Professors. The rest of the subcommittee are at-large members elected by the college faculty.

The PRC shall select its chair from its members holding the rank of Professor, who will chair both the overall Promotion Review Committee and the subcommittee for evaluating Associate Professors. The chair shall appoint co-chairs to head each NTT subcommittee; any member of a subcommittee is eligible to co-chair that subcommittee. One Professor from the Associate Professors subcommittee serves on

---

<sup>1</sup> Should the PRC determine that it would be in the best interests of the candidate and COS, the PRC Chair may, with the Dean's approval, solicit additional information in the form of either written documentation or oral presentation from other sources deemed appropriate by the PRC. The candidate shall be informed of all additional information being sought, and shall not be denied access to it unless access has been waived in a notarized letter.

<sup>2</sup> If a member cannot fulfill their term, their service concludes (they may serve in the future if elected again). In such cases, replacements for the Associate Professors review subcommittee will be elected and serve as if they are starting a new term. In contrast, replacements for NTT subcommittees can be elected if time allows, but another member of the PRC of appropriate rank can serve as a replacement if necessary.

each NTT subcommittee in order to provide consistent interpretation of the criteria among all subcommittees of the PRC.

#### *PRC Election and its Protocols*

PRC elections shall be conducted before December 15<sup>th</sup> for service commencing the following academic year. The elections will identify as needed (a) the PRC members representing each of the academic units of the College, (b) any at-large members, and (c) the COS nominee for tenure committee appointment outside of COS by the Academic Senate. In order to allow for continuity, the selection of the committee's membership will provide for at least two members to continue serving on the committee over any two consecutive year period. The election process will be as follows:

##### *Academic Unit Representatives*

When an Academic Unit has a vacancy on the PRC, the AUH will seek nominations of at least two of its faculty members holding the rank of Professor. All tenure-track and tenured faculty of the unit may submit nominations and vote to determine the Academic Unit's representative. If a tie occurs, the AUH will break the tie by a lot in the presence of two or more of the unit's tenured members. The AUH will transmit the results of the unit's election to its faculty and the Dean no later than December 15<sup>th</sup>.

##### *COS-Wide Elections*

When vacancies exist, COS will conduct separate nominations<sup>3</sup> and elections to determine at-large membership for its PRC. Nominations for open at-large positions for the PRC subcommittee for evaluating Associate Professors will be accepted from any COS tenure-track or tenured faculty, and all tenure-track and tenured faculty are eligible to vote. Nominations for open positions on the NTT subcommittees will be accepted from any COS faculty member and all faculty are eligible to vote. The results will be communicated to the COS faculty no later than December 15<sup>th</sup>.

#### *PRC Responsibilities: Internal Letters*

The PRC Chair shall seek letters from all eligible faculty and require a letter from the candidate's Academic Unit Head. Each letter must have a clear statement recommending for or against the promotion of the candidate. These letters will become part of the candidate's portfolio for review by only the PRC, Dean, and Provost (see Table 2).

##### *Internal Faculty Letters*

The PRC Chair shall solicit a confidential letter from each eligible faculty member within the candidate's academic unit and from any programs to which the candidate belongs as Program Faculty. The letter should include a clear vote (yes or no) for or against promotion, accompanied by a supporting explanation. If letters are not received from all eligible faculty members within the department, the PRC shall attempt to obtain input from those faculty members who did not respond. These letters must be submitted directly to the Chair of the PRC.

##### *Academic Unit Head's Assessment*

Based upon the documentation submitted to the head of the candidate's academic unit, the AUH will provide a written assessment of the candidate from the perspective of colleague, supervisor, and administrator. The head's written assessment shall include a clear vote (yes or no) with regard to whether the candidate has met the criteria for promotion, followed by an explanation of the vote. The letter shall be forwarded to the PRC Chair. For candidates who are

---

<sup>3</sup> Eligible faculty members may not decline nomination nor appointment to the PRC. The Dean may be petitioned for an exemption under extraordinary circumstances.

also program or program allied faculty, the directors of those programs who are responsible for staffing courses, student advising, and committees within the program, shall be consulted for input.

#### *PRC Responsibilities: External Review Letters*

The PRC Chair will solicit a minimum of four external reviewers<sup>4</sup> to evaluate the candidate's scholarship. The external reviewers must be at the level of Professor or equivalent, have fields of study within the candidate's expertise, and shall not have personal ties or conflicts of interest (see C4.0 and Appendix COI of this document) with the candidate. The PRC Chair will obtain from the candidate suggestions of five external reviewers. The AUH will appoint a Scholarship Evaluation Peer Group (SEPG)<sup>5</sup> with expertise as close as possible to that of the candidate's to identify a list of at least five potential external reviewers distinct from the candidate's list of suggested reviewers; the AUH will forward this list to the PRC Chair. To assist this process, the candidate may submit a list of up to ten names of individuals who meet the criteria for serving as an external reviewer, but with whom the candidate has no conflict of interest. The candidate may submit a list of up to five names of non-preferred external reviewers. The PRC Chair will solicit letters from at least two external reviewers suggested by the candidate and at least two external reviewers suggested by the SEPG. The external review letters will be received by the Dean's Office.

External review letters are not required for promotion of non-tenure track faculty.

<b>COS Policies on External Reviewers</b>	<b>Candidate suggests</b>	<b>Head suggests</b>	<b>Candidate-suggested reviewers COS should seek</b>	<b>non-Candidate-suggested reviewers COS should seek</b>	<b>Minimum external letters to receive, regardless of who suggested</b>	<b>Co-authors that can be external reviewers (former advisors forbidden)</b>
Tenure Review	5	5	≥ 2	≥ 2	4	≤ 1
Tenure Track Promotion	5	5	≥ 2	≥ 2	4	0
NTTF Promotion	Not required					
NTTRF Promotion						
mid-Tenure						

#### *PRC Responsibilities: Recommendation*

Recommendation for approval of promotion shall require a minimum 2/3 majority in favor, as determined by secret vote. The six members of a PRC subcommittee vote on the candidates under their subcommittee's purview; there shall be no abstentions or avoidance of voting by absence. The subcommittees' recommendations for approval or denial of promotion shall be in writing and include a statement of reasons that support the recommendation, as well as the vote and their signatures. The recommendations from each subcommittee and all supporting documentation, including letters, shall be forwarded by the PRC Chair to the Dean.

<sup>4</sup> Letters from thesis advisors are not to be used in the official list of external letters; they may, however, be included in the dossier as further evidence of the candidate's work.

<sup>5</sup> Three to four faculty members; the Academic Unit Head may not be a member of this group.



## COS Promotion Criteria

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and professional service to the Institute and beyond is essential to the continued success and advancement of the College of Science and its faculty. Promotion in the College of Science is a distinct honor that goes well beyond recognition of length of service. Performance standards, therefore, defined by those criteria at the time of appointment to the candidate's present rank (e.g., Associate Professor, Lecturer, or Senior Lecturer) must be demonstrably exceeded.

### *Teaching Expectations*

A faculty member's teaching and educational activities must clearly indicate commitment to student learning, must support the instructional needs of the faculty member's academic unit, college, and institute, and must demonstrate a commitment to connect the faculty member's research and scholarly work to student learning. Faculty members seeking promotion must meet the following minimum expectations:

- High quality of teaching in the classroom and one-on-one teaching outside the classroom.
- Meaningful engagement of students in experiential learning through undergraduate research, mentoring, and advising of graduate student theses.
- Curriculum development or new program development.
- Demonstrate a commitment to connect research and scholarly work to student learning.
- Substantially and consistently demonstrate performance and productivity that exceeds (breadth and/or depth) criteria satisfied at the time of appointment to the candidate's present rank.

### *Scholarship and Research Expectations*

Faculty members in the College of Science are expected to conduct scholarship that is documented, disseminated, peer reviewed, and supported by external funding at a rate consistent with their teaching load and their discipline and in accord with the Teacher-Scholar model. The Institute policy (E4.0) recognizes five kinds of scholarship: discovery, teaching/pedagogy, integration, application, and engagement. The College of Science encompasses these five elements and recognizes the role of scholarship and its importance as part of the Faculty Plan of Work. Faculty members seeking promotion to the rank of professor must meet the following minimum expectations:

- Established track record of externally reviewed scholarly work, research and creative attainment, by publication in refereed journals, books, manuscripts, patents, publication in symposia, and presentations at national and international conferences.
- Established track record, at a rate consistent with the teaching load and their discipline, of obtaining external funding for research, instruction, pedagogy, and/or other efforts to support Academic Unit/College/Institute goals and objectives.
- Substantially and consistently demonstrate performance and productivity that exceeds (breadth and/or depth) criteria satisfied at the time of appointment to the candidate's present rank.

### *Professional Service Expectations*

Faculty members should demonstrate contributions within the scope of service work to their academic unit, the College, the Institute, and to their profession. Participation in these activities fosters engagement in and awareness of the current and future directions of the Institute. Faculty members seeking promotion must meet the following minimum expectations.

- Service on academic unit, college and institute committees.

- Contributions to the mission of the Academic Unit, the College or the Institute through leadership (expected for tenured faculty) in or contributions to professional activities on and off campus, such as: major initiatives, outreach activities, recruitment, and work with external organizations that benefit the Academic Unit, College and Institute, e.g., sponsoring a study abroad program.
- Advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students and/or post-doctoral fellows (not expected for lecturer ranks).
- Professional service, such as: referee for scholarly publications; reviewer for funding agencies; serving on professional review panels; journal editorship; officer in a professional society; serve on committees of professional societies; conference organization (not expected for lecturer ranks).

### *Nomination for Promotion*

Cognizant of the above criteria, candidates may be nominated for promotion in any one of the following ways:

- The Academic Unit Head may nominate a candidate for promotion.
- A faculty member eligible to serve on the PRC may nominate a candidate for promotion.
- A faculty member may self-nominate for promotion.

The Academic Unit Head shall notify the faculty member in writing of his or her nomination for promotion, or of the receipt of the self-nomination. The nominee has the right to withdraw from the process at any time.

The promotion from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor typically occurs at the same time as tenure evaluation; see policy E5.0 Policies on Tenure.

## Documentation and Portfolio

Documentation must include information for each year since the last promotion or hire. The following outlines the documentation to be sent to the Provost by COS, sectioned by the responsible party.

### *Access to Documentation*

Table 2 below describes who has access to documentation. Upon completion of the process, the faculty recommendation letters, the Academic Unit Head's letter, the Dean's letter, and external letters of recommendation will be maintained in the candidate's confidential file in the Dean's Office. All other documentation will be returned to the candidate.

<b>Table 2: Access to Documentation for Promotion Review</b>						
<b>Documentation</b>	<b>Access of each party:</b>					
	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>Eligible Department Faculty</b>	<b>Academic Unit Head</b>	<b>College Promotion Committee</b>	<b>Dean</b>	<b>Provost</b>
Candidate's Portfolio	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Annual Reviews	-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Internal Letters from Eligible Department Faculty	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Academic Unit Head Recommendation	No	No	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
COS Promotion Committee Recommendation	No	No	No	-	Yes	Yes
External Review Letters	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dean Recommendation	No	No	No	No	-	Yes
Provost Evaluation	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	-

### *Responsibility: Dean's Office*

- Dean's letter of recommendation for or against promotion;
- College tenure policy;
- Promotion form; completely filled out with all necessary signatures.

### *Responsibility: COS Promotion Review Committee*

- The PRC's recommendation for approval or denial of promotion which shall include a statement of reasons that support the recommendation as well as the committee vote;
- Internal review letters:
  - ☐ Academic Unit Head's letter of recommendation;
  - ☐ Letters from faculty senior in rank to the candidate;
  - ☐ Tabulated results of the unit faculty vote.
- External review letters.
  - ☐ Table documenting the nominated external reviewers who were solicited by the committee. This should indicate who nominated (candidate or department), and the response of the reviewer (accepted, declined, no response). Arrange the table with those that wrote letters at the top.

*Responsibility: Academic Unit Head*

- All items in the following table.
- Certify to the Dean's office that the candidate's portfolio is complete and contains appropriate information.
- The AUH will coordinate with the candidate the gathering of all student and peer evaluations of the candidate for each year since the candidate's last promotion or hire date for Tenure Track Faculty; only the prior four years of such evaluations are required for Non-Tenure Track Teaching Faculty, and, if relevant, Non-Tenure Track Research Faculty.

<b>Portfolio Items Inserted by Academic Unit Head</b> 1 = Required 2 = If relevant 3 = Optional	<b>PDF naming scheme</b>	<b>Mid-Tenure</b>	<b>Tenure</b>	<b>Ext. Review?</b>	<b>Assoc to Full</b>	<b>Ext. Review?</b>	<b>NTTF</b>	<b>NTTRF</b>
Annual reviews for the relevant time period (arranged most recent to oldest)	B0_AnnRev_name	1	1	-	1	-	1	1
Summary table of annual reviews broken down by scholarship, teaching, service, and overall	B0_AnnRevTab_name	1	1	-	1	-	1	1
Plans of work for the relevant time period (arranged most recent to oldest)	B1_POW_name	1	1	-	1	-	1	1
Peer reviews for the relevant time period (arranged most recent to oldest)	B2_PeerRev_name	1	1	-	1	-	1	2
Student ratings of instruction for the relevant time period (summary chart for last five years, followed by ratings & student comments for each section taught, arranged chronologically within course)	B3_StdEvals_name	1	1	-	1	-	1	2
Copy of the original hire letter	C_HireLett_name	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
Letters of approval for extensions to the probationary period or reduction in previously granted credit toward tenure (with the reason(s) for such action(s) redacted)	D_Mods_name	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
Statement of Expectations – include a copy of the original agreement and any subsequent modifications	E_SoE_name	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
All agreements relating to the faculty member's conditions of employment (salary information redacted)	F_CoE_name	1	1	-	1	-	1	1
Optional Letters solicited by candidate (see appendix on optional letters). Letters authored by others must be received and inserted into the portfolio by the AUH, not the candidate	Q_OthLett_name	3	3		3		3	3

### *Responsibility: Candidate*

The following delineates the items that comprise the items required for a candidate's portfolio. The candidate is responsible for obtaining each of the items and presenting them in the order listed below using the indicated naming scheme for electronic documents. An overview of each item and necessary templates can be found in the appendix.

Not all items are required for each of the review processes or faculty categories (TT = Tenure Track; NTTTF= Non-Tenure Track Teaching Faculty; NTTRF = Non-Tenure Track Research Faculty). Refer to the legend to determine if a document is required or optional for your rank and review.

<b>Portfolio Items Inserted by Candidate</b> 1 = Required 2 = If relevant 3 = Optional	<b>PDF naming scheme</b>	<b>Mid-Tenure</b>	<b>Tenure</b>	<b>Ext.Review?</b>	<b>Assoc to Full</b>	<b>Ext. Review?</b>	<b>NTTTF</b>	<b>NTTRF</b>
Candidate's CV	A_cv_name	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Teaching philosophy	G_TPhil_name	1	1	-	1	-	1	2
Courses taught	H-Taught_name	1	1	-	1	-	1	2
Scholarship Statement	I_Schol_name	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Scholarship Table 1	I_ScholTab1_name	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Future Research Directions	J_Future_name	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Funding	K_Funding_name	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Noteworthy Publications	L_Pubs_name	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
<a href="#">List of Collaborators and Other Affiliations (e.g., using NSF template)</a>	M_Collabs_name	1	1	-	1	-	2	1
Student Interactions	N_Students_name	1	1	3	1	3	1	1
Service Activities	O_Service_name	1	1	3	1	3	Sr.: 2 Prin.: 1	2
Other documentation related to faculty duties.	P_OthDoc_name	3	3	-	3	-	3	3

## COS Review Process Schedule

		Tenure	Promotion	Mid-Tenure
Party	Action Item	Date	Date	Date
AUH	The Academic Unit Head (AUH) solicits nominations for promotion.		By April 1st	
AUH	Nominations for promotion must be submitted to the AUH.		by April 10th	
AUH	The AUH notifies the candidate of their nomination for promotion.		By April 15th	
Candidate	Candidate attends COS MT, T, or P Process Workshop.	Early April	Early April	Early April
Dean	The MT, T, and P Review Committees are formed.	By May 1 <sup>st</sup>	By May 1 <sup>st</sup>	By May 1 <sup>st</sup>
Candidate	Candidates must notify the AUH if they accept the nomination for promotion.		by May 1 <sup>st</sup>	
Candidate	Candidate submits: (a) recommended external reviewers, and (b) up to ten experts that could serve as external reviewers and who have no conflict of interest with the candidate, and (c) up to five names of non-preferred external reviewers.	By May 1 <sup>st</sup>	by May 1 <sup>st</sup>	
AUH	The AUH appoints a Scholarship Evaluation Peer Group (SEPG) to recommend external reviewers.	By May 1 <sup>st</sup>	By May 1 <sup>st</sup>	
SEPG	The SEPG submits recommended external reviewers to AUH.	By May 15 <sup>th</sup>	By May 15 <sup>th</sup>	
Dean	The Dean charges the MT, T, and P Review Committees; they elect a chair.	By May 15 <sup>th</sup>	By May 15 <sup>th</sup>	By Sept 30 <sup>th</sup>
Candidate	The candidate submits materials for external reviewers in electronic format.	By June 15 <sup>th</sup>	By June 15 <sup>th</sup>	
AUH	AUH submits list of external reviewers to the Chair of the review committee, and verifies candidate's scholarship documents to the Dean's Office	By June 15 <sup>th</sup>	By June 15 <sup>th</sup>	
PRC	The T, P Review Committee Chairs solicit letters from external reviewers.	By July 1 <sup>st</sup>	By July 1 <sup>st</sup>	
Candidate	The candidate submits documentation to their folder in a shared drive.	By Sept. 1 <sup>st</sup>	By Oct. 1 <sup>st</sup>	By Nov. 1 <sup>st</sup>
Dean	External letters Due. The Dean's office forwards letters to the T/PRC chair.	By Sept. 1 <sup>st</sup>	By Sept. 1 <sup>st</sup>	
PRC	The first meeting of the MT, T, and P Review Committees.	By Sept. 15 <sup>th</sup>	By Oct. 15 <sup>th</sup>	By Nov. 15 <sup>th</sup>
AUH	The AUH makes the candidate's material/folder available to the faculty senior in rank for their review. The folder must include the external review letters but not the annual performance appraisals written by the AUH.	By Sept. 15 <sup>th</sup>	By Oct. 15 <sup>th</sup>	By Nov. 15 <sup>th</sup>

Table continued on next page...



	COS Review Process Schedule Continued...	Tenure	Promotion	Mid-Tenure
Party	Action Item	Date	Date	Date
Senior Faculty	The faculty senior in rank must submit their recommendation letter and vote for or against promotion to the MT, T, and P Review Committee Chairs.	By Oct. 15 <sup>th</sup>	By Nov. 15 <sup>th</sup>	By Dec. 15 <sup>th</sup>
AUH	The Recommendation Letter and annual performance appraisals written by the AUH are placed in the promotion folder.	By Oct. 15 <sup>th</sup>	By Nov. 15 <sup>th</sup>	By Dec. 15 <sup>th</sup>
AUH	The AUH submits the candidate's folder (paper and electronic copy) to the Dean's Office.	By Oct. 15 <sup>th</sup>	By Nov. 15 <sup>th</sup>	By Dec. 15 <sup>th</sup>
PRC	The MT, T, and P Review Committees submit their recommendations to the Dean.	By Jan. 1 <sup>st</sup>	By Feb. 1 <sup>st</sup>	By Mar. 1 <sup>st</sup>
Dean	Dean submits documentation and recommendations to Provost.	By Feb. 1 <sup>st</sup>	By Mar. 1 <sup>st</sup>	By Apr. 1 <sup>st</sup>
Provost	The Provost sends notification letter to the candidate.	By Apr. 15 <sup>th</sup>	By May 1 <sup>st</sup>	By May. 15 <sup>th</sup>

## APPENDIX: PORTFOLIO ITEMS' DETAILS AND TEMPLATES

This appendix provides some information and context about the required elements for which the candidate is responsible. Several items below include templates for tables that the candidate should use; add rows as necessary. These templates are current as of Spring 2021.

### A\_cv\_name

Include a 1 page executive summary. Include all publications, separated by status (published, under review, etc.). Separate peer reviewed publications from other publications. Include a separate list of presentations.

### G\_TPhil\_name

Provide a summary of teaching philosophy, goals, and accomplishments. Aim for a clear and succinct description that can be understood by someone not in the field. Two to four single-spaced pages single-spaced is typical.

### H-Taught\_name

Fill in the table below for courses taught during the period under review (since hire, or since last promotion). Order by course, and chronologically within course. Add additional rows as necessary. Add examples of curriculum development at the end.

Course Number	Course Title	Contact Hours	Semesters taught	Relevant comments (new prep; co-taught with Prof. X; curricular revisions; revised delivery mode; etc.)
ABCD 321	Intro to Getting Promoted	3	Fall 2020	
ABCD 321	Intro to Getting Promoted	3	Fall 2019	New prep
EFGH 221	Intro to Getting Tenure	4	Fall 2020	Move to online asynchronous format

### I\_Schol\_name

Fill out the two tables below, then provide a summary of philosophy, goals, and accomplishments in narrative form. Aim for a clear and succinct description that can be understood by someone not in the field. Four to six single-spaced pages is typical.

**I\_ScholTab1\_name Table 1: Scholarly Outputs Table. A template will be sent each year. This must be a separate pdf file.**

**I\_Schol\_name Table 2: Scholarship Details**

Scholarly Product	Briefly describe your contributions to the product
Paper #43 in my cv	I directed the study, supervised one undergrad, one PhD student, and one post-doc coauthors. We all contributed to writing the paper equally.

### J\_Future\_name

Provide summary of your future research directions written in a way that can be understood by someone not in the field. Three to four single-spaced pages is typical.

### K\_Funding\_name

Fill in the four tables below for funding proposals that you have submitted and/or were awarded at RIT.

**K\_Funding\_name: Table 1.** Summarize your funding statistics for **externally** sponsored projects during the period under review (since hire, or since last promotion)

Externally Sponsored	As PI		As co-PI		As Senior Personnel	
Year	Proposals submitted	Proposals awarded	Proposals submitted	Proposals awarded	Proposals submitted	Proposals awarded

**K\_Funding\_name: Table 2.** Summarize your funding statistics for RIT/COS/Department funded projects during the period under review (since hire, or since last promotion). Do not include start-up funding.

RIT-Sponsored	As PI		As co-PI		As Senior Personnel	
Year	Proposals submitted	Proposals awarded	Proposals submitted	Proposals awarded	Proposals submitted	Proposals awarded

**K\_Funding\_name: Table 3.** Report the following for each contract/grant/gift that was awarded during the period under review (since hire, or since last promotion). This section should only be those that were “**awarded**”.

Your Role	
Project Title	
Sponsor	
Total Award Amount	
Your fraction of the total	
Start date - End Date	
Person-months committed to the project	

**K\_Funding\_name: Table 4.** Report the following for each contract/grant/gift that was proposed but not awarded during the period under review (since hire, or since last promotion). This section should only be those that are “declined” or “pending”.

Status	
Your Role	
Project Title	
Sponsor	
Total Award Amount	
Your fraction of the total	
Start date - End Date	
Person-months committed to the project	

### L\_Pubs\_name

Copies of up to three full publications. You may describe your contributions to these publications in a preface not to exceed 1 page. You may also add the first page of any additional publications.

### M\_Collabs\_name

List of collaborators and other affiliations, e.g., using the templates required by NSF/NIH for any grant submission.

### N\_Students\_name

Describe mentorship and related interactions with undergraduate students, graduate students, and post-docs. Fill out the summary table below with number of students in each category. One to three single-spaced pages is typical.

RIT Undergrad Research Mentees	RIT Masters Research Mentees	RIT PhD Research Mentees	RIT Post-Doctoral Research Mentees	Thesis Committees for non-Mentees	Other student mentorship

#### O\_Service\_name

List and briefly describe your service contributions to your academic unit, college, university, and any other types of professional service. Two to four single-spaced pages is typical.

#### P\_OthDoc\_name

Other documentation related to faculty duties, such as certifications, awards, etc.. Letters authored by others belong in item Q\_OthLett\_name.

## APPENDIX: COI

External reviewers may not have a conflict of interest with the candidate. Institute Policy C4.0 covers COI related to university business. The following examples of possible conflicts of interest have been derived from the National Science Foundation's "Conflict-of-Interests and Confidentiality Statement for NSF Panelists". The College of Science will judge COI in this manner for the purpose of peer review of scholarship for tenure and promotion, in addition to C4.0.

### **1. YOUR AFFILIATIONS WITH A Reviewer's INSTITUTION.**

You may have a conflict if you have/hold/are:

- *Current employment at the institution as a professor, adjunct professor, visiting professor, or similar position.*
- *Other current employment with the institution (such as consulting or an advisory arrangement).*
- *Previous employment with the institution within the last 60 months.*
- *Being considered for employment at the institution.*
- *Formal or informal reemployment arrangement with the institution.*
- *Ownership of securities of firms that employs the reviewer.*
- *Current membership on a visiting committee or similar body at the department, school, or facility of a reviewer.*
- *Any office, governing board membership, or relevant committee chairpersonship that could affect a reviewer's judgement.*
- *Current enrollment as a student in the department or school of the reviewer.*

### **2. YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH Reviewer.**

- Known family relationship as spouse, child, sibling, or parent.
- *Business or professional partnership.*
- Past or present association as thesis advisor or thesis student.
- Collaboration on a project, proposal, or a book, article, report, or paper within the last 60 months.
- Co-editing of a journal, compendium, or conference proceedings within the last 36 months.

### **3. YOUR OTHER AFFILIATIONS OR RELATIONSHIPS.**

- Interests of the following persons are to be treated as if they were yours: Any affiliation or relationship of your spouse (e.g., your spouse's thesis advisor may not be your external reviewer), of your minor child, of a relative living in your immediate household or of anyone who is legally your partner that you are aware of, *that would be covered by any italicized items above.*
- Other relationships, such as close personal friendship, that you think might tend to affect the reviewer's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship. e.g., anyone with whom you were academic contemporaries ("lab mates"), even if you did not publish together.



## APPENDIX: OPTIONAL LETTERS SOLICITED BY THE CANDIDATE

The COS Promotion Policy allows candidates to solicit optional letters (e.g., from collaborators). *These letters are optional and are not required by the RIT policy.* An optional letter can be considered either a *letter of review/recommendation* or a *letter of collaboration*:

- A *letter of review/recommendation* is a letter that offers an assessment of the candidate in one or more areas. Like an external review letter, a letter of review/recommendation cannot be shown to the candidate. Candidates should not solicit letters of recommendation.
- A *letter of collaboration* is not an assessment or review/recommendation letter. It comes from individuals who have collaborated with the candidate in teaching, scholarship, or service, and it objectively documents the contributions of the candidate to the partnership/collaboration. It should not be subjective, and it should lack commentary as to the fitness of the candidate for promotion overall or in any area.

### Inclusion of Optional Letters in a candidate's folder

An optional letter is not to be included in a candidate's materials if:

- The letter is a *letter of review/recommendation* not solicited by the committee.
- The letter was not kept confidential to the candidate, e.g., if they insert the letter themselves into the portfolio or forward the letter to their Academic Unit Head.
- The letter is not signed by the author.
- The letter's author has a conflict of interest, real or apparent, with the candidate or the process (e.g., letters from parents of the candidate's students).
- The letter is from an author who can have undue influence on departmental faculty and/or the promotion committee (e.g., letters from members of the upper administration, deans, trustees, etc.).
- The letter provides an assessment of the candidate's promotion case, but the materials provided to the letter writer cannot be verified. (Review letters should provide objective assessment of the candidate's promotion case based on complete and verified documentation. The materials provided to authors of optional letters is unknown, and thus cannot be verified. Allowing such letters undermines the external review process, which must be based on the approved package of material that is sent by the review committee. This is particularly obvious if candidates themselves communicate documentation to the optional letter writers.)

## APPENDIX: SAMPLE OF EXTERNAL LETTER SOLICITATION FOR PROMOTION REVIEW



**Rochester Institute of Technology**

College of Science  
Office of the Dean  
84 Lomb Memorial Drive  
Rochester, NY 14623  
Telephone: 585-475-5221  
Fax: 585-475-2398  
[www.rit.edu/science/](http://www.rit.edu/science/)

June 1, {2021}

{Name}

{Address}

Dear Dr. X,

We are writing to request your assistance as an external reviewer of Associate Professor {Candidate} for Promotion to Full Professor in the {School} at Rochester Institute of Technology.

We rely heavily upon the expertise of external reviewers to help assess the merits of a candidate's scholarly work and contributions to the field. As someone with expertise in the same general area of research as the candidate, and we request a review letter from you. Your letter will not be shared with the candidate, but it will be included in the materials read by the senior faculty and administrators reviewing the entire dossier.

**We will need your letter by September 1 of this year to be included in their portfolio.**

In your letter, we ask that you focus solely on the candidate's research/scholarship (not teaching or service) and address the following with respect to evidence/data provided in the dossier.

1. How do you rate the quantity, quality, and impact of the candidate's scholarship based on the evidence in the dossier?
2. What are the candidate's specific contribution(s) to their field/s?
3. How important are the candidate's current and future research questions?
4. How does the candidate's record compare to peers at similar institutions?
5. We also ask that you indicate any capacity in which you may have interacted with the candidate in the past.

If you agree to write a letter, we will send you the candidate's i) up-to-date Curriculum Vitae; ii) Scholarship Statement; iii) Future Research Directions; iv) Noteworthy Publications (up to three noteworthy publications), as well as information on the candidate's workload distribution, our expectations for tenure and promotion as it pertains to scholarship, and a copy of RIT's definitions of scholarship.

*Please let us know as soon as possible if you are willing to review {Prof. X's} portfolio and to supply a review letter with your professional evaluation of the candidate's current and future research and*

*scholarship contributions.* If you cannot provide us with the requested review, we would appreciate hearing that from you as soon as possible, to the above email address, to allow us time to seek an alternative reviewer. We are happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Thank you for your consideration,

Prof. Y  
Chair, College of Science Promotion Review Committee

Prof. Z  
Dean, College of Science  
Professor of Mathematics

cc: Georgeanne Hogan, administrative assistant

### For Inserts (depending on the faculty candidate's portfolio):

Research portfolio: A research portfolio faculty member spends approximately 50-60% effort on research/scholarship, approximately 20-30% effort on teaching, and approximately 20% effort on service to the department, college, RIT, and their discipline.

Blended Portfolio: A blended portfolio faculty member typically spends approximately 20-30% effort on research/scholarship, approximately 50-60% effort on teaching, and approximately 20% effort on service to the department, college, and RIT.

COS Expectations for Scholarship: Faculty members in the College of Science are expected to conduct scholarship that is documented, disseminated, peer reviewed, and supported by external funding at a rate consistent with their teaching load and their discipline and in accord with the Teacher-Scholar model. The Institute policy (E4.0) recognizes five kinds of scholarship: discovery, teaching/pedagogy, integration, application, and engagement. The College of Science encompasses these five elements and recognizes the role of scholarship and its importance as part of the Faculty Plan of Work. Faculty members seeking tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must meet the following minimum expectations:

- Established track record of externally reviewed scholarly work, research and creative attainment, by publication in refereed journals, books, manuscripts, patents, publication in symposia, and presentations at national and international conferences.
- Established track record, at a rate consistent with the teaching load and their discipline, of obtaining external funding for research, instruction, pedagogy, and/or other efforts to support Academic Unit/College/Institute goals and objectives.

### Policy History:

Approved: May 1995

Updated: May 2012

Updated: June 2013

Updated: May 2015

Updated: April 2016

Updated: September 2016

Updated: April 2018

Updated: April 2019

Updated: January 2021

Reformatted: April 2021

Appendix updated March 2022

Updated: April 2023