UNH PHYSICS DEPARTMENT
PROMOTION & TENURE & REVIEW PROCESS

Timeline, Package Preparation, Expectations, Rules

Contents

Revision History

- Initial issue – Fall, 2005
- First Revision – May, 2010
- Second Revision – July, 2012
  Updated suggested timeline to coincidence with deadlines set by CEPS.
- Third Revision – August, 2012
  Updated suggested timeline to start the solicitation of outside letters before the end of August.

1. Promotion and Tenure Committee Rules and Guidelines

1.1 Committee Composition

The Composition of the Committee depends on the rank for which the candidate is applying: the Committee is made up of all faculty at that rank or higher. The Department Chair is always a member of the committee, regardless of their rank. To be specific:

- If the candidate is applying for tenure at the Associate level or promotion to Associate with tenure, the committee is made up of all tenured professors at the rank of Associate and above.
- If the candidate is applying for tenure at the Full level or promotion to Full, the committee is made up of all tenured professors at the rank of Full.
- If the candidate is applying for Associate Research Professor, the committee is made up of all faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Associate Research Professor and above.
- If the candidate is applying for Full Research Professor, the committee is made up of all faculty at the rank of Full Professor or Full Research Professor.

For Research Faculty whose primary administrative home unit is not the College of Engineering and Physical Sciences, for example, for those within the Institute for the Study of Earth Oceans and Space the evaluation for promotion is conducted in this home unit. Since the Physics Department is the secondary unit the Physics Promotion and Tenure Committee and its Chair provide evaluative input.

1.2 Committee Chair

The Department Chair is the Chair of this Committee. The Chair does not vote with the Committee but makes a separate recommendation directly to the Dean.

If the Chair is up for promotion or tenure, then the most recent past Chair who is not on sabbatical or leave of absence or retired will take the role as Committee Chair. If no past Chair is available, a vote will be taken in the Committee to determine the Chair of the Committee.

The roles of the Chair of the Committee are to appoint a subcommittee for each candidate, to oversee the preparation of the package, to call and preside over Committee meetings, to provide an independent evaluation of the candidate, to notify the candidate of the outcome of the vote, and to document the vote and the rationale of the vote of the Committee for the tenure package.

1.3 Package Preparation by Sub-committee

The Committee Chair appoints a sub-committee of three people for each candidate. If possible, one member of the committee should be in a closely related sub-field of physics. If the candidate is a Research Professor, one member should also be a Research Professor. The Chair of the full

P&T Committee should not be on the sub-committee, in order to allow for an independent evaluation.

The sub-committee is responsible for preparation of the package. This includes soliciting outside letters; writing the evaluation of teaching, research and service; providing guidance and advice to the candidate in their preparation of their part of the package; organizing the package materials in the notebook provided by the staff; presenting the case to the P&T Committee; and revising the evaluation to reflect the discussion by the P&T committee. The sub-committee should also ensure that the candidate gives a departmental colloquium in the Fall semester so that the members of the department are familiar with their recent work. The package should be available in early November so the full committee has time to read the materials.

At the end of this document, we list what must be done, organized according to the individuals doing the work.

1.4 Presentation and Discussion

In mid-November the sub-committee will present the candidate's case to the full committee. At this time the sub-committee should be careful to summarize the data gathered without a recommendation.

The full committee will first decide if more information is needed from the subcommittee or the candidate. Then they will discuss the case and attempt to form a consensus on their evaluation of the candidate in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service. If consensus cannot be reached, the differing viewpoints must at least be clear and well supported by available data.

The subcommittee will then revise the evaluation portions of the package to reflect the discussion. The sub-committee will also write the summary statement that describes the basis for the vote. (This is under the Recommendations section.) This revised version of the evaluation and the summary is made available for reading at least a week prior to the final vote.

1.5 Voting

At least a week after the presentation and discussion and revision of the evaluation portion of the package, voting takes place. The committee vote is done by open ballot. Those who cannot attend the meeting may vote by absentee ballot or by proxy. In either case, the ballot or proxy must be given in writing to the Committee Chair; notification by email is sufficient. Voting may take place only after the package has been available for reading for at least a week, and after a discussion of the package by the committee. All members of the committee must be sure to sign and date the signature page (in the Recommendation Section) for each package.

For Research Faculty with a different primary home unit the promotion package will come to the Physics Department office from this primary home unit. The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee may vote on those cases after the package has been available in the Department Office for at least one week.

2. Expectations

Within the physics department, a typical split of effort between research, teaching, and service is approximately 40/40/20. For more senior faculty with tenure, a heavier service load (e.g. being chair) is recognized as valuable and appropriate for some of the time. To put the expectations for being awarded tenure or being promoted within the Department in Physics into the general context of department and faculty effectiveness, the reader may also be referred to the "Department and Faculty Effectiveness and Productivity Metrics", which contains a description of what constitutes effective contribution to the Department mission and spells out a number of factors for each of the above mentioned effort components that contribute to a positive evaluation. Successful and promising interdisciplinary activities across different departments and colleges in teaching, research, and service are counted as valuable contributions within the appropriate categories in the overall evaluation. In particular, such activities are expected for faculty who are also members of interdisciplinary programs, such as the Material Science Program, the Integrative Applied Math Program, and other current or future programs of that nature.

It should be noted that all faculty members who have any question or concern about any of the guidelines laid out below are encouraged to talk with their faculty mentor and/or the Chair about the meaning and interpretation of those. The sections below provide a more specific description of expectations at the point of evaluation for tenure and/or promotion, separate for Associate Professor and Full Professor.

2.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The department expects that someone who is given tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor has demonstrated effectiveness as a teacher in a variety of classes offered by the department, capability of guiding, advising, and mentoring graduate and undergraduate students in their research, and scholarly independence and leadership in their field of study and research. In addition, the candidate must have demonstrated adequate involvement in service and outreach activities, and consideration will be given as to how well the candidate fits into the overall goals and activities of the Department, as judged by the current tenured faculty.

2.1.1 Teaching

Effectiveness as a teacher can be demonstrated by the quality and student reception of classes they have taught or developed in the department, and the contributions they make to the educational mission of the department. It is expected that effective teaching is fundamental for promotion to Associate Professor.

Based on this general expectation, successful teaching is judged by a combination of the following factors. The first four are expected, while the others are viewed as valuable enhancements to a standard portfolio.

1. Peer evaluations (including conversations and classroom visits). These are especially helpful to assess a professor's teaching relative to effectiveness and department expectations. At the same time they will help identify key issues and find appropriate remedies as a feedback to the professor. These peer evaluations will also supplement the numerical student evaluations and comments with qualitative data and put them into context.
2. Ability to teach a range of classes within the spectrum of Physics courses (e.g. Discovery up through junior level classes, or junior level through graduate classes) and associated interdisciplinary programs, if applicable.
3. Teaching evaluation summary numbers and comments, as well as written feedback from previous students. Student feedback and comments that should be summarized will provide a substantive basis for the effectiveness of the professor's teaching. While numerical scores of 4/5 or better are typically viewed as satisfactory in classes for our majors and graduate students and scores 3.5/5 or better are for large classes, we realize that many things (e.g. innovations in the classroom, first time in a course) may result in lower evaluations. Therefore, potentially lower scores need to be put into perspective with student feedback and peer evaluations from (1.), and they require some discussion of causes and planned remedies. (See number 4.)
4. Course portfolio with syllabus, selected assignments, and student work as appropriate. The professor's thoughtful reflections on goals, implementations, success and challenges need to be included.
5. Documented and shared innovations in the classroom.
6. Documented classroom assessment.
7. Unique offerings (new elective courses in a specialty courses, Inquiry courses, interdisciplinary courses).

2.1.2 Research and Scholarly Work

Research and scholarly work can be demonstrated by a combination of professional publications, awards, research grants and collaborations, invited presentations, experimental activity and development, and professional service on committees. Allowance will be made for the considerable range of activities in different areas of specialization. For example, it may take several years for an experimentalist to build equipment and get results in a long-term experiment at a national laboratory, whereas a theorist may publish several peer reviewed papers each year. Contributions in the form of giving or organizing informal seminars or Colloquia in the Department will be considered.

The ability to attract graduate and undergraduate students to research, to support them on grants and/or fellowships, and to advise them successfully are important considerations for someone going up for tenure. The prospects and success in these areas can be measured by a combination of recruitment efforts, work with students, and successful progress of students working with the faculty member in their research activities.

In this context, successful research is judged by a combination of the following factors. There needs to be some level of success in at least the first three, while the others are viewed as valuable enhancements to a standard portfolio.

1. Grant funding, proposal writing and/or collaboration and taking on responsibilities on existing grants
2. Refereed Publications
3. Advising and financial support of graduate students
4. Advising and financial support of undergraduate students
5. Invited talks
6. Citations
7. Papers published with students
8. Research awards of the professor and their students

2.1.3 Service

For the promotion to Associate Professor, adequate contribution to the service load within the Department and some contribution to service within the College or the University is expected. Part of the service contributions may also consist of work within professional societies as service to the research community that the faculty member is active in. Engagement in K-12 education, informal education, and public outreach activities are also counted as a service contribution.

Successful service for promotion to associate is judged by a combination of the following factors. The first two are expected, while the others are viewed as valuable enhancements to a standard portfolio.

1. Participation in 2-3 departmental committees by the time of the tenure review. While a leadership role is not expected at this stage it will be weighed in favor of the candidate.
2. Participation in 1-2 college or university committees by the time of the tenure review. While a leadership role is not expected at this stage it will be weighed in favor of the candidate.
3. Reviewing of journal articles and/or grant proposals
4. Editorships
5. Conference/session organization
6. Leadership in national/international professional organizations
7. Engagement in education and public outreach activities within the university, the state, and/or the nation

2.1.4 Weighting for Research Faculty

While generally all the components compiled above for teaching faculty also are relevant for research faculty members, a much greater emphasis on demonstrating effective research activity relative to teaching and service is put into the consideration for promotion to Associate Research Professor. As for teaching faculty, this can be shown by peer-reviewed publications, invited talks, and contributions to research activities in the Department, the research home unit of the faculty member, and across the College. Ability to obtain independent research grants and contracts and to carry out independent research work is generally very important for research faculty. Effective interaction with graduate students and undergraduate students is an important consideration. While it will be viewed very positively if a research faculty member also supports graduate students financially, it will be taken into consideration that research faculty members already are expected to bring in the resources to pay for their own salary. Generally, their contribution to advising of graduate students and/or a role on masters and/or doctoral committees is expected. While classroom teaching is not required for promotion of a research faculty member, it will be considered as an important component of their interaction with students.

For Research Faculty service in the research community and the faculty member's home unit will be considered as their service contribution.

2.2 Promotion to Full Professor

The department expects that someone who is promoted to Full Professor has demonstrated effectiveness and versatility as a teacher generally across the full spectrum of classes offered by the department, demonstrated capability of guiding, advising, and mentoring graduate and undergraduate students in their research, as well as national and international prominence and leadership in their field of study and research. In addition, the candidate must have demonstrated leadership roles in service and outreach activities.

2.2.1 Teaching:

Effectiveness as a teacher can be demonstrated by the quality and student reception of classes they have taught or developed in the department, and the contributions they make to the educational mission of the department. It is expected that effective teaching is fundamental and that the faculty member has demonstrated the ability to teach across the spectrum of classes (introductory undergraduate through graduate level) for promotion to Full Professor.

Successful teaching is judged by a combination of the following factors. The first five are expected, while the others are viewed as valuable enhancements to a standard portfolio.

1. Peer evaluations (including conversations and classroom visits). These are especially helpful to assess a professor's teaching relative to effectiveness and department expectations. At the same time they will help identify key issues and find appropriate remedies as a feedback to the professor. These peer evaluations will also supplement the numerical student evaluations and comments with qualitative data and put them into context.

2. Ability to teach the full range of classes within the spectrum of Physics courses (introductory through graduate level) including teaching large introductory courses, as well as within associated interdisciplinary programs, if applicable.
3. Teaching evaluation summary numbers and comments, as well as written feedback from previous students. Student feedback and comments that should be summarized will provide a substantative basis for the effectiveness of the professor's teaching. While numerical scores of 4/5 or better are typically viewed as satisfactory in classes for our majors and graduate students and scores 3.5/5 or better are for large classes, we realize that many things (e.g. innovations in the classroom, first time in a course) may result in lower evaluations. Therefore, potentially lower scores need to be put into perspective with student feedback and peer evaluations from (1.), and they require some discussion of causes and planned remedies. (See number 4.)
4. Course portfolio with syllabus, selected assignments, and student work as appropriate. The professor's thoughtful reflections on goals, implementations, success and challenges need to be included.
5. Documented and shared innovations in the classroom.
6. Documented classroom assessment.
7. Unique offerings (new elective courses in a specialty courses, Inquiry courses, interdisciplinary courses).

2.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work:

At the level of Full Professor leadership stature in the specialty field of the faculty member on the national and international level is expected. The prominence of scholarly work can be demonstrated by a combination of professional publications, including their impact on the community, awards, research grants and collaborations, invited presentations, experimental activity and development, and professional service on committees. Allowance will be made for the considerable range of activities in different areas of specialization. For example, it may take several years for an experimentalist to lead the development and implementation of a major research instrument at the university, in space, or at a national laboratory, which then will provide results on the long run for students and post-doctoral researchers, whereas a theorist may publish several peer reviewed papers each year.

The demonstrated ability to attract graduate and undergraduate students to research, to support them on grants and/or fellowships, and to advise them successfully is expected. At this stage of the career there should have been a small "pipeline" of students, with ongoing student involvement in the research group.

Successful research and prominence in the research field are judged by a combination of the following factors. The first seven are expected, while the others are viewed as valuable enhancements to a standard portfolio.

1. Grant funding, proposal writing and/or collaboration and taking on responsibilities on existing grants
2. Refereed Publications
3. Advising and financial support of graduate and an established track record of graduating students.
4. Has developed a national and international reputation as a strong contributor in their field.
5. Advising and financial support of and undergraduate students
6. Invited talks
7. Citations
8. Papers published with students
9. Research awards of the professor and their students

2.2.3 Service:

For the promotion to Full Professor, a substantial contribution to the service load within the Department as well as engagement in service within the College and the University is expected. Part of the service contributions may also consist of work within professional societies as service to the research community that the faculty member is active in. Generally, some leadership roles in some of the service activities are expected at this stage. Engagement in K-12 education, informal education, and public outreach activities are also counted as a service contribution.

Successful service for promotion to full is judged by a combination of the following factors. The first four are expected, while the others are viewed as valuable enhancements to a standard portfolio.

1. Participation in 2-3 departmental committees each year.
2. Participation in 1-2 college or university committees each year.
3. Several leadership roles (e.g. chair of a department or college committee).
4. Reviewing of journal articles and grants
5. Editorships
6. Conference/session organization
7. Leadership in national/international professional organizations
8. Mentoring other faculty in teaching/research and/or service.

2.2.4 Weighting for Research Faculty

While generally all the components compiled above for teaching faculty also are relevant for research faculty members, a much greater emphasis on demonstrating effective research activity

and on national and international prominence in the research field relative to teaching and service is put into the consideration for promotion to Full Research Professor. As for teaching faculty, this can be shown by peer-reviewed publications, invited talks, and contributions to research activities in the Department, the research home unit of the faculty member, and across the College. Continuous success to obtain independent research grants and contracts and to carry out independent research work is generally very important for research faculty. Effective interaction with graduate students and undergraduate students is an important consideration. While it will be viewed very positively if a research faculty member also supports graduate students financially, it will be taken into consideration that research faculty members already are expected to bring in the resources to pay for their own salary. Generally, their contribution to advising of graduate students and/or a role on masters and/or doctoral committees and involvement of students in the research group are expected. While classroom teaching is not required for promotion of a research faculty member, it will be considered as an important component of their interaction with students.

For Research Faculty service and respective leadership roles in the research community and the faculty member's home unit will be considered as their service contribution.

3. Suggested Timeline

- Late August
  - Bring cases forward; a CV is helpful to make a case; by AAUP contract, faculty may request that their own case go forward.
  - Create sub-committees for each case
  - Candidate provides an up-to-date CV
  - Candidate schedules a colloquium for the fall
  - Candidate begins to gather information and writes description
  - Sub-committee sends out solicitations for outside letters
- Early-October
  - Candidate submits package to committee
- Late-October
  - Sub-committee prompts for return of outside letters from peers that have not yet arrived
  - Sub-committee begins to write evaluation
- Early- November
  - Department Chair and sub-committee chair review package
  - Package available for reading
- Mid-November
  - First presentation of case to department
- Late November
  - Vote is taken
  - Subcommittee chair and Committee Chair finalize the package
  - Page numbers are put on and package is copied
- December 1st
  - Package due at the Dean's office

4. Suggested Package Preparation

The package will be put together in accordance with the current official UNH instructions available on the Provost's website. Great care should be taken to follow the rules to the letter so that the case can be carefully and fairly evaluated. It is helpful to use the *MSWord* template for the evaluation and description portions.

The following items are meant to clarify and extend those instructions. If they contradict the official instructions, the official instructions should be followed.

4.1 Notes for Research Faculty

Research faculty cases should be prepared according to the instructions for tenure track faculty, but they are evaluated differently, and in cases that their research home unit is different from the Physics Department their package is prepared and primarily evaluated in that home unit. For research faculty teaching and University service are optional and this must be reflected in the evaluation. Many of these sections may read "None", but that is entirely acceptable. Note that this means extra material may be included, above and beyond what is required by the Provost; we feel this is not a contradiction but an extension.

4.2 Clarifications

Here we gather informal suggestions of the CEPS P&T committees in the past, and suggestions from our own experience as a Department:

- It is very important that the materials clearly evaluate the case in terms of accepted norms for the candidate's field. The sub-committee must make these norms clear in their written evaluation. For example, available funding for theorists is generally less than that for experimentalists. This includes the departmental norms for teaching and service.
- If there are weaknesses (or perceived weaknesses) in a candidate's record, these must be met head on and explained.
- If a candidate is going up before the mandatory date, the sub-committee must make the case that they have clearly met the department's criteria for promotion and tenure.
- The candidate should give details on publications. What is the role of the candidate? What is the quality of the journal? Were the papers refereed? (Some are refereed lightly, especially proceedings.) Letters from collaborators are helpful in documenting the role of the candidate in joint work. This clarification is especially important for papers with many authors.
- The candidate should give detailed information on grants: What is the role of the candidate (PI, co-PI)? How many students are supported? What is the dollar amount, agency, grant period?
- It is now common practice to present the citation rate of the candidate's publications obtained from the SCI database and displayed in the SCI Citation Report.

- Outside reviewers: What is the relationship with the candidate, if any (e.g. advisor, collaborator)? How was the reviewer chosen (by candidate or committee)? What are the qualifications of the reviewer? What supporting materials were sent along with the solicitation letter?
- The comments on the back of the student course evaluations sheets are to be included in the package.
- Teaching evaluations of the candidate for the current semester can be done a bit early so that these evaluations can be included in the package. This is not required.
- One or more members of the subcommittee can sit in on the candidate's classes in order to help evaluate their teaching. This is not required.

4.3 Soliciting Outside Letters

The outside letters are the cornerstone to the package. These should be sent out early to be sure there is ample time for people to respond.

Three outside reviewers on scholarship should be selected from a list created by the candidate. At least another three reviewers are chosen by the committee. The department recognizes that in some subfields of physics (where experiments are done and/or data is shared by large groups of researchers) it is difficult to find knowledgeable reviewers who are not collaborators. But close collaborators can have the appearance of bias, so careful thought should be given to collaborations when reviewers are chosen. In any case, the relation of the reviewer to the candidate should be made clear in the package. It is strongly felt that the candidate's thesis advisor should not be one of the essential six reviewers; however if their input is sought, they could be a seventh reviewer. These solicitation letters should be sent out by the first week in October. The letters should be sent out with a CV and copies of three to five of the candidate's most relevant publications. Scholarship letters must be signed by the author; an email is not sufficient.

If solicited letters are not received in a timely manner (they should be requested by early-November), reminders should be sent out or calls should be made. All care should be taken to avoid bias in these calls, and the same information should be given to all outside reviewers.

Letters of evaluation of his/her teaching and advising will be solicited from a significant number of recent students, both graduate and undergraduate where possible. By significant we mean 50% of the candidate's students in the last 5 years or 50 students total, whichever is less; no less than 30 students (or all students taught) should be solicited since the return rate is typically low. Also, care should be taken to solicit letters from a broad range of classes. All students who have worked on (or are currently working on) research projects (either graduate or undergraduate) should be solicited for their input. Students should be asked to describe their interaction with the candidate (i.e., which classes were taken, how long they were advised by the candidate, what was the frequency of interaction.) Email letters from students are acceptable.

Service letters should be solicited from those who have carried out service work with the candidate; these are typically from colleagues within UNH but may certainly include colleagues from other institutions. It may also be appropriate for the scholarship letters to comment on scholarly service.

Sample solicitation letters are available in departmental files; the sub-committee should take great care to include the required paragraph on confidentiality issues that is included in the UNH instructions. It is also helpful if the solicitation letter includes explicitly the address to which the evaluation letter should be sent and whether email is acceptable.

During fall 2007 we were concerned about the submission of peer and student letters via e-mail. We inquired about this point to Jim Varn (Assistant Provost for Faculty Development and Strategic Planning). He responded:

> *Here is the relevant sentence from the p and t guidelines: "The authenticity of individual faculty or student statements that are made a part of the record must be confirmed with a signature or sender's email address; no anonymous statements may be included or attributed in the case materials." So, it looks like emails are ok as long as they are attributed and come from the sender's email address.*

We found in fact that students were most successfully contacted by e-mail.

4.3 Organizing the Package

Initially, there should be only one copy of the package for reading. This copy should be kept in the Department Manager's office, so that confidentiality can be assured. Copies of the original outside letters should be kept by the subcommittee chair for safe-keeping. Once the package is finalized (including final versions of the evaluation, signature page, recommendation page, and numbering of the appendix pages) the second and third copies can be made. One copy and the original of the package must be submitted to the Dean and one copy must be kept by the department.

The package contents are confidential; only committee members and staff members should be involved in organizing the package. In particular, hourly student workers should not copy any part of the package (other than publications).

<u>Narrative Tabs</u>

Title page

1. CV (one page form from instructions)
2. Integrated Statement (optional)
3. Description of Teaching
4. Evaluation of teaching

5. Description of Scholarly Activities
6. Evaluation of Scholarship
7. Description of Service Activities
8. Evaluation of Service
9. Recommendations
10. Department summary with numerical vote and recommendation, signed
11. Signature page
12. Chairs recommendation, signed
13. Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Appendix Tabs

Title page

1. Full CV
2. Student Evaluations of Teaching (ordered by course number, and then by year)
3. Course Syllabi (only the most recent for each course, ordered by course number)
4. Student letters (alphabetical) and Sample request letter
5. Scholarship letters (alphabetical) and Sample request letter
6. Service Letters (alphabetical) and Sample request letter
7. Selected publications
8. Annual reports and evaluations (chronological order), including third year review.
9. Any substantial Media exposure

5. Instructions for the Candidate

1. As soon as you join the faculty:
    a. Keep the following records/copies:
        i. all the rosters from courses so that students can be contacted at tenure time.
        ii. courses taught each year and your overall rating
        iii. teaching evaluations (the summary page and backs and fronts of student evaluations that have comments on the back).
        iv. all grants applied for (who is PI, your role, amount, grant period, agency, funded or not, number of students supported, whether funded or not)
        v. all students advised (in research, not for courses),
        vi. committees served on and who was chair, so they can be contacted for comment.
        vii. copies of your annual reports and the responses from the Chair and Dean.
        viii. Records of all papers published. Was paper refereed? What was your role in the paper (e.g. major contributor, provided data, etc)
    b. Be sure to do your annual report and read your annual evaluation from the Chair and Dean. If they mention any areas of concerns, you should work to improve in these areas. If you have concerns about the review, talk to your Chair, Dean or other trusted colleague.
    c. By AAUP rules, you have the right to go up for tenure before the mandatory year. If you are considering doing this, it is wise to consult with a few faculty to get a sense of how they see your case (it would be good to have a CV to share with them in this conversation). The department will advise you whether they think it is wise, but you have the right to go forward in all cases. If you want to bring your name forward for tenure, you must do it in September (or earlier) in order to have time for the department to put your tenure package together.
    d. The summer before you go up for tenure and in early fall:
        i. Find out from the Department chair, who your P&T committee is.
        ii. Give names and addresses/emails of possible peer reviewers (at least 4), people who can comment on service, rosters of students in all of your classes, names of any students (grad and undergraduate) you have advised in research (even at another institution) to your P&T committee chair. For the peer reviewers, clearly state your relationship with them (e.g. collaborator, co-author, etc). It is best if you can suggest names of people who know your work but are not collaborators.
        iii. At this writing, the P&T package is all paper, not electronic; scans are not useful.
        iv. In general it is useful to add things to your Appendix as they are gathered; don't wait to put it all in at the last moment. Either put it in yourself, or give to the staff, noting which section it goes under (see list of tabs above).

v. Give names of courses taught and when taught to staff. They can copy teaching evaluations for you and they can put in the Appendix.
vi. Gather selected publications; we need two copies each. These go in the copies of the Appendix.
vii. Update your CV and put in Appendix. If there are any important changes (e.g. papers accepted or submitted), make those updates by end of November.
viii. Put the most recent syllabus for each course you have taught in the Appendix.
ix. Get the latest instructions from the Provost's web site for the preparation of the P&T package. You absolutely must follow the format given in the instructions and answer all questions asked. Below are some clarifications or amplifications of those instructions:
    1. Teaching section: One confusing thing: in "advising of students" under teaching, what is meant is advising students in research, not advising students on what courses to take.
    2. Research: If the research norms for your field are unique (e.g. you work in large collaborations) it is very important that the materials clearly evaluate the case in terms of accepted norms for the candidate's field. You must make these norms as clear as you can.
    3. Give details on publications. What was your role (if not a single author paper)? What is the quality of the journal? Were the papers refereed? (Some are refereed lightly, especially proceedings.)
    4. Give detailed information on grants: What is your role (PI, co-PI)? Who is the PI if not you? How many students supported? What is the dollar amount, agency, grant period?
    5. For students that you advised in research, what did they work on (in a sentence or two). If they have not yet graduated, what is the anticipated graduation date?
    6. What is the scientific goal of your research? The readers know the goal of your teaching and service, but you will need to tell them the goal of your research.
    7. The narrative needs to have consecutive page numbers (even though your description interleaves with the committees evaluation). Discuss with your committee how this will be accomplished (so there is no last minute difficulties with this).
x. Your completed package should be given to your committee by mid October (or at least a decent rough draft).

6. Instructions for the Subcommittee

1. The summer before the case goes up and early that fall
    a. Decide on how to split the work. One person each for research, service and teaching.
    b. Meet as necessary to decide on the process and procedures.
    c. One or more members of the subcommittee can sit in on the candidate's classes in order to help evaluate their teaching. This is not required, but gives a peer view of what is going on in class.
    d. Be sure to get from the candidate the following: names and addresses/emails of possible peer reviewers (at least 4), people who can comment on service, rosters of students in all of candidate's classes, names of any students (graduate and undergraduate) candidate has advised in research (even at another institution). For the peer reviewers, the candidate must clearly state their relationship with them (e.g. collaborator, co-author, etc.)
    e. Solicit letters as early as possible. If you wait until November, it will be stressful for all involved. Sample letters are on the departmental blackboard site. Be sure to get clarity about whether or not email is okay. Have a plan to remind letter writers if their letters are late (by plan, I just mean on what date is it reasonable to ask again and not appear to be pestering them). See section above on soliciting letters. Remember to thank those writing the evaluation letters after their letters are received.
    f. If you decide to solicit letters from students via email, you can give student names to the staff, and they can help find e-mails by using the directory on BlackBoard.
    g. In general it is useful to add letters to the Appendix as they are gathered; don't wait to put them all in at the last moment. Either put them in yourself, or give them to the staff, noting which section they go under (see list of tabs above).

2. Once the candidate's material is in (or at least a decent draft) hopefully by mid-October:
    a. Begin to write your evaluation. Get the latest instructions from the Provost's web site for the preparation of the P&T package. You absolutely must follow the format given in the instructions and answer all questions asked. Below are some clarifications or amplifications of those instructions:
        i. It is very important that the materials clearly evaluate the case in terms of accepted norms for the candidate's field. The candidate and/or sub-committee must make these norms clear in their written evaluation. For example, available funding for theorists is generally less than that for experimentalists. This includes the departmental norms for teaching and service.
        ii. If there are weaknesses (or perceived weaknesses) in a candidate's record, these must be met head on and explained.

iii. If a candidate is going up before the mandatory date, the sub-committee must make the case that they have clearly met the department's criteria for promotion and tenure.
iv. Outside reviewers: What is the relationship with candidate, if any (e.g. advisor, collaborator)? How was reviewer chosen (by candidate or committee)? What are the qualifications of the reviewer? What supporting materials were sent along with the solicitation letter? These all help the readers make sense of what they read.
v. The narrative needs to have consecutive page numbers (even though the subcommittee's evaluation interleaves with the candidate's description). This is easier if you have a plan upfront (e.g. if you have the candidate's statement in electronic form that you can paginate).

b. Give the candidate feedback on their statement (for example, you may need to ask for clarification or more details). Document these requests and include this document in your part of the package.
c. Make sure that the Appendix is readable and that items are easy to find.
    i. Insert title pages as necessary in Appendix ("sample letter", "student letters, alphabetical order")
    ii. It is very helpful to be sure that within a section, items are gathered with paper clips or binder clips. It is very hard to find your way around numerous pages of teaching evaluations unless all evaluations from one course are clipped together.

3. In preparation for the departmental meetings (there are two meetings: the first to give an overview and get feedback from the P&T committee; the second is to vote and approve the departmental summary).
    a. Two weeks before the first meeting most of the Appendix and good drafts of the narrative must be in place for the rest of the faculty to read.
    b. Prepare an overview (10-15 min) for meeting to remind faculty of the key points of the case
    c. During the discussion, one member of the sub-committee take notes of the discussion
    d. After the meeting, use notes to write a draft summary and share with P&T committee via email for comment.
    e. Create a signature page with a table containing each P&T committee members' name and a place for their signature and date. If any members are non-voting (e.g. on sabbatical) that should be noted.
    f. At the second meeting, wrap up any discussion, take a vote, sign the signature page.

4. Finalizing the package
    a. Once all of the narrative is final, make the page numbers consecutive. This is easiest if you have the candidates statements in electronic form.

b. Do a final check of the appendix. Consult with Committee Chair. Once you agree that it is final, ask the staff to make the second and third copies.

7. Instructions for the Physics Staff

1. The summer before or early fall:
    a. Purchasing Binders and Plastic Sleeves:
        i. There are two pieces to each case: Narrative and Appendix.
        ii. There are three copies of each case. Two go in binders and are sent to the Dean's office. One copy stays in the department file drawers and doesn't need a binder.
        iii. Initially, only one copy will be made. Only once that is complete (sometime in December) will the other two copies be made.
        iv. Each binder must have a clear plastic sleeve on the front and side so the case can be clearly labeled. The original should be clearly labeled as such.
        v. The Narrative binder should be 1/2 inch thick; the appendix binder should be 2-2.5 inches thick (thicker for those who have taught large 400 level courses!)
        vi. Plastic sleeves are good to have for the original letters and the copies of papers.
    b. Making Tabs: the tab labels are given several pages back
2. During the school year
    a. The committee may need your help gathering e-mails for the students. They will give you rosters and you can use Blackboard to look students up.
    b. Making copies of teaching evaluations. The candidate will give you a list of course taught and year. For each course, make copies of the summary sheet and the front and back of evaluations with comments (evaluations without comments need not be copied). Be sure that the copies are dark enough to read, since they are in pencil. Paper or binder clip together each set from one course and order the evaluations by course number; this will make it easy to find evaluations later.
    c. Numbering the Appendix: The pages in the appendix must be numbered. This means that the numbering must be done at the last minute, after all items are received and the faculty have checked that the Appendix is complete. These can be typed on labels, and the labels can be affixed at the last moment, however in the past these labels sometimes come off in the copier. We currently have a stamp that automatically advances the number as it is used. The page numbers start at A-1 and increase from there without regard to which section the pages are in. We will not number the publications or any of the pages in the annual report section, as these already have page numbers.

d. Copying: Once the sub-committee and P&T committee chairs have ensured that the package is in proper order, make the second and third copies.

8. Instructions for the Committee Chair

1. Summer before
    a. Nominate sub-committee members and chose the chair of the sub-committee; someone close to candidate's research field should be on the committee.
    b. Review CV's of all faculty who are not yet full. Determine, in consultation with others, if anyone is up for promotion and/or tenure.
2. During the school year
    a. Set up department meetings in the period between Thanksgiving and the end of classes. It is best if there is one meeting to discuss, one week to think, write a draft and comment, and another meeting to wrap up discussion and vote.
    b. As soon as the Narrative and Appendix are in good shape, read them carefully. Look for omissions, and lack of clarity or data.
    c. Give the candidate feedback on their statement (for example, you may need to ask for clarification or more details) Document these requests and include this documentation in your recommendation.
    d. Write your recommendation
    e. Get the package to the Dean's office on time.
    f. If there are questions from other recommenders, you initiate the response with help from others.