These procedures outline the process of promotion for candidates for Associate Scientist and Senior Scientist referenced in MBL policy A.1.3.3.1 and A.1.3.3.2

1. Process
If this process is unlikely to be completed before the end of the candidate’s current appointment a revised timeline should be determined with the approval of the MBL Director.

1.1. **Twelve months** before the end of the current appointment the candidate should meet with their Center Director or designated Senior Scientist mentor to discuss the renewal process. Over the next three months the candidate, working with their Center Director or designated Senior Scientist mentor, should prepare the documents specified in 4.1 below and schedule a public seminar (MBL Seminar Series, Informal Scientists’ Meeting, etc.) to be given no later than four months before the end of the current appointment. The seminar will be recorded for the benefit of the Promotion Committee.

1.2. **Nine months** before the end of the current appointment the candidate should submit their promotion material to their Center Director. The Center Director will consult with senior members of the Center according to Center protocols and present a recommendation to the Director of Research with the documents specified in 4.2 below.

If the Center does not recommend the candidate for promotion the Center Director, with the Director of Research as necessary, will present a written explanation of the decision to the candidate. The candidate may opt to proceed with the promotion application.

The Center Directors and the Director of Research will appoint a Promotion Committee made up of 4–5 resident and 1–2 external scientists; the committee will not include the sponsoring Center Director but may include other Center Directors or senior members of the candidate’s Center. The committee will review and approve the lists of potential external evaluators and may select an additional 3–4 so that there are at least 10 approved by the committee. The Center Director may advise the committee to resolve conflicts of interest of external evaluators. Guidance for selecting external evaluators is provided in 4.3 below.

The Center Director will solicit letters from the external evaluators, and ensure that at least six return letters six months before the end of the current appointment. Guidance for the letter to external evaluators is provided in 4.4 below.

1.3. **Five months** before the end of the current appointment the Center Director will submit a letter of recommendation with the complete promotion package to the Director of Research, who will distribute the package to the Promotion Committee. The candidate may choose to provide an updated CV and/or Statements to the committee, in which case any differences from the versions sent to external evaluators should be noted or the original versions should also be provided. Guidance for the recommendation letter is provided in 4.5 below. The required documents are listed in 4.6 below.

1.4. **Four months** before the end of the current appointment the Promotion Committee will meet, discuss the candidate’s case, and draft a written report including an evaluation and recommendation. The Director of Research will share the report with the candidate after redacting any information that would identify the authors of the evaluation letters. The candidate may provide a written response to any aspect of the evaluation that they feel is unrepresentative of their performance. The Promotion Committee may elect to alter the report
until the Committee and candidate agree on the evaluation of performance; otherwise the candidate’s response will be included in the final package delivered to the Director of the MBL.

1.5. One month after receiving the final package the Director will return a decision.

2. Criteria
A candidate for promotion to Associate Scientist should have contributed significant and fundamental research in their field and demonstrate potential for sustained contributions of increasing importance.

A candidate for promotion to Senior Scientist should be widely recognized as a rising leader in their field, with a record of continued contributions since promotion to associate scientist, as well as evidence that the candidate will continue to lead their field for the foreseeable future. Promotion to the rank of Senior Scientist is not pro forma and some faculty may be reappointed at the Associate level indefinitely.

Factors to evaluate these criteria include a combination of success in research results, publications, and grants; the candidate’s contribution to the intellectual community and to the broader goals and activities of the MBL; and the candidate’s service to the MBL and to their field nationally or internationally. If there is an education or other specific service component to current appointment the candidate’s success in this activity should also be a factor in promotion.

3. Outcomes
Assistant Scientists ordinarily will be either promoted to Associate Scientist or receive a shorter terminal appointment. Associate Scientists may be promoted to Senior Scientist, reappointed at the Associate level for another term, or receive a shorter terminal appointment.

4. Documents
This section describes the documents necessary for the promotion package.

4.1. Documents to be provided by the candidate, working with their Center Director or designated Senior Scientist mentor, to the Center Director:

- A CV in any standard format, including separate headings for:
  - all peer-reviewed publications (in press, or published)
  - all peer-reviewed publications submitted or in revision. These manuscripts should ideally be submitted to bioRxiv or similar repository, or be made available to the Promotion Committee on request.
  - any non peer-reviewed publications (submitted, in revision, in press, or published).
  - invited seminars and presentations at national and international meetings since the last appointment.
  - grants received, including funding source, title, start and end dates, and role (PI, co PI, senior personnel, etc.).
  - service to the MBL and the wider scientific community, including educational outreach, diversity and inclusion.
- A research statement emphasizing accomplishments and publications during the appointment period and detailing future research and funding plans (this should not exceed 5 pages).
- If the Scientist’s appointment includes a teaching or other major service component, contributions to MBL and plans for future contributions should also be summarized in a separate statement (this should not exceed 2 pages). For other Scientists this statement is optional and its absence will not count against the Scientist during review.
- A list of 3–5 potential external evaluators, with contact information. The candidate may request specific individuals to be excluded from the final list.
- A list of colleagues with conflicts of interest, in NSF or NIH format.

4.2. Initial documents to be provided by the Center Director, working with senior members of the Center, to the Director of Research:
- The candidate’s package.
- A list of 3–5 potential external evaluators provided by the candidate.
- A list of 3–5 additional potential external evaluators.

4.3. List of approved evaluators to be provided by the Promotion Committee to the Center Director:
- The Conflict of Interest list provided by the candidate can be used as a guide in selecting evaluators, but the Promotion Committee should exercise their discretion in determining what constitutes a disqualifying conflict of interest. For example, co-authorship on large multi-author papers or other peripheral collaboration does not disqualify a potential evaluator. Ordinarily the final six evaluators should not be close current collaborators or former mentor/mentees, but the Committee may wish to solicit evaluation from these or other close collaborators in addition if it would be helpful to the review process.
- Evaluators should hold a rank at least equivalent to that sought by the candidate.
- The list of evaluators should reflect gender equity and diversity.

4.4. Letter to external evaluators, written by the Center Director:
- The letter should be clear about the proposed appointment rank and the criteria for promotion.
- Evaluators should be asked to identify any relationship or interaction with the candidate.
- Evaluators should be asked to evaluate the originality, rigor, and fundamental significance of the candidate’s research and impact on their field based on the candidate’s reputation and the material provided.
- Evaluators should be told of expectations for evaluation. If there is an education or other MBL service component to current appointment the Center Director should ask for an evaluation of that activity.
- The evaluator should indicate whether they would support the promotion of the candidate to the equivalent rank at their own institution.

4.5. The recommendation letter to be written by the Center Director to accompany the final package should include:
- A summary of the candidate’s major research contributions, including:
  - What has been the impact on science at the MBL?
  - What has been the impact in the broader field?
- An assessment of the balance between and contribution to unique original research and collaborative research.
- A summary of the candidate’s service to the Center, the MBL, and the field, including:
How does the candidate enhance the MBL community?
How does the candidate contribute to the broader goals of the MBL?

- Representative quotes from letters of evaluation. Evaluators should be referred to only by a letter code (Evaluator A, B, etc.) without other identifying information, as the recommendation will be read by the candidate.

4.6. The final package assembled by the Center Director to be delivered to the Director of Research and the Promotion Committee:
- The recommendation letter described in 4.5 above.
- The C.V. and statements described in 4.1 above. The candidate may choose to provide an updated CV and/or Statements to the committee, in which case any differences from the versions sent to external evaluators should be noted or the original versions should also be provided.
- The list of outside evaluators described in 4.3 above, annotated to indicate why any on the list had not been solicited and why any that had been solicited declined to provide an evaluation. The list should include the letter code used in the recommendation letter described in 4.5 above.
- A generic version of the letter to evaluators described in 4.4 above.
- At least six letters from outside evaluators.