

College of Science Promotion and Tenure Manual 10 December 2000

Contents:

1. Introduction and general considerations
2. Responsibilities of the candidate
 - External letters of evaluation
 - The promotion/tenure file
3. Responsibilities of the department chair
 - Notification of mandatory tenure candidates
 - External letters of evaluation
 - Review of materials in promotion/tenure file
 - Recommendation of the chair
 - Managing the departmental review process
4. Responsibilities of the departmental committee
5. Responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee
6. Responsibilities of the dean

1. Introduction and general considerations

The procedures and policies described in this manual are intended to be completely compatible with University policy as outlined in Chapter 7 of the Faculty Handbook. Generally, the material in this manual will not repeat material in the Faculty Handbook and will, instead, describe procedures not covered by the Faculty Handbook.

Candidates and other faculty members involved in the promotion and tenure process, particularly department chairs, should be familiar with procedures stated in the Faculty Handbook.

2. Responsibilities of the candidate

The two primary responsibilities of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure are to provide the department chair with a list of possible external evaluators of the candidate and to prepare the promotion/tenure file for review.

External evaluators. Although the UAH procedures require letters from peer evaluators outside the university only for candidates for promotion to professor, the College of Science requires external evaluations for promotion to associate professor and for tenure as well. The candidate will provide the department chair with a list of four persons who the candidate believes is able to evaluate the candidate's record. This should occur by early summer at latest. None of the four persons may be UAH faculty or staff members.

The department chair will consider the evaluators proposed by the candidate along with others proposed by the chair and members of the promotion/tenure committee and will select at least four evaluators. The candidate will be informed of the chair's selections and will be given the opportunity to register any objections, in writing, to the chair. The chair may amend the list in view of the candidate's objections, but the final decision on evaluators rests with the chair. The chair will receive from the candidate packets of information to send to outside evaluators. Each packet will contain:

- The candidate's CV
- No more than five representative research publications of the candidate
- A signed form indicating whether the evaluative letters may be kept confidential.

The promotion/tenure file. The candidate, with the assistance and guidance of the chair, is responsible for preparing the candidate's promotion/tenure file by October 1. The file should be limited to two three ring binders each with a spine no thicker than two inches. One binder should contain the primary materials and the other supporting documents. Plastic covers are not to be used to cover pages in the curriculum vitae, although plastic covers may be used to hold off-prints and other multi-page documents. As much material as possible should be double-sided.

The candidate should submit a promotion/tenure file consisting of the following materials, in the order given below.

Primary materials

1. Title Page
2. Table of Contents
3. Candidate's Statement
4. Summary of Professional Career
 - a. Curriculum Vitae
 - b. Primary teaching materials
 - c. Primary research materials
 - d. Primary service materials

Supporting Materials

5. Annual activity reports and performance evaluations
6. Supporting teaching materials
7. Supporting research materials
8. Supporting service materials.

Additional information on some sections of the promotion/tenure file is given below.

The Candidate's Statement should be an argument summarizing the candidate's reasons why the proposed action (promotion and/or tenure) is justified. The Statement should be no longer than three pages.

The Curriculum Vitae should contain information about the candidate in the following order:

- Name.

- Home address.
- Work address.
- Date and place of birth.
- Citizenship.
- All academic degrees, in chronological order, including dates, majors and minors, granting institutions, honors, titles of thesis and dissertation, and other pertinent material.
- Professional employment history, in chronological order.
- Professional memberships, including titles and dates of offices held
- Awards and honors.

Primary teaching materials should be presented in the following order:

- One page executive summary of teaching accomplishments and highlights.
- Statement of teaching philosophy.
- Special awards and honors related to teaching.
- Courses taught, in chronological order, including numbers of students and SIE scores. If student comments are included, all comments must be presented.
- Graduate students supervised, in chronological order, including degrees, theses, and dissertations.
- Graduate student committees, in chronological order, including degrees, theses, and dissertations. Students supervised by the candidate should not be included here.
- Advising activities, including a brief description of the student advising work, especially non-standard work such as advisement of student organizations.
- Curriculum and program development. This should include brief descriptions of courses developed or significantly modified by the candidate.
- Textbooks and other instructional publications. This list should include all non-research publications.
- Peer reviews of teaching. If peer review is carried out in the candidate's department, the review reports should be included here.
- Unsolicited testimonials and reviews. The candidate should provide copies of letters, reviews, etc. that testify to the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching.

Primary research materials should be presented in the following order:

- One page executive summary of research accomplishments and highlights.
- Brief statement of areas of research interest and expertise.
- Concise overview of research activity. This should contain brief descriptions of major research projects.
- Special awards and honors for research.
- Publications in chronological order. This should consist of a numbered list of all research publications, grouped as indicated below. Each entry should give the full title of the paper, the full list of authors as it appeared in print, the journal name, volume number, beginning and ending page numbers, and date. Publications should be grouped as follows:
 - a. Refereed research publications. Include only publications that have already appeared in print.
 - b. Refereed research manuscripts accepted for publication. The term "accepted" means that an editor has written to the authors that the manuscript is accepted in its final form.

- c. Research papers submitted for publication. A paper is considered “submitted” until it is accepted in final form.
- d. Refereed research conference publications.
- e. Non-refereed research publications. List material that has appeared in print, including papers presented at conferences and published as transactions, abstracts, and proceedings.
- f. Technical reports and final reports on grants and contracts.
- g. Other research publications.
- Patents and copyrights
- Significant processes, devices and software developed.
- Funding history. This should be a chronological list of research funding including grants, contracts, and other sources of research funds. Each entry should contain the full title of the award, the full list of authors as it appeared on the proposal, the status of the candidate (Principal Investigator, Co-Investigator, etc.), the funding agency or entity, amount of award, award period. A candidate should be very clear about his or her role in the project and the funding level of multi-year awards.
- Research proposals submitted but not awarded. This should be a chronological list of proposals. Each entry should contain the full title of the proposal, the full list of authors as it appeared on the proposal, the status of the candidate, the funding agency or entity, the proposed amount, and the proposed award period. The status of each proposal (declined, submitted, etc.) should be clearly stated.
- Unsolicited testimonials and reviews.

Primary service materials should not duplicate material presented as teaching and research materials and should be presented in the following order:

- One page executive summary of service accomplishments and highlights.
- Service to the department in chronological order, including committees (indicating committees chaired) and other noteworthy contributions.
- Service to the College of Science in chronological order, including committees (indicating committees chaired) and other noteworthy contributions.
- Service to UAH in chronological order, including committees (indicating committees chaired) and other noteworthy contributions.
- Service to the professional community in chronological order, including committees (indicating committees chaired) and other noteworthy contributions.
- Unsolicited testimonials and reviews.

The annual activity reports section should include, in chronological order, all annual activity reports submitted by the candidate and the evaluations by the department chair during her or his appointment at UAH.

Supporting teaching materials should include in chronological order

- Title pages and acknowledgments from dissertations and theses supervised.
- Copies of no more than ten peer reviewed professional papers on teaching and related matters.
- Other relevant material.

Supporting research materials should include in chronological order

- Copies of the five most recent and no more than ten other key research publications in chronological order. If room permits, copies of the entire publication as it appeared in print should be used. Otherwise, the candidate should decide which

papers she or he wishes to include in entirety and include only the first page of others. For those papers that are not yet in print, a copy of the editor's letter of acceptance should precede the unpublished manuscript or first page. Noteworthy citations of a particular publication may also be included in this section.

- Copies of the summary and budget summary pages of all proposals that the candidate submitted as PI or co-PI since the candidate's last promotion and that resulted in the award of a grant or contract. If the grant or contract has been completed, a copy of the final report and indication of resulting publications or citations may be included here.
- Full copies of all proposals currently pending, if space permits.
- Copies of the summary and budget summary pages of all proposals that the candidate submitted as PI or co-PI since the candidate's last promotion that were declined by the funding entity
- Sources and nature of other research support for the candidate since the candidate's last promotion. This can include grants and contracts for which the candidate was neither PI nor Co-PI.
- Chronological list of all students, identified as graduate or undergraduate, who have been supported on grants for which the candidate was PI or co-PI.
- Summary of Science Citation Index references to the candidate's research papers. This summary is optional.

Supporting service materials should include in chronological order any other service-related material deemed appropriate by the candidate.

3. Responsibilities of the department chair

The department chair is responsible for soliciting and receiving letters of evaluation from external evaluators, for reviewing the promotion/tenure file submitted by the candidate to ensure that it conforms to the format and substance specified in this document, for writing the chair's recommendation, and for ensuring that the departmental review process conforms to UAH and College of Science policies and practices. The chair will also give a copy of the College of Science Promotion and Tenure Manual to the candidate and include a copy of the Manual in the candidate's promotion/tenure file.

Notification of mandatory tenure candidates. By May 15, the department chair will notify those candidates serving in their mandatory year for a decision on the award of tenure that the review process is to begin. The list of mandatory tenure candidates will be transmitted from the dean to the department chair.

External letters of evaluation. The department chair will consider the evaluators proposed by the candidate along with others proposed by the chair and members of the promotion/tenure committee and will select at least four evaluators. The candidate will be informed of the chair's selections and will be given the opportunity to register any objections, in writing, to the chair. The chair may amend the list in view of the candidate's objections, but the final decision on evaluators rests with the chair. The chair will receive from the candidate packets of information to send to outside evaluators. Each packet will contain

- The candidate's CV
- No more than five representative research publications of the candidate
- A signed form indicating whether the evaluative letters may be kept confidential.

The chair is strongly advised to call or e-mail potential evaluators to determine whether they can submit letters in time for them to be fully considered by the department. The chair must solicit enough letters to be confident that at least three of them will actually arrive. The chair will write to each of the external evaluators using a letter modeled on the one included as an appendix to this document. All correspondence between the chair and external evaluators will be added to the promotion/tenure file along with the evaluative letters themselves. In addition, the file should contain a brief statement of the qualifications of each evaluator. This may be in the form of the evaluator's CV, an extract from Who's Who in Science (or equivalent), or a statement written by the chair.

Review of promotion/tenure file. The candidate has primary responsibility for preparing the promotion/tenure file. The department chair, however, will review the file as soon as it is submitted to ensure that it conforms to the format (including order of material) and substance required in the Faculty Handbook and this document. The chair will, as soon as possible after receiving the file, inform the candidate about missing material and significant departures from the expected format of the file. It is then up to the candidate to supply the missing material or replace defective material in time for the completed file to be reviewed thoroughly by the department.

Recommendation of the chair. The chair will submit a recommendation separate from that of the departmental committee. The chair will confirm that the departmental review process conformed to UAH and College of Science policy and that the departmental faculty has exercised the highest professional standards in making its recommendation. If there have been lapses in the review process or in the professional conduct of the faculty, the chair will describe such lapses.

The chair will give her or his own recommendation with full justification. The chair will use all the standards and criteria used by the departmental committee, but will also address the impact of the recommendation on departmental needs and plans. The recommendation of the chair will become part of the promotion/tenure file.

Managing the departmental review process. The chair has responsibility for managing the promotion/tenure review process within the department. The chair is responsible for the integrity of the review process and for ensuring that it conforms to UAH and College of Science policies and practices. Some specific managerial responsibilities of the chair are

- Obtaining evaluative letters (see above).
- Forming the promotion/tenure committee. By October 1, and following consultation with the candidate, the dean, and prospective committee members, the chair appoints the departmental promotion/tenure committee. The Faculty Handbook (7.9.5 and 7.9.6) describes eligibility criteria and composition of the committee.
- Ensuring that the committee report includes a specific recommendation, contains a written rationale, records the committee vote, includes a minority report if the vote was not unanimous, and is signed by all committee members. If the report does not contain all these components, the chair will return it to the committee chair to be completed.
- Ensuring that all review materials including the promotion/tenure file, the evaluative letters (and accompanying information about the evaluators), the committee report, and the chair's recommendation reach the dean by November 1.

4. Responsibilities of the departmental committee

The recommendation of the departmental promotion/tenure committee should address the following issues

- On what basis is the committee able to evaluate the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching? This should not be merely a recitation of SIE scores but should contain specific examples and testimony.
- How does the candidate's teaching expertise fit into the department's long-range plans and needs? This is an issue primarily in tenure decisions.
- How effective is the candidate at supervising graduate students? The candidate may not have been at UAH (or elsewhere) long enough to have supervised many, if any, dissertations. Nonetheless, the candidate's record and potential for producing Ph.D.s should be addressed in the recommendation. The candidate's record of supervision of M.S. students should also be assessed.
- Are the candidate's research papers significant? Here the committee should indicate which are the candidate's most significant research contributions, what part the candidate played in them, and why they are significant. A mere tally of publications is not a satisfactory assessment of the quality of the candidate's research.
- How does the candidate's research fit into the department's long-term plans? Every department should have a strategic plan and the role of the candidate in this plan should be indicated. If there is no written plan, the committee should show how the candidate's research fits into the department's informal plans. This is an issue primarily in tenure decisions.
- How will the candidate continue to develop professionally? The committee should indicate what the department can reasonably expect for future development of the candidate. For promotion to associate professor, the committee should indicate whether the candidate is making progress toward eventual promotion to professor according to the qualifications and standards laid out in the Faculty Handbook.

The committee will prepare a report that includes a specific recommendation, contains a written rationale, records the committee vote, includes a minority report if the vote was not unanimous, and is signed by all committee members. The report is described more fully in the Faculty Handbook (7.9.7). The committee will make the report available to the department chair, who will submit to the dean after ensuring that it is complete. The departmental committee report will become part of the promotion/tenure file.

5. Responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTAC) has two essential responsibilities. The first is to review and evaluate the promotion/tenure file using the same standards and criteria as the departmental committee. The second is to help ensure the integrity of the review process. The PTAC will ensure that the department has adhered to high standards, that the promotion/tenure recommendation has been made solely on the basis of the highest possible professional basis, and that the department has carried out a thorough review. The PTAC should assess the departmental recommendation to see that it has carefully addressed all the components described above. The PTAC will ensure that all candidates have been treated fairly and equally. To do so, the PTAC will ensure that the standards set by any department are consistent with the overall standards of the College of Science.

The review carried out by PTAC is described in the Faculty Handbook (7.9.9). If any item is questioned or if additional information is requested, the chair of the PTAC will make the request or seek clarification through the dean. The report of the PTAC will include a specific

recommendation, contain a written rationale for the recommendation, record the committee vote, include a minority report if the recommendation is not unanimous, and be signed by all members. The PTAC forwards its report to the dean by December 1. The PTAC report will become part of the promotion/tenure file.

6. Responsibilities of the dean

The dean is responsible for managing the review process at the college level. Specific responsibilities of the dean are to

- Ensure that faculty members who are serving in their mandatory year for a tenure decision are informed by their chairs by May 15 that the evaluation process is to begin.
- Discuss with the department chair the makeup of the departmental review committee. This will occur before October 1.
- Supervise the election of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The process for electing the PTAC is described in the Faculty Handbook (7.9.8). The election will take place by October 15.
- Review promotion/tenure files submitted by departments to ensure their completeness. If a file is incomplete, the dean will request missing information from the department chair.
- Hold a preliminary meeting with the PTAC to review their duties and responsibilities, discuss any unusual situations or conditions related to candidates, a review college standards and criteria for promotion and tenure.
- Receive the reports of the PTAC. The dean will ensure that the reports are complete. If a report is incomplete, the dean will return it to the PTAC to be completed.
- Review the material submitted by the candidate, evaluative letters, the recommendation of the departmental review committee, the recommendation of the department chair, and the report of the PTAC. Based this material and her or his own judgment the dean will prepare a recommendation to the Provost. The recommendation will be in writing, and will contain a specific recommendation about promotion and/or tenure and the reasons and rationale for the recommendation. The dean's recommendation will become part of the promotion/tenure file.
- Submit all promotion/tenure materials, including the dean's recommendation, to the Provost by January 15.
- Transmit the recommendations of the PTAC and the dean, without rationales, to the candidate and the department chair by January 15.