DATE: October 27, 2010

FROM: Daniel J. Larson

TO: Department Heads in the Eberly College of Science
Candidates for Promotion and Tenure Consideration

Promotion and Tenure, 2010-2011 – Part II

Enclosed are:

1. The membership of this year’s College-level Promotion and Tenure Committee,
2. Helpful Resources for Dossier Preparation,
3. Helpful Information for Dossier Preparation
4. Checklist for Promotion and Tenure Dossier Preparation Assembly, and
5. The general timetable of deadlines for this year’s activities
6. A printed copy of the ECoS Dossier Preparation Template

While solicitation of external letters of evaluation has been completed, and we are waiting for responses, candidates and their department heads should be preparing the factual information for the dossier. Note that the next key deadline is Friday, December 3, 2010, at which time I am asking for one copy of the complete dossier—signed and dated by the candidate—in order to ensure that we have time to check it and make any necessary final adjustments before it’s copied for use in the review.

The complete version must be finalized and signed by the candidate before it may be reviewed by the department committee.

DJL:bhm

c: Administrative Support Staff

An Equal Opportunity University
University Park Eberly College of Science Promotion and Tenure Committee 2010-2011

Leonid Berlyand, Professor of Mathematics (10/12)
Philip Bevilacqua, Professor of Chemistry (10/12)
Vincent Crespi, Professor of Physics (09/11), Chair
Mark Levi, Professor of Mathematics (09/11)
Runze Li, Professor of Statistics (09/11)
Bernhard Luscher, Professor of Biology (09/11)
Andrea Mastro, Professor of BMB (10/12)
Mary Poss, Professor of Biology (10/12)
Alex Wolsczczan, Evan Pugh Professor of Astronomy (10/12)

HELPFUL RESOURCES FOR DOSSIER PREPARATION

The following three resources are the backbone of entire Promotion and Tenure process and contain information that is extremely valuable in dossier preparation.

1. The Pennsylvania State University Administrative Guidelines HR-23: Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations (2009-10) can be found at:

   http://www.psu.edu/vpaa/pdfs/p_and_t_%20guidelines.pdf

2. The actual policy HR-23 can be found at:

   http://guru.psu.edu/policies/OHR/hr23.html

3. Frequently Asked Questions About Promotion and Tenure – 2009-2010 can be found at:

   http://www.psu.edu/vpaa/pdfs/p_and_t_faq.pdf

7. A printed copy of The Eberly College of Science Promotion and Tenure Dossier Preparation Template
   You can get a copy of the template in Microsoft Word from Bronnie McLaughlin (bhm1@psu.edu)
HELPFUL INFORMATION FOR DOSSIER PREPARATION

Please provide, **no later than Friday, December 3, 2010** one copy (loose-leaf **single-sided** in a manila folder) to Bronnie McLaughlin in 512 Thomas Building of each UP candidate’s dossier, complete except for the departmental committee and department head recommendations, which will be added later.

Adherence to the P&T Guidelines and careful attention to detail are intended to give the candidate the best possible presentation and provides uniformity as the dossier moves through a complex review by faculty and administrators from many different disciplines.

Department Heads: Note that these directions and the dossier template also apply to 2nd and 4th year dossiers and any other special tenure-track reviews which will occur during the Spring of 2011 with the exception of the format for research grants and contracts. Please share these guidelines with all faculty undergoing evaluation during this academic year.

**Guidelines.** The dossier must be **complete** (**containing a signed statement of review of the factual information by the candidate**) dated before review by departmental committee members may begin.

**The narrative statement.** The purpose of this statement is not so much to call attention to achievements that are listed elsewhere in the dossier as it is to give candidates the opportunity to place their work and activities in the context of their overall goals and agendas. The narrative should be an objective statement with no evaluative content. The statement is critical to reviewers who are not familiar with the candidate's field and what constitutes important work. Candidates should carefully prepare the narrative so others can understand their fields and how their scholarly work relates to the larger field. Ideally, the statement should also demonstrate the connections among the parts of the dossier and the integration of the three university functions of teaching, research and service.

The statement should be no longer than two pages. Avoid summarizing your dossier contents. The statement should not be edited by the Department Committee or the Department Head. This statement is meant to aid the College and University Committees in their review of the dossier by giving the candidate’s perspective on their own research and teaching.

**Teaching Section.** Special care is suggested in assembling the teaching section of the dossier.

- For all candidates, there should be a detailed record of SRTE scores and student comments. Starting this academic year a department staff member (who has been given access) will be able to download candidate’s SRTE scores directly from the Web at SRTE.psu.edu, (under the “Online SRTEs, click on the link that says “Reports.””) Faculty members can see their own scores only. The Administrative Guidelines ask for comments from SRTE to be written in **summary form**. The summary of student comments must contain comments that reflect the overall student assessment of the candidate’s performance, including both strengths and weaknesses.

- The department head will designate a senior faculty member or committee to summarize the content.

- The candidate **must not** be involved in selecting student comments.

- Student comment summaries should be listed in order reverse chronologically (newest to oldest), showing the course number and semester.

- Candidates are urged to keep track of former students and to record their awards and subsequent successes.
• Peer evaluations should be completed regularly for all faculty members, and shared with them in a timely fashion.

• All peer evaluations should be dated and signed by the reviewer.

Research Section. All listed items in the Research Section of the dossier must appear in reverse chronological order from newest-to-oldest. The candidates must clearly indicate their specific role in multi-author publications, talks/presentations, and research grants with multiple participants.

i. For publications, use the following key to describe authorship role –
   a. Principal author
   b. Contributing author
   c. Supervised principle author
   d. other

ii. For talks and presentations, separate out
   a. Candidate’s invited talks at universities
   b. Candidate’s invited talks at technical and professional meetings
   c. Candidate’s invited talks at research laboratories/institutions
   d. Contributed talks and/or presentations at conferences
   e. Record of participation in, and description of workshops

iii. For grants, provide the name of the PI and list all co-PI’s. In situations where the candidate is not the sole PI, indicate the candidate’s contribution and the fraction of support attributable to the candidate.

For 2nd/4th or Special 3rd/5th year reviews, information about research grants and contracts must include the information in iii, above, and the Research Office will provide only the latest report from SIMS, early during the Spring Semester, to assist departments in ensuring completeness. These reports are not intended to be inserted into the dossier, but can be used to double-check information provided by the candidate.

Upon the initiation of a case for promotion and/or tenure, the Research Office will assemble information on grants and contracts from its records in order to assist the faculty in dossier preparation and to ensure uniformity for grant and contract reporting. These reports will be issued by mid-November 2010. The candidate should review this information and offer corrections and additions, if appropriate. The format of this information provided is to be cut and pasted into the dossier.

• Listings of work in progress are not to appear in the dossier; work that is not supported by external funding may be addressed in the candidate’s Narrative Statement.

General Notes.

• If there are unusual circumstances in any area of the dossier, it is advisable to include brief explanatory notes. For example, if there are few invitations to speak and there is a legitimate reason why such talks could not be undertaken, an explanation is in order. If invitations had to be declined, the declined invitations should be listed with a brief explanation. If the candidate has invitations for future events, please list them. Another example might involve a subdiscipline where collaboration rather than independent research is the standard; since the factual information in the dossier will look different from what might be expected, an note about the reason for the differences would be appropriate.
• Information should not appear in more than one place. If an element of information is applicable to more than one section, list it once and provide a “see also” note referring the reader to the other section.

• Inclusion of a citation study, in summary form, is possible and you are encouraged to do one at the appropriate place in the dossier. Such a study can provide evidence for the impact of the candidate’s work.

• If a statement from the administrator of a secondary unit is solicited, that document will appear in the dossier section most closely related to the primary involvement of the candidate in that unit; if the candidate’s relationship involves more than one criteria area, the document should appear in only one place, with a citation directing the reader to other sections, as appropriate.

• Informational materials should be arranged in each section in strict order, according to the dossier divider.

• All pages within each section, including the final, Administrative section, should be numbered and identified by the candidate’s name and dossier section title, in accordance with instructions in the Administrative Guidelines.

• Please remember to include a copy of both the college and department criteria statements in the preliminary section of the dossier. Current versions of such statements are available under “Faculty Affairs Information” under “Faculty and Staff” on the College home page at www.science.psu.edu.

• Evaluation by the departmental committee must not begin until after the candidate has signed off on the factual content of the dossier.

• Department committee reports must provide both the recommendation and the numerical vote (even if the vote was unanimous) in the first paragraph of the report. If the vote was split, the report must contain not only the majority opinion, but also statements reflecting the minority opinion(s). If there was an abstention, the reason for the abstention must be noted in the report.

• Changes to the dossiers after they have entered the review process should occur only if the information is substantive. When any of the factual information changes, the dossier must travel back in the process to all prior levels of review for reconsideration and the process must be documented. The absolute last date changes can be made is February 15, 2011 at which point it would be necessary to reconvene the departmental committee, department head, and the college committee to consider changes to their recommendations prior to the Dean’s consideration.
CHECKLIST FOR PROMOTION/TENURE REVIEWS

P & T Cover Sheet
https://guru.psu.edu/forms/4-21PromotionandTenureFormAfm3.pdf
___ One or two cover sheets as needed (one for tenure, one for promotion)
___ “untenured” checked if simultaneous tenure-promotion to associate professor
___ Accurate PSU id+ number
___ Complete rank and title including identifier i.e., “of Biology”
___ Box checked, signed & dated by Chair of P/T Committee
___ Box checked, signed & dated by Department Head

Biographical Data Form
https://guru.psu.edu/forms/4-21BiographicalDataforPromotionTenureReviewBfm3.pdf
___ Complete rank and title including identifier i.e., “of Chemistry”
___ Signed & dated by candidate

College P/T Criteria, current version
http://www.science.psu.edu/human-resources/faculty-information/promotion-and-tenure-1/ECOScriteria.htm

Department P/T Criteria, current version

Narrative, preferably 2 pages but not exceeding 3 pages

Orange Section – Teaching
___ All Pages numbered beginning with A-1, A-2 including peer review letters
___ Reverse chronological order, most recent date first (except for Peer Review section)
___ Peer reviews of teaching inserted earliest date first, signed and dated by evaluator
___ No unsolicited letters included

Green Section – Research & Scholarship
___ All pages numbered beginning with B-1, B-2
___ Reverse chronological order, most recent date first
___ Role of author defined on each multiple authored publication
___ Role and contribution indicated on research projects
___ Beginning and ending dates for membership in professional and learned societies
___ Letter of acceptance included for papers accepted for publication (if appropriate)

Pink Section – Service
___ All pages numbered beginning with C-1, C-2
___ Reverse Chronological order, most recent date first
___ Beginning and ending dates for service

Gray Section – External Evaluators
___ All pages numbered beginning with D-1, D-2
___ Identify evaluators in order listed on log
___ Log of evaluators
___ Letters from evaluators in order listed in log

Blue Section – Review Committees
___ All pages numbered beginning with E-1, E-2
___ Committee letter on letterhead, addressed to Dean in memo form
___ Committee letter signed by Chair
___ Committee Members listed with professorial rank on Committee letter
___ Numerical vote indicated on Committee letter
___ Consultation noted and discussed or any absentia explained if applicable.
___ Department Head letter on letterhead, addressed to Dean in memo form
___ College Committee letter on letterhead, addressed to Dean in memo form
___ All letters in reverse chronological order (most recent first)
___ No mention or identification of external evaluators in Review Letters

Candidate Signature Page - signed and dated
TIMETABLE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE ACTIVITIES
EBERLY COLLEGE OF SCIENCE University Park, 2010/2011

The call is issued to kick off 2010/2011 P&T activities no later than July

9/3/10 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.)

9/10/10 Deadline for departments to submit packets for External Evaluators to Bronnie McLaughlin in 512 Thomas.

Dean writes to external evaluators

Dean’s Office orders dossier pages and dividers

10/2010 College faculty are notified about College Committee memberships and are provided with a copy of the College Statement of Expectations

10/5/10 College Promotion & Tenure Workshop for new tenure-eligible faculty as well as faculty currently under review, with panel discussion (2:00 pm, 16 Ritenour).

12/3/10 Copies of external letters and log are sent to department heads

12/3/10 Deadline for departments to submit one copy (loose-leaf, single sided, in manila folders) of each candidate’s dossier, complete except for the external evaluator section and the departmental committee and department head recommendations to Bronnie McLaughlin in 512 Thomas for review.

1/7/11 Deadline for the departments to submit the original plus one additional single sided copy and 10 complete double sided copies of each candidate’s dossier, including dated and signed department committee and department head recommendations. Submit these loose-leaf in manila folders.

1/17/11 College-level committee begins review

February Dean’s review begins

2/7/11 Deadline for 2010 Faculty Activity Reports (FAC)
Submitted in loose-leaf notebooks with copies of the FAC followed by the CV and separated by index tabs
TIMETABLE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE ACTIVITIES
EBERLY COLLEGE OF SCIENCE University Park, 2010/2011 (continued)

no later than

2/28/11  Dossiers leave the College for review by University Committee

3/1/11    Dean informs candidates whether or not their dossier was forwarded to the University Committee

3/1/11    Deadline for Departments to submit 2nd and 4th year tenure dossiers to Bronnie McLaughlin in 512 Thomas. Please submit the original and one copy

3/31/11   Deadline for HR-40 Five Year Evaluations to Bronnie McLaughlin, 512 Thomas

4/29/11   2nd and 4th year dossiers are returned to the departments, complete with the Dean’s report

5/2/11    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.

5/16/11   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.

5/16/11   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.

6/1/11    (approx.) Final decisions on promotion and tenure cases are made by the President; candidates to be notified soon thereafter.

6/15/11   (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.