

De-mystifying the ISR Reappointments and Promotion Process

February 2009, revised November 2016

The quality and reputation of ISR arises from the quality and reputation of our faculty. Accordingly, reappointment and promotion (R&P) decisions are the most important decisions that the ISR faculty makes, with the longest-term consequences. These notes are intended to clarify the R&P activities, schedules, and responsibilities of all participants. They do not modify CMU and SCS policies.

Policies

1. *Governing policies.* We are governed by the CMU and SCS policies, which can be found at <http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~scsdean/FacultyPage/R&PGrid.html> (3/16: The CMU appointment and tenure has migrated to <http://www.cmu.edu/policies/faculty/appointment-and-tenure-policy.html> but this is not yet reflected in the SCS R&P grid, whose links now reach the generic University policy page). Templates for each type of case can be found at this location as well. Note especially the criteria for promotion and the “clock”, or the schedule of required promotion decisions, for appointments in the tenure and research tracks. Every tenure- and research-track faculty member should have a letter on file documenting the mutual understanding between the faculty member and ISR/SCS about the timing of the clock; see <http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~scsdean/FacultyPage/TenureDecision.html>.

2. *Voting.* This table shows which faculty ranks are entitled to participate in discussion and voting on each type of decision. For example an untenured Associate Professor does not discuss or vote on a tenure case, and both Tenured Professors and Research Professors vote on all cases. Both teaching and systems track faculty of appropriate rank in track vote on appointments in both teaching and systems tracks. Note that departmental voting policies are not uniform across departments in SCS.

Who participates?

	<i>Tenure and Research Track Decisions</i>				<i>Teaching and Systems Track Decisions</i>			
	Reapt as Asst (Resch) Prof	Prom to Assoc (Resch) Prof unten	Reappt as Assoc (Resch) with (p-) tenure	Prom to (Resch) Prof	Reappt as Asst Teach Prof / Sys Sci	Prom to Assoc Teach Prof / Sr Sys Sci	Reappt Assoc Teach Prof / Sr Sys Sci	Pro/Reapt to Teach Prof / Princ Sys Sci
V V V V votes on >>>>								
Univ Prof / Prof / Resch Prof	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Assoc Prof (ten) / Assoc Resch Prof (p-ten)	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no
Assoc Prof (unten) / Assoc Resch Prof (un-p-ten)	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no	no
Asst Prof / Asst Resch Prof	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
Teach Prof / Princ Sys Sci	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Assoc Teach Prof (reapp) / Sr Sys Sci (reappointed)	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no
Assoc Teach Prof (not reapp) / Sr Sys Sci (not reappointed)	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	no
Asst Teach Prof / Sys Sci	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no

3. *Participation.* The most significant obligation in the R&P process of every voting ISR faculty member is to attend, **in person**, the fall ISR R&P meeting and participate in the discussion and vote of the cases he or she is entitled to vote on. The discussion at the fall ISR R&P meeting is essential to informed decisions, so proxy votes are not normally accepted.

4. *Reasonable person principle.* In accordance with the reasonable person principle, the quality of the decisions has higher priority than universal exact adherence to all process details.

The Annual Calendar

For decisions that will take effect in July of year N+1, these are the events and deadlines of year N. The calendar associates responsibilities with four important roles. The *candidate* is the faculty member being reappointed or promoted. The *shepherd* is a member of the faculty who is familiar with the candidate's work, who is eligible to participate in the case, and who accepts responsibility for helping the candidate prepare the case dossier and for presenting it to the ISR faculty. The *reading committee* is chaired by the shepherd and also includes a few other faculty who are eligible to participate in the case; if appropriate, it may also include faculty who are not eligible to vote (most commonly, faculty in other departments), but in most cases these additional committee members will not attend the ISR R&P meeting. If the shepherd is not a member of the senior faculty, a member of the senior faculty will be identified as liaison to the senior faculty. The *R&P Coordinator* is a member of the administrative support staff who is responsible for assembling the cases, obtaining letters, distributing materials, and keeping the process on track. Currently the R&P Coordinator is Victoria Poprocky <poprocky@cs.cmu.edu>

Event	Activity	Time frame	Deadline	Who's involved
Faculty reports	Annual report	January, February	March 1	Every faculty member
Preview meeting		March		Full prof / resch prof
	Organize cases	April to June	June 1 (names of references, letters, materials to include with ref request)	Shepherds, candidates
	Request letters	1 st half June	June 15	R&P Coord, shepherds
	Prepare dossiers for cases	July, August	Mid August	Reading committees, candidate, R&P Coord
Reading committee meeting		Late August to 1 st week of class	>1 week before ISR R&P meeting	Reading committees
ISR R&P meeting		Mid- to late September	>2 weeks before SCS R&P meeting (date to be set early June)	All ISR faculty eligible to vote should attend
SCS R&P meeting		Mid October	Set by SCS	SCS Review Committee
Univ R&P meeting			Set by University	
Trustees meeting	Finalize decisions		Set by University	

Faculty reports: Following the practice of all SCS units, ISR requests each faculty member to submit a short annual report. The department sends a reminder with format instructions in January or February. All faculty who may be considered at the preview meeting should be certain to submit their departmental annual reports in timely fashion; it would be helpful to include a draft of their career goals.

Preview meeting: Full professors and full research professors meet to identify the cases to be considered in the fall. This meeting also selects shepherds and reading committees (and senior faculty liaisons if appropriate), and it seeks to identify special considerations about cases that should be addressed during preparation of the cases. SCS guidance on the responsibility of the shepherds and reading committees is at <http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~scsdean/FacultyPage/READING%20COMMITTEES%20FOR%20PROMOTION%20CASES.htm> Some decisions in the tenure and research tracks are forced by the “clock” (university policies on timing of decisions), and other cases are forced by terms of appointment; one function of the preview meeting is to identify cases that are not automatically considered by these timing requirements. Faculty who wish to be considered for a promotion that is not forced by the “clock” should discuss this *before March 1* with the department head or someone else who will attend the preview meeting.

Organize cases: Shepherds, in consultation with the reading committee and the candidate, start preparing the case. The candidate, usually with advice from the shepherd, prepares a CV and career statement (teaching philosophy and self-evaluation for teaching faculty) and, if appropriate, a list of candidate letter-writers. The shepherd reviews the material to ensure that it is consistent with SCS standards and that it contains no “padding” or other inappropriate content. The committee independently nominates other

letter-writers, and the shepherd selects the final list (the candidate does not know who is on this list) and customizes the standard request template to fit the case, especially any potential issues identified at the preview meeting. The R&P Coordinator selects students at random from the candidate's recent courses. It is not appropriate to ask potential letter writers what they would say; we want independent observation. It is also not appropriate for the candidate to contact potential letter writers directly.

The candidate statement, a selection of 2-3 research papers or other materials to enclose with letters, contact information for the letter-writers, and the individually-tailored request letters are due to the R&P coordinator by June 1. In the list of letter-writers the shepherd must indicate which names were offered by the candidate, which by the committee, and which by both; the list must include for each person the name, title and organization, and it should also include a short phrase about why this person was chosen.

Request letters: The R&P Coordinator sends out requests for letters during the first two weeks of June. As noted above, the shepherds should tailor the standard letter to elicit information specifically relevant to the case. However, University lawyers are preparing text about the privacy of the letters, and this text must remain intact. The request for letters will be part of the dossier.

Prepare case dossiers: The candidate continues preparing the rest of the case in cooperation with the shepherd and the R&P Coordinator. The reading committee is responsible for understanding the case thoroughly and reviewing it, including re-reviewing the candidate statement and CV. This usually requires reading some papers and perhaps discussions between the shepherd and the candidate (the candidate does know who else is on the reading committee). The case should be sufficiently complete for the committee to meet by mid-August, though in practice some of the letters may not yet be in hand.

Reading committee meeting: The reading committee meets to discuss and evaluate the case. The committee should understand the strengths and weaknesses of the case and summarize the case in the form of the case digest, which is written by the shepherd. The reading committee does not vote on the case. If the outcome is strongly indicated by the case, the digest will indicate that; if the committee has a difference of opinion, the digest should show that rather than voting. The committee may ask the candidate to revise the dossier at this point in order to strengthen the case. The digest may include quotes from external letters, but it may not identify the authors of the quotes (this is a confidentiality issue).

ISR R&P meeting: Each member of the faculty is expected to attend for the discussion of those cases on which he or she is eligible to vote. The departmental decision is based on the academic and scholarly merits of the case; other considerations should be deferred to the SCS meeting. If at all possible, the meeting will begin with cases in which the most people can participate, so that people can leave the meeting as their obligations are fulfilled. Because this mid-September meeting so important, the date and time will be set well in advance.

This means you!!

The discussion at the fall R&P meeting is essential to informed decisions, and your most significant obligation in the R&P process is to prepare for and participate in this meeting. When you are asked about your schedule for the fall R&P meeting, take the request seriously and provide as much flexibility as you can. When the date is set, put it on your calendar with high priority, avoid conflicting obligations, and alert your support staff to do the same. Often there is no date that suits everyone, so the best available date will be chosen; if you have a conflict with this date, try to rearrange your schedule so you can attend.

Seriously, once the R&P meeting is scheduled, treat it as a major conflict with other requests!

Cases will be distributed a reasonable time in advance of the meeting, generally at least one week in advance. Cases are distributed electronically, and the case material is highly confidential. A URL and authentication instructions will be provided to participating faculty members at an appropriate time.

The ISR meeting makes a recommendation to SCS, conveyed in the Department Head's Recommendation section of the case template. The recommendation generally focuses on the academic and scholarly merits of the case, not on strategic or financial questions that might affect the position, though these should be identified if they arise in the discussion.

All discussions at the R&P meeting are strictly confidential.

SCS, University, and Trustees meetings: The SCS R&P meeting reviews the recommendations of the department and makes a recommendation to the University. This recommendation may be based on strategic and financial issues as well as the merits of the case itself. The R&P process then continues at the University level, and decisions are eventually made (or at least ratified) by the Trustees. Decisions become effective July 1 of the following year.

Evaluation of Teaching in Formats other than Lecture Courses

The University is placing increasing emphasis on innovations in education so evaluation criteria should encourage these innovations. However, the criteria for evaluation of teaching in SCS have historically been based on traditional classroom-based lectures. In 2009 the SCS policy was revised with guidance on evaluating teaching in other formats; the new guidelines are at <http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~scsdean/FacultyPage/SCS-TeachingTrackGuidelines.htm> . This policy supplement calls for each nontraditional format to be documented with descriptions of the teaching format and the evaluation criteria appropriate to that format. Each program that does substantial teaching in a non-lecture format (e.g., mentored studios, learning-by-doing) should create appropriate evaluation instruments and document the format-specific evaluation in a supplement to the 2009 policy that has been approved by the college.

The format-specific evaluation criteria and processes must be developed and approved by each affected program. This must be done well in advance of presenting cases to the department so that evaluation results for a suitable period of time are available to prepare the cases. Any required synthesis or summarization should be done by the end of May so that requests for letters may go out in timely fashion.

For all faculty whose teaching activity is largely in one of these non-lecture-based formats, the case dossier should identify the model and apply the appropriate criteria in the teaching evaluation sections. For cases in the teaching track, the evaluation of teaching and the candidate's self-evaluation should respond directly to these evaluation criteria. The use of non-lecture evaluation criteria should be explained in the department head's summary and the case digest, and these should refer to an appendix that includes the format-specific criteria for reference. This supplement for MSE mentors is in the R&P section of <http://isri.cs.cmu.edu/bizoff/forms.html> .

Content of Case

The presentation of the case should explain the research and educational contributions of the candidate and their significance. Here we offer additional advice on various sections of the case, numbered to match the case template. Policies and templates for cases, plus a checklist for non-teaching-track cases, are at <http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~scsdean/FacultyPage/R&PGrid.html> . Advice specifically for the teaching track template is at the end of this section

Special note for Research and Systems track candidates: Some sections in the template may not apply to you – for example, Research and Systems track faculty are welcome to teach but are not generally required to. These sections are optional – fill them in only if you have activity you would like to include.

3. Digest

SCS guidance on the digest is at [http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~scsdean/FacultyPage/READING COMMITTEES FOR PROMOTION CASES.htm](http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~scsdean/FacultyPage/READING_COMMITTEES_FOR_PROMOTION_CASES.htm)

The digest is prepared by the shepherd to summarize the case and the reading committee's interpretation of it; as noted above, the committee does not make an overall recommendation. The digest should explain anything unusual, for example by highlighting contributions that come in nontraditional forms. The digest may include quotes from external letters, but it may not identify the authors of the quotes (this is a confidentiality issue). If quotes are used, they should support the narrative prepared by the shepherd; they should not dominate the narrative and they should be substantive.

The focus should be on the significance of the contributions, not on the number of papers or grants. CMU counts major results with demonstrable impact, not papers; excessive use of bibliometrics is not well received at the school level. This is consistent with the 2015 CRA guidance on valuing quality over quantity http://cra.org/resources/bp-view/best_practices_memo_evaluating_scholarship_in_hiring_tenure_and_promot/#_ftn1 (“Sheer numbers of publications (or derivative bibliometrics) should not be a primary basis for hiring or promotion, because this does not encourage researchers to optimize for quality or impact. Other proxy measures are similarly problematic.”) For further discussion of this, see Parnas' Viewpoint column in the Nov 07 CACM (<http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1297797.1297815>). The Journal Impact Factor is especially problematic; it was designed to help libraries decide which paper journals to purchase. The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment <http://www.ascb.org/dora/> recommends assessing research on its own merits and specifically against the use of journal-based metrics in appointment or promotion discussions.

Section 4. Curriculum Vitae

The CV section should not list papers, grants, etc that appear in other sections. It should list awards and honors as well as jobs. Note that for purposes of this section “CV” means this abbreviated content. However, when you are asked for a CV to send with the request for external letters, please supply your full CV. This confusion of terms is unfortunate, but we seem to be stuck with it.

Section 5: Candidate statement

The candidate statement should focus on the key contributions and coherence of your work and the excitement of where it will go next. It should address both research and education. It is a good idea to have a senior mentor read and comment on this section before you submit it. The CMU and SCS policies give the criteria for evaluation. Find them for your own situation at <http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~scsdean/FacultyPage/R&PGrid.html> . *Please read these!*

The research portion of the statement should explain the significance of the work, not just the results themselves. For the research portion of the statement, the skeleton of the case should be the particular set of driving issues you have taken up. The muscle of the case is the body of scientific results and the cleverness/innovation in achieving them. The skin and clothing of the case is the impact that has been achieved from this and your various outreach and transition activities. CMU highly values the latter, but the case must fundamentally rest on the former. Broadly, we want to pick significant societal problems, render them in the context of particular scientific challenges, come up with worthy technical solutions to those scientific challenges, and then see those solutions applied to achieve a real societal impact. The case should also show influence in the scientific community -- how your work shapes the way problems get framed and solved by others.

One good way to approach the statement is to structure the outline around the scientific questions that drive your work, and, in separate paragraphs, illuminating the extent of impact and recognition the results have received. Remember that framing the question well can be as important as individual results. As faculty rank increases, so do the expectations for the research statement to be organized around an innovative, integrative vision (for example, a theory) that shows how individual results contribute to the vision, how the vision shapes new directions, and the impact of the work.

Similarly, the education part of the statement should show your overall educational vision and how your activities and accomplishments contribute to that vision.

Section 9: Contract and Grant Support (this section does not appear in the teaching faculty template)

The department will provide a preliminary list of contracts and grants, based on funds administered by the department. However, many faculty receive funding from multiple sources, including sources administered by other departments. It is therefore the candidate's responsibility to make sure the list is complete; the business office can help discover details, but it can't find every grant. Include past, current, and pending (proposed but not yet funded) support.

Section 13. Evidence of Teaching Performance (this section does not appear in the teaching faculty template; the evidence is distributed through various sections)

This section typically focuses on evidence of teaching quality in classes. It is supplemented by Section 12 (letters from students). The SCS checklist says it includes "a list of courses taught (show units and class level, number of students taught, and date), results of Faculty Course Evaluations (Overall course and instructor rating)". When the teaching is in a format other than traditional lecture format, the department may have alternative evaluations to the FCE; indeed, if evidence other than FCEs is available, it should be included; see the section, "Evaluation of Teaching in Formats other than Lecture Courses" above for details on evaluating teaching in nontraditional formats. Include supervision of postdoctoral research, graduate research, and independent study projects in section 15.

Section 14. Contributions to education (this section does not appear in the teaching faculty template; the closest thing is section 8, *related non-classroom activities*, and this advice should be considered in preparing that section of teaching track dossiers)

University policy for tenure track faculty identifies two categories of evidence for appointment and tenure decisions, *Teaching and Other Educational Activities* and *Research, Scholarly or Artistic Activities*. Of the former, it says

Teaching, a principal function of the faculty, is direct educational involvement with students inside or outside the classroom, laboratory or studio, and includes such activities as classroom, laboratory or studio instruction, seminars, independent study project supervision and supervision of graduate and postdoctoral research. It also includes the advising of undergraduate and graduate students.

Competence in teaching should be documented by means including colleague evaluations and meaningful student evaluations obtained through surveys and solicited and unsolicited written opinions.

Other educational activities include development of new or reformed courses, curricula, degree programs and training programs; educational publications, textbooks and other instructional materials; and technical and critical popularization.

Use this section to show off all educational contributions beyond the classroom. This may include

- original material for classes, including projects, lecture notes, and teaching materials (or links on to online versions of these,
- new course designs or substantial revisions of existing courses, with description of the innovative elements,
- contributions to designing or helping to start a major, minor, Phd, master's, distance learning, or exec ed program,
- any special work on educational outreach or education of minorities and women,

- dissemination of educational contributions outside the university, including papers, grants, textbooks, outside adoptions of courses,
- external boards and panels on educational matters, such as model curriculum development or boards of visitors
- interpretation of technical material for the general public and for non-research professionals,
- awards and other recognition related to education,
- and any other external evidence of educational contributions.

It is acceptable to repeat material that appears elsewhere. One strategy for drafting this section is to take a copy of your CV, strike out everything not arguably related to education, and make sure everything else shows up in either Section 13 or Section 14.

Additional notes on Teaching Track Cases

The template for teaching track faculty is significantly different from the templates for the other tracks. Three concerns merit special note.

First, the sections on teaching strategy, goals, and self-evaluation are key elements; make them deep and reflective. In particular, the goals for the previous appointment period are in one section and the self-evaluation is in a different section. The self-evaluation should include evaluation of whether those goals were achieved (that is, there should be traceability from the goals to the self-evaluation).

Second, it remains awkward to show research activity in this template, including grants and publications. Do not omit this material. The teaching track template provides guidance about how to include this material in the “Non Classroom Activities” section, new subheadings may be added as appropriate.

Third, teaching track faculty are especially likely to be teaching on non-lecture formats. In these cases, preparation of the dossier should follow guidance in the section on “Evaluation of Teaching in Formats other than Lecture Courses” above.

Shepherd's Handbook

If you are asked to serve as the shepherd for a case, you are being entrusted with the tasks of advising the candidate on preparation of the case and of ensuring that the case presents the candidate's accomplishments as clearly as possible. The departmental R&P Coordinator will help with the administrative details, but you are responsible for the content and overall presentation. Hence you are the liaison between the candidate and the Coordinator. Here is a checklist, drawn from the narrative above, of the shepherd's responsibilities:

Here is the SCS guidance on the reading committee (http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~scsdean/FacultyPage/READING_COMMITTEES_FOR_PROMOTION_CASES.htm) (the "designated chair" is often called the "shepherd") :

- The purpose of the Reading Committee is to have a small group of faculty (2-3) from different areas carefully read, digest and discuss the merits of each candidate's case. In addition to considering the details of the case as it stands alone, the committee should take the opportunity to discuss how the promotion fits with the whole of SCS.
- One member of each committee will be a designated chair, and will be responsible for arranging the committee meetings. The meetings should be forums for gaining fairly thorough, real understandings of each candidate's specific contributions and position in the field and in the school.
- The reading groups are not meant to inhibit faculty from looking at all the materials of all the other cases. Rather, by setting up these groups we ensure that in-depth, informed discussion goes on before the larger official meetings and votes take place.

The reading committee does not vote or make a recommendation. It does not need to reach consensus; it is acceptable to present more than one view at the R&P meeting.

Here is a chronological description of the Shepherd's tasks:

[[March]] Confirm reading committee members with R&P Coordinator. You should have received a cc of a message from Mary to the candidate saying that the case is under consideration and you are the coordinator.

[[May]] Work with the candidate on the statement of goals and selection of papers to send out for review.

[[May]] Consult the table below to see how many internal, external, and student letters to request. Get lists of potential internal, external, and student letter writers (as appropriate) from the candidate. Also get a list of past/current advisees. Independently, get list of potential internal and external letter writers from the committee. Select an appropriate number (see table below) of names from the combined lists. Give the final lists to the R&P Coordinator, who will send out requests for letters. For each name, your list should include name, position, institution, short reason for selection, and which of the candidate/committee lists the name came from; if you also have full contact information, please include it (if not, the R&P Coordinator will help track it down). In addition, review the standard templates for requests for letters and modify them as necessary to cover any special aspects of the cases.

[[June]] Help the candidate develop the non-confidential portions of the case.

[[July]] Help the R&P Coordinator assemble the full case; schedule reading committee meeting for late August.

[[mid-August]] When the R&P Coordinator has full cases ready to distribute, remind committee members to read them carefully, because the committee does the in-depth analysis and interpretation of the case.

[[late August]] Hold Reading Committee meeting (this might slip to early September, but it must take place in time for revised documents to be distributed a week before the departmental R&P meeting). This meeting discusses and analyzes the case. It does not vote or make a formal recommendation. Occasionally the committee does not reach consensus; this is ok; be prepared to explain the difference of opinion/interpretation at the departmental R&P meeting. Immediately afterward, write Digest. See above (item 3 under Content) for guidance on the content of the digest.

[[September]] Present the case at the departmental R&P meeting (remind the reading committee members that they should also attend to help interpret the case).

Evaluation letters: This table below indicates which types of cases require letters. The number of letters indicated is typical; if particular circumstances indicate a need for a few more that's ok. Consult with the ISR Director before requesting fewer letters. In particular cases, it may be appropriate (and is therefore permitted) to request letters even when not required here. For example, it may be appropriate to ask for external letters for a Senior Systems Scientist who has published independently or collaborated with industrial partners.

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Internal letters</i>	<i>External letters</i>	<i>Student letters</i>
Promotion to Professor	4 required	8-12 required	required
Reappointment as Associate Prof with tenure	4 required	8-12 required	required
Promotion to Associate Prof	2-4 required	6-8 required	required
Reappointment as Assistant Prof	2-4 required	Not required	required
Promotion to Research Prof	4 required	8-12 required	Yes, if teaching
Reappointment as Associate Research Prof with pseudo-tenure	4 required	8-12 required	Yes, if teaching
Promotion to Associate Research Prof	2-4 required	6-8 required	Yes, if teaching
Reappointment as Research Scientist	2-4 required	Not required	Yes, if teaching
Promotion to Teaching Prof	6 or more required	6-8 required	required
Reappointment as Associate Teaching Prof	4-6 required	Not required	required
Promotion to Associate Teaching Prof	4-6 required	Not required	required
Reappointment as Lecturer	4-6 required	Not required	required
Promotion to Principal System Scientist	4-6 required	6-8 required	Not required
Reappointment as Senior System Scientist	4-6 required	Not required	Not required
Promotion to Senior System Scientist	4-6 required	Not required	Not required
Reappointment as System Scientist	4-6 required	Not required	Not required

For student letters, the candidate provides about six student names, including both graduate and undergraduate students if the candidate has worked with both. The shepherd may also add student names. The department adds all current advisees and as many former advisees as possible, plus names selected at random from courses taught in the past two years, usually 1-3 students from each course, depending on course size. Letters are requested from this set of students plus all current/former advisees (graduate advisees or undergraduate thesis students).

Coordinator's Schedule

The Coordinator is responsible for ensuring that everything happens – and that it happens on time. This timetable identifies the Coordinator's major tasks. In particular, the Shepherd for each case should be coordinating with this schedule.

Approx dates	Events, deadlines	Activities	Letters	Dossiers
Feb 1-15		Be sure Mary or Bill checks with CMU-Q on cases involving their faculty		
Feb 1-15		Schedule preview meeting		
March 1-15	Preview meeting			
March 16-31		Be sure Mary sends summary of preview to faculty and notes to each candidate		
April 1-15		Provide shepherds with templates, schedule		
April 16-30				
May 1-15			Set up secure server to receive letters	Set up dossiers on secure server
May 16-31		Get materials for letters from shepherds	Get text of letters from shepherd; get department head to approve text	
June 1-15	6/1 Names & materials for letters due	Schedule ISR review meeting for late Sep	Send out letter requests	Add CV and statement to dossiers
June 16-30			Log letters as they arrive; put PDFs of replies on secure server	Get FCE & grant info from university, put in dossiers
July 1-15		Schedule reading committee meetings		Help shepherds format dossiers
July 16-31			Set up letters sections of dossiers	
Aug 1-15	8/15 Letters due	If ISR review meeting not scheduled yet, make that a priority	Get dept head to remind people who have not replied. Combine letters to include in dossier	Finish dossiers, set up to distribute for reading committee meetings
Aug 16-31	Reading committee meetings			
Sep 1-15				Revise dossiers per reading committee, set up to distribute for ISR R&P meeting
Sep 16-30	ISR R&P meeting			
Oct 1-15				Revise dossiers per ISR meeting, set up to distribute for SCS R&P meeting

Detailed descriptions of the tasks are in a procedure description maintained by the R&P Coordinator.

Change History

5/8/08	M Shaw	Beta version released to ISR faculty
9/4/08	M Shaw	Added advice on grant support and number of letters, other minor changes
4/11/09	M Shaw	Added emphasis on committee reviewing CV/statement critically, clarified distinction between merits of case and strategic issues, advanced spring dates, other minor changes
4/12/11	M Shaw	Added senior faculty liaison, added exhortation about annual report, added notes in content section, changed Kari Samuels to Keri Burd, added note on non-classroom-style teaching
8/8/11	M Shaw	In annual calendar, moved dates earlier June 15>>June 1, June 30>>June 15, added mandate to set fall meeting date in early June, reading comm by 1 st week of classes, R&P meeting mid- to late Sep
8/19/11	M Shaw	Added SCS guidance on reading committees
8/21/11	M Shaw	Clarified shepherds' responsibilities; added Shepherds Handbook section
8/23/11	M Shaw	Added section with schedule of R&P Coordinator's major tasks
9/16/11	M Shaw	Repeated in Shepherds Handbook guidance on content of digest; added emphasis of the obvious, that for teaching cases in nontraditional format the digest and self-evaluation should respond directly to the format-specific evaluation criteria; declared that this meeting is more important than travel
9/23/11	M Shaw	General tidying-up. Traceability of goals to self evaluation for teaching track. moved some material around; changed CD distribution to electronic.
10/24/11	M Shaw	General cleanup, added schedule for R&P Coordinator
2/29/12	M Shaw	Added Victoria Poprocky as R&P coordinator
3/24/15	M Shaw	Added CRA R&P guidance, clarified CV, strengthened educational accomplishment advice (added sec 13, beefed up sec 14)
4/20/15	M Shaw	Clarified in 1 st para that clock only applies to tenure and research tracks; document need to send notes to shepherds and candidates; incorporate Victoria's changes to timeline
5/1/15	M Shaw	Made annual report explicit (it's input to preview mtg); clarified clock in preview meeting narrative; added CMU-Q reminder for Feb; emphasized question framing and integrative vision in research statement
5/12/15	M Shaw	added DORA on journal impact factors, pointed out that sections that don't apply to research/systems track are optional
11/14/15	M Shaw	added note about broken link on SCS R&P grid
2/17/16	AK. Dey	Cloned a version of this document and tailored it for HCII
3/7/16	M Shaw	Picked up improvements from HCII version, updated links
9/22/16	M Shaw	Clarified that all Full Teaching Profs and Principal System Scientists may vote on reappointments in that rank
9/26/16	M Shaw	Strengthened guidance on teaching evaluation in nontraditional formats, both for teaching and non-teaching-track cases
10/3/16	M Shaw	Refactored discussion of teaching evaluation in non-lecture formats to make it more obvious that applies to everyone
11/26/16	M Shaw	Added link to MSE mentor evaluation, clarified that departmental decision is based on academic and scholarly merits of case; added reminder at top of Shepherd's handbook that reading committee does not vote or recommend