

**PROVOST'S GUIDELINES FOR THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS
FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY
For Applicants, Committees, Chairs, and Deans
2020-2021**

The Provost's guidelines provide recommendations to the candidate developing a portfolio for promotion and tenure on ways to present their accomplishments effectively and concisely. They were developed to promote consistency in the organization of the candidate's materials, to provide the candidate with an understanding of what reviewers look for, and to provide clarity to readers at various levels of review.

The guidelines in no way supersede, replace the language of the MSP contract, or reflect a comprehensive statement of MSP contract principles. The faculty candidate, members of personnel committees, and chairs are expected to review the relevant sections of the MSP contract.

SPECIAL NOTE: Tenure decision delay available to pre-tenure faculty, published March 25, 2020

Given current unprecedented conditions, the administration and MSP have agreed that all pre-tenure faculty members will receive a one-year delay of their tenure decision.

Should a faculty member not wish the tenure delay, they may opt out at any time, such that if they choose to go up as they were initially scheduled, they may do so simply by submitting their materials in accordance with the P&T protocols for that year.

CANDIDATE ELIGIBILITY

Important note: The candidate is advised to talk with their chair and dean, and to consult the MSP contract, before deciding when to seek promotion and tenure.

For candidates seeking promotion to rank of associate professor with tenure

- Assistant professors must submit their portfolio for tenure no later than September of their sixth year. The "tenure clock" will be extended only upon terms as expressly set forth in the MSP contract.
- A maximum of three years of full-time service in other four-year institutions of higher education may be credited to the experience requirement for promotion which results in tenure. This consideration of professional work prior to hire at UMass Lowell must be specified in the letter of offer from the Provost (the hiring authority) at the time of hiring. This allows productivity at the previous institution to be included in the consideration for tenure and promotion along with their productivity at UMass Lowell, thus providing an option (not a requirement) for candidates to submit their materials for tenure and promotion prior to September of their 6th year.
- Any candidate may elect to submit their portfolio for consideration prior to their sixth year where a case can be made that they have satisfied the criteria as set forth in the MSP contract. It is prudent in all such cases for the candidate to consult with their department chair and dean prior to considering submission of their portfolio.
- Persons hired as Associate Professors and not given tenure at the time of hire must have at minimum two years of service at the University of Massachusetts Lowell at the time tenure becomes effective.

For candidates seeking promotion to rank of full professor

- The candidate must have eight years of successful, full-time teaching experience in four-year institutions of higher education at the rank of assistant professor or higher, with three years of such experience at the University of Massachusetts Lowell, two of which years must be at the rank of associate professor.
- The various review levels for consideration for promotion typically will focus on the candidate's accomplishments and performance while in rank at the University of Massachusetts Lowell. Secondary consideration is then given to the overall body of work of the candidate over their career, including work prior to previous promotions or at prior institutions.

REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Eligible candidates are advised to begin their preparation by reviewing Article VIII of the MSP contract, which outlines the tenure and promotion procedure, and to make themselves familiar with the promotion and tenure calendar and the relevant deadlines that are part of the process.

Article VII of the MSP contract provides guidance for the candidate and reviewers on the requirements for promotion and tenure.

Based on the contract, consideration of a candidate for tenure shall be based on the following:

- a. *Convincing evidence of excellence in research, creative or professional activity and teaching and strength in service such as to demonstrate the possession of qualities appropriate to a member of the faculty occupying a permanent position.*
- b. *Reasonable assurance of continuing development and achievement leading to further contributions to the University.*

The MSP contract also sets forth specific promotion requirements for faculty ranks; please see VII.B.2.d.(1).

EXTERNAL REVIEW LETTERS – Information, Procedures, and Timeline

External review letters are a fundamental component of the tenure-track process and for promotion to Associate Professor, Professor, and conferral of tenure. The purpose of external review letters is to provide an independent evaluation of the candidate's scholarly reputation and achievements in the discipline. Accordingly, candidates benefit most optimally when their external reviewers are of the highest echelon of their discipline and can address the candidate's eligibility for promotion and/or tenure. To be effective, the external reviewers must have achieved or surpassed the rank that is being sought by the candidate under review.

External review letters are solicited by the department chair in consultation with the candidate and the dean; in most cases, the chair solicits more than five external reviews to ensure that an appropriate number is obtained. **All external review letters solicited and received by the chair are included with the candidate's evaluation; no letters received will be dismissed, edited, excluded or discarded.**

Confidentiality of the External Review Process:

- External reviews provided in confidence carry the highest value to the reviewers and the candidate.
- To the extent possible, external reviewers shall be assured confidentiality of reviewing bodies.
To protect the confidentiality of external peer reviewers, no letter from any level of campus review should use the name of reviewers. Where external letters are cited or quoted, those references should be made by the number assigned on Appendix 2, e.g., "reviewer 2 indicated that [...]"
- External reviewers shall be advised by the chair prior to submitting the review letter as to whether the candidate has waived the right to see the external review letters. (See Appendix 1: External Review Letters Waiver Statement.)
- If the candidate elects to view the external review letters, as specified in the External Review Letters Waiver Statement, the chair will notify the external reviewer of this decision **at the time of the initial request for the review.**

Guidelines for Selecting External Reviewers:

These outside reviewers should be affiliated with institutions that require rigorous research and scholarship, the quality of which either meets or exceeds the standards of the University of Massachusetts Lowell. It is suggested that an explanation be provided if external reviewers are selected from institutions that are not of the same stature.

Qualified external reviewers:

- should be actively engaged in the discipline, including emeriti faculty members
- must have achieved the rank sought by the candidate, or higher
- must not** have a vested interest in the outcome of the decision. Such conflicts of interest with the candidate may include but are not limited to:

- having served as a mentor, such as those who served on the candidate's dissertation committee or been a post-doctoral advisor
- having conducted research collaboration or published with the candidate with the exception of a mega-multiple-authored publication (in some fields, it may be difficult to find appropriate reviewers who have not collaborated in some way with a candidate for full professor. In such a case, the chair will document this and discuss with the Office of the Provost prior to soliciting a letter)
- having a close personal or familial relationship
- having been a student of the candidate
- having a professional or financial stake in the candidate's promotion

External reviewers are asked to address:

- the nature and length of the external reviewer's past or present association to the candidate
- the significance of the candidate's contributions to the discipline/profession
- an assessment of the candidate's development as a scholar compared with others in the field who are at a similar stage of their career
- the quality and quantity of the candidate's work, and the appropriateness of the venues/outlets used by the candidate to disseminate scholarly works
- an assessment of papers/discoveries/innovations published by the candidate that may have a major impact on the field
- the extent to which the candidate's record reflects a productive scholarly and creative activity agenda compared to peers in the discipline. Scholarly and creative activity include publications, presentations, patents, performances, exhibits, extramurally funded activities, intellectual property, and corporate relationships.
- any relevant information about common practices within the discipline such as conventions regarding multiple authorship, expectations for extramural funding, collaborative interactions, appropriate terminal outlets for publication, or other factors that may help the university evaluate the candidate relative to disciplinary expectations
- special distinctions and honors achieved by the candidate

External reviewers are asked to provide a clear recommendation for or against the desired personnel action based upon their assessment of the candidate's research.

EXTERNAL LETTER PROCEDURES

Candidate's Suggested Reviewers

- The candidate provides a list of suggestions for external reviewers to their department chairperson to consider. It is recommended that this list be provided to the chair **by May 1** prior to the September when the candidate will submit promotion and tenure materials.
- The candidate may also inform the chair of persons they wish to exclude from consideration as potential reviewers on the basis of real or perceived conflict of interest.
- The candidate will provide to their chair:
 - a signed, completed waiver form (Appendix 1)
 - suggestions for external reviewers and excluded reviewers (Appendix 2a)
 - a current CV
 - a reasonable number of samples of scholarly work for submission to external reviewers
 - (optional) a brief statement (suggested no more than one page) of research accomplishments—this statement is typically incorporated into the research section of the candidate narrative.

The candidate will not solicit letters from or have any contact with external reviewers during the entire promotion and tenure process. The final list of external reviewers will not be shared with the candidate.

Chair and Dean Consultation on Reviewers

The chair and the dean supplement the list of suggested external reviewers submitted by the candidate (Appendix 2a). **The chair selects the reviewers from whom letters will be requested.** Reviewers selected by the chair should represent a balance of input from the candidate, the dean, and the chair. The list should not include reviewers excluded by the candidate.

Chair Solicitation of External Letters

By May 15, the chair solicits external reviews from the final list via a preliminary email to secure a commitment from reviewers and to prompt reviewers to disclose any potential conflicts of interest.

Once a reviewer has confirmed their willingness to write, the chair sends to the reviewer

- a letter (see Appendices 4 and 5) outlining the review expectation (as specified in the MSP contract, Articles VII and IX), indicating whether or not the candidate has waived the right to view the external review letter, and requesting the reviewer’s CV
- the candidate’s current CV
- a reasonable number of samples of the candidate’s scholarly work
- the candidate’s brief statement of research accomplishments (if provided)

The chair will provide all reviewers with the same set of materials, and an identical letter soliciting their review. If the chair does not receive at least five external review letter commitments per candidate **by June 22**, they will solicit additional reviewers using the process above. All external review letters and reviewer CVs should be received **by September 1**.

The chair will upload the following to the P&T fileshare, in accordance with the P&T calendar:

- the final copy of the External Review Letters Waiver Statement, Appendix 1
- the final copy of the External Review Letters Evaluator Selections, Appendix 2b & 2c
- and, for each external reviewer:
 - o the chair’s letter (email) requesting the external review
 - o the external review letter
 - o the external reviewer’s CV

Please note: Department chairs who have completed Appendix 2 prior to the workshop may submit the form as it was used in 2019-20 for this cycle.

EXTERNAL LETTER TIMELINE

Early requests may facilitate reviewer availability; it is recommended that each of these milestones are met no later than the dates noted:

May 1	Candidate provides list of potential reviewers and those to exclude from the reviewer list
May 15	Chair solicits external reviews from final list of reviewers
Last week of May	Chair sends candidate materials to reviewers who have accepted
June 22	If the chair has not received at least five external review letter commitments per candidate, they will solicit additional reviewers
September 1	External reviewers should submit their evaluation and CV
First Monday in October	Chair submits materials to P&T fileshare (this is a contractual deadline)

THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PORTFOLIO

Portfolio Format

The candidate submits two PDF files: a main portfolio and a supplemental materials file. The Electronic Materials Workshop is offered each spring to provide the candidate with support for constructing their portfolio. These materials may not be edited after the submission deadline. (Candidates may submit updates as addenda; see the section on addenda and responses for acceptable items.)

Main Portfolio Content

- Cover page, to include:
 - name
 - present rank
 - department and college
 - date of appointment at the University of Massachusetts Lowell and rank awarded
 - number of credits for years of prior service, if applicable
 - area of specialization within the discipline
- External Letter Waiver Statement (Appendix 1)
- Candidate's section of the List of Suggested External Reviewers (Appendix 2a)
- Candidate's Curriculum Vitae (CV) (MSP contract Appendix A-9, Personnel Form #6)
The CV is intended to provide the accomplishments of the candidate's entire career, including the specific details of accomplishments at UMass Lowell. Accomplishments from the period under review are typically provided in bold face type. There is no page limit for the CV.
- Candidate's Narrative—recommended length, approximately 5 to 7 pages
- Instructional Activity Chart (Appendix 6)
- Research Funding Report (Appendix 7) (if applicable)

Electronic Supplemental Materials Content

Required

- All annual or periodic evaluations by the Department Personnel Committee, department chair, and dean
- Student evaluations from the period under review—including scanned copies of all pages/sides of all completed evaluation forms (including numerical ratings and written comments)

Optional

- Several samples of the candidate's most notable scholarly works
- Other supplemental content that significantly advances or illustrates the case that cannot be sufficiently expressed in the CV or narrative – in consideration of the readers, the candidate should include only the most critical items, and should label them clearly

NEW

- COVID-19 impact statement (see addendum of August 17, 2020 at the end of this document.)

There is no preclusion of the candidate to include any item that they deem important. However, candidates are advised that reviewers are unlikely to put weight on ancillary material or documentation beyond what is indicated above. Accordingly, candidates are advised to focus their efforts to ensure that their narrative and CV are thorough and complete.

CANDIDATE'S NARRATIVE

The candidate's narrative should tell the story of their accomplishments in research/scholarship/creative activity, instructional effectiveness, and service. The narrative should provide the context, perspective and focus of the candidate's work, describing its place in their discipline and in the university, impact on the field and their contributions to the mission of UMass Lowell. We recommend that an effective candidate narrative is 5 to 7 pages in length.

An effective narrative will present a concise, synthesized overview of the candidate's accomplishments and their distinctive contributions. It will offer the reader a sense of the candidate's overall career trajectory, using selective details that focus on the candidate's achievements during the relevant period of review at the University of Massachusetts Lowell.

The narrative should address each of the three standard areas of evaluation outlined in the MSP contract (IX.E.) and should focus on the outcomes of the work in each. Both for tenure and for promotion to full professor, accomplishments may be assessed in a variety of ways and may vary across disciplines. The narrative should enable reviewers—**including those who come from other specialties or disciplines**—to make informed judgments based on both qualitative and quantitative measures.

RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, CREATIVE ACTIVITY

In this section of the narrative, the candidate should show how they have advanced their scholarly agenda, furthered conversations in their field, and established their commitment to the work. These examples should illustrate key accomplishments listed in the CV. The candidate should provide sufficient explanation of disciplinary conventions to allow colleagues from any discipline to interpret their accomplishments and to understand the criteria that are most important in the candidate's field of study.

The candidate should discuss the importance of their research, scholarly works, and/or creative activity and the development of their discipline. This is defined in the MSP contract (VII.B.2.c.(2)):

Including, but not limited to research funded by governmental agencies, professional associations and/or publicly acknowledged by learned and professional societies; book publications by governmental agencies, professional associations, and/or acknowledged publishing houses; and publications in recognized professional and/or academic journals, and published conference proceedings.

In addition to the above, the narrative may also address the outcomes of other types of research, scholarship and creative activity, such as, but not limited to:

- adoption, dissemination, and recognition of work through extramural funding
- collaboration with the private sector, public schools and non-governmental agencies
- impact of work on diverse communities
- intellectual property disclosures, patent application and licenses
- performances
- juried displays
- extent to which the work has promoted interdisciplinarity
- extent of leadership of a multidisciplinary team
- honors, awards and recognitions received

Faculty seeking promotion to full professor should emphasize examples of distinguishing accomplishments, such as, but not limited to:

- the development of disciplinary or interdisciplinary scholarship sustained over time, earning stature and recognition in the field(s)
- research or scholarly achievement as demonstrated by a continued record of accomplishments resulting in publication of a significant number of articles in recognized journals and/or in publication of a book or its edited equivalent
- leadership roles on multi-investigator grants
- examples of translational scholarship: impact on the field, scholarly paradigms being adapted by others, or put into practice in settings beyond academia through patents, licensing of intellectual property, or adoption in the private or public sectors
- significant and wide recognition by learned societies or professional associations for demonstrated achievement of leadership in the discipline or professional area
- prominent, invited talks (keynote addresses, etc.)

When articulating the impact of the scholarship:

- the candidate should provide a measures of impact appropriate to the discipline, such as, but not limited to:
 - contextualized use of citation indices
 - information about the quality of peer-reviewed presses or journals

- the candidate should remember that not all reviewers will be familiar with the conventions of their discipline, and compose their narratives accordingly

The Research Funding Report

For faculty with research funding managed through the Office of Research Administration (ORA), the portfolio should include the Research Funding Report (Appendix 7) after the conclusion of the narrative. This chart, which will be prepared for candidates by the Office of Research Administration, documents key data items relating to proposals, sponsors, roles, effort, awards and increments, providing readers with a comprehensive overview of research funding. As needed, an alternative or supplemental chart may be provided to showcase a particular aspect of research activity that the candidate wishes to emphasize. The P&T team will send the names of tenure-track candidates who have requested a fileshare folder to ORA by mid-July; ORA will send the complete report to any candidate with a history of ORA funding from 2014 (the first available year) to the present.

INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

In this section of the narrative, the candidate should articulate their contributions to the University's instructional mission in and beyond the classroom. The candidate should specify the student outcomes resulting from their instructional efforts. The candidate should present their accomplishments in ways that enable colleagues from any discipline to understand the criteria that are most important for instruction in the specific field of study.

Excellence in instruction is central to the mission of UMass Lowell, and faculty engage in a wide array of related activities that, both directly and indirectly, create the rich educational environment we provide for our students. In accordance with the MSP contract, evaluation of faculty achievement in instructional effectiveness should consider the full breadth of their contributions.

The MSP contract (VII.B.2.c.(1)) defines instructional effectiveness as:

Including, but not limited to [...] development, improvement and demonstration of subject matter competence, continued improvement of methods and procedures of classroom presentation; active participation in departmental evaluation of course offerings and curricula for the purpose of maintaining their quality, relevance, and viability; conscientious discharging of responsibilities for student advisement throughout the academic year; and special or uniquely valuable contributions to the development or implementation or teaching of needed courses in any college or division of the University, and the like.

In addition to the above, the narrative may address other aspects of the candidate's contributions related to instruction, such as, but not limited to:

- ensuring student success through the continuous improvement of instruction
- pedagogic innovation
- courses developed, redeveloped, and taught; and their place in the curriculum
- currency and appropriateness of course content
- fulfillment of program, department, and Core learning outcomes
- promoting equity in student achievement
- clarity and transparency of teaching materials, including articulating expected student outcomes
- response to instructional issues raised in teaching observations, annual/periodic reviews, or student evaluations
- use of student learning outcomes assessment to improve teaching
- role and contribution in the supervision/ mentoring of independent studies, experiential learning opportunities (undergraduate research, service learning, community-engaged learning, external placements, etc.), theses, dissertations

- engagement in interdisciplinary/collaborative instruction
- teaching awards and honors

The narrative may also address contributions to the university's instructional mission beyond classroom instruction, including, but not limited to:

- academic advising, including advisee load
- development of learning opportunities outside the classroom
- promoting equity in providing special opportunities and achievements for students
- curriculum development and implementation
- program-level assessment of student learning outcomes used for curricular improvement
- development of curricular materials to be shared with colleagues
- seeking or providing professional development on instruction-related topics
- production of scholarship of teaching and learning (presentations, publications)
- internal or external funding for instructional activities
- partnering with campus support services to improve students' academic success

Faculty seeking promotion to full professor should emphasize examples of distinguishing accomplishments, such as, but not limited to:

- demonstration of pedagogical improvements sustained over time
- mentoring of junior faculty with respect to teaching
- examples of impact on the department or wider university relating to instructional methods
- leadership in curriculum development and continuous improvement

The Instructional Activity Chart

In the portfolio, the candidate provides the Instructional Activity Chart (Appendix 6) after the conclusion of the narrative. This chart documents key data items relating to teaching assignments, enrollments, and student evaluations, helping readers to visualize the teaching load for each term. As needed, a supplemental chart may be provided to showcase a particular aspect of instructional activity that the candidate wishes to emphasize.

SERVICE

In this section of the narrative, the candidate should discuss the impact of their sustained and transformative service to the profession, University, and community. The narrative should not merely list activities undertaken or committee memberships, but should provide readers with a clear picture of how the candidate shapes professional life in the discipline, participates in faculty self-governance, and enacts leadership at these various levels. The narrative should clarify the candidate's role in key service activities cited, and identify the resulting accomplishments and outcomes; leadership roles should be emphasized.

Please refer to the definitions of service outlined in the MSP contract, which provide a foundation for what should be included in this section. In addition to those definitions, the narrative may address the outcomes of other types of service within the three categories:

Service to the Profession, such as, but not limited to:

- service as a reviewer or editor of publications/proposals
- presentations and organizing panels and other events at national and international conferences
- moderating at conferences and professional meetings
- serving on the boards of professional societies
- evidence of impact on diverse communities, where applicable

Service to the University, such as, but not limited to:

- service on department, college or university-wide committees

- mentoring junior faculty, e.g., service on Launch@UML teams, or as part of college or departmental efforts
- fundraising or recruiting for the department or college
- service on professional boards or accreditation agencies as a representative of the University
- service on University-wide task forces
- service as an MSP officer or board member
- service as a faculty advisor to students including clubs, Living- Learning Communities, DifferenceMaker teams, etc.

The candidate should list both compensated and uncompensated service assignments, and delineate accordingly.

Service to the Community, such as, but not limited to:

- participation on community boards, activities developed outside regular curricula engaging communities in the work of the faculty member
- serving as an expert on public panels or giving presentations to the public
- significant outreach activities performed in a professional capacity, such as outreach to K-12 students and teachers, outreach to other community groups, or public outreach
- engagement with diverse communities related to the faculty member's area of academic or professional expertise

Faculty seeking promotion to full professor should emphasize examples of distinguishing accomplishments, such as, but not limited to:

- national leadership roles in disciplinary or professional societies or journal editorships
- leadership roles on campus
- mentoring of junior faculty with respect to career development
- leadership in major, university-wide initiatives
- forging sustained, impactful partnerships with the community

UPLOAD INFORMATION FOR ALL CANDIDATES

The two PDF files described above (the main portfolio and the supplemental materials) are uploaded into a UML P&T fileshare for secure distribution to authorized campus reviewers. Access to the fileshare for the candidate and all reviewers strictly follows the P&T calendar; late upload is not permissible.

In order to facilitate establishment of a candidate folder within the P&T fileshare, it is recommended that the candidate sends a notice of intent to apply for promotion and/or tenure—via the new web form accessible at <https://www.uml.edu/service/Apps/Forms/Form/Render?id=218412>—by **July 1, 2020**.

The final portfolio and supplemental materials must be uploaded electronically to the P&T fileshare by **Monday, September 21, 2020 at 5:00 pm**. The candidate is advised to have the portfolio reviewed by mentors prior to uploading, as it may not be altered after this deadline.

ADDENDA & RESPONSES

After September 21, 2020, the candidate may submit addenda to the portfolio that includes significant new updates to the materials in the portfolio. Addenda should be submitted by email to PandT@uml.edu with a copy to the department chair and dean. Only the candidate may submit addenda. Because they are not a formal part of the portfolio, these addenda will not trigger further review by levels completed prior to submission. Addenda are limited to:

- publications accepted after final submission of the candidate's portfolio
- funded grant notices/awards after final submission of the candidate's portfolio
- honors or awards received after final submission of the candidate's portfolio
- candidate responses to recommendation letters by various levels of review (in accordance with the

promotion and tenure calendar)

- other extraordinary examples appropriate to the candidate's discipline

RESOURCES

Additional information can be found at www.uml.edu/PandT, including the promotion and tenure calendar, which provides the candidate and reviewing authorities with a timetable of due dates for the given academic year, and the addenda and templates referred to in this document.

Candidate questions about portfolio content should be addressed to the department chair.

Any questions about electronic portfolio creation or fileshare uploads may be directed to PandT@uml.edu.

These guidelines were approved by the Provost in April 2020.

SUMMARY OF KEY GUIDELINE CHANGES FOR 2020-2021

- **Tenure decision delay available to pre-tenure faculty, published March 25, 2020**

Given current unprecedented conditions, the administration and MSP have agreed that all pre-tenure faculty members will receive a one-year delay of their tenure decision.

Should a faculty member not wish the tenure delay, they may opt out at any time, such that if they choose to go up as they were initially scheduled, they may do so simply by submitting their materials in accordance with the P&T protocols for that year.

- New process for candidates to request a 2020-21 P&T fileshare folder: Complete the simple web form at <https://www.uml.edu/service/Apps/Forms/Form/Render?id=218412> by July 1, 2020.
- External reviewers will not be asked to submit a biographical paragraph.
- Appendix 1, the External Review Letters Waiver Statement, has been edited. A candidate who has already submitted the 2019-20 version of the form to the department chair does not need to resubmit.
- Appendix 2, the External Review Letters Evaluation Selections form, has been split into three parts to make it easier to use. The candidate will fill out part 2A only. The dean will fill out part 2B, and the chair will fill out part 2C.
- Appendix 6, the Instructional Activity Chart, has been edited.
- Appendix 7, the Research Funding Report, is a new element of the portfolio to be included by faculty for whom it is applicable (i.e., faculty with projects managed through the Office of Research Administration).
- **IMPORTANT:** The submission deadline for the candidate's materials has been moved **from 11:59 pm to 5:00 pm on September 21, 2020**. This change ensures that IT Help Desk assistance will be available for candidates with any last-minute password or technical issues.

ADDENDUM August 17, 2020

In recognition of the many ways in which the disruption of COVID-19 has affected faculty work, the Provost invites candidates to include in their supplemental materials for 2020-21 a one-page statement outlining any relevant impact of the pandemic and its resulting conditions on their efforts in the areas of evaluation.

A COVID-19 Statement is not required. Faculty who opt to provide one may include it in their supplemental materials file (see page 5 of this document).

Faculty candidates and members of review committees may wish to refer to this helpful document as a reference:

Asking the Right Questions: A primer for merit, tenure and promotion evaluation committees.

<https://www.pnas.org/content/pnas/suppl/2020/06/17/2010636117.DCSupplemental/pnas.2010636117.sapp.pdf>

For a more complete discussion of the impact of COVID-19 on faculty work, please refer to the following article, which is the source of the primer linked above:

Malisch, J.L. et al. (2020). Opinion: In the wake of COVID-19, academia needs new solutions to ensure gender equity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* Jul 2020, 117(27), 15378-15381

<https://www.pnas.org/content/pnas/117/27/15378.full.pdf>