

**Swanson School of Engineering
University of Pittsburgh**

**APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND
GUIDELINES (TTS Faculty)**

August 26, 2016

Updated June 17, 2020

Updated December 21, 2021 per March 2021 APTRC meeting

The most important criterion for promotion is the stature of the individual in his or her 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 very important factors when considering promotion. Professional and service activities are also important considerations. However, it is recognized that all candidates will not fit a single mold. It is up to the Department Chair (or advocate) to clearly document how the candidate has satisfied the criteria of teaching, service and scholarship and meets the strategic needs of the department and the School. 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., post-graduate fellows, undergraduate research assistants).

The difference between expectations for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor is contained in the *Faculty Handbook*, where the descriptions of these two ranks are provided.

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 that during APTRC reviews of those seeking promotion to associate professor, the APTRC has typically found that “*guiding and counseling students*” is a substantial and important component of the dossier. However, “*guiding and counseling ... junior faculty members*” is typically not a substantial portion of an assistant professor's portfolio (unless those junior faculty members are Appointment Stream (AS) faculty (formerly known as NTS faculty) or visiting professors in the group of the candidate seeking promotion) 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, (i.e., Associate Professor).*

Required documentation as enumerated below includes:

Teaching – Demonstrated continuing teaching effectiveness (course evaluation surveys for at least the three previous years); documentation of other contributions to teaching.

Service/Leadership – Demonstrated continuing service to the department, School, University, and professional community; contributions to the School’s diversity initiatives.

Scholarly Activity/Research – Demonstrated sustained record of publications in peer-reviewed literature, an appropriate level of externally funded research (including peer-reviewed research funding), and graduate student support and production.

Although not a requirement, the creation of intellectual property, particularly patents, should be considered as an important aspect of scholarship. Because the patent process goes through a series of steps with increasing level 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, such entrepreneurial activities as start-up businesses (including competitive SBIR or similar grants obtained), and commercialization of discoveries should be considered as part of the promotion process for advancement of all academic ranks, both tenure and non-tenure stream.

Other documentation as described in the Office of Provost Promotion Guidelines (January 14, 1998; attached) must be provided as part of the promotion and tenure process.

The purpose of the School-wide Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (APTRC) is to conduct a thorough review of the candidate’s credentials and achievements and then make a recommendation 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.

A. Annual Faculty Review Process

- A.1. Each faculty member will provide an annual report of his/her activity, in the format required by the School and the University, to his/her Department Chair.
- A.2. The Department Chair will review each faculty member annually. The results of that review are to be communicated to each faculty member both orally and in a letter, a copy of which will be included in that faculty member’s promotion file. This review is to be based on the Provost’s Guidelines. (Salary information to faculty will be provided separately from this 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, normally in April of the calendar year that the promotion process will be initiated. If the chair and candidate agree to delay the promotion process (i.e., maternity/paternity leave, disruptive circumstances such as COVID-19), the chair notifies the Dean and the chair provides a concise explanation of the delay in nomination letter when it is eventually submitted.
- B.2. Under certain exceptional circumstances the faculty member can initiate this process. 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, then the candidate and the Dean are so informed. The candidate may select an advocate from among the Department's full-time professors or he/she can ask the Dean to appoint an advocate who could be 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, then the case will not go forward unless **the candidate specifically requests to the Dean that the case proceeds. Such request 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 to first attempt to obtain Department faculty (and possibly Chair) support for advancing the case for APTRC review. However, if majority faculty support remains absent, the review can proceed upon the candidate's request. It will be the advocate's responsibility to solicit the external letters of review and prepare 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 in a unique position to evaluate the candidate. That letter should discuss the circumstances that influenced the Chair's decision including annual reviews, faculty input, and their own evaluation of the dossier and external letters. That letter should be considered privileged correspondence and only shared with the Committee and the Advocate.
- B.4. Prospective faculty candidates will be reviewed by the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Review Committee in an expedited fashion, following a departmental review.

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 for the standard format for the dossier). Should the APTRC require additional information about the candidate's qualification, or if the APTRC determines that the dossier has not been properly prepared, the APTRC Chair shall so 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 him/her of the steps necessary to rectify the deficiencies in the candidate's dossier (e.g., providing additional external letters).

- C.1. The Department Chair (or advocate) provides the candidate with the standard format for the dossier and helps guide 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). (See Appendix A.)
- C.2. The Department Chair (or advocate) solicits letters of recommendation as follows:
 - a. Referee letters should be sought from well-regarded scholars in similar and/or related fields, without defining the area too narrowly. **Template SSOE letters must be used by the chair or advocate to solicit these letters for TTS appointments. These 2 templates (one for**

those seeking promotion to Associate Professor, one for those seeking promotion to Full Professor) are included in the Appendix to this document. Eight substantive letters constitute a minimum (see page 9 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 10 letters should be included in the dossier. However, if an additional letter(s) (e.g. an 11th) does arrive, it (they) should be included in the dossier with an explanation why letters above the maximum were obtained. The candidate should be asked to suggest 5 referees, and a maximum of 3 letters can be requested from persons on the candidate's list; the referees on the candidate's list who are not solicited for letters should not be solicited as part of the chair's/advocate's list. A table indicating name, position, and person identifying the referee should preface the referee letters in the dossier. As many as 3 letters in the dossier may be from referees who have had previous professional association with the candidate i.e. doctoral or post-doc supervisor, co-principal investigator, or co-author on a major project. In the case of a candidate for Professor, at least 2 letters (and no more than 4) in the dossier should be from highly qualified international referees who are able to attest to the level and impact of the individual's scholarship. In the case of a candidate for Associate Professor, it is not required to include a letter in the dossier from highly qualified international referees who are able to attest to the level and impact of the individual's scholarship. However, if international letter writers are considered, no more than 4 international letters should be included in the dossier for one seeking promotion to Associate Professor. Lastly, it is recommended that there be only one external letter per institution.

- b. The candidate's curriculum vitae (including teaching record), self-evaluation and five selected publications are sent to all of the referees).
- c. The referees may be contacted only by the chair or advocate in advance, but only to determine if they will submit a letter in a timely fashion in an attempt to ensure that the dossier contains 8 – 10 letters. The candidate should not be told who the referees are.
- d. All letters or emails received should be included in the dossier. All letters or emails received, including communications received from those declining to review the candidate should be included in the dossier.

The letters should be shared only with those faculty involved in making promotion/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 is closely connected with its ability to assure referees that their responses are confidential. The SSOE templates will inform the external letter writers that their letters will be held in confidence, except if their 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 in order to protect the confidentiality of the candidate's application.
- C.3. The Department Chair or advocate requests letters from those senior faculty (within University of Pittsburgh or from outside) who have collaborated closely with the candidate. These letters should describe the candidate's contribution to the collaborative effort, especially in terms of independent scientific contributions, proposal preparation, archival and conference publications, supervision of graduate students and other facets of scholarly activity.

- C.4. The Department Chair or advocate asks all tenured, departmental faculty of rank equal to or higher than the proposed rank for the candidate to review a dossier consisting of the candidate's curriculum vitae, self appraisal, external referees' letters and letters from senior collaborators. Each departmental reviewer must provide a letter of recommendation, clearly indicating whether he/she supports, does not support, or abstains from voting on the application.
- C.5. The Department Chair or advocate prepares a Memorandum of Recommendation that summarizes the details of the case. This Memorandum of Recommendation should include, at a minimum, the following.
- A table that summarizes the candidate's research funding with the following headers: Title, Source, Dates, Role, Total Amount, Role Amount (if applicable)
 - A table of teaching summary for the past 5 years with the following headers: Course (e.g., ECE 2097), Course Name, Credits, Term, Number of students, OMET score
 - A table that summarizes the sources of external letters and senior collaborator letters with headers: External/Sr Collaborator, Name, Institution, candidate suggestion, invited, response.
 - A summary of the faculty recommendations (voting).

If the Chair does not support the promotion of the candidate, then both the candidate and the Dean must be so informed, and the appointed advocate should prepare a separate Memorandum of Recommendation, which would be included in the final dossier. (The Chair also must include 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), then the completed dossier must clearly describe the candidate's contributions to those endeavors. Further, where it is felt that the candidate has made important contributions to non-classroom teaching, those contributions must also be clearly documented. The completed dossier with full documentation must be transmitted to the Dean by October 1 of the year that the candidate is to be evaluated. 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 decide for themselves to 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 or not 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 that is guided by this document. Letters from individual eligible faculty are still required as in C4.

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

D.1. Constitution of APTR Committee

- In order to maximize departmental representation on 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 Associate Dean for Academic Affairs or the Associate Dean for Research will be appointed as an ex-officio (non-voting) member of the Committee. The Dean may be present at these meetings and participate in discussions, but will not vote.
- b. The ex-officio member of the committee will neither vote, nor enter into discussions related to the merits of promotion. His/her role is to ensure the both the university and SSOE guidelines and procedures are followed, to help the APTRC gather information that was missing from the dossier, and to count the secret ballots.
 - c. The term of 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 Committee Chair is appointed by the Dean for a one-year term. The Dean may elect to retain the current chair or select a new chair at the Dean's discretion.
 - f. Conflicts of Interest (COI) policy – When a dossier is being considered, all APTRC activities (discussions, votes, letter writing, signing letters) will be bound by these guidelines.
 - 1. Members of the candidate's primary department are excluded
 - 2. Appointment Stream (AS) members (formerly known as NTS) are excluded from TTS cases
 - 3. Associate professors are excluded from full professor discussions
 - 4. This policy applies to all APTRC members, including the chair and ex officio member
 - 5. Other conflicts of interest as identified by the APTRC members (e.g., APTRC member is a senior collaborator with a candidate, is a Co-PI or PI with a candidate)
 - 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 and/or abstain from a vote only if he/she believes 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 full APTRC Committee meets with the Dean to discuss procedural aspects of the review process.
- b. Typically, a three-member sub-committee is formed to facilitate a detailed evaluation of a candidate. That evaluation is presented to the APTRC, which will function as a whole; i.e., each eligible member (members with COI are excluded) is required to review every case and cast his/her vote secretly (with votes counted by the ex officio member or the APTRC chair or dean if the ex officio member has a COI).

- c. After having convened and reviewed the candidate's dossier, the APTRC may arrange a meeting with the Department Chair or Advocate in order to clarify outstanding questions. In the case of an Advocate, the APTRC will invite the Advocate to present the dossier to the Committee and to answer questions of fact or clarification concerning the promotion case at hand. The Committee should also invite the Department Chair to answer questions of fact or clarification.
- d. The APTRC writes a detailed letter of recommendation to the Dean for each case. The vote for each case is provided by the ex officio member (or APTRC chair if there was a COI with the ex officio member). Comments regarding Teaching, Research, Service, Internal Letters, External Letters, etc. are provided. In the case of split decisions, both points of view are represented in an unbiased manner. Each letter is signed by all eligible committee members, but the signatures do NOT indicate the vote of the member. Rather, the signature means that the members concur that the APTRC letter fairly and accurately conveys the deliberations of the discussions for that case. A paragraph may be added to the candidate's letter that provides collective APTRC faculty development suggestions for the candidate's next career phase.
- e. All APTRC proceedings must be kept 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.
- f. The APTRC Chair submits the final recommendation letter to the Dean by January 15.

E. Dean's Decision Process

- E.1. At the end of the review process, the Dean will discuss with the APTRC the Committee's recommendations.
- E.2. The Dean reviews his/her decision with each candidate directly regardless of the outcome (positive or negative) for promotion. If the decision for promotion to full professor is negative, 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).
- E.3. The Dean will then meet with the department chair/advocate of every case (whether promotion is accepted or denied). 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, he/she may not retain a copy of the letter. The department chair/advocate may ask the APTRC chair to see this letter 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.
- E.4. The Dean sends all positive recommendations to the Provost with the full dossier and all other necessary documentation.

APPENDIX A

Promotion Dossier Contents:

The APTRC carefully checks for the inclusion of every section of the Dossier provided in this Appendix. Therefore, the chair/advocate should include every portion of the dossier found in this Appendix.

I. Memorandum of Recommendation

Written by the Department Chair (or advocate), this Memorandum presents the details of the case. **A SSOE template of the information that is required in this memorandum is found in the Appendix to this document.** The Memorandum must address, in separate sections, the candidate's contributions to the teaching, research and service/leadership missions of the Department, the School of Engineering and the University. Where the candidate has substantially participated in collaborative, including interdisciplinary research, those contributions must be clearly documented. Similarly, if the candidate has made substantial contributions to non-classroom teaching or has introduced teaching innovations, those contributions must also be documented. The Memorandum should provide an assessment of the role of the candidate in the context of the department's future plans. Further, the Memorandum should summarize the results of the voting of the senior faculty. If the Chair does not support the promotion, then the candidate and the Dean must be informed 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. Rather the APTRC bases its decisions solely on the review of the dossier. (Retention issues are important, but they should be directed to the Dean, not to 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 important changes (e.g. new research grants, summer term teaching scores, publications, invited presentations, awards, etc.) In no case will information 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 department chair/advocate will be informed of the voting dates by the APTRC chair.

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 - a complete listing.

1. Refereed Publications sub-divided as follows:

- (i) Refereed journal papers, including names of co-authors (author list should be exactly as it appears in the published paper), dates of publication, volume/issue numbers and inclusive page numbers. It is suggested that the candidate indicate author relationships (e.g., advisor, graduate student, etc.).
- (ii) Books and monographs, including names of co-authors (if any), dates of publication and publishers.

- (iii) Edited books and chapters in edited books, including names of co-authors and co-editors (if any), dates of publication and publishers.
 - (iv) Papers in fully refereed conference proceedings, including names of co-authors, name and date(s) of conference and sponsoring organization(s) and inclusive page numbers.
2. Non-refereed Publications subdivided as follows:
- (i) Papers in non-refereed conference proceedings and conference proceedings edited, author list should be as it appears in the publication, name(s) and date(s) of conference(s) and sponsoring organization(s), and inclusive page numbers
 - (ii) Patents and other intellectual property created
 - (iii) Invited presentations, including titles, dates and locations
- D. Externally Funded Research Proposals divided into two categories: (i.) Peer-reviewed proposals and (ii) non-peer reviewed proposals. For each proposal in each category, include the names of agencies, organizations or companies, levels and periods of support, and the roles of the candidate (PI, co-PI, or Senior Investigator). The name of PI if other than the candidate and names of all co-PIs must be included. For each proposal, a brief summary of the nature and aim of the proposed work is needed. Proposals submitted and still under consideration can be included and noted as such.
- E. Contributions to Teaching
1. Courses Taught over the past five years, including core/elective, level of study, and number of students.
 2. Courses developed by the applicant should be denoted. Courses that have been significantly changed/improved/new pedagogical method/etc. should be noted, as well as if new programs, certificates were developed.
 3. The specific description of type of course should be indicated (lecture, lab), along with the level (grad/undergrad), and whether the course was co-instructed with others (and if so, what role did the candidate play?).
 4. Classroom innovations introduced
 5. Contributions to non-classroom teaching
 6. An OMET summary table
 7. Complete OMET forms, scores, and student comments should be provided in the Section VIII Dossier Appendix
 8. Any other measure/evidence of teaching effectiveness that the candidate wishes to include
- F. Graduate Students - a complete listing of MS and Ph.D. students advised or in progress (as the major advisor or co-advisor), including the source of support for each student. Students for whom the applicant served merely as a committee member should not be included.
- G. Honors and Awards
- H. Professional Service & Leadership Activities - a detailed listing including:
1. Department, School and University committees on which the applicant served in a position of leadership (chair, vice chair);

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 within the community.

J. Consulting Activities

K. Contributions to Innovation – this section should detail any contributions to Innovation demonstrated by the candidate, with examples including spin-off companies based on the candidate’s technologies, licensing of patents, new software products, changes in ways that companies operate or manufacture materials based on the candidate’s research, new product designs, new technologies, etc. associated with the research, teaching, or service associated with the candidate.

III. Self Evaluation

The candidate must prepare a self-evaluation 5-8 pages in length that expands upon and clarifies information in the CV regarding research, service and teaching. The self-evaluation of contributions to diversity should be incorporated in the appropriate section(s). The report should include a summary of teaching evaluation results since last promotion. The self-evaluation should also be consistent with the descriptions of the desired rank (associate or full professor) that is provided in the Provosts’ Office Faculty Handbook and in quoted earlier in these guidelines.

IV. Letters from Eligible Departmental Faculty

Each member of the Department of TS rank equal to or higher than the proposed rank for the candidate is asked by the Department Chair to write a letter of recommendation. It is the obligation of each departmental reviewer to provide a letter that indicates either support or non-support of or abstaining on the candidate’s case. These letters are considered extremely important; the Department Chair should make sure that all eligible faculty provide written input.

V. Letters from External Scholars

The Department Chair should provide a brief description of each of the external referees, why he or she is particularly qualified to evaluate the candidate, and any prior interactions with the candidate, such as Ph.D. advisor, collaborator, etc.

VI. Letters from Senior Collaborators

Individual letters from senior faculty (within the University of Pittsburgh or from outside) who have had substantial collaborations with the candidate should be included. These letters should describe the candidate’s contribution to the collaborative effort, especially in terms of independent scientific contributions, proposal preparation, archival and conference publications, supervision of graduate students, and other facets of the scholarly activity. **A SSOE template for a letter soliciting Senior Collaborator input is included in the Appendix to this document.** These letters are not intended to be letters that review the teaching, research and service contributions of the candidate followed by a

statement that provides support (or not support) for promotion. Rather, this letter should clarify the role and contributions of the candidate in their joint projects with Senior Collaborators. Senior Collaborator letters may be solicited from professors holding the same current rank as the candidate, or a higher rank.

VII. Annual Review Letters

The Department Chair will add copies of the candidate's annual review letters.

VIII. Dossier Appendix

This second volume should include additional materials, such as:

- A. Reprints of five representative, refereed publications; and
- B. Copies of all teaching evaluation forms from all courses taught during at least the past 5 years, including student comments

**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*.