This document compiles a list of recommendations from the SEAS Tenure Committee based on various dossiers we have seen in the last three years.

1. Input on candidate CVs

* Number all lists of research products, with the most recent product at the top of the list, and number the products chronologically (earliest is number 1).
* List all co-investigators in a grant along with everyone’s percentage share; indicate who is the PI 1, 5
* Indicate University at Buffalo students supervised by the applicant in all papers; distinguish by undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students 2
* Give full bibliographic information on all papers including page numbers 3
* If available and significant, provide number of citations associated with the paper and the impact factor associated with the paper 4
* Where relevant, give acceptance percentage for conference papers 4
* If it is a workshop paper, please indicate whether it is peer reviewed or not 4
* Clearly mark if students are jointly advised and if so, who is the co-advisor 1
* Clearly indicate for which papers/presentations/abstracts you are the lead/corresponding author and distinguish these items from those that include doctoral or postdoctoral advisors1, 5
* Indicate which papers/presentations/abstracts have been peer-reviewed or invited 4
* Separate primary literature articles from review articles or book chapters and again indicate those that have been solicited and those that have been peer-reviewed 4
* When possible, provide metrics like citations, h-index, i-index, WoS, Google Scholar page link, etc. 4
* For papers accepted but not in print, provide a DOI number, if available 2

Rationale:

1 Helps to establish candidate’s intellectual contribution to work and leadership role in project.

2 Demonstrates successful student training leading to scholarly products and graduation metrics; student level (UG, graduate, postdoctoral) indicates range of students trained and productivity of that student group, here, productivity leading to the graduation of PhD students is emphasized.

3 Clearly indicates the details of the papers; most funding agencies require this level of detail in proposal submissions. A key goal here is to see publication products with the candidate’s PhD students as lead authors and the candidate as the corresponding author.

4 Helps establishes impact of scholarly product.

5 Helps establish independence of applicant from collaborators and previous mentors/institutions. The goal is to see stand-alone scholarly products and accomplishment completed at UB.

2. Specific Instructions for Tenure

* Do not give list of proposals rejected
* Do not list any papers that are “in preparation”
* Give name of journal for any “submitted papers”
* Do not list yourself as advisor to students who have done a course project with you. List them only if they are doing a dissertation (PhD) or thesis (MS)

Rationale:

All of these suggestions are to help the committee clearly evaluate accomplishments completed in the probationary tenure period.

3. Specific Instructions for 3-year reappointment

* List all proposals submitted and their status (categorize them as rejected, submitted, funded) 1
* Give name of journal for any “submitted papers” 2

Rationale:

1 This is to let the committee assess the range of agencies targeted, collaborators included, proposal types that are being submitted, and overall effort of the applicant. Recommendations can then be made on how funding strategies may be adjusted.

2 This is to allow the committee to evaluate trajectory of candidate’s tenure process.

4. Input on Chair’s Letters

* Discuss the candidate using the following descriptive categories: Departmental Discussion and Vote (in the case of reappointments, please converge on a single vote for a term length [typically 3 years but 1 or 2 year terms have been selected in the past]), Selection and Stature of Reviewers, Scholarship and Research, External Funding, Classroom Teaching and Graduate Student Advisement, Service, Recommendations of External Disinterested Reviewers, Recommendations of Internal Reviewers, and Chair’s Summary and Recommendation.

For tenure cases it is useful to include comparisons with faculty in other peer institutions using metrics such as Google Scholar citation counts