DATE: July 1, 2009
FROM: Daniel J. Larson
TO: Department Heads in the Eberly College of Science

**Promotion and Tenure, 2009/2010**

This memorandum initiates the Promotion and Tenure activities for academic 2009/2010 and describes the procedures. Information about dossier preparation will be sent out in September. Several changes have been instituted to our procedures to keep us in step with the University process and to aid in uniformity and consistency within the College. We hope you will find these changes helpful.

Three items are being called for **no later than September 4, 2009:** (1) a list of the members of your department Promotion and Tenure Committees. Please include the full title of each member and be sure to indicate the chairperson; (2) a copy of your departmental statement of expectations and procedures for promotion and tenure; and (3) a separate memo for each individual being considered in this year’s promotion or promotion and tenure review containing a potential list of external evaluators.

The packets for external evaluators are to be delivered no later than **September 11, 2009.** Please send one copy to Bronnie McLaughlin, 512 Thomas to be checked for consistency and accuracy **before** making copies.

The following pages provide more detail on the formats and method of delivery of these materials. The general timetable of activities is also attached.

Please note that the **Promotion and Tenure Administrative Guidelines** can be found at [http://www.psu.edu/vpaa/pdfs/p_and_t_%20guidelines.pdf](http://www.psu.edu/vpaa/pdfs/p_and_t_%20guidelines.pdf). We will inform you of any changes once they are updated for 2009-2010. You can locate **Policy HR-23, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations** at [http://guru.psu.edu/policies/OHR/hr23.html](http://guru.psu.edu/policies/OHR/hr23.html).
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c: Administrative Assistants and Administrative Support Staff

An Equal Opportunity University
Notes and Helpful Hints on required documentation
Due in Dean’s Office no later than September 4, 2009

Please provide an **electronic copy** of the following three documents to Bronnie McLaughlin, at bhm1@psu.edu, **no later than Friday, September 4, 2009**. In addition, please send an original signed copy of the memo for each candidate described in #3 below to Bronnie McLaughlin, 512 Thomas Building.

1. A list of the faculty members serving on your department Promotion and Tenure Committee. Please include the full title of each member and be sure to indicate the **chairperson** of each committee and/or subcommittee.

2. A copy of your departmental statement of expectations and procedures for promotion and tenure.

3. A separate memo for each individual being considered in this year’s promotion and tenure review. Each memo must contain the following:

   a. Description of the **action(s)** (i.e., promotion to the rank of …, tenure, etc.) under consideration. Note that the Provost has asked that deans consult with him prior to initiating a tenure review for any case that might be perceived as being “early.” If you are considering such a case, please discuss it with me so that I can follow up with this consultation.

   b. An electronic list of at least 12 potential external evaluators. In preparing your lists, please ask each candidate for a written list of up to 6 prospective external evaluators. The department promotion and tenure committee must provide a **completely independent** list. I am counting on department heads to ensure the integrity of this process. Please assemble and send a final list of at least 12 names based on the candidate’s recommendations, the committee’s recommendations, and, where appropriate, your own recommendations, identifying the source of each recommended name. There is no problem with overlapping recommendations as long as the department committee and the candidate have produced their lists completely independently. Typically I will send requests for evaluations to **8 or 9 of the 12 potential evaluators**. Not infrequently, additional names of potential evaluators may be suggested by one or two of the original evaluators. I may write to additional evaluators, depending upon the numbers of substantive responses we receive to the first requests. In the rare circumstance that you have compelling reasons for avoiding a request to a particular individual, include the name of that individual and the reason(s) along with the original list of 12 names.

   For candidates who work in more than one research area, please ensure that the evaluator list includes experts in all of the appropriate areas. In such cases, please include a note regarding the range of expertise of the evaluators.

   Please note that we have been asked to avoid listing, as an external evaluator, individuals who were former Penn State faculty members who may have sat on a department or college committee in consideration of the tenure or promotion of the particular candidate. If there is a compelling reason to list such an individual, please provide the justification in detail.

   Ph.D. and postdoctoral advisors should not be included on the lists; if there is a very good reason to list them, please note the relationship and give a clear justification for inclusion.
c. If the candidate does a substantial amount of work with other scientists, the name(s) of the major collaborator(s) should be included and clearly identified. **Collaborators should be suggested in addition to the 12 other names.** Normally, collaborators will be asked to comment on the candidate’s role in the collaboration and will not be asked for an overall evaluation of the candidate. I normally write to all of the collaborators that you identify, but more than three or four collaborator letters begin to over-emphasize this part of the dossier. As with evaluators, please take care to ensure that the recommended collaborators span the range of the candidate’s work.

If a collaborator is a current Penn State employee, the letter will be placed into the dossier, as part of the factual material (which must be shared with the candidate). The collaborator letter will have a statement indicating that the letter will not be confidential. If a collaborator is from outside Penn State, the letter will be placed into the External Letters section of the dossier, and our request will contain language parallel to that found in the request for an external evaluation, about holding the response as confidential.

d. For faculty with split appointments, the department head must request input from the administrator of a secondary unit to be included in the dossier as well as a brief statement concerning the nature of the candidate’s involvement in the secondary unit. Please provide the name and address of the individual who will provide the evaluation. For faculty who are co-funded with inter-college non-tenure granting units, University policy says we may request input from those units (e.g., MRI, Huck Institutes), but the College Executive Committee decided that we will not.

**Your final list of external evaluators should be prepared as a memorandum from the department head, addressing the personnel action(s) for which the candidate will be considered, and in an organized and easy-to-read format appropriate for subsequent use in the dossier.**

The list of external evaluators should be formatted as follows and include:

- Full Name of the proposed evaluator
- Title (rank) of the proposed evaluator
- Institution
- Current full mailing address
- E-mail address
- Phone
- Fax
- Source: ( ) Committee; ( ) Candidate; ( ) Department Head; ( ) Other (you may check more than one category, if appropriate)

A brief narrative statement about why the evaluator’s name is on the list, including a succinct description of the individual’s accomplishments and significance in the field, and biographical/career information noting major awards and key memberships.

** ***

Continue with next 11 or so names using the exact same format

***
Notes and Helpful Hints on PACKETS for External Evaluators
Due in Dean’s Office no later than September 11, 2009

When assembling the initial packets, please send one copy to Bronnie McLaughlin in 512 Thomas to be reviewed prior to making multiple copies. You will need to make enough copies for each of the recommended evaluators + two (no more than a total of 12 copies should be submitted).

The packets should be organized in spiral-bound packets for the convenience of the evaluators, and individual articles separated by colored dividers. This document should contain information in the following categories:

1. candidate’s current c.v. including
   educational background
   previous experience
   honors and awards
   professional memberships
   list of publications (full citation, including beginning and ending pages; list authors as they appear in the journal; list publications which have appeared, are accepted, or submitted in separate category headings)
   invited talks (may include talks scheduled for the future)
   contributed talks/seminars
   research support (list all co-investigators, agency, dollar amount, duration, title; may include grant proposals submitted)
   graduate students and postdoctoral fellows (M.S. and Ph.D., past and present)
   teaching experience, assignments
   professional service
   optional: abstracts, patents, referee work, consulting, committee assignments, etc.

2. statement of research interests, keeping in mind that this statement – unlike that written for the dossier itself – is addressed to an audience of experts in the field. (1-2 pages, written in first person)

3. copies of selected publications (separated by a colored sheet divider)

   Please make note of the following items:
   
a. Items “To be Submitted” or “In Preparation” should not be included.

b. All those listed under “Submitted” must be included to be sent to evaluators and must indicate the journal and date submitted.

c. Items listed as “Accepted” must be accompanied by a copy of the acceptance letter at the time the c.v. is submitted to this office. Letters which state that acceptance is contingent upon revisions are not sufficient. Notes about “verbal acceptance” are not acceptable. E-mail and FAX notices are acceptable.
TIMETABLE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE ACTIVITIES
EBERLY COLLEGE OF SCIENCE University Park, 2009/2010

July
The call is issued to kick off 2009/2010 P&T activities

9/4/09
Deadlines for the following materials to be delivered to Bronnie McLaughlin, bhm1@psu.edu, 512 Thomas Building, 863-6216:

1. an electronic listing of the faculty members serving on their promotion and tenure committee, with full titles, indicating the chair.

2. an electronic copy of their current Department Expectations for promotion and tenure

3. a separate electronic memo for each candidate in this year’s promotion and/or promotion and tenure review. (Please follow instructions on page 2 and formats listed on page 3.)

9/11/09
Deadline for departments to submit packets for External Evaluators to Bronnie McLaughlin in 512 Thomas. (Please use format listed on page 4.)

9/15/09
College faculty are notified about College Committee memberships and are provided with a copy of the College Statement of Expectations

Mid-Sept
College Promotion & Tenure Workshop for new tenure-eligible faculty as well as faculty currently under review, with panel discussion (date/time/location to be announced).

Dean writes to external evaluators

Dean’s Office orders dossier pages and dividers

Mid-Oct
Dr. Blannie Bowen, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will talk with department heads and committee chairpersons to discuss procedures and key issues (date/time/location to be announced)

12/1/09
Copies of external letters and log are sent to department heads

12/4/09
Deadline for departments to submit one copy (loose-leaf in manila folders) of each candidate’s dossier, complete except for the departmental committee and department head recommendations to Bronnie McLaughlin in 512 Thomas for review.
TIMETABLE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE ACTIVITIES
EBERLY COLLEGE OF SCIENCE University Park, 2009/2010

(continued)

1/8/10 **Deadline** for the departments to submit the original plus ten (11 total) complete copies of each candidate’s dossier, including dated and signed department committee and department head recommendations. **Submit these loose-leaf in manila folders.**

1/18/10 College-level committee begins review

February

Dean’s review begins

2/6/10 **Deadline** for 2009 Faculty Activity Reports (FAC)
Submitted in loose-leaf notebooks with copies of the FAC followed by the CV and separated by index tabs

2/27/10 Dossiers leave the College for review by University Committee

3/1/10 Dean informs candidates whether or not their dossier was forwarded to the University Committee

3/1/10 **Deadline** for Departments to submit 2nd and 4th year tenure dossiers to the Dean

3/31/10 **Deadline** for HR-40 Five Year Evaluations to the Dean

4/28/10 2nd and 4th year dossiers are returned to the departments, complete with the Dean’s report

5/3/10 **Deadline** for the departments to provide copies of evaluations for all faculty who did not otherwise undergo a formal review, along with a confidential faculty ranking.

5/17/10 **Deadline** for the departments to provide confirmation that each faculty member received the annual or five-year evaluation, including an invitation to discuss the results.

5/17/10 **Deadline** for the department heads report on completion of all faculty evaluations, along with confirmation of completion of 2nd and 4th year review meetings and a statement confirming that the candidate received a copy of all review documents.

6/1/010 (approx.) Final decisions on promotion and tenure cases are made by the President; candidates to be notified soon thereafter.

6/15/09 (approx.) Annual evaluations are sent by the Dean to all faculty. Dean reports on completion of all reviews and submits final summary report to the Provost.