SCHOOL OF DATA SCIENCE
PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY FOR TENURE TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY

Date: Passed by the SDS AAC on March 18, 2020
Policy ID: rfc_14

Reason for Policy:
Recommendations to promote and tenure faculty members are the most important decisions made by the School of Data Science (SDS) as they determine the quality of the faculty for decades to come. Decisions will be based on the extent and impact of the contributions the candidate has made and potentially will make in teaching, research, and service towards the SDS Guiding Values. The evaluation of an individual's contributions necessitates the collection of information and the preparation of documents by which the candidate's past performance and future potential can be assessed. The evaluation will be based on both quantitative and qualitative information and a fair and transparent process, as described in this policy.

Applies to:
SDS tenure track and tenured faculty

Policy Statement:
This school-specific policy conforms to and supplements the University of Virginia provost policy governing promotion and tenure, based on the needs and structure of SDS.

I. The Probationary Period for Tenure-Track Faculty
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 years for any full-time faculty member. The probationary period may only be extended beyond the ordinary term 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;
- 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.

Faculty seeking an extension of the probationary period will submit a written request to the dean as soon as is feasibly possible prior to or following the reason for the extension. In cases where a decision must be made by the school, the dean's cabinet will be responsible for reviewing these requests and forwarding a recommendation to the dean. An extension or stoppage of a candidate's tenure clock must also be approved by the provost.

Tenure-track assistant professors are typically evaluated in the third year for reappointment. Using the criteria for tenure and promotion, the third-year review will emphasize the potential for tenure and promotion in due course. Associate professors hired with term may also request an evaluative critique during their probationary period.

Except in special circumstances, assistant professors will be reviewed for promotion to associate professor with tenure in their sixth year of service, allowing for a terminal year if tenure is not granted. A faculty member who wishes to be reviewed for promotion earlier than the sixth year should submit a request to the dean, who will discuss the request with the dean's cabinet before reaching a decision. If the review is being undertaken in response to an outside offer, the dean will consult with the dean's cabinet about an expedited schedule for the review.

Tenure-track faculty members who are not reappointed or promoted within the seven-year probationary period must be given written notice of termination of contract as specified in the provost's promotion and tenure policy under "probationary period for tenure." They are entitled to twelve months of employment after notice.

II. Promotion Within Tenure
The timing for promotion to professor should be based on consultation between the candidate and the dean. A candidate may request to be reviewed for promotion based on the belief that they have attained the sustained excellence and other criteria, as described below, to merit a promotion. If the promotion process results in a negative decision, the candidate will remain in the rank of associate professor. 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.

III. Procedure for Promotion and Tenure Review

1. In April of each year, the dean and the dean's cabinet will determine who will be reviewed the following academic year.

In cases of joint appointments with units that will be carrying out a simultaneous review, the dean will be 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. See Section IV for more information regarding joint appointments.

2. By April 15, the dean and the dean's cabinet will appoint an ad hoc promotion committee for each candidate for promotion. The committee will consist of at least 3, preferably 5, tenured members of UVA faculty at or above the rank sought by the candidate, one of whom the dean will designate as chair. Committee membership should reflect the broad interdisciplinary research community of the school as well as the candidate's disciplinary field from within SDS and/or other UVA schools[1]. Efforts will be made to ensure diversity on the committee, using the same diversity guidelines used for search committees. Committee members must have received or undertake bias training, as approved by the SDS Committee

---

[1] Once SDS has a sufficient number of tenured faculty, to promote consistency in process and evaluation, the dean will appoint at least three faculty at a time to staggered terms to serve on a standing promotion and tenure committee and will designate one of these core faculty as the chair of the committee. The dean will appoint up to two additional members, from within SDS and/or other UVA schools, to reflect the particular capabilities and field of the person under review.

on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. The identities of the committee members will be revealed to the candidate.

If the candidate believes there are individuals whose service on the committee would be inappropriate, they should provide the dean with this information, indicating briefly but clearly the nature of the reasons. The dean and the dean's cabinet will give serious weight to this information in appointing the promotion committee.

3. The candidate for promotion will be invited to submit a list of six individuals outside the University of Virginia who might be asked to write external letters evaluating the candidate's scholarship and standing in the field. This list must include 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 should also include and identify co-authors and/or co-investigators that are able to delineate the candidate's contributions to collaborative work. 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 May 1.

The promotion committee will also assemble a list of potential external reviewers. In consultation with the dean's cabinet and the members of the promotion committee, the dean will select the names of prospective external reviewers from the candidate's list and the list constructed by the promotion committee and contact them in writing 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. See Appendix B for templates to request external letters.

4. The committee chair will contact faculty who have engaged in peer review of the candidate's teaching for an assessment of teaching quality and trajectory.

5. The committee chair may contact students who have first-hand knowledge of the candidate's teaching quality and invite comments concerning the candidate's contributions to their education.

6. By July 1, a candidate for review will submit a dossier with materials described in Appendix A to the dean for use in the review.

By July 15, the dean 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 promotion committee. 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 sent to external reviewers by July 15, along with a copy of the SDS criteria for promotion. External reviewers will be asked to submit their letters by October 1.

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 by September 15.

7. The dean will invite the heads of other units with which the candidate is affiliated to submit a memo providing whatever information about the candidate's participation in the unit that it wishes SDS to take into account in its evaluation of the candidate. The dean will request that these memos be submitted by October 1.

8. The committee will review the materials provided and write an analysis discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the case. It will submit its report to the dean by November 15. The report must include an explanation of disagreements or dissenting votes. The committee shall attach a final page to the report that includes 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.

9. A copy of the report (with identifying information redacted and without the final page containing the vote and recommendation) will be given to the candidate, who may submit a written response within ten days of receiving it.

10. The candidate's dossier, the external letters, the committee report, and the candidate's response to it will be distributed to the eligible members of the SDS faculty with at least a 50% appointment in the school at least two weeks prior to the meeting at which these faculty will discuss the case. Eligibility is defined as tenured faculty at or above the rank sought by the candidate and academic general faculty at or above the rank sought by the candidate. Faculty will be expected to read these documents and review the candidate's published research prior to the meeting.

The dean will schedule well in advance two meetings of the eligible faculty, scheduled for approximately one week apart in November or December. At the beginning of each meeting the dean will remind the faculty that discussions at these meetings are strictly confidential and that any breaches of confidentiality will be regarded as unprofessional conduct. The dean will then leave for the deliberations. At the first meeting, the chair of the promotion committee will summarize the committee's recommendation and reasoning and will facilitate the discussion. No vote will be taken at this meeting. At the second meeting, the discussion will be resumed and a vote will be taken. All eligible faculty present at the second meeting are eligible to vote. Those not present at the second meeting will be permitted to vote by proxy only if they attended the first meeting.

11. Following the vote, the dean decides whether or not to concur in the recommendations of the committee and the faculty vote. The final decision to recommend promotion rests with the dean. The dean will inform the candidate of the decision and provide the voting faculty's justification as soon as possible after the faculty meeting, documented as required in [provost policy](#) to allow for an appeal of a negative recommendation. The dean delivers recommendations on promotion and tenure to the provost by February 1. School recommendations for tenure and promotion 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 Promotion and Tenure](#), in particular Section 8. Actions in the Office of the Provost.

12. 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 ad hoc committee (in consultation with the dean's cabinet) may expedite the process of generating external reviews; the report will not be shared with the candidate for written response; and the discussion of the case and relevant faculty vote will be conducted at a single meeting.

13. Faculty members who serve on the promotion committee and the 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 promotion committee and the voting faculty meetings, the following hold:

A. All deliberations and recommendations must be kept strictly confidential.

B. 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 external information provided to the committee or faculty meeting must be documented in writing.

C. Any verbal communication from outside the committee or faculty meeting that is considered in the evaluation must be documented in writing.

D. For each case the 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. 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.

IV. Principles and Procedures Regarding Joint Appointments

One of SDS's strengths is its formal commitment to help faculty move across disciplinary boundaries. When a faculty member's sense of academic "home" crosses disciplinary boundaries, they may establish and maintain two or more academic bases. The schools or colleges in which the faculty member holds appointments have a responsibility to help the faculty member achieve this goal. Faculty members with joint appointments sometimes encounter quite different administrative processes in their different academic homes. This section provides a set of principles and guidelines to help make processes related to joint faculty appointments as clear and direct as those for faculty with appointments solely in SDS.

A. 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.

B. 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. Together, the appointing schools should agree on the procedures they will use to appoint, evaluate, promote, resolve disputes, or change employment conditions for jointly appointed faculty. This plan must be outlined in a written memorandum of understanding. In the case of a new assistant professor, the initial memorandum of understanding may defer, until the third year, making a specific plan for coordinating the tenure review.

• SDS is committed to evaluating candidates with joint appointments holistically. Whenever possible, the deans' offices should agree on a joint process for making promotion and tenure decisions about the jointly appointed faculty member. A unified process, at least at the initial evaluation committee stage, is the clearest and simplest way to ensure that both schools are represented in the promotion process

while reducing the faculty member's administrative burden and properly valuing interdisciplinary scholarship. This includes permitting the submission of a single candidate dossier and coordination on the choice of external reviewers. The deans' offices should discuss the timing and key elements of the promotion processes in each academic unit so that the overall process can be streamlined and synchronized.

• In cases of joint tenure-track appointments, the MOU must provide the option and process for the faculty member to choose to be evaluated for tenure in a single unit. SDS seeks to avoid conflicting outcomes with other units in joint tenure decisions by establishing a joint evaluation process, as discussed above. However, the MOU should contain controlling terms if SDS votes to recommend promotion and the other unit does not, and vice versa. If SDS votes to recommend promotion and the other unit does not, SDS, as a means of reconciliation, will offer promotion with a higher fraction in SDS (presumably 100%). (i.e. will SDS and/or the other unit offer to be the tenure home). If SDS votes to not recommend promotion, that decision will stand, although the faculty member may continue to teach in the school if the other unit serves as the tenure home.

V. Standards for Promotion and/or Tenure

A. Criteria for the award of tenure

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.

Although a faculty member may excel in a particular area, and effort distributions vary, strength in one area does not compensate for a deficiency in another area. Beyond substantive requirements in the areas below, faculty are expected to continuously exhibit collaboration, collegiality, professionalism, and good citizenship in each aspect of their work, with the expectation that these behaviors will influence the quality of one's own work as well as that of others. Moreover, given that the practice of data science is inherently collaborative, SDS is most effective when faculty and staff work openly and cooperatively toward the accomplishment of mutually agreed upon 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.

1. Research, Scholarship, and Translation

Faculty members must demonstrate excellence in open research and scholarship. Independent and collaborative research and disciplinary and interdisciplinary research are all valued.

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

• 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.

6

• 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
• Successful advising of Ph.D. students and other trainees
• Awards and honors received for research
• National and international recognition
• Letters of support evaluating research and research impacts
• A demonstrated commitment to diversity and inclusion in research, scholarship, and translation.

Openness: Tenure in SDS requires a commitment to open scholarship. Evidence of that openness comes in the form of observed degree of collaboration, data and software availability, publishing in open access journals, the use of preprints, the presence of an ORCID and Google Scholar profile and other evidence.

Translation: The candidate must also demonstrate evidence of translation of research into products, policies, services and other vehicles capable of societal impact through patent filings, contracts, etc. 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.

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.

Evidence of commitment to excellence in teaching and educational activities typically includes:

• Peer reviews of teaching
• Development of new courses and/or programs, both on Grounds and online.
• Letters from current and former students
• Student evaluations
• Curriculum development, including continuous improvement and updating material in existing courses
• Introducing innovative instructional practices
• Efforts to improve teaching effectiveness
• Presenting and/or publishing about teaching/education
• Awards and honors for teaching (local, regional, and national)
• Advising and 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

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.

B. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

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/fields with a sustained record of significant scholarship, sustained teaching excellence, and strong internal and external service and leadership.

C. 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.

Appendix A Candidate's Dossier

By July 1, a candidate for review will submit one copy of the following materials to the dean for use in the review:

A. **A current curriculum vita.** The CV should include, at a minimum, the following items, each organized in a 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: archival peer reviewed journal articles, archival peer reviewed conference proceedings, books, book chapters, 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, the selectivity/impact of each paper should be given, for example, by giving the acceptance rate of the conference.

• For regular papers, the number of views and downloads if known.

e. The candidate's h-index and citation count, according to Google Scholar, Web of Science or some other citation organizations.

f. A list of datasets, software, protocols and other research objects placed into the public domain with, where possible, a quantitative definition of impact.

g. list of graduate students directed or being directed (separated into Doctoral and Master's of Data Science), their status, including year of the most recent major milestones (qualifying exam, proposal, projected defense date), and the placement of the students after graduating.

h. A list of undergraduate student researchers who were involved in a significant manner in the candidate's research with or without a thesis.

i. A list of visitors and postdoctoral fellows supervised.

j. 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 role (e.g., PI, Co-PI and Senior Personnel), and the amount of total funding and the amount targeted for the candidate.

k. A list of presentations organized by keynote and invited presentations, with the inviting organizations and institution/department and date indicated.

l. A list of issued patents, filed patents and disclosers and formal copyrights awarded or pending.

m. A list of internal service/leadership performed since joining UVA. Service shall be categorized as Department, School, or University.

n. A list of professional services, identifying leadership roles in service assignments such as conference organizer roles and journal editorial board.

o. The candidates ORCID identifier.

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

B. The candidate's statements

• A statement describing the candidate's scholarship in the current rank and indicating how it contributes to a coherent field (or fields) of inquiry and describing future research agendas. This statement should provide the committee and external reviewers with an overview of the candidate's research and an evaluative framework for reading and understanding the work. The candidate must include an explanation of their own original contributions to collaborative work. (suggested length: 5-10 single spaced pages)

• A statement describing the ways in which the candidate's published work, research products aside from papers (data, software, protocols etc.), and professional activities have contributed broadly to the field of Data Science. (suggested length: 5 pages)

• A statement describing the candidate's teaching philosophy, experience, and future teaching plans. (no more than 3 pages)

• A statement describing the candidate's service activities within the SDS, other UVA units, the University, and beyond the University and how the candidate's activities have contributed to these environments. (no more than 3 pages)

• A statement describing examples of the candidate's collaboration with faculty, staff, students, and/or others in scholarship, translation, teaching, and/or service activities. (no more than 3 pages)

C. Supporting materials (focused on activities within current rank)

• Research
> • Copies of or links to publications that the candidate considers their most significant work; the impact of these selected publications should be discussed in the candidate's research statement. Other published and unpublished work may be included.
> • Links to relevant research products as described above.
> • Reviews of published work (if available)

• Teaching
> • List of courses taught (in SDS and elsewhere), including term taught and enrollment
> • Course syllabi and other course materials that provide insight into the faculty member's teaching in SDS and in other units
> • Course evaluations
> • Information on other teaching activities (advising, exam service, dissertation service, curricular development, etc.) in SDS and other units

• Materials documenting engagement with the practice and translation of Data Science

• Materials documenting the candidate's service activities

Appendix B External Letters

For tenure and promotion, external letters of reference must be solicited from widely recognized external experts competent to assess the standing of the candidate in their research field. The dean 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 of 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.

Candidates may identify individuals from whom they prefer that letters not be solicited, with the final decision on this resting with the dean.

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.

1. Template for initial ask

<Date>

To: <email address>

Subject: Request for Evaluation

Dear Professor YYY,

<Professor X> is being considered for < promotion and/or tenure> to <Associate Professor/Professor> in the School of Data Science at the University of Virginia. As you know, promotion and tenure recommendations are among the most important decisions that a department, school, or university makes. An important part of the evaluation is a set of letters from experts in Professor X's field. I am writing to find out if you would be available and willing to review Professor X's accomplishments. The evaluation letter would be due by xx xx, 20xx.

I hope you are available to write the evaluation, and I would greatly appreciate your letting me know in the next two weeks if you are able to do so. If you are available, I will send further instructions and copies/link of Professor X's material.

2. Template for formal requested letter:

Dear Professor YYY,

Thank you for agreeing to write a letter evaluating the work of Professor X as < he/she > is being considered for <tenure and/or promotion to Associate/Professor>. You can access THE PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY OF THE SCHOOL OF DATA SCIENCE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA (UVA) by clicking on the link so that you can review the criteria for tenure in UVA's School of Data Science.

To assist you in writing this evaluation, I <have enclosed> <provide a link to> the following materials: Professor X's Curriculum Vitae and research and teaching statements. If you have any questions or would like additional materials, please let me know. I would like to ask that your letter of evaluation include:

- A brief statement describing the context of your knowledge of <Professor X>

- An evaluation of Professor X's achievements and impact on his/her field,
- An indication whether Professor X should be <tenured and/or promoted> based on the criteria of UVA's School of Data Science. We ask that you also state whether you believe the candidate would be promoted in your own school.

Although you may not be familiar with Professor X's teaching and service, we would be grateful if you would share any comments that you have on these activities.

The School of Data Science is intent on reshaping what constitutes scholarship in the modern age, so please pay attention to contributions that occur through collaboration throughout the research lifecycle such as well-described data and software, workflows, preprints and other forms of output.

In order to meet the School and University deadlines, I will need your letter by <Date>. 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 X has signed the form to waive his/her 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 call me at 434–xxx-yyyy or send e-mail to <ZZ@VIRGINIA.EDU>.

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

3. Template for requesting letters from students

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, such as 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 for Professor X. I would like to receive the letters no later than <October 1 or DATE>. 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.