

Title: SDS Promotion and Tenure Policy for Tenure-Track, Tenured, and Academic General Faculty

Status: Final

Original Policy Date: Passed by the SDS AAC on March 18, 2020

Last Revised: December 1, 2025; Passed by SDS Faculty on December 10, 2025; Approved by SDS Dean on December 19, 2025

Oversight Executive: Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs

Applies to: SDS Tenure-Track, Tenured, and Academic General Faculty

Publicize Policy? Yes

Definitions:

Promotion: The act of being raised in a professional position or academic rank (e.g., Assistant Professor to Associate Professor)

Tenure-Track Faculty (with term): A faculty appointment with *finite* duration (a ‘term’) that is tenure-eligible (i.e.; an explicit end date is stated for that position, which is typically three years from the initial appointment).

Tenured Faculty (without term): A non-term faculty appointment having an indefinite duration (i.e., there is no end date to employment within that position). Faculty who are hired in as “tenured pending review” are automatically assigned a five-year term until tenure is awarded.

Academic General Faculty (AGF): A faculty appointment with a finite duration not tenure-eligible (i.e., the position is ‘termed’, where an explicit end date is stated for the position, typically three or five years from the initial appointment). AGF are appointed to one of three tracks: teaching, research, or practice.

Reviewers and Referees: Letter writers who are asked to provide a formal assessment of the candidate’s promotion dossier. The terms **reviewer** and **referee** are interchangeable for the purposes of this document. Reviewers/referees are asked to provide an objective and informed assessment of the candidate. Reviewers/referees can express their support for the candidate’s case through either an arm’s length letter or a letter of support (see definitions below).

Arm’s Length Letters: As noted in [PROV-017](#), “arm’s length” refers to “outside references who are not likely, and not perceived to be likely, to have a preexisting positive or negative bias toward the candidate. Letters from former or current advisors, collaborators, or co-workers are not arm’s-length. Letters from individuals with only incidental relationships with the candidate, such as serving together on editorial boards or professional committees, may be considered arm’s length.” If an arm’s length reference writer has collaborated peripherally with a candidate in the past (e.g., co-author on a paper with a large number of co-authors, was at a prior institution at the same time, etc.) but did not collaborate closely and could therefore not be perceived to be likely to have preexisting bias, both the candidate supplying that arm’s length name and the reference writer themselves must outline the extent of prior collaborations.

Letters of Support: Individuals contributing letters of support accompanying a candidate’s appointment or promotion materials may be prior or current collaborators, past mentors, supervisors, etc., who have direct knowledge of the work, teaching, and service history of the candidate.

Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review: A review process at the midpoint of an assistant professor's probationary period, typically within the third year of their initial appointment. This process prepares candidates for their eventual consideration for promotion or tenure review in year six (6) and provides formal feedback on their progress towards their next faculty action. Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Reviews are a formal process that enlists reviews from the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee, the School Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the dean.

Expedited review: A review process that is fast-tracked off-cycle within the School and University to accommodate hiring, retention promotions, and other urgent personnel matters requiring a timely decision.

Faculty action: A promotion, a position renewal, title change, and/or tenure decision for a faculty member.

Reason for Policy:

The intention of this policy is to provide transparency into the promotion and tenure (P&T) process in the UVA School of Data Science (SDS). This document provides the steps used to evaluate candidates for promotion and/or tenure. SDS seeks to ensure a fair and comprehensive process for all faculty, regardless of rank or track. The evaluation of a faculty member's scholarly and academic record will be conducted in a balanced and thorough manner based on critical assessment of past performance and future potential. The guidelines listed here are intended to ensure that the evaluative process for promotion and/or tenure is comprehensive, fair, and transparent by outlining the different criteria for academic promotion in each track and each rank.

This SDS policy was constructed in accordance with [PROV-017](#), [PROV-004](#), and [PROV-029](#), the policies which broadly govern university policy on faculty promotion and tenure, and therefore this policy is understood to be compliant with university policy. This policy does not apply to faculty wage employees, who are given the title of "Lecturer" in the School of Data Science (see [PROV-026](#)). This policy does not apply to visiting faculty appointments, courtesy appointments, or visiting scholar appointments (see [SDS Policy on Visiting and Courtesy Appointments](#)); it does not apply to non-professorial administrative or professional general faculty members (see [HRM-003](#)).

Policy Statement:

This school-specific policy conforms to and supplements the University of Virginia Provost policies [PROV-017](#), [PROV-004](#), and [PROV-029](#) governing promotion and tenure, based on the needs and structure of SDS.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	3
Section 1: Faculty Types, Ranks, and Titles	5
1.1. Faculty Appointment Types	5
1.2. Academic Ranks	6
1.3. Faculty Titles and Requirements.....	6
Section 2: SDS Promotion and Tenure Committees	8
2.1. Committee Overview	8
2.2. Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee (FP&T)	9
2.3. School Promotion and Tenure Committee (SP&T)	10
Section 3: Overview of the Pre-Promotion and Pre-Tenure Periods	11
3.1. Tenure-Track Faculty.....	11
3.1.1. The Probationary Period for Tenure-Track Faculty: Overview	11
3.1.2. Extending the Tenure-Track Probationary Period	11
3.1.3. Mid-Cycle (3 rd -Year) Review for Tenure-track Faculty.....	12
3.1.4. Reappointment for Tenure-Track Faculty During the Probationary Period	13
3.1.5. Non-Reappointment for Tenure-Track Faculty During the Probationary Period	13
3.1.6. Promotion With Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty	14
3.1.7. Tenure Denial, Appeals, and Grievances for Tenure-Track Faculty.....	15
3.2. Academic General Faculty.....	16
3.2.1. Pre-Promotion Period for Academic General Faculty: Overview	16
3.2.2. Mid-Cycle (3 rd -Year) Review for Academic General Faculty	16
3.2.3. Reappointment for Academic General Faculty (Pre-Promotion Contract Renewal).....	17
3.2.4. Non-Reappointment for Academic General Faculty (Contract Non-Renewal).....	17
3.2.5. Reappointment for Senior Academic General Faculty (Contract Renewal)	17
3.2.6. Promotion Reviews for Academic General Faculty	18
3.2.7. Promotion Denial, Appeals, and Grievances: Academic General Faculty	19
3.3. Expedited Reviews: Tenure-track and AGF.....	20
Section 4: Procedures and Timeline for Promotion and Tenure Review	21
4.1. Overview	21
4.2. Promotion and Tenure Timeline (On-Cycle) At-A-Glance.....	21
4.2.1. Mid-Cycle (3 rd -Year) Reviews (All Faculty): Timeline	21

4.2.2. Promotion and Tenure (All Faculty): Timeline	22
4.3. Detailed Promotion and/or Tenure Process and Timeline (All Faculty)	23
Section 5: Principles and Procedures Regarding Joint Appointments	26
5.1. Overview	26
5.1.1. Procedures for SDS faculty with a non-tenure-track secondary appointment:	26
5.1.2. Procedures for faculty with joint tenure-track appointments:	26
Section 6: Standards for Promotion and/or Tenure	27
6.1. Overview	27
6.2. Criteria for the award of tenure with promotion: Tenure-Track faculty	27
6.2.1. Research, Scholarship, Openness, and Translation	27
6.2.2. Teaching and Educational Activities	29
6.2.3. Service and Leadership	29
6.3. Criteria for Promotion to Professor: Tenure-Track/Tenured Faculty	30
6.4. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor: Academic General Faculty <i>Teaching Track</i>	30
6.5. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor: Academic General Faculty <i>Research Track</i>	31
6.6. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor: Academic General Faculty <i>Practice Track</i>	32
6.7. Criteria Considerations for Joint Appointments	32
Section 7: Appendices	33
Appendix A: Candidate’s Dossier	33
A.1. A current <i>curriculum vita</i> (CV).	33
A.2. Candidate Statements	34
A.3. Supporting materials (focused on activities within current rank)	35
A.3.1. Research materials	35
A.3.2. Teaching record/reviews	35
A.3.3. Service and Translational Works	36
Appendix B: External Letters (from Reviewers/Referees)	36
B.1. Template for initial ask (Via Email)	36
B.2. Template for formal requested letter (on letterhead, delivered via email):	37
B.3. Template for requesting letters from students	38
Appendix C: Template request memo for tenure clock stoppage (from faculty member)	39

Appendix D: Template request letter to the Provost’s Office for tenure clock stoppage (from SDS Office of Faculty Affairs)..... 40

Appendix E: Template request letter for faculty leave request (from faculty member) 40

Appendix F: Materials Required for the Mid-Cycle Review (3rd Year) for Tenure-Track Faculty 40

Appendix G: Materials Required for the Mid-Cycle Review (Academic General Faculty, All Tracks) 42

Section 1: Faculty Types, Ranks, and Titles

1.1. Faculty Appointment Types

Tenured/Tenure-track Faculty Appointments: By definition, a tenure-eligible or tenure-track faculty appointment has a finite duration (i.e., an explicit end date is stated for the position, which is typically three or five years from the initial appointment). Tenure-track faculty members may be appointed without term after a probationary period as assistant professor and promotion to a higher rank (associate professor or professor). Only full-time faculty members in tenure-eligible positions may be appointed without term (no end date). Faculty without term are also known as tenured faculty. See [PROV-017](#).

Academic General Faculty Appointments: Academic General Faculty (AGF) are not eligible for appointments without term (e.g., they are not tenure-eligible). AGF appointments have a finite duration (i.e., they are “termed” where an explicit end date is stated for the position, which is typically one, two, three, or five years from the initial appointment).

Academic General Faculty in the School of Data Science (SDS) are appointed to one of three tracks – Teaching, Research, or Practice – that reflects the primary focus of their faculty activities. As a rule, AGF faculty shall apply **at least 60%** of their workload to track-specific work. Track-specific work shall include either teaching or research (depending on track), and translation (for all tracks). In addition, each track may include elements of the other tracks, so long as the majority of the workload is track specific. Consistent with [PROV-004](#), SDS reserves the option, in special cases, to assign AGF with “primary responsibilities for research with minimal or no responsibility for classroom instruction” or with “primary responsibilities for teaching and/or practice without research obligations.” That is, in some cases, teaching and research faculty may devote 100% of their time to their track-specific responsibility.

Joint Appointments: Faculty members of all ranks and tracks may be appointed to the School of Data Science and at least one other UVA School. Faculty may also hold tenure in two or more schools in accordance with [PROV-029](#). Faculty with joint appointments of 10% or more in SDS are eligible for membership in the Faculty Promotion and Tenure (FP&T) Committee and hold voting rights for applicable cases, as described later in this document.

Visiting Faculty Appointments: Visiting Faculty are appointed for terms of one year or less, at the dean’s discretion and with advisement from SDS faculty. Visiting Faculty appointments may be paid appointments if teaching obligations are included in the agreement, which must be clearly outlined in the appointment letter. During the appointment period, Visiting Faculty hold a faculty rank as described in their offer letter but do not have voting privileges as SDS faculty. Visiting Scholar appointments are unpaid affiliations and are described in detail in the SDS Courtesy and Visiting Faculty Policy: see [PROV-013](#) and [SDS Courtesy and Visiting Faculty Policy](#).

Courtesy Appointments: Courtesy appointments are termed appointments awarded to UVA faculty external to SDS who contribute to SDS or advance SDS's mission. These appointments are typically awarded for three-year terms with the option for renewal requested and approved in writing. A courtesy appointment is an affiliation with SDS, not a primary or secondary appointment in SDS, as described in [PROV-029](#). Academic general faculty, tenure-track, and tenured faculty in other schools at UVA are all eligible for a courtesy appointment in SDS. Courtesy appointments do not possess voting privileges in SDS, cannot directly supervise but can co-mentor or co-advise SDS doctoral students. See also [SDS Courtesy and Visiting Faculty Policy](#).

1.2. Academic Ranks

Faculty members may hold only one academic rank at the University. All joint or temporary appointments must be at the same rank (e.g., a faculty member holding the rank of associate professor in one school at the University shall not be given a concurrent appointment as assistant or full professor in the School of Data Science).

Lecturer Ranks: SDS may appoint AGF members to the lecturer ranks, as defined in [PROV-004](#). The lecturer ranks are lecturer, senior lecturer, and distinguished lecturer. In accordance with Office of the Provost guidelines, terminal degrees are required for these positions, and requests for exceptions can be submitted to the Office of the Provost for special circumstances. SDS currently only uses lecturer ranks for part-time wage faculty.

Instructor Ranks: Any school at UVA may appoint instructors for specific teaching assignments where the instructor/instruction may or may not necessitate a terminal degree. The rank of instructor is not currently in use in the School of Data Science.

Professorial Ranks: The professorial ranks are assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Professorial ranks are used for all tenured, tenure-eligible, and AGF appointments in accordance with qualifications, promotion and tenure criteria, and other stipulations set forth in [PROV-017](#), [PROV-004](#), and [PROV-029](#).

1.3. Faculty Titles and Requirements

In compliance with [PROV-029: Faculty Appointment Types and Titles](#), the School of Data Science requires formal faculty titles to be used when presenting faculty actions for approval to the University's Board of Visitors and in all school communications related to a faculty member's employment (including appointment letters, performance evaluations, recommendations for promotion, etc.).

Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty Titles: Formal faculty titles for tenured/tenure-track faculty members are Assistant Professor of Data Science; Associate Professor of Data Science, and Professor of Data Science.

According to [PROV-017](#), the primary responsibilities of the tenured and tenure-track faculty include research and scholarship productivity, a commitment to quality student instruction, including student advising and engagement in research, and service contributions to the University, the profession, and the public.

Academic General Faculty, Teaching Track Titles: Formal faculty titles for academic general faculty members on the teaching track are Assistant Professor of Data Science, General Faculty; Associate Professor of Data Science, General Faculty; and Professor of Data Science, General Faculty.

Additional titles in the Academic General Faculty, Teaching Track include Lecturer of Data Science and Instructor of Data Science. The School of Data Science does not currently grant Lecturer or Instructor titles to full-time faculty. At present, only part-time, faculty wage employees are given the title of Lecturer in Data Science. The qualifications of faculty who will assume teaching responsibilities as Lecturers but who do not hold the qualifying terminal degree must be approved in accordance with [PROV-004, II.B and Procedure 3](#).

According to [PROV-004](#), the primary responsibilities of AGF on the teaching track “include teaching, research, professional practice, or clinical service without encompassing the full scope of responsibilities expected from tenure-track faculty positions.” For example, an AGF with primary responsibility for classroom instruction might have minimal or reduced research or practice obligations. Teaching track AGF are required to hold a terminal degree in a discipline related to data science.

Academic General Faculty, Research Track Titles: Formal faculty titles for AGF members on the research track are Research Assistant Professor of Data Science; Research Associate Professor of Data Science; and Research Professor of Data Science. Research track AGF are required to hold a terminal degree in a discipline related to their research area of expertise.

According to [PROV-004](#), the primary responsibilities of AGF on the research track “include teaching, research, professional practice, or clinical service without encompassing the full scope of responsibilities expected from tenure-track faculty positions.” For example, an AGF with primary responsibility for research might have minimal or no teaching or practice obligations.

Use of formal titles by AGF shall conform to the requirements specified in [PROV-004](#) in all communications related to the faculty member’s employment, such as offer letters, evaluation letters, reports of faculty actions to the Board of Visitors, and so on. In other contexts, such as email signatures, department websites, business cards, and conference presentations, faculty may use simplified variations of their title, such as “Assistant Professor of Research.” In very informal situations, such phrases as “Research Professor” may be used.

Academic General Faculty, Practice Track Titles: Formal faculty titles for AGF on the practice track are: Assistant Professor of Practice in Data Science; Associate Professor of Practice in Data Science; and Professor of Practice in Data Science. Practice track AGF may combine teaching, research, and translation in proportions consistent with their background and established at time of hire, continuation, or promotion. Practice track AGF are required to hold a terminal degree in a discipline related to their core teaching. In rare cases, professors of practice may have significant relevant experience in the practice of data science or a related field in a professional setting, such as government or industry, that demonstrates sufficient disciplinary knowledge to warrant appointment without a terminal degree. In these cases, a special exemption must be approved by the dean of the School of Data Science and the Vice Provost’s office. The qualifications of faculty who will assume teaching responsibilities but who do not hold the qualifying terminal degree must be approved in accordance with [PROV-004, II.B and Procedure 3](#).

According to [PROV-004](#), the primary responsibilities of AGF on the practice track “include teaching, research, professional practice, or clinical service without encompassing the full scope of responsibilities expected from tenure-track faculty positions.” For example, an AGF with primary responsibility for practice/translation might have minimal or no research or teaching obligations.

Section 2: SDS Promotion and Tenure Committees

2.1. Committee Overview

Two promotion and tenure (P&T) committees exist at the School of Data Science: The Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee (FP&T) and the School Promotion and Tenure Committee (SP&T). As further described below, the FP&T Committee plays the role of a traditional department P&T committee (e.g., soliciting letters, compiling the dossier, conducting the first review and vote) while the SP&T committee plays the role of a traditional college-level P&T committee that conducts a separate review to ensure the fidelity of the FP&T review, consistency of recommendations in the school, and adherence to established P&T school and university policy. The activities of both committees consist of critical examination, discussion, and voting on faculty actions. Membership and charge are detailed below for each committee. Faculty can serve and vote on only one committee. In cases of conflicts involving personal or professional interest, committee members are expected to recuse themselves as appropriate, with proper notification to the associate dean of academic and faculty affairs and the committee chair.

In both committees, and for all cases, the names of all voting committee members and the vote tally will be included in both P&T committee reports. The individual committee members’ internal deliberations and votes are kept strictly confidential. For positive recommendations, candidates will receive a fully redacted copy of the Dean’s recommendation and SP&T and FP&T reports after the Provost’s recommendation is conferred. In cases of negative recommendations, the candidate will be given an opportunity to review, and prepare a rebuttal to, the fully redacted copies of the SP&T and FP&T reports before the Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost. In the redacted reports, the final vote tallies will not be redacted, but any individual attributions to committee members or letter writers will be redacted.

The P&T committees may only make recommendations based on the materials they receive via formal submission either by the candidate or through the committee chair. Faculty annual reports and review letters are automatically included for review at the faculty and school levels. If more information is required beyond the dossier submitted for consideration by the faculty candidate, or if there are questions about the materials submitted, the chair of the committee may request additional documentation from the candidate’s nominator (the nominator is typically a department chair or the chair’s designee). In the absence of departments in SDS, the nominator is the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs. A faculty member may also nominate themselves in a case of self-nomination or can request that another faculty member nominate them on their behalf. Committee members may obtain, evaluate, and discuss any material, or portion thereof, that the candidate submits or references in their submitted materials (e.g., papers or pre-prints lists on the candidate’s CV) but they should not actively solicit external information outside of the formal review process. However, if unsolicited information about a candidate is received (e.g., an email from a colleague expressing concerns), the committee member should document it through the appropriate channels and share it

with the committee chair, who has the final say regarding whether to share it with the rest of the committee. This ensures transparency and due process rather than disregarding or concealing the information. Committee members and nominators are not to communicate directly with the candidate about their pending faculty action for any reason.

2.2. Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee (FP&T)

1. The FP&T Committee consists of tenured faculty and AGF in SDS who are at the rank of associate professor and/or above (at or above the rank sought by the candidate).
2. **FP&T Membership** is *automatic* by nature of the full-time appointment held at UVA by each faculty member and salaried appointment in SDS. Membership includes faculty in schools outside of SDS who hold at least a 20% joint appointment in SDS. This does not include part-time faculty, adjunct faculty, lecturers, or AGF Professors of the Practice.
3. Faculty members may only review and vote on cases that are equal to or below their own academic rank, regardless of track.
4. All associate and full professors vote on 3rd Year reviews for assistant professors.
5. Tenure decisions are made by all faculty regardless of track and tenure status at or below their rank. Faculty who serve on the SP&T may be invited by the FP&T chair to participate only in an advisory, non-voting capacity during FP&T deliberations. Such individuals may not vote during FP&T deliberations, speak on behalf of the SP&T, or otherwise attempt to influence FP&T decisions beyond the limited advisory context. Likewise, FP&T members may be invited to join SP&T discussions in an advisory, non-voting capacity to ensure procedural continuity. To promote balanced participation, the chair must ensure that advisory-status attendees contribute only factual clarifications or procedural input, and that FP&T deliberations and votes are driven by voting-eligible members. **Faculty may cast only one vote on a given case at any level of review.** A faculty member who participates in FP&T deliberations in an advisory role and later votes at SP&T must continue to refrain from expressing opinions formed during FP&T discussions other than through their formal SP&T review. These provisions are intended to prevent undue influence by individuals serving in multiple roles, ensure that SP&T votes remain independent of FP&T deliberations, and ensure that neither committee is dominated by a small number of voices. It is intended that the FP&T Committee should both (a) represent both academic general faculty and tenure-track faculty and (b) approximate the proportions of associate and full professorial faculty within the school subject to the limitations of numbers of faculty available.
6. The chair of the FP&T Committee is the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs or their designee (e.g., assistant dean for faculty affairs). The chair is responsible for convening the committee; coordinating timelines; ensuring that deliberations are fair, balanced, and procedurally consistent; appointing sub-committees for candidate review; and serving as the primary point of contact with the SP&T, the Dean's Office, and the Office of Faculty Affairs.
7. For each candidate, the FP&T chair will appoint a small sub-committee ("case review team") of two or more voting-eligible members to conduct a detailed review of the dossier and external letters. When possible, sub-committee members will be selected to ensure disciplinary relevance to the candidate's scholarly area(s). The case review team is responsible for conducting a thorough evaluation of the candidate's dossier, confirming that materials are complete and consistent with policy, preparing an initial assessment of strengths, weaknesses, and questions for full-committee discussion, and presenting a summary of findings at the FP&T meeting. Sub-committee members do not cast an additional vote; they vote once in the full committee deliberation like all eligible members. To promote transparency and procedural consistency, at

least one member of each sub-committee will have prior FP&T experience when feasible. New FP&T members may be paired with experienced members to ensure high-quality evaluation. Final recommendations regarding each candidate are made by the full FP&T following presentation and discussion; sub-committee presentations are advisory and non-binding.

8. **The FP&T Committee serves** as the traditional “departmental P&T committee” or “first-level review” in schools clearly distinguished by individual departments and is responsible for the following activities:
 - Review CVs for all faculty eligible for faculty action within the coming year.
 - Initial vote to request a full P&T dossier from P&T-eligible candidates for advancement within the P&T process.
 - Review and vote to advance P&T candidates through to referee letter request stage.
 - Review and vote to recommend Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) tenure-track and AGF appointments and contracts for advancement to the SP&T Committee.
 - Review final dossiers for P&T candidates and vote to submit to SP&T Committee for review.
 - Review prospective candidates being considered for hire at a proposed rank higher than assistant professor.
9. Candidates may discuss general promotion and tenure questions with the committee before their dossier is submitted, but once their dossier is submitted, no further discussion will be allowed to ensure the absence of bias.
10. All FP&T Committee members must have received or undertake bias training, as approved by the associate dean for community and government partnerships.
11. The identities of the committee members will be revealed to the candidate upon request, as occasionally the membership changes over the course of a case. If a candidate believes there are individuals whose service on the committee would be inappropriate, they should inform the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs (as the nominator) in writing and include all pertinent and relevant documentation. The letter should briefly but clearly describe the concerns. The associate dean for academic and faculty affairs, in consultation with the dean and the chair of the SP&T Committee, will review the submitted materials and give serious consideration to this information in appointing or modifying the SP&T Committee for deliberation of the case.

2.3. School Promotion and Tenure Committee (SP&T)

1. The School Promotion and Tenure Committee is a **committee comprised of full professors, tenured and AGF, appointed by the dean of SDS**. This review is also known as the “school-level review” or the “second-level review.” Each year during the spring semester, the dean appoints and reconfirms the membership of the SP&T for the upcoming academic year. When confirmed, the committee shall consist of at least five tenured faculty members and at least one AGF member. The AGF member shall ordinarily be drawn from SDS, ensuring AGF representation reflects the School’s own academic and professional context. If a qualified SDS AGF member is unavailable or recused (e.g., due to conflict of interest or insufficient rank), the Dean may appoint an AGF member from another UVA school whose appointment and expertise are clearly relevant to SDS’s disciplinary scope. The committee composition will, to the extent possible, reflect the breadth of SDS disciplines and tracks (tenured and AGF) and include representation from both internal and, when appropriate, cross-school perspectives. All SP&T members serve

three-year terms unless otherwise negotiated in writing with the Dean. The dean will appoint one member as the chair.

- a. Committee membership reflects the broad interdisciplinary research community of the school as well as the candidate's disciplinary field from within SDS and/or other UVA schools. Efforts will be made to ensure intellectual and individual diversity on the committee. The identities of the Committee members are public and revealed to the candidate upon request, as occasionally the committee membership changes over the course of a case.
 - b. Candidates may discuss general promotion and tenure questions with the committee before their dossier is submitted, but once their dossier is submitted, no further discussion will be allowed to ensure the absence of bias.
 - c. All SP&T Committee members must have received or undertake bias training, as approved by the associate dean for community and government partnerships.
 - d. If a candidate believes there are individuals whose service on the committee would be inappropriate, they should inform the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs (as the nominator) in writing and include all pertinent and relevant documentation. The letter should briefly but clearly describe the concerns. The associate dean for academic and faculty affairs, in consultation with the dean and the chair of the SP&T Committee, will review the submitted materials and give serious consideration to this information in appointing or modifying the SP&T Committee for deliberation of the case.
2. **The SP&T Committee serves** as the traditional "school-level P&T committee" and is responsible for the following activities:
- Review final dossiers for P&T candidates (as recommended for review by the FP&T Committee) and vote to submit to recommend a faculty action to the dean. Upon dean's approval, the dean submits the dossier with their endorsement to the provost's office for final review.
 - Review and vote to recommend Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Tenure-Track and AGF appointments and contracts for advancement to the dean.
 - Review prospective candidates being considered for hire at a proposed rank.

Section 3: Overview of the Pre-Promotion and Pre-Tenure Periods

3.1. Tenure-Track Faculty

3.1.1. The Probationary Period for Tenure-Track Faculty: Overview

The probationary period for tenure is the amount of time served as a faculty member in the school in full-time termed appointments on the tenure-track. The probationary period ordinarily may not exceed seven (7) years for any full-time faculty member. The tenure clock for faculty members who are appointed in January does not formally begin until the following August of the first year. For all other faculty, the tenure clock begins in August, at the beginning of the first faculty appointment.

3.1.2. Extending the Tenure-Track Probationary Period

The probationary period may only be extended beyond the ordinary term (typically one year) if a written request by the faculty member has been approved in writing by the dean and provost. Examples of circumstances under which this "clock-stopping" may be approved include but are not limited to:

- A qualifying parental leave event, as defined in [HRM-038: Faculty Leaves](#), regardless of whether the faculty member takes parental leave; [Modified Duties for School of Data Science Faculty on Personal Leave Policy](#)
- Severe personal or family illness.
- Public or university service responsibility. Occasionally, an assistant professor may be invited to take on a heavy public or university service responsibility that is clearly of long-term value to the individual and institution, but which imposes time demands that will substantially limit research activity during the period of service.
- Other exceptional circumstances within the school that directly and adversely impact a candidate's ability to conduct research.
- A template leave request letter can be found in **Appendix E** of this document.

All requests for extensions, for parental events or other reasons, must be submitted at least six months before the date the formal dossier is due. More than two one-year extensions to the probationary period (tenure clock stoppages) are rare and are only granted in exceptional circumstances.

Faculty seeking an extension of the probationary period must submit a written request addressed to the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs as soon as is feasible, but not more than one (1) year after a qualifying event. A template request letter can be found in **Appendix C** of this document. In cases where a decision must be made by the school, the manager for faculty affairs will review the request and assemble any additional documentation. The associate dean for academic and faculty affairs is responsible for reviewing such requests and obtaining a recommendation from the chair of the SDS SP&T Committee. An extension or stoppage of a candidate's tenure clock, if approved by associate dean for academic and faculty affairs and the SP&T, must be approved by the dean prior to submission to the provost. Application to the provost requires written justification of the request, including the school's intention to support the decision, and the CV of the faculty member making the request. The request to the provost's office is managed by the manager of faculty affairs.

3.1.3. Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review for Tenure-track Faculty

Tenure-track assistant professors will undergo a Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review to evaluate the faculty's current and projected scholarly trajectory as it pertains to a potential tenure decision. Using the criteria for tenure and promotion, the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review will emphasize the potential for tenure and promotion in due course and written feedback will be provided to the candidate on this matter. This process prepares candidates for their eventual promotion or tenure review beginning in year six (6) and provides formal feedback on their progress towards their next faculty action. Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Reviews are a formal process that enlists reviews from the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee, the School Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the dean. All faculty in professorial roles will participate in the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review process. Required materials for this review are listed in Appendix F: Materials Required for the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review for Tenure-Track Faculty and include a current CV, a reflective statement summarizing research, teaching, and service progress, annual reports, and representative evidence of scholarship and instruction.

In extreme cases, the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs may elect to initiate a Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review early (e.g., faculty member demonstrating severe lack of progress endangering the path to tenure/promotion reflected in minimal or no scholarship, consistently poor teaching performance,

and/or low-quality or extremely low-volume service engagement, etc.) to determine a corrective course of action to assist in setting the faculty member back on track for promotion and/or tenure.

Associate professors hired with term may also request an evaluative critique during their probationary period. This is limited to once per probationary period. This process is run in parallel with other Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Reviews, to the extent possible.

The Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review is initiated in writing by the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs in the fall semester of the third year with a specific timeline and any additional instructions. Faculty may elect to undergo the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review early (e.g., in year two) by written request to the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs. The materials required for the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review as well as the process details are listed in **Appendix F**. Minor extensions to the submission deadlines related to the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review process may be granted by the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs, in writing, but major extensions to the process will not be granted. Any major extension of the timeline for this process could greatly diminish the purpose and outcome intended by the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review, potentially limiting the amount of time remaining to address recommendations and feedback.

3.1.4. Reappointment for Tenure-Track Faculty During the Probationary Period

Upon successful outcome of the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review and Faculty Annual Reviews, assistant professors will be reappointed for at least a three-year term. In reappointment cases, the school will issue a reappointment letter detailing the new appointment dates and listing any changes to the agreement that may differ from the original letter. The faculty member will be required to sign the reappointment letter. All decisions on renewals or reappointments must be made by May 1, or no later than three months before the next appointment starts.

Associate professors with term may also require reappointment. Although they are not required to undergo a Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review, they otherwise follow the same procedure as assistant professors.

3.1.5. Non-Reappointment for Tenure-Track Faculty During the Probationary Period

Tenure-track faculty members for whom reappointment is not recommended at their Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review, and who are on three- or four-year appointments, are required to receive a written notification indicating that the faculty member will not be reappointed. This provides the faculty member with one year (twelve months') notice of the end-of-employment. This notice should be given no later than **May 1** in the year preceding their final contract year and should state that their position is ending (e.g., the fourth year becomes their final year). Written notice of contract termination is specified in the provost's promotion and tenure policy [PROV-017](#) under "probationary period for tenure." In non-reappointment cases, a letter of non-reappointment or termination will be issued by the dean and facilitated by the manager of faculty affairs. This letter will detail the terms of the non-reappointment and the dates of the final period of employment. The faculty member will be required to sign the notice of non-reappointment letter.

If a faculty member's reappointment review is delayed without modification of the probationary period, a letter of non-reappointment shall be issued with twelve (12) months' advance notice, stating that the review is to be conducted in the following year (e.g., fourth year). Under such circumstances, the letter will warn the candidate that an unsuccessful Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review will lead to the expiration of

their contract in May following the review, in accordance with their contract. A successful review will lead to a reappointment. All decisions must be communicated in writing, requiring signatures from the dean or designee, and the faculty member.

3.1.6. Promotion With Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty

Assistant professors are typically reviewed for promotion to associate professor with tenure during their **sixth** year of service, allowing for a terminal year if tenure is not granted (e.g., the faculty member is granted twelve months' notice of end-of-employment). A faculty member who wishes to be reviewed for promotion **earlier** than the sixth year should submit a request to the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs, who will verify the request, compile the documentation, and submit the formal request to the SDS Faculty Promotion and Tenure (FP&T) Committee. The FP&T Committee is tasked with reviewing the materials and making an informal recommendation, but ultimately the decision to proceed with the review rests with the faculty candidate. Candidates interested in "going up early" for tenure consideration before a traditional 6-year tenure-track period should be advised that they are allowed only one attempt at tenure. A negative verdict, even if rendered early in the tenure-track period, would initiate the twelve months' notice of end-of-employment. If the review is being undertaken in response to an outside offer or related retention effort, the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs will consult with the chair of the FP&T Committee about an expedited schedule for the review. Criteria for promotion within tenure for tenure-track faculty are listed in **Section 6** of this document.

3.1.6.a. Continued Reappointment of Tenured Faculty Members

Tenured faculty members are appointed without term and therefore do not undergo periodic reappointment review. However, post-tenure review may be initiated under either of the following conditions:

- The faculty member receives two consecutive overall annual performance ratings greater than 3.5, where a rating of 3 indicates "as expected" and a rating of 4 indicates "below expectations."
- The dean formally requests a post-tenure review due to concerns of gross negligence of duties or misconduct.

When triggered, post-tenure review will involve a thorough review of the faculty member's current CV, annual Faculty Activity Reports and Faculty Annual Review Feedback letters over the preceding years, as well as any other relevant evidence of concern. For faculty with joint appointments, this review will be performed in coordination with the appropriate administrative head (e.g., chair, associate dean, etc.) in the faculty member's other unit, though may be initiated solely by SDS.

A Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) will be developed in consultation with the faculty member, detailing specific expectations and milestones for improvement. The faculty member will have one year to adhere satisfactorily to the PIP and achieve an annual performance rating of 3 or below. If the faculty member fails to meet these expectations, additional administrative action will be pursued in conjunction with the dean, which may include initiating formal processes for removal of tenure in alignment with [University policy](#).

SDS follows the University's post-tenure review policy as outlined in the Provost's Office's [Policy on Disciplinary Suspension or Termination of Academic Faculty](#). In accordance with this policy, the School's process serves as the initial level of review, after which the results and recommendations are submitted to the Provost's Office for acknowledgment and further review. The School process focuses on assessing

continued performance, constructive engagement, and professional contribution within SDS. When the School identifies concerns through a post-tenure review (e.g., through two consecutive “below expectations” annual ratings or concerns of neglect of duties), the SDS review report and PIP become part of the faculty member’s official personnel record and are forwarded to the Provost’s Office. The University-level process ensures consistency across all academic units and may request supplementary documentation from SDS or the faculty member before taking further administrative action. In all cases, the School’s internal review must be completed and documented before any University-level review or action is initiated.

3.1.7. Tenure Denial, Appeals, and Grievances for Tenure-Track Faculty

If the promotion process results in a decision of tenure denial, the candidate will remain in their current rank. Faculty members who have been denied tenure or promotion may appeal the decision of the dean. The procedure for appeals can be found within the UVA policy for tenure denials [here](#), which includes a written request for appeal to the provost’s office with a copy to the SDS dean. The timing for a subsequent request for promotion should be based on consultation between the candidate and the dean, but in all cases the faculty member must skip at least one promotion cycle. See [PROV-017](#) 8.b.

The provost’s office will review all denial recommendations on the promotion or tenure on process and substantive grounds. In addition, candidates may submit a written appeal within 30 days of being notified of the school’s decision. For prompt consideration of appeals, deans must notify candidates of their recommendation no later than February 1. Appeals should be accompanied by adequate documentation and with a statement of reasons as to why the recommendation is believed to be inappropriate. To ascertain when the 30-day period begins, the provost requires that the dean provide the provost’s office with a copy of the communication to any candidate who notifies them of the negative recommendation for promotion or tenure. The provost may refer such appeals to the Provost’s Promotion and Tenure Committee for its consideration and advice.

Given the reality that promotions to full professor within tenure may occur at substantially different times, even within a school, and given the possibility of multiple considerations of such promotion over a career, as noted in [PROV-017](#) there is a limit to the “appeal of right” to the provost in cases where faculty with tenure are denied promotion. Each school should establish a reasonable period during which promotions within tenure will ordinarily be considered. A person who is passed over for promotion one year may be reconsidered the following year. Appeal of negative decisions on promotion within tenure will be reviewed by the provost only if no previous request has been made by the same candidate within a five-year period.

The UVA Faculty Senate has a grievance procedure that can be found here: [Grievance Procedure for Academic Faculty | Faculty Senate, U.Va. \(virginia.edu\)](#).

The timing for promotion to professor should be based on consultation between the candidate and the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs in the School of Data Science and, as appropriate, the dean. A typical timeline for consideration of promotion to professor is in the sixth year after promotion to associate professor.

3.2. Academic General Faculty

3.2.1. Pre-Promotion Period for Academic General Faculty: Overview

Academic General Faculty (AGF) in SDS shall normally be appointed initially to the rank of assistant professor in a track deemed appropriate at the time of hire, or lecturer when appropriate for position duties. In some cases, faculty may initially be appointed to a higher rank. Initial appointments shall normally be for one three-year term, although SDS reserves the option to appoint new faculty for three one-year terms, or a one-year term followed by a two-year term. As provided by [PROV-004](#), AGF holding the rank of assistant professor may choose to be considered for promotion to associate professor after serving six continuous years.

The Academic General Faculty are tenure-ineligible and do not operate under a probationary period in the same fashion as tenure-track faculty. However, AGF members are eligible for the same faculty leaves as tenure-track faculty. Leaves must be requested and approved, and examples of these circumstances include but are not limited to:

- A qualifying parental leave event, as defined in [HRM-038: Faculty Leaves](#), regardless of whether the faculty member takes parental leave; [Modified Duties for School of Data Science Faculty on Personal Leave Policy](#)
- Severe personal or family illness.
- Public or university service responsibility. Occasionally, an assistant professor may be invited to take on a heavy public or university service responsibility that is clearly of long-term value to the individual and institution, but which imposes time demands that will substantially limit research activity during the period of service.
- Other exceptional circumstances within the school that directly and adversely impact a candidate's ability to conduct research.

A template leave request letter can be found in **Appendix E** of this document. All requests for extensions, for parental events or other reasons, must be submitted at least six months before the date the formal dossier is due.

3.2.2. Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review for Academic General Faculty

AGF assistant professors will undergo a Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review to evaluate the faculty's current and projected scholarly trajectory as it pertains to a potential promotion decision. Using the SDS criteria for promotion, the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review will emphasize the potential for promotion in due course, and written feedback will be provided to the candidate on this matter. This process prepares candidates for their eventual promotion review beginning in year six and provides formal feedback on their progress towards their next faculty action. Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Reviews are a formal process that enlists reviews from the FP&T Committee, the SP&T Committee, and the dean. All faculty in professorial roles will participate in the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review process. See **Appendix G** for more information.

In extreme cases, the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs may elect to initiate a Mid-Cycle Review (3rd-Year) early (e.g., AGF member demonstrating severe lack of progress endangering the path to promotion) to determine a corrective course of action to assist in setting the faculty member back on track for promotion.

AGF associate professors, hired with term, may also request a one-time evaluative review during their first contractual cycle. This process is run in parallel with the annual Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Reviews, to the extent possible.

The Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review is initiated in writing by the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs in the fall semester of the third year with a specific timeline and any additional instructions. Faculty may elect to undergo the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review early (e.g., in year two) by written request to the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs. The materials required for the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review, as well as the process details, are listed in **Appendix G**. Minor extensions to the submission deadlines related to the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review process may be granted by the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs, in writing, but major extensions to the process will not be granted. Any major extension of the timeline for this process could greatly diminish the purpose and outcome intended by the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review, potentially limiting the amount of time remaining to address recommendations and feedback.

3.2.3. Reappointment for Academic General Faculty (Pre-Promotion Contract Renewal)

AGF at the rank of assistant professor will be reviewed in the third year for reappointment at the discretion of the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs. Reappointment at this stage is typically for an additional three-year term. In all contract renewal/reappointment cases, a reappointment letter will be issued by the dean to the faculty member, which will detail the new appointment dates and list any changes to the agreement that may differ from the original letter. The faculty member must sign off on the reappointment letter, which will be issued no later than 3 months from the renewal date.

3.2.4. Non-Reappointment for Academic General Faculty (Contract Non-Renewal)

AGF with two- or three-year appointments, who are not reappointed at their annual review or Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review are required to receive a written one-year notice and are entitled to twelve months of employment, starting one day after the final date of the current appointment. This notice should be given no later than May 1 when their position is ending (e.g., the fourth year becomes their final year). Written notice of contract (appointment) termination is specified in the provost's promotion and tenure policy [PROV-004](#) under IV.E. Standards of Notice for Non-Renewal. In non-reappointment cases, a letter of non-reappointment or termination will be issued. This letter will detail the terms of the non-reappointment and the dates of the final period of employment. The faculty member will be required to sign the notice of a non-reappointment letter, *which will be issued to allow for a twelve-month period of remaining employment*.

3.2.5. Reappointment for Senior Academic General Faculty (Contract Renewal)

All senior AGF (associate or full professor) who are eligible for renewal will be reappointed at the discretion of the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs. Reappointments at this level will be for terms of five years and issued in writing no later than three months from the renewal date. The associate dean for academic and faculty affairs may reappoint for terms fewer than five years for senior faculty, but the associate dean must first obtain a vote in support of such an action from the FP&T Committee and clearly delineate in writing the reasons for such a decision (e.g., poor performance). In all contract renewal cases, a reappointment letter will be issued by the dean to the faculty member, which will detail the new appointment dates and list any changes to the agreement that may differ from the original letter. The faculty member must sign the reappointment letter, which will be issued no later than 3 months from the renewal date.

3.2.5.a. Initial Reappointment Process for Senior Academic General Faculty (AGF) Members

At the conclusion of their initial term, senior Academic General Faculty (AGF) members holding the rank of Associate or Full Professor will undergo a comprehensive contract renewal review. This review is designed to assess their sustained contributions to the School's teaching, scholarship, and service missions, and to determine eligibility for a new, renewable appointment.

Required Materials

Each senior AGF candidate must submit by the stated fall deadline (1) a current CV containing all required components listed in the SDS AGF policy and (2) a three- to five-page integrative statement summarizing their contributions across the domains of:

- Teaching and advising,
- Educational scholarship and/or research,
- Service and leadership,
- Contributions to the field of data science,
- Collaborative activities (e.g., across teaching, research, and service) within and beyond SDS,
- A completed Teaching Evaluation Summary and Course List (template provided in Appendix),
- Any non-SDS teaching evaluations which are not already held by SDS.

This statement should reflect on the candidate's accomplishments during the initial appointment term, with attention to impact, innovation, and alignment with the mission of SDS.

Review Process

The assistant dean for faculty affairs and the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs will jointly review the submitted materials. If they determine that the reappointment is clearly warranted, a recommendation will be forwarded directly to the dean. If either reviewer believes further evaluation or a non-renewal recommendation is appropriate, the case will be referred to the Faculty P&T Committee for review and recommendation before a final decision by the dean. Candidates wishing to pursue promotion should notify the SDS Faculty Affairs Office by the announced deadline so that appropriate review procedures and timelines may be initiated.

3.2.5.b. Continued Reappointment for Senior Academic General Faculty (AGF) Members

By the stated fall deadline prior to the expiration of a senior AGF member's current appointment, the faculty member must submit their current CV and an overview statement of activities to the Office of Faculty Affairs. This CV will be evaluated by the assistant dean for faculty affairs and the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs, along with the faculty member's annual Faculty Activity Reports and Faculty Annual Review Feedback letters covering the current contract period. Based on this review, a reappointment recommendation will be made to the dean, who has final authority regarding contract renewal.

3.2.6. Promotion Reviews for Academic General Faculty

AGF members will be considered for promotion in rank in the sixth year as an assistant, lecturer, or instructor rank unless they choose to postpone or forego promotion review by opting out in writing. Choosing to postpone or forego promotion review does not preclude renewal.

AGF will normally be considered for promotion in rank within six continuous years on a particular track. In some cases, when deemed appropriate by the FP&T Committee and the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs, consideration for promotion may take place before this time. Appointment in SDS carries no presumption of promotion to the next rank. For purposes of a successful promotion in rank, it is expected that candidates will display the qualities of recognized excellence defined in these guidelines in the primary assignment area and other areas of substantial effort and activity. Consistent with [PROV-004](#), AGF at the rank of assistant professor may be considered for promotion to associate professor within seven years, (e.g. with review in the sixth year such that the promotion would go into effect in the seventh year). If they choose to be considered, they shall be expected to meet the general criteria for promotion as specified in [PROV-004](#). Criteria for promotion for academic general faculty are listed in Section 6 of this document.

The timeline for promotion to AGF full professor shall be at the discretion of the FP&T Committee. All faculty should receive written feedback on progress toward promotion during the annual performance review which is shared with the FP&T and SP&T. Faculty at associate rank will be offered a one-time dossier review by the promotion committee after three years in rank to provide more detailed feedback and suggestions on progress toward promotion to full professor.

AGF members who have received notice of non-renewal (see section [PROV-004](#) IV.E. Standards of Notice for Non-Renewal) may not initiate the promotion review process.

3.2.7. Promotion Denial, Appeals, and Grievances: Academic General Faculty

AGFs who are denied promotion are not eligible to be considered for promotion the following academic year. They must wait one full academic year before being reconsidered. However, AGF faculty members' contracts may be renewed at their current rank even if they have been denied a promotion.

In the event of a negative renewal decision by SDS, the dean will notify the AGF member in writing, with a copy to the provost, and provide reasons for the non-renewal. The faculty member will have thirty (30) days to submit a written appeal to the provost as outlined in [PROV-004](#). The appeal should be accompanied by adequate documentation and a statement of reasons as to why the decision is believed to be inappropriate. Note that SDS will abide by the [University's statement on academic freedom](#) when deciding to extend a faculty member's employment contract.

The provost reviews all AGF promotion cases, whether positive or negative, on the process and substantive grounds, as supported by the written evidence of adequate consideration and review. For prompt consideration of appeals, deans must notify candidates of their recommendation no later than February 1. Appeals should be accompanied by adequate documentation and with a statement of reasons as to why the recommendation is believed to be inappropriate. To ascertain when the 30-day period begins, the provost requires that the dean provide the provost's office with a copy of the communication to any candidate that notifies them of the negative recommendation for promotion. The provost may refer such appeals to the Provost's Promotion and Tenure Committee for its consideration and advice.

Given the reality that promotions to full professor may occur at substantially different times, even within a school, and given the possibility of multiple considerations of such promotion over a career, there is a

limit to the "appeal of right." A person passed over for promotion one year must wait one year before being reconsidered.

The UVA Faculty Senate has a grievance procedure that can be found here: [Grievance Procedure for Academic Faculty | Faculty Senate, U.Va. \(virginia.edu\)](#).

3.3. Expedited Reviews: Tenure-track and AGF

Expedited Review Procedures:

Expedited review procedures make it possible for faculty candidate reviews to be completed in a compressed period; they are not intended to bypass normal review processes. Such instances reflect hiring cycles, target-of-opportunity hiring, cluster hiring, etc.

A typical, on-cycle promotion and tenure review requires:

- Faculty-level review (FP&T),
- FP&T chair recommendation to the school-level committee (SP&T),
- SP&T-level faculty review and recommendation to the dean,
- Recommendation from the dean to the provost, and
- Review by the provost's committee.

In expedited review, because the same members of the FP&T review and vote on the candidate's hire at a particular rank and track, no additional FP&T review or recommendation letter occurs. However, the SP&T chair and dean appoints an SP&T subcommittee consisting of no fewer than three eligible faculty members that solicits arm's length letters, reviews the nomination, and provides the dean with a decision and rationale letter as quickly as possible. Once the provost receives the dean's recommendation, the provost reviews the nomination and decides as quickly as possible.

Materials submitted in a dossier for expedited review should be the same as (or as similar as possible to) those normally included in a promotion dossier, including a complete, detailed curriculum vitae and candidate statements. A candidate's cover letter or research plans may substitute for the usual statement in the dossier. Evidence of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness is required and can include a summary of teaching evaluations from the University or the prior institution, teaching awards, and other documentation may provide evidence of effective teaching.

The School requires a minimum of three arms-length external review letters for all traditional-cycle promotion and/or tenure cases, consistent with University policy. The candidate and the FP&T committee chair may solicit additional letters beyond this minimum at their discretion. For expedited or off-cycle reviews, the school may permit a smaller number of arm's length letters, but no fewer than two. The justification for reduced letters must be documented in the candidate's dossier and approved by the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs. These letters should address the candidate's suitability for the faculty rank and tenure. If arm's length letters are not immediately available and need to be requested, the appointment at the tenured and/or promoted rank may be made conditionally, pending the completed expedited review. The conditionality of tenure and/or promotion must be stated in the offer letters, in cases of new hires. Complete dossiers should be provided to avoid needless delays in the process. In cases of denial of promotion and/or tenure based upon expedited review, the same procedures for appeals outlined above and in [PROV-017](#) and [PROV-004](#) hold.

In expedited cases, a representative subset of a P&T committee, selected by the associate dean of academic and faculty affairs, consisting of at least three members holding the same rank or the rank above that of the candidate under consideration, may review the case and vote.

Section 4: Procedures and Timeline for Promotion and Tenure Review

4.1. Overview

The Office of Faculty Affairs sends informal reminders to eligible candidates in September regarding their upcoming review. Early in the Spring Semester of each year, for faculty with an administrative home in SDS, the Office of Faculty Affairs sends out formal notifications to faculty members who must be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure. Eligible faculty receive a letter with specific instructions and details on the timeline as well as the required and optional elements to be included in the promotion and tenure dossier. The Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee (FP&T), chaired by the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs or assistant dean for faculty affairs and the assistant dean for faculty affairs, along with faculty members at or above the same rank as the candidate(s), will meet mid-Spring to recommend revisions and additions before the dossier is shared with external reviewers. The FP&T Committee also reviews the candidate’s list of recommended external letter writers and submits additional letter writers to round out the list. The FP&T selects the final list of external letter writers, who receive formal requests for evaluation of the candidate, along with an abbreviated dossier and a copy of the School policy on or about July 1. The FP&T meets again in September after the dossier is finalized and the external letters are received, so that the formal recommendation letter can be drafted to the School P&T Committee by October 1.

In cases of joint appointments, the original hiring MOU will detail how the process proceeds in the non-administrative unit. The associate dean for academic and faculty affairs is responsible for arriving at a mutually acceptable plan for coordinating the reviews in the other units. This will include consultation and coordination with other units concerning the set of external reviewers. Notification of the P&T process for a jointly appointed faculty member must occur as early as possible in the process, and the joint department should be kept up to date on the process. Faculty with joint appointments have to meet the P&T criteria/policies of both units, and in rare cases where there is a substantive discrepancy or difference, the administrators from the two units will discuss and negotiate, typically deferring to the administrative home’s process in cases of disagreement.

4.2. Promotion and Tenure Timeline (On-Cycle) At-A-Glance

The following calendars provide an overall timeline of the Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Review and Promotion and Tenure (On-Cycle) Processes. Note that faculty with an administrative home in another unit may have a different timeline.

4.2.1. Mid-Cycle (3rd-Year) Reviews (All Faculty): Timeline

Deadline	Deliverable	Responsible Party	Submit to
August 1	Eligible candidates are notified of Mid-Cycle Review (MCR) schedule and requirements.	OFA	ALL FACULTY

October 1	Submit MCR Dossiers	FACULTY	OFA
October 8	Submit MCR Dossiers	OFA	FP&T
October	Discuss MCR cases for reappointment and VOTE to advance to SP&T	FP&T	SP&T
October - November	FP&T sends written recommendations to SP&T with dossiers for review	FP&T	SP&T
November-January	SP&T meets, reviews, and VOTES on MCR , reappointments or non-reappointments; provide written notice to dean	SP&T	Dean, MFA
NLT May 1	Dean issues reappointment letters for formal signature plus feedback (<i>within 3 months of renewal date</i>)	OFA	FACULTY
NLT May 1	Dean issues notice of non-reappointment letters (<i>entitled to 12 months' employment</i>)	OFA	FACULTY

4.2.2. Promotion and Tenure (All Faculty): Timeline

Deadline	Deliverable	Responsible Party	Submit to
September	"Must" and "may" candidates are notified of P&T eligibility	OFA	FACULTY
September 15	OPT OUT DEADLINE (in writing)	FACULTY	OFA
January	Candidates receive instructions to compile full dossier with letter writers	OFA	FACULTY
February	Full initial dossiers due	FACULTY	OFA
Feb-April	Submit additional items as requested	FACULTY	OFA
April	Letter writers list due	FACULTY	OFA
June - July	Submit P&T final dossiers for referees	FACULTY	OFA
May – July	Polish dossiers and meet with mentors	FACULTY	TBD
July 1	Candidates reminded to send final additions to dossier	OFA	OFA
August 1	Submit final dossier	FACULTY	OFA
September 5	Candidates are notified of advancement or non-advancement to SP&T review*	FP&T and/or ADAF	PT Candidates
Sept-Feb	*Candidate may self-nominate for promotion and/or tenure without the department support (submit to provost on Feb 1)		
Oct-Jan	SP&T deliberates on P&T cases and votes		
February 1	Candidates are notified of advancement to provost's review	FP&T and/or ADAF	PT Candidates
May	Receive Provost decisions via email	All	Dean, ADAF, ADAF, SP&T
June 3 (tbd) ASAP	Meeting of the UVA Board of Visitors BOV minutes released; candidate letters sent	NA Provost	NA OFA, Dean, Candidates

KEY:

OFA: Office of Faculty Affairs (currently Assoc. Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs, Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs, and Mgr of Faculty Affairs)

MFA: Manager of Faculty Affairs

ADAF: Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs

ADFA: Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs

FP&T: Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee (Department-level committee of internal faculty at rank or above that of candidate being evaluated)

SP&T: School Promotion and Tenure Committee (Committee of full professors nominated by SDS dean to serve on behalf of the School)

PT: Promotion and Tenure (general)

NLT: No Later Than

MCR: Mid-Cycle Review

4.3. Detailed Promotion and/or Tenure Process and Timeline (All Faculty)

1. The Office of Faculty Affairs notifies faculty members who *must* advance in the next promotion and tenure cycle as a courtesy reminder with a general timeline in the fall semester prior to beginning the process.
2. The Office of Faculty Affairs formally notifies candidates who *must* advance within the promotion and tenure pipeline to compile and submit a full dossier. The notification will occur in writing in January. The preliminary dossier will be due around **February 15** to the Office of Faculty Affairs. Candidates who have expressed interest in going up early may be invited to submit a dossier through the same mechanism.
3. In addition to the full dossier, the candidate will be invited to submit a list of a total of at least **ten** individuals outside the University of Virginia who might be asked to write external letters evaluating the candidate's scholarship and **reputation** in the field. This list must include **six** individuals who can provide an **arm's length** objective evaluation of the candidate's scholarship and standing in the field, meaning they do not have a close professional relationship with the candidate such as an advisor, mentor, co-author, etc. The list may also include and identify at least **four** co-authors and/or co-investigators that are able to delineate the candidate's contributions to collaborative work, broadly defined. The candidate may also be invited to submit a list with the names of up to five former students who are particularly well positioned to comment on the candidate's contribution to their education. These lists will be due by **March 15 to the Office of Faculty Affairs**.

The FP&T Committee will also assemble a list of potential external reviewers. The FP&T will select the names of prospective external reviewers from the candidate's list and the list constructed by the FP&T. The Manager of Faculty Affairs will contact them in writing on behalf of the School to ascertain their availability to participate in the review. *The goal will be to receive evaluations from at least six external reviewers. At least three letters must be from arm's length reviewers, except in the case of expedited review when two arm's length letters may suffice.* See **Appendix B** for templates to request external letters.

4. By March 1, the FP&T chair (typically the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs or assistant dean for faculty affairs) will distribute the dossier and the candidate's annual evaluations, including peer evaluations, since hiring at UVA or since the candidate's last

promotion, to the FP&T. The curriculum vitae, candidate statements, and copies of or links to the candidate's research publications will be sent to external reviewers by July 1, along with a copy of the **SDS Promotion and Tenure Policy**. External reviewers will be asked to submit their letters by August 1 **to the Dean's Office in the School of Data Science, as directed by the request letter.**

The candidate will have the opportunity to submit additional research publications and an updated curriculum vita by the end of the first week of classes in Fall term. These updates and publications will be made available to the promotion committee around August 1.

5. The associate dean of academic and faculty affairs will invite the heads of other units with which the candidate is affiliated (joint departments) to submit a memo providing whatever information about the candidate's participation in the unit that it wishes SDS to consider in its evaluation of the candidate. The associate dean of academic and faculty affairs will request that these memos be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs by August 15.
6. The FP&T Committee will review the final materials; they will meet in early fall, where a committee member will present the final case and invite a discussion. All members of the committee possessing appropriate SDS voting privileges will vote to advance the candidate to the School P&T Committee. In the case of a positive vote, the FP&T chair will draft a nomination letter to accompany the candidate's dossier which will be provided to the SP&T. The full dossier, including the nomination letter, will be sent to the SP&T chair as early as possible.
7. Note that all junior faculty dossiers complete the full review process regardless of the voting outcome from the FP&T, SP&T, and Dean's recommendations. In addition, all junior faculty dossiers, regardless of recommendations, are reviewed by the Vice-Provost's office (This does not include 3rd year reviews). If a senior faculty dossier does not receive a positive vote at the FP&T or SP&T, or does not garner a positive Dean's recommendation, the faculty member may "self-nominate" themselves and provide a "rebuttal" for their desired promotion or tenure decision after the Dean's review is completed. Note that this requires that the faculty member take responsibility for the dossier-generating process (including soliciting additional external reviews).
8. The SP&T Committee will review and deliberate each case as it is presented. The committee will write an analysis discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the case. It will submit its report to the dean no later than January 10. The report must include an explanation of disagreements or dissenting votes.
9. During its deliberation period, the SP&T Committee reserves the right to request up to two advisory opinions from non-committee members within UVA or external to UVA. The purpose of this optional process informs of the standards and metrics for promotion and tenure in disciplines not well represented in the data science community at present (e.g., humanities, social sciences, philosophy, media studies, etc.) and provide additional written feedback on the strength and/or impact of the case. Written evidence of these requests must be included in the final dossier.

10. **All members of the SP&T Committee having appropriate SDS voting privileges will vote on each case.** Their final report to the dean will include the faculty who voted, the final vote tally, and its recommendation concerning promotion. The committee will also submit to the dean all evidence used in making the recommendation (full dossier).
11. A copy of the final FP&T and SP&T Committee reports (with committee and referee identifying information redacted) will be given to the candidate, who may submit a written response to the SP&T chair, dean, or associate dean for academic and faculty affairs within ten days of receiving it.
12. Upon receipt of the Committee recommendations and full dossiers, the dean decides whether to concur with the recommendations of the committees. The final decision to recommend promotion rests with the dean. The dean will inform the candidate of the decision in writing and provide the voting faculty's justification as soon as possible after the faculty meeting, documented as required in the appropriate provost policy to allow for an appeal of a negative recommendation.
13. The dean will compose a formal recommendation letter to the provost's office either upholding the nomination presented to them or to notify the provost's office of a failed case. All cases must go to the provost's office, regardless of result. The manager for faculty affairs will manage the submission of the complete contents of the nomination to the provost's office no later than February 1 following the guidelines and exact deadline provided by the provost's office. School recommendations for promotion and tenure are considered by the provost with the advice of a University-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee. This process is governed under provost policy [PROV-017](#) for tenure line cases and [PROV-004](#) for academic general faculty cases.
14. In the cases of initial faculty offers in SDS or retention of current faculty, expedited promotion and review may be conducted for tenure-track faculty. Although the same standards will apply to such faculty, the review process itself may be streamlined. In particular: the relevant SP&T subcommittee (in consultation with the dean) may expedite the process of generating external reviews; the report will not be shared with the candidate for a written response; and the discussion of the case and relevant vote will be conducted at a single meeting.
15. Faculty members who serve on the SP&T Committee as well as eligible voting faculty have a significant responsibility to ensure that deliberations are thorough, unbiased, thoughtful and fair. Faculty must report inappropriate conversations to the dean.

For both the SP&T and FP&T Committee meetings, the following are held:

- All deliberations and recommendations must be kept strictly confidential.
- Recommendations must be based on the materials submitted. If more information is needed, or if there are questions about the materials submitted, the chair of the committee may request additional documentation from the candidate. Committee members and voting faculty will not seek information on their own. Any solicited or unsolicited external information provided to the

committee or faculty meeting must be documented in writing. Faculty annual reviews are automatically included as part of the dossier.

- Any verbal communication from outside the committee or faculty meeting that is considered in the evaluation must be documented in writing.
- For each case, each committee will review the materials provided and write an analysis discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The voting faculty will review the materials provided and write a justification of their recommendation (except in the case of expedited review, when only the SP&T subcommittee writes a justification). At both stages, a report that includes the faculty who voted, the final vote tally, the recommendation, and the evidence used in making the recommendation will be submitted to the dean. SDS will maintain records to meet auditing, personnel, and other requirements.
- Only committee members who attend the meeting in person or virtually may vote on a case. Votes are taken by a show of hands, whether in person or online. Quorum must be met for a vote to take place (a minimum of seven committee members present for associate cases and mid-cycle reviews, and at least half of FP&T voting-eligible full professors not voting at the SP&T, with a minimum of three present to cast a vote for full professor cases). Quorum is assumed to be met unless the question is raised.

Section 5: Principles and Procedures Regarding Joint Appointments

5.1. Overview

Faculty may establish and maintain joint appointments in schools outside of SDS. Faculty members with joint appointments may encounter quite different administrative processes for promotion and tenure. This section provides a set of principles and guidelines to help make processes related to joint faculty actions as clear and direct as those for faculty with appointments solely in SDS.

5.1.1. Procedures for SDS faculty with a non-tenure-track secondary appointment:

The promotion and tenure procedures for faculty with a non-tenure-track secondary appointment in another school are the same as above except that:

- at least one member from the secondary school or department shall serve on the promotion committee, and
- A letter from the secondary school or department must be submitted to the promotion committee outlining the views of the candidate by that unit.

5.1.2. Procedures for faculty with joint tenure-track appointments:

At the beginning of the joint appointment, the deans' offices and department chairs/center directors (if applicable) of the schools must clarify and agree on how they will engage in key procedures related to the faculty member's academic career. In general, the appointing units agree that joint faculty must adhere to the unit-specific guidelines for promotion and tenure. Where possible, and where advantageous to joint faculty, the units will agree to reduce the amount of administrative workload associated with the promotion and tenure process. For example, the nominating committee for joint faculty will typically consist of a joint committee from the two units. Note that joint faculty do not

undergo a special process that is different from the standard promotion and tenure process in each unit. Rather, joint faculty must demonstrate, according to the bylaws of each unit, that they satisfy the standard promotion and tenure criteria, and joint faculty receive an independent vote in each unit accordingly. Together, the appointing schools agree on the procedures they will use to oversee the process, resolve disputes, and change employment conditions (if necessary) for jointly appointed faculty. This plan must be outlined in a written memorandum of understanding (MOU). SDS is committed to evaluating candidates with joint appointments holistically according to the scope of the promotion and tenure guidelines.

Section 6: Standards for Promotion and/or Tenure

6.1. Overview

In addition to the substantive requirements in the areas below, faculty are expected to exhibit constructive engagement in each aspect of their work, with the expectation that these behaviors will influence the quality of their own work as well as that of others. Accordingly, constructive engagement is an important component of successful promotion. Moreover, given that the practice of data science is often collaborative, SDS is most effective when faculty and staff work openly and cooperatively toward the accomplishment of mutually agreed goals and purposes. A candidate's demonstrated ability to work with other faculty, staff, and students will be considered in relation to its impact on SDS's overall mission. Constructive engagement specifically refers to the professional behaviors that enable a healthy, collaborative, and inclusive academic community. It is not synonymous with personality or viewpoint but rather includes observable conduct that affects the School's academic mission. Evaluations of constructive engagement must focus on documented, job-relevant behaviors and their impact on the academic environment, not on personal style, social preferences, or disagreements expressed professionally. Consideration of constructive engagement may not be used to penalize individuals for good-faith scholarly dissent, advocacy, or lawful activity. It is intended solely to ensure that faculty meet baseline professional expectations necessary to maintain an effective academic community. The specific ways in which constructive engagement is documented and assessed are currently under development and discussion by SDS faculty. As a result, specifics will be added to this section as best practices are identified.

6.2. Criteria for the award of tenure with promotion: Tenure-Track faculty

All tenure-track faculty or potential new hires under consideration for a contract without term in the School of Data Science (i.e., the award of tenure), must be evaluated under the common criteria provided in this section. In most cases, a faculty member will be evaluated for promotion to associate rank and the award of tenure simultaneously. A new hire may also be recruited at associate rank with an offer of tenure. Occasionally, a new hire may be offered a termed contract at the associate rank, with an established shortened probationary period before tenure consideration.

6.2.1. Research, Scholarship, Openness, and Translation

Faculty members must demonstrate excellence in research and scholarship. Independent and collaborative research and disciplinary and interdisciplinary research are all valued. SDS uses a "make your case" model of evaluation for research, scholarship, and translation. Rather than prescribing specific quantitative benchmarks (e.g., number of publications, journal impact factors, or grant amounts), the School invites candidates to articulate the significance and impact of their scholarly

contributions in the context of their field(s). Faculty come from a range of disciplinary traditions connected to data science, and each case will be evaluated holistically, with respect to the norms, values, and forms of scholarly output that are most relevant to the candidate's domain.

Evidence of excellence in research and scholarship, which varies by field, typically includes:

- Evidence of a positive and impactful **national reputation at the associate level** and **international reputation at the full professor level**.
- Demonstrated originality and significance of contributions to research areas and/or interdisciplinary areas, including the quality, quantity, focus and scholarly impact of the work.
- Demonstrated citation and/or use of algorithms, data, software, workflows and other output of the research lifecycle other than traditional publications.
- Use of diverse dissemination platforms—such as blogs, GitHub, YouTube, and other public-facing media—to share research insights, methods, or tools in accessible ways that contribute to scholarly and societal impact.
- Sustained research support and proposal submissions, including awards of competitive fellowships, and the impact of funding results on research communities, data science disciplines and practice, industry/startups, and society.
- Awards and honors received for research.
- Letters of support evaluating research and research impacts.
- A demonstrated commitment to intellectually diverse research, scholarship, and translation.

Openness: SDS recognizes open scholarship, transparency, and reproducibility as central values in contemporary data science research. Candidates are encouraged to document their commitment to making research artifacts—such as data, code, protocols, and workflows—openly available whenever ethically and legally feasible. Promotion and tenure materials should describe steps taken to ensure reproducibility of results, including transparent reporting of methods, sharing of materials, and use of tools that support computational reproducibility. Evidence of such contributions may include:

- Depositing data and code in public repositories
- Publishing reproducible research compendia or notebooks
- Providing persistent identifiers (e.g., DOIs, ORCIDs) for research outputs
- Engaging in open peer review or public preprint dissemination
- Participating in community standards development around openness and reproducibility

The School encourages these practices not as rigid requirements but as meaningful markers of scholarly integrity, scientific stewardship, and, when relevant, translational impact.

Translation: Candidates are encouraged to demonstrate how their research contributes to the translation of data science into practice, policy, or public understanding. Translation refers to the process of applying research insights in ways that achieve societal, organizational, or community impact. This may include, but is not limited to, the development of products, tools, or open data resources; contributions to public policy or advocacy; engagement with public and private partners in data-driven decision-making; leadership in open science initiatives; dissemination through public communication, education, or media; and the promotion of data literacy. Recognizing the diversity of scholarly traditions within the School, translation may take many forms—ranging from open-source dissemination of data

and code to advisory roles, policy engagement, or other activities that extend the reach and relevance of scholarship. Candidates whose work focuses on foundational theory or methods may demonstrate translation through openness, education, and the creation of resources that enable further discovery.

The School views both openness and translation as desirable and valued indicators of scholarly impact. They are strongly encouraged but not required for promotion or tenure; faculty should be evaluated according to how these values align with their disciplinary norms, career stage, and individual scholarly trajectory.

6.2.2. Teaching and Educational Activities

The candidate must demonstrate a commitment to excellence in teaching, advising, and mentoring students. Ideally, the candidate will accumulate teaching experience at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and will have conducted classes of various sizes and types. Evaluation of teaching shall be holistic, evidence-based, and contextualized within the faculty member's instructional responsibilities. Because no single instrument captures teaching effectiveness, the School evaluates teaching using multiple complementary forms of evidence, typically including:

- Peer observations or evaluations of teaching quality.
- Development of new courses and/or programs, both on Grounds and online.
- Syllabi and course design materials.
- Evidence of student learning outcomes or pedagogical innovation.
- Letters from current and former students.
- Student Experiences of Teaching (SET) reports.
- Curriculum development, including continuous improvement and updating material in existing courses.
- Introducing innovative instructional practices.
- Efforts to improve pedagogical effectiveness.
- Presenting and/or publishing about teaching/education.
- Awards and honors for teaching (local, regional, and national).
- Advising/Co-advising and mentoring/co-mentoring students – both graduate and undergraduate.
- A demonstrated commitment to diversity and inclusion through teaching, research, mentoring, outreach, and program development. This includes promotion of an inclusive class environment that values diversity, takes into consideration students from a broad variety of backgrounds and learning styles and challenges students to their best efforts.
- Contributing to the professional development of other faculty.

The School values excellence and growth in teaching as essential to its mission. All forms of teaching evidence will be weighed together to form a fair and balanced judgment of instructional effectiveness, rather than relying on any single metric or comparison across faculty (e.g., solely or primarily based on SET feedback).

6.2.3. Service and Leadership

Each faculty member is expected to contribute to the functioning of the University, SDS, local community and/or their program by serving on/chairing committees, participating in activities, and undertaking a fair share of service assignments. Both quality and quantity are important. Each faculty member is

expected to perform and take leadership roles in external professional activities (e.g., professional practice, public service, service in technical and professional societies and associations, and editorial work for professional journals). As in the other criteria areas, candidates should demonstrate a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in their service activities, including contributions to programs that strengthen inclusivity, equity, diversity or access to education.

6.3. Criteria for Promotion to Professor: Tenure-Track/Tenured Faculty

Promotion to full professor is based on a higher level of sustained achievement in research, teaching, and service/leadership than expected for promotion to associate professor and the award of tenure. Expectations include conformance to the SDS Guiding Values, demonstrated achievements and leadership in the candidate's field or fields with a sustained record of significant scholarship, sustained teaching excellence, international reputation, and strong internal and external service and leadership.

6.4. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor: Academic General Faculty *Teaching Track*

According to **PROV-004.II.F.1**, "**To be promoted to associate professor on the teaching track**, Academic General Faculty Members must demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching and meet or exceed the expectations of their position as defined in their appointment letter or position statement. They also must demonstrate, either through internal review or local or regional reputation, that they have attained status as a superior educator. Scholarship is not required for promotion unless it is specified as a requirement in the appointment letter or position statement. If required, scholarship for promotion on the teaching track must be evaluated for its contributions to the enhancement of the Academic General Faculty Member's teaching.

Promotion to [full] professor on the teaching track requires further sustained excellence in teaching, contributions to the educational capabilities and excellence of the University, and regional, national, or international reputation based on academic achievements. Promotion to professor also may require further achievements, as set forth in the school's policies on Academic General Faculty Members, such as substantial scholarship that enhances their teaching, national contributions to the development of curriculum or pedagogy in their discipline, or many years of extraordinary service to the school or University."

Within the context of the SDS, sustained excellence in teaching may include excellence in traditional, on-line, or blended course development and delivery. Teaching-track faculty are also expected to have devoted significant time to pedagogical innovation and on-going course design. For example, demonstrated development, effort, and success in the use of active, project-based, and collaborative learning models in a variety of contexts shall be recognized and valued. Teaching contributions in other schools or units of the University (e.g., advising PhD students in related fields) may also be considered. Teaching-track faculty may also engage in research, scholarship, and translation to the degree that their portfolios allow for this activity. These contributions for teaching-track faculty shall normally focus on either the pedagogy of data science or on substantive topics directly related to the faculty member's course portfolio. These contributions will be evaluated for their impact on the faculty member's teaching. SDS reserves the right to allow teaching faculty to pursue research, scholarship, and translation that falls outside of these two domains if this research shows merit, or where teaching faculty are

candidates for switching to the research track, but this activity is not relevant to promotion on the teaching track.

Teaching track faculty seeking promotion should also demonstrate engagement in service, which may include service to SDS, the University, or the profession.

6.5. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor: Academic General Faculty *Research Track*

According to **PROV-004.II.F.2**, “**To be promoted to associate professor, Academic General Faculty Members on the research track** must establish a substantial record of scholarship appropriate to their responsibilities and leadership in local, regional, or national discipline-related affairs.

Promotion to [full] professor requires independent research or research support as defined in the appointment letter or position statement, a sustained record of scholarship appropriate to the position, and national or international recognition for contributions to the field. Promotion to professor also may require further achievements, as set forth in the school’s policies on Academic General Faculty Members, such as significant innovations or accomplishments in research or many years of extraordinary service to the school or University.”

Within the context of the SDS, a faculty member must have an established record of excellence in research as recognized through internal and external assessments of its quality, relevance to data science, and impact. In recognition that data science research is inherently multi-disciplinary, special attention will be paid to assessing that multi-disciplinary value of the resulting scholarship. All forms of research activity shall be considered, including mentorship, contributions to funded research programs and centers, collaboration on research projects at the University and elsewhere, scholarly presentations and publications, programming libraries, software products, curated data sets, and patents. In addition to traditional channels of publication and participation, all contributions to open science will be recognized and evaluated in accordance with the [SDS Open Access Guidelines](#).

Individual distinction may be demonstrated by the development of, or independent contribution to, a program of research in which the candidate plays a distinctive role, or independent work that distinguishes the candidate and the candidate’s contribution to the development of scholarly knowledge in an area that can be recognized and evaluated by reviewers.

Promotion to [full] professor on the research track requires a sustained record of independent research or research support as defined in the appointment letter or position statement that goes substantially beyond the research required for promotion to associate professor, a sustained record of scholarship appropriate to the position, and national or international recognition for contributions to the field.

Faculty on the research track may also have established records of excellence in the translation of data science into products, policies, services, and other vehicles with significant impacts on the world outside of SDS. Translation may take a wide variety of forms, including but not limited to collaboration with public and private organizations in data-driven decision-making, public service in leading open data initiatives, working with nonprofit and private-sector organizations in the spreading of data literacy and cultures of evidence, invited commentary in the media, public speaking engagements, and the advancement and promotion of data science through various media.

6.6. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor: Academic General Faculty Practice Track

According to **PROV-004 II.F.3**: “**To be promoted to associate professor on the practice track**, Academic General Faculty Members must demonstrate sustained excellence in integrating professional experience with the academic mission of the school, meet or exceed the expectations of their position as defined in their appointment letter or position statement, and receive regional, national, or international recognition for contributions to their professions. Scholarship is not required for promotion unless it is specified as a requirement in the appointment letter or position statement. If required, scholarship for promotion on the practice track should relate primarily to integrating professional experience into academic instruction or scholarly research.

Promotion to [full] professor on the practice track requires further sustained excellence in integrating professional experience with the academic mission of the school, substantial contributions to the capabilities and excellence of the University, and further recognition for regional, national, or international achievements in the relevant professional field(s).

Promotion to professor also may require further achievements, as set forth in the school’s policies on Academic General Faculty Members, such as substantial scholarship related to integrating professional experience into academic instruction or scholarly research, national or international contributions to the integration of professional experience with academic instruction or scholarly research, or many years of extraordinary service to the school or University.

Within the context of the SDS, to be promoted to associate professor on the practice track, a faculty member must demonstrate sustained excellence in integrating professional experience with the academic mission of SDS. This integration can occur through teaching (including course, curriculum, and/or program design and development), research and scholarship, service, or a combination, and evaluation of will generally follow the same form it would take on the teaching or research tracks, with the caveat that research and scholarship for promotion on the practice track should relate primarily to integrating professional experience into academic instruction or scholarly research. In addition, the faculty member must meet or exceed the expectations of their position as defined in their appointment letter or position statement, and receive regional, national, or international recognition for contributions to their professions.

Faculty on the practice track may also have established records of excellence in the translation of data science into products, policies, services, and other vehicles with significant impacts on the world outside of SDS. Translation may take a wide variety of forms, including but not limited to collaboration with public and private organizations in the area of data-driven decision-making, public service in leading open data initiatives, working with nonprofit and private-sector organizations in the spreading of data literacy and cultures of evidence, invited commentary in the media, public speaking engagements, and the advancement and promotion of data science through various media.

6.7. Criteria Considerations for Joint Appointments

Candidates with a joint appointment being evaluated for promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate the required standards above as related to the quality and impact of their work. Evaluations of quantity and productivity will account for the joint effort distribution.

Section 7: Appendices

Appendix A: Candidate's Dossier

A.1. A current *curriculum vita* (CV).

The CV should include, at a minimum, the following items, each organized in reverse chronological order:

- a. Starting date (including year and month) of UVA professional appointments and previous professional employments.
- b. The date and place of undergraduate and graduate degrees and postdoctoral training.
- c. Honors and awards received.
- d. A list of publications and scholarly work separated into categories: for example, archival peer reviewed journal articles, archival peer reviewed conference proceedings, books, book chapters, other media, and other categories, as appropriate:
 - Each publication listing must include the complete list of authors, with student coauthors advised by the candidate underlined and the candidate's name in bold, title of publication, name of the Journal/Conference, date of publication, page numbers/article number and Digital Object Identifier (DOI).
 - For conference papers, a description in square brackets (i.e. "[]") describing the candidate's contribution, the selectivity/impact of each paper, and/or the acceptance rate of the conference should be given.
 - For regular papers, the number of views and downloads if known.
- e. Highlighted Scholarly Contributions. Candidates must include an additional list of up to five scholarly works or research products that best represent the originality, significance, and impact of their contributions to the field(s). For each entry, candidates should provide a brief description (2–3 sentences) explaining: (a) Why this work is significant in the context of their career trajectory and (b) its contribution to the field or broader impact on scholarship, practice, or society. These highlighted works will receive particular attention from both internal and external reviewers. Candidates are encouraged to select works that reflect the breadth and depth of their scholarship, including nontraditional outputs where appropriate (e.g., software, datasets, public-facing scholarship).
- f. Other media may include, but is not limited to, YouTube channels, blogs, podcasts, free and open access media, other traditional forms of media citation organizations; ORCID identifier.
- g. A list of datasets, software, protocols and other research objects placed into the public domain with, where possible, a quantitative definition of impact.

- h. A list of graduate students directed or being directed (separated into Doctoral and Master's of Data Science, for instance), their status, including year of the most recent major milestones (qualifying exam, proposal, projected defense date), and the placement of the students after graduating (**if known**). **Include candidate's role in relationship with student (e.g., mentor, chair, etc.)**
- i. A list of undergraduate student researchers who were involved in a significant manner in the candidate's research with or without an accompanying thesis.
- j. A list of visitors and postdoctoral fellows supervised.
- k. A list of external research grants and contracts, including proposals currently under review. The listing must include the name of the sponsoring institution, the amount of the award, the duration of the award (including years and months), the candidate's official role (e.g., PI, Co-PI, Co-I, etc.), and the amount of total funding and the amount targeted for the candidate.
- l. A list of presentations organized by keynote and invited presentations, with the inviting organizations and institution/department and date indicated.
- m. A list of any issued patents filed patents and disclosures and formal copyrights awarded or pending.
- n. A list of internal service/leadership performed since joining UVA. Service shall be categorized as Department, School, or University.
- o. A list of professional services, identifying leadership roles in service assignments such as conference organizer roles and journal editorial board.
- p. A chronological list of media relations concerning the candidate and/or their research – newspaper/magazine articles, radio, or television appearances, etc.

Note: The candidate may provide additional items on their CV they deem relevant.

A.2. Candidate Statements

Complete statements from the candidate concerning their research, teaching, and service, should not exceed 18 pages in total (applicable to any track, rank, or level of review).

A.2.1. Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

1. **Research Statement:** A statement describing the candidate's scholarship in their current rank and its impact. The research statement should provide reviewers with an explanation of how the candidate's contributions have had a scientific and/or societal impact, and a description of the candidate's future research agenda. This statement should give the committee an overview of the candidate's research, its impact, and an evaluative framework for reading and understanding their work. Candidates are encouraged to highlight original contributions to collaborative work. (*suggested length is 5-10 single*

spaced pages)

2. **Teaching Statement:** A statement describing the candidate's teaching philosophy, teaching activity at UVA, and future teaching plans. (*suggested length is 3-5 single spaced pages*)
3. **Service Statement:** A statement describing the candidate's service activities and contributions to SDS, the University, and the candidate's academic field. Candidates are encouraged to describe how their activities and collaborations have contributed to these environments. (*suggested length is 3 single spaced pages*)

A.2.2. Academic General Faculty

1. **Teaching Statement:** A statement describing the candidate's teaching philosophy, educational activities at UVA, achievements, and future teaching plans. (*suggested length is 5-8 single spaced pages*)
2. **Educational Scholarship/Research Statement:** A statement describing the candidate's educational scholarship and/or research contributions, their impact on the appropriate scholarly community, and the candidate's agenda for the next few years. This statement should give the committee an overview of the candidate's scholarly activity beyond the classroom, its impact, and an evaluative framework for reading and understanding the candidate's work. Candidates are encouraged to highlight original contributions to collaborative work. (*suggested length is 4-7 single spaced pages*).
3. **Service Statement:** A statement describing your service activities and contributions to SDS, the University, and your academic field. Be sure to describe how your activities have contributed to these environments. (*suggested length is 3 single spaced pages*)

A.3. Supporting materials (focused on activities within current rank)

A.3.1. Research materials

1. Copies of or links to publications that the candidate considers their most significant works; the impact of these selected publications should be discussed in the candidate's research statement. Other published and unpublished work may be included.
2. Reviews of published work (if available)
3. Links to, or copies of, relevant publications and/or other scholarly work
4. Evidence of research, teaching, or service work in data science
5. Evidence of nontraditional scholarly activity (Blogs, YouTube channels, etc.)
6. Evidence of national/international reputation and impact (awards, invited talks, national committee service, honors, recognitions, etc.)

A.3.2. Teaching record/reviews

1. Summary of all course listings and overall evaluation scores, including term taught and enrollment (template).
2. Course evaluations (SDS has access to all SDS course evaluations; candidates must provide copies of course evaluations for any course taught outside of SDS).
3. Course syllabi and other course materials that provide insight into the faculty member's
4. Teaching in SDS and in other units.
5. Information on other teaching activities (advising, exam service, dissertation service, curricular development, etc.) in SDS and other units

A.3.3. Service and Translational Works

1. Materials documenting engagement with the practice and translation of Data Science
2. Materials documenting the candidate's service activities

Appendix B: External Letters (from Reviewers/Referees)

For promotion and tenure, external "arm's length" letters of reference must be solicited from widely recognized external experts competent to assess the standing of the candidate in their research field. The associate dean for academic and faculty affairs and the assistant dean for faculty affairs, along with members of the FP&T Committee, will select potential reviewers from the candidate's and the promotion committee's lists, chosen to obtain a balanced and objective evaluation of the candidate.

The dean's submission to the provost must include all requests for letters, all the responses of the letter writers, and all the letters received. Each individual must be identified by who recommended them as a reviewer (the candidate, the committee, or the dean), a short biography, and a statement as to why the reviewer's opinion is important. The relationship to the candidate must be explained and identified as arm's length or not. Letter writers who are co-authors and/or co-investigators shall be explicitly identified ([template](#)).

Candidates may identify individuals from whom they prefer a letter not to be solicited from, with the final decision on this resting with the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs.

For candidates being considered for promotion to full professor, at least one letter should be received from someone outside the U.S. who can speak to the international reputation of the candidate.

Information Provided to the Letter Writers:

At a minimum, the curriculum vitae, statements concerning the candidate's research and the translation of that research, the teaching statement, and copies of or links to the candidate's research publications will be provided to all external letter writers.

Requests for external letters of reference generally involve two steps. Initially an email inquiry is made to find out if the person is available to serve as a reviewer on the case. Later a formal letter of request is made with full instructions, due date, and materials or information on how to access materials.

B.1. Template for initial ask (Via Email)

Subject: Request for [Promotion/Tenure] Evaluation

CC: sdsfacultyaffairs@virginia.edu; dean

Dear Professor [Y]:

Professor [X], [Assistant/Associate] Professor of Data Science in the School of Data Science at the University of Virginia is being considered for [promotion to and/or tenure] [associate professor / professor] in the School of Data Science. Letters from experts like yourself are an essential and critical part of Professor [X's] evaluation. I am writing to see if you would be available and willing to review Professor [X's] accomplishments.

As you know, promotion and tenure recommendations are among the most important decisions that a School makes. If you agree to write an evaluation, we will send further instructions and Professor [X's] full dossier for you to review. We ask that you submit your letter via email to [Jennifer Kirkham] at sdsfacultyaffairs@virginia.edu by [DATE, i.e. August 9, 2024], but if you need some flexibility on the due date, we will do our best to accommodate.

I realize that this is a request that will take significant effort on your part and that you are likely to get many such requests. I appreciate your willingness to consider it, and I hope you will be able to help us with this important task. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Name] on behalf of
[Name of Dean]
[Dean titles]

B.2. Template for formal requested letter (on letterhead, delivered via email):

Subject: Request for Promotion/Tenure] Evaluation – [Candidate Full Name]
CC: sdsfacultyaffairs@virginia.edu; dean

Dear Professor [Y]:

Thank you for agreeing to write a letter evaluating the work of Professor [X], who currently serves as [current rank and track]. Professor [Candidate Last Name] is being considered for [promotion / promotion with tenure] to [new rank / with tenure] in the School of Data Science at the University of Virginia (UVA). I am including the current Promotion and Tenure Policy of the School of Data Science at the University of Virginia (**policy**) for your reference.

The candidate's dossier can be found **here** [or via attachment], which includes their curriculum vitae, candidate statements, selected publications, a course evaluation summary, and any available supplemental materials. If you have any difficulty accessing the documents, please let me know.

In your letter of evaluation, please include:

- The context in which you know of Professor [Candidate Last Name's] scholarly contributions, if any.
- Your evaluation of Professor [Candidate Last Name's] scholarship, particularly their "methodologic" contributions to the field of Data Science.
- Your assessment of how Professor [Candidate Last Name's] scholarship has impacted science and society.
- Your assessment of Professor [Candidate Last Name's] contributions to education and learning, both in the classroom and beyond (e.g. advising, mentoring, published lectures).
- Your assessment of Professor [Candidate Last Name's] teaching and service contributions, and any comments that you have on these activities.

- Your assessment of whether Professor [Candidate Last Name] should be [tenured/promoted/promoted with tenure], based on the criteria outlined in UVA's School of Data Science Promotion and Tenure Policy.
- Please also state whether you believe Professor [Candidate Last Name] would be promoted or tenured at your own institution.

The School of Data Science highly values collaborative activities where faculty lend their expertise to solve real-world problems and develop new data science tools or frameworks to address modern challenges. This includes engagements on projects encompassing the research lifecycle, such as work with data structures and storage, software, workflows, preprints, blogs, YouTube channels, and other forms of modern-day scholarly activity.

In order to meet the School and University deadlines, please email your letter to Jennifer Kirkham at sdsfacultyaffairs@virginia.edu no later than [DATE, i.e. August 9, 2024 at 5 pm]. In addition, please provide a brief/paragraph bio/CV on yourself.

Please note that, under University of Virginia policy, the identity of authors of letters of evaluation that are included in the personnel review files are to be held in confidence. Professor [Candidate Last Name] waived their right to access letters of reference. To the extent permitted by law, we will treat your response as confidential and make it available only to those involved in the review process.

The School of Data Science is aware that requests such as this are time-consuming, and I am very grateful to you for taking on this task. If you have any questions, or will have any difficulty responding in time, please send e-mail to Jennifer Kirkham at [jhk3s@virginia.edu] or to me at [peb6a@virginia.edu] and we will address your questions as quickly as possible.

Thank you for agreeing to do this. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

[Name] on behalf of
[Name of Dean]
[Dean titles]

B.3. Template for requesting letters from students

Subject: Request for Letter of Support [Promotion/Tenure] Evaluation – [Candidate Full Name]
CC: sdsfacultyaffairs@virginia.edu; dean

Dear <student name>:

The School of Data Science is considering the promotion of Professor X from XX Professor to YY Professor. Part of the process requires letters from students whom Professor X has interacted with, including as a teacher, mentor, research adviser, interest group adviser, etc. We are interested in learning about your experience with <him/her> and the impact on your education, professional and personal development, and goals. We are also interested in your experience interacting with Professor X, as a

teacher and mentor, providing timely feedback, communicating clear expectations, explaining complex concepts, and treating students fairly.

I am writing to ask if you would be willing to write a letter in support of Professor X's [promotion/tenure]. In order to meet the School and University deadlines, please email your letter to Jennifer Kirkham at sdsfacultyaffairs@virginia.edu no later than [DATE, i.e. August 9, 2024 at 5 pm]. In addition, please provide a brief/paragraph bio/CV on yourself. If you are able write such a letter, please let me know by replying to this email at your earliest convenience.

I realize that requests such as these represent an imposition on your valuable time and will indeed be grateful if you are willing to assist us in this important review process. If you need any other information, please let me know.

Thank you in advance for your consideration, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

[Name] on behalf of
[Name of Dean]
[Dean titles]

Appendix C: Template request memo for tenure clock stoppage (from faculty member)

To: Associate Dean for Academics and Faculty Affairs
From: [Faculty Member Name]
Date: [Date]
CC: sdsfacultyaffairs@virginia.edu

I write to request a one-year tenure clock stoppage. [Insert detailed justification. If applicable, reference faculty leave request in this section (faculty leave request is a separate request)]. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Faculty Name:
Faculty Rank:
Department:
Track Start Date:
Current Probationary End Date:
Requested Probationary End Date:
Current Academic Appointment End Date:
Requested Academic Appointment End Date:

Appendix D: Template request letter to the Provost's Office for tenure clock stoppage (from SDS Office of Faculty Affairs)

To: Office of the Provost (vpfa@virginia.edu)

From: Dean or Designee

Date:

CC: sdsfacultyaffairs@virginia.edu

[Name of faculty member] has requested a one-year clock stoppage as noted below. This has received the endorsement of the [associate dean/dean/designee].

Faculty Name:

Faculty Rank: Assistant Professor

Department: NA

Track Start Date:

Current Probationary End Date:

Requested Probationary End Date:

Detailed Justification of Request: [parental leave/family leave/other]

Appendix E: Template request letter for faculty leave request (from faculty member)

To: Associate Dean for Academics and Faculty Affairs

From: [Faculty Member Name]

Date:

CC: Manager of Faculty Affairs

I write to request leave for the [term/year] semester. I would like to select [8 weeks of full pay / 16 weeks of half pay] during this time. [Insert detailed justification. *Please include existing teaching, research, and/or service responsibilities affected by this request.* If applicable, reference clock stoppage request in this section (clock stoppage request is a separate request)].

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Appendix F: Materials Required for the Mid-Cycle Review (3rd Year) for Tenure-Track Faculty

***See the bottom of Appendix F for Joint Appointees not housed in SDS.**

The following materials are *required* for the Mid-Cycle Review:

- Current CV containing all required components listed in the current [SDS policy](#).
- Three Statements (with a suggested length of *6 pages or less*):
 1. **Research Statement:** A statement describing your scholarship and its impact. Please be sure to explain how your contributions have had a scientific and/or societal impact and describe your future research agenda for the next few years. This statement should give the committee an overview of your research, its impact, and an evaluative framework for reading and understanding your work. Be sure to highlight your original contributions to collaborative work. (*suggested length is 2-3 pages*)
 2. **Teaching Statement:** A statement describing your teaching philosophy, teaching activity at UVA, and future teaching plans. (*suggested length is 1-2 pages*)
 3. **Service Statement:** A statement describing your service activities and contributions to SDS, the University, and your academic field. Be sure to explain how your activities have contributed to these environments. (*suggested length is 1 page*)
- Teaching Evaluations (SDS already has all DS course evaluations; please forward evaluations for all non-DS courses)
- Teaching Evaluation Summary and Course List [template](#)

The following supporting materials are *optional* for the Mid-Cycle Review:

- Links to, or copies of, relevant publications and/or other scholarly work
- Evidence of research, teaching, or service work in data science
- Evidence of nontraditional scholarly activity (Blogs, YouTube channels, etc.)
- Evidence of national/international reputation and impact (awards, invited talks, national committee service, honors, recognitions, etc.)

PROCESS:

- The candidates are notified of the Mid-Cycle Review process initiation, with instructions, around August 1.
- Candidate materials are submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs around October 1.
- After a completeness review by the Office of Faculty Affairs, the dossier is advanced to the Faculty P&T Committee (FP&T).
- All FP&T members are invited to review the dossier; the FP&T chair assigns a member to present the case to the full FP&T Committee at the fall meeting.
- The FP&T Committee meets in October and November, to discuss, and vote to recommend the case to the School P&T Committee (SP&T).
- The FP&T chair composes a letter incorporating the recommendation of the Committee, along with comments generated by the FP&T, to the chair of the SP&T Committee on or about November 15.
- The chair of the SP&T Committee distributes the dossier and discusses with SP&T Committee; one or more members are assigned to draft the formal recommendation letter. The SP&T Committee must vote on the recommendation no later than February 28.
- The SP&T Chair provides a formal, written recommendation letter to the dean, on behalf of the Committee, and they provide verbal and/or written feedback and relevant context to the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs and dean.
- The dean will issue written feedback as appropriate and will provide authorization on issuing a reappointment letter to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

- They recommend a reappointment and the length of the reappointment term to the dean, in writing. Or
- They recommend a non-reappointment, in writing, to the dean, which initiates the non-renewal process. **(See Section 3).**
- All decisions on Mid-Cycle Reviews for reappointments must be communicated no later than May 1, and all reappointments or contract renewals must be issued no less than 3 months prior to the start of the new appointment.

***Joint Appointees not administratively housed in SDS will undergo a “Mid-Cycle Review” within their home department/school.**

- SDS will be invited to participate in the review held by the home department.
- SDS and the home department will collaborate to ensure that SDS receives a full copy of the faculty member’s review at the conclusion of the home school review. This may occur at the end of the review cycle (January-February).
- Upon receipt of the home department’s review, the SDS P&T Committee will conduct an independent review using the process noted above.
- Upon conclusion of the SDS review, the faculty member, their chair, and their dean will receive a letter of concurrence.
 - In cases of an unfavorable review by SDS, the dean will initiate a conversation with the appropriate members of the faculty member’s school or department leadership to discuss continuing the joint appointment.
 - All interactions and discussions will be recorded in writing.

Appendix G: Materials Required for the Mid-Cycle Review (Academic General Faculty, All Tracks)

***See the bottom of Appendix G for Joint Appointees not housed in SDS.**

The following materials are *required* for the Mid-Cycle Review:

- Current CV containing all required components listed in the current [SDS policy](#).
- Three Statements (with a suggested length of *6 pages or less*):
 1. **Teaching Statement:** A statement describing your teaching philosophy, educational activities at UVA, and future teaching plans. (*suggested length is 2-3 pages*)
 2. **Educational Scholarship/Research Statement:** A statement describing your educational scholarship and/or research contributions, their impact on the appropriate scholarly community, and your future agenda for the next few years. This statement should give the committee an overview of your scholarly activity beyond the classroom, its impact, and an evaluative framework for reading and understanding your work. Be sure to highlight your original contributions to collaborative work. (*suggested length is 1-2 pages*)
 3. **Service Statement:** A statement describing your service activities and contributions to SDS, the University, and your academic field. Be sure to describe how your activities have contributed to these environments. (*suggested length is 1 page*)
- Teaching Evaluations (SDS already has all DS course evaluations; **please upload evaluations for all non-DS courses**)
- Teaching Evaluation Summary and Course List [template](#)

The following supporting materials are *optional* for the Mid-Cycle Review:

- Evidence of teaching, research, or service work in data science
- Links to, or copies of, relevant publications and/or other scholarly work
- Evidence of nontraditional scholarly activity (Blogs, YouTube channels, etc.)
- Evidence of national/international reputation and impact (awards, invited talks, national committee service, honors, recognitions, etc.)

PROCESS:

- The candidates are notified of the Mid-Cycle Review process initiation, with instructions, around August 1.
- Candidate materials are submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs around October 11.
- After a completeness review by the Office of Faculty Affairs, the dossier is advanced to the Faculty P&T Committee (FP&T).
- All FP&T members are invited to review the dossier; the FP&T chair assigns a member to present the case to the full FP&T Committee at the November meeting.
- The FP&T Committee meets in October and November to discuss and vote to recommend the case to the School P&T Committee (SP&T).
- The FP&T chair composes a letter incorporating the recommendation of the Committee, along with comments generated by the FP&T, to the chair of the SP&T Committee on or about November 15.
- The chair of the SP&T Committee distributes the dossier and discusses with SP&T Committee; one or more members are assigned to draft the formal recommendation letter. The SP&T Committee must vote on the recommendation no later than February 28.
- The SP&T Chair provides a formal, written recommendation letter to the dean, on behalf of the Committee, and they provide verbal and/or written feedback and relevant context to the associate dean for academic and faculty affairs and dean.
- The dean will issue written feedback as appropriate and will provide authorization on issuing a reappointment letter to the Office of Faculty Affairs.
 - They recommend a contract renewal and the length of the contract renewal term to the dean, in writing. Or
 - They recommend a non-renewal of the contract, in writing, to the dean, which initiates the non-renewal process. **(See Section 3).**
- All decisions on Mid-Cycle Reviews for contract renewals must be communicated no later than May 1, and all contract renewals must be issued no less than 3 months prior to the start of the new appointment.

***Joint Appointees not administratively housed in SDS will undergo a “Third-Year Review” or “Mid-Cycle Review” within their home department/school.**

- SDS will be invited to participate in the review held by the home department.
- SDS and the home department will collaborate to ensure that SDS receives a full copy of the faculty member’s review at the conclusion of the home school review. This may occur at the end of the review cycle (January-February).
- Upon receipt of the home department’s review, the SDS P&T Committee will conduct an independent review using the process noted above.
- Upon conclusion of the SDS review, the faculty member, their chair, and their dean will receive a letter of concurrence.

- In cases of an unfavorable review by SDS, the dean will initiate a conversation with the appropriate members of the faculty member's school or department leadership to discuss continuing the joint appointment.
- All interactions and discussions will be recorded in writing.