

MEMORANDUM

DATE: 07 May 2015

TO: Faculty Applying for Promotion and/or Tenure in 2015-16

FROM: Herbert A. Medina, Professor of Mathematics, Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure
Jennifer Pate, Associate Professor of Economics, President of the Faculty Senate

RE: Some suggestions to faculty applying for promotion and/or tenure in 2015-16

Introductory remarks

Section IV. A. 4. 9 of the *Loyola Marymount Faculty Handbook & Handbook Addenda*, commonly referred to (including in this memo) as the Rank and Tenure Resource Manual (RTRM), states that on a yearly basis, after its review and deliberations are done for the academic year, the Committee on Rank and Tenure (CRT) should write a memo to the Faculty Senate President and Provost “detailing overarching issues encountered during its review of materials and deliberation.”

As is customary, this year’s CRT memo had a section (included verbatim from the memo below) containing suggestions to applicants for assembling a promotion/tenure application; we felt it important to share it with candidates applying for promotion and tenure in the coming year.

Suggestions to Applicants in Assembling a Promotion/Tenure Application

1. It would be useful for candidates to refer to the 22 May 2014 memo posted on the Provost website from the Faculty Senate President and the Chair of the CRT as it contains suggestions for applicants assembling a promotion/tenure application from the 2014 version of this current memo. (See <http://academics.lmu.edu/ranktenure/candidateresources/>)
2. The RTRM encourages the submission of an “electronic dossier of read only files.” The CRT strongly seconds this encouragement and urges applicants to submit electronic files whenever possible. Large-scale items such as books are of course welcome in their original form. Electronic submission makes the organization of electronic files containing application materials of paramount importance. The candidate should aim to organize these files so that they are easy to navigate for everyone (departmental colleagues, chair, dean, et al.) who will be reading them; careful naming of the files is also particularly helpful. ***The Provost’s website provides a .zip file with an electronic folder structure that mirrors the dossier structure suggested in the RTRM and includes a file naming scheme; the CRT recommends that candidates use this .zip file and follow the instructions for organization and naming contained therein to assemble their electronic dossier.***
3. Candidates are required to provide two *identical* copies of their application dossier. For electronic dossiers, this means that two physical flash drives or electronic media, one for each dossier, must be provided, and the candidate must ensure that these contain exactly the same files.
4. Even if the applicant chooses to provide hard copies of primary application materials (e.g., narrative, CV, publications, etc.), it would be useful for these documents to also be included electronically where feasible, e.g., on a flash drive ideally as PDF files. These ought to be separate, properly-named PDF files rather than the scanned file of an entire application dossier. Again, the organizational structure provided in the .zip file is recommended. But we emphasize that if a file in the dossier is provided in electronic format, there is no need to provide a paper duplicate. If the candidate chooses to provide a paper duplicate, then s/he should ensure that the paper duplicate and electronic file have *exactly* the same content.

5. Applicants should take note that the RTRM states that “Statistical Summary Reports for *all courses* taught are required. In addition, candidates are strongly encouraged to provide *all available* written Student Course Evaluations for all courses. Student Course Evaluations may be submitted on CD” [emphasis added]. The CRT strongly encourages all applicants to a.) keep all CDs from each academic semester and summer, and b.) copy statistical summaries and the actual course evaluations from the CDs provided by the university each semester into the correct folder of the electronic dossier. In rare cases where student course evaluations are not available, their unavailability should be explained and accounted for in detail in the dossier. The applicant should also list the text of questions 9 and 10 where s/he wrote in her/his own assessment questions.
6. In the case that peer-reviewed work is published or presented in non-traditional venues, or if there is any reason that the peer-review process was other than a standard process, the candidate should provide verifiable evidence of the peer review and a description of the level of peer review (e.g., blind, double-blind) that the work underwent.
7. Candidates should remember to include a copy of the provost’s letter in which their eligibility to apply for promotion and/or tenure is specified. Also, any “non-traditional” faculty appointments (e.g., administrative/leadership positions, reduced teaching loads, etc.) that have relevance to the rank and tenure process should be specified and documented by the candidate in the dossier.