The following is a College of Science Promotion Document format that incorporates current University formats. The primary committee, or members of the individual's promotion evaluation committee, is responsible for reviewing and approving these Form 36 supplementary materials. The target length for promotion documents is no more than approximately 40-60 pages. Documents longer than 100 pages will not be allowed.

All pages of the document, including the first page which is the Form 36, should include the footer "LastName, Page 1 of XX" in the lower right corner. In the lower left should be the department name.

Department of Computer Science	Jones, Page 1 of XX

Page 2 should be the Table of Contents. Use the outline format:

    I.
    A.
    1.

I. *Executive Summary*
In one page or less, summarize how this candidate has met the criteria for promotion and tenure (if applicable) at Purdue University, within the College of Science, and the department. This section should be written by the candidate's nominator after the promotion package–including external letters–is complete, but prior to voting by the primary committee. It is meant to be understandable by any faculty member across the wide variety of disciplines at Purdue, and should avoid scientific jargon. It should focus on accomplishments and impact, and may summarize input from letters but should avoid quotations. It is to be treated as a confidential part of the promotion package, not shared with the candidate.

II. *General Information*

    A. Education
    B. Previous academic appointments
    C. Present academic appointment
    D. Awards and Honors
        a. External to Purdue
        b. Internal to Purdue
    E. Memberships in academic, professional, and scholarly societies
    F. Other items unique to the person or Department not included in A-D. Examples: professional licenses or certifications, business or governmental positions

III. *Discovery*

    A. Discussion
       In approximately 2000 words or less describe the most significant research

B. Publications
A list of the top-tier journals (and conferences, if appropriate) in the candidate's field should be at the beginning of this section. The method by which the top-tier ranking was determined should be stated. List publications in conference proceedings separately with an indication of the importance of such publications in the particular field. The primary author(s) should be indicated by an asterisk (*), post docs by "P", graduate students by "G" and undergraduate students by "U". Publications with previous mentors should also be distinguished by "M". **Note**: all publication sections should be listed with the most recent publications first. For Assistant-Associate candidates, please separate out the following sections into pre-Purdue hire and post-Purdue hire. For Associate-Full candidates, please indicate pre-tenure and post-tenure.

1. Refereed
2. In press
3. Submitted (do not include in preparation)
4. Non-refereed books and book chapters, etc.

C. Invited Lectures

D. Other Presented Papers

E. Other Professional Activities

F. Interdisciplinary Activities/Collaborations

G. Patents

H. Funding (be sure to clearly note internal to Purdue vs. external to Purdue awards)

1. Discussion of support (optional)
As necessary to convey information important to the individual's promotion, succinctly describe awards, the candidate's roles and responsibilities, and any other information not provided in section 2, below.

2. Award information

Agenda/Title of Grant: _____
Dates of Funding (beginning to end): _____
Total Amount of Award: _____
Your Role: _____
If Co-PI, for how much of the total funding are you directly responsible: _____

The above is the University required information. May be placed into table format if desired, as long as all elements are included.

I. Evidence of Involvement of Students and Postdoctoral Scholars in Research Programs
1. M.S. and Ph.D. students graduated – for each student, please list name, date graduated and position taken
2. Current graduate students, with start date of research with advisor and expected completion date
3. Current and previous undergraduate students with dates and major. Supervision of undergraduate research should be included here. Numbers or lists of undergraduates doing projects in a lab and a brief overview of the types of projects should be included. You may cite publications, but please do not list them separately if they are already included in section B, above.
4. Current and previous postdoctoral associates
5. Service on MS/Ph.D. committees with dates.

IV. Learning

In approximately 1000 words or less, a statement on the individual's teaching may be included from either the candidate's departmental committee or the individual. The document should contain a clear indication regarding who created the material. The University Promotions Committee Guidelines state that the last 3 years of teaching data should be included, with a maximum of up to 5 years of data where appropriate for cases where promotion is based on teaching. Contributions from beyond the 3 years of data may optionally be included in the narrative if they are considered important for promotion.

A. Teaching Assignments at Purdue
A table format is suggested. Present the most recent 3 years by semester (maximum 5 if needed). **Do not show more than 5 years of information**. Use the narrative to indicate teaching commitment over time. Please list courses with most recent first and clearly indicate any online courses with an *.

Semester & Year	Course Number, Credit Hr. and Type	Title of Course	No. of Students	Student Classification
S 1999	SCI 150, 4 cr, lecture/lab	Principles of Science	408	Fr through Sr
S 1999	SCI 430, 1 cr, seminar	Science Seminar	12	Sr
F 1998	SCI 350, 3 cr, lecture	Science Lectures	45	Jr & Sr

B. Selected Discussion of Courses
Include innovation, significant impact on curriculum, or other evidence of impact on undergraduate education.

C. Course Evaluations

1. Student Evaluation
   For course evaluations **prior to Fall 2021**, please include course evaluation information as outlined below. List two to five of the major questions on the evaluation instrument (e.g., I rate the instructor's teaching as excellent, very good, etc.) and show the results. Give the number of students in each course and the number responding. Include course-specific norms for the past 3 years if this information is available. Do NOT include student comments. Again, indicate online courses with an *.

Semester & Year	Course	Responses/Enrollment	C1 Score (course median)	C2 Score (course median)
S 1999	SCI 150	104/115	4.3 (4.7)	4.5 (4.9)
S 1999	SCI 430	20/21	4.2 (4.5)	4.6 (4.3)
F 1998	SCI 350	46/55	4.6 (4.4)	3.2 (4.5)

Beginning Fall 2021, please provide course evaluation information on the following four questions:
 My instructor seems well-prepared for class.
The instructor is fair and consistent in evaluating my performance in the course.
The instructor created a welcoming and inclusive classroom environment.
The instructor is open to my questions and effectively answers them.

Semester/ Year	Course	Well-Prepared	Fair and Consistent	Welcoming and Inclusive	Open to Questions
S 2022	SCI 100	4.3/5.0	4.0/5.0	4.4/5.0	3.9/5.0
F 2022	SCI 430	4.6/5.0	4.2/5.0	4.3/5.0	4.0/5.0
F 2022	SCI 350	4.4/5.0	4.1/5.0	4.3/5.0	4.0/5.0

2. Peer Evaluation
   The format for peer evaluation is determined by the department policy. The evaluation summary here should be ~500 words or less, and should be from within the last 5 years.

D. Other Contributions to Undergraduate Education
   This may include, for example, counseling, being a faculty fellow, online course creation, leadership of study abroad programs, promoting student success, etc.

V. *Engagement and Service*

A. Discussion of Engagement

In approximately 500 words or less describe how scholarly work is addressing need(s) inside or outside of the academy and serving Purdue's land grant mission. For example, this can be engagement through partnerships with outside entities, or outreach to communities of interest, individuals, or schools through activities or media.

    a. Engagement with Partners - Engaged scholarship may include working with a variety of partners such as governments, schools, non-profit organizations, national academies, professional societies, business, and/or industries.
    b. Individuals Mentored through Engagement Activities – undergrad students, grad students, postdoctoral scientists, community members, etc.
    c. Impact of the Scholarship of Engagement – reciprocal relationships established, high level of disciplinary expertise, innovation, capability for replication or elaboration, professional and/or peer-review, documented results and impact.
    d. Technology Transfer or Commercialization Results of Engagement.
    e. Other Engagement Activities (for example – mention of work in the media, creation of websites to disseminate research results, short courses/workshops, etc.)

B. Discussion of Service

List or succinctly describe contributions through service to the university, professional societies, or other organizations.

    a. Department
    b. College
    c. University
    d. Professional (editorial boards, study sections, panels, consulting, program committees, national academies, societies, etc.)
    e. Consulting Activities (with bearing on promotion candidacy)
    f. Other Service Activities

VI. Mentoring

Effective mentoring is important for the success of students, faculty, and staff, and can take many forms. Criteria for promotion at Purdue include a commitment to active and responsive mentorship, as well as an active role in mentoring, advising, and supporting the academic success of students and postdoctoral scholars. Describe here your mentoring activities and/or philosophy. Do not repeat information provided in section III (Evidence of Involvement of Students and Postdoctoral Scholars in Research Programs).

A. Undergraduate students

B. Graduate students

C. Postdoctoral Scholars

D. Faculty members

VII. External Referees

A. External letters should be collected for all tenure and/or promotion cases. External letters should be sought from peer or aspirational peer universities. Examples of the peer and aspirational peers include members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) and leading international institutions. Letters may also be sought from faculty members at top academic programs from other institutions, and from preeminent experts at other institutions, although justification in the form of expertise credentials is expected in the latter case.

B. A minimum of **8** letters is expected for tenure and/or promotion cases, and documentation should be included stating whether a letter writer was suggested by the candidate or by the department/school (or both). **Additional letters provide the potential for more evidence and hence an even more robust assessment.**

C. It is essential to obtain unbiased external evaluations, so the letters should come from distinguished scholars who are not: the candidate's thesis advisor (M.S. or Ph.D.) or postdoctoral advisor; a business or professional partner; any family relation such as a spouse, sibling, parent, or relative; a collaborator on a substantive project, book, article, paper, or report within the last **24** months. An exception would be a letter from a collaborator, clearly identified, who can help to define and evaluate the candidate's role in major collaborative work, as per section IV.B.6 of the promotion Procedures document.

D. Credentials and, if appropriate, relationship to candidate. Identify which referees were suggested by the candidate and which by the Department. **The number of writers chosen by the primary committee should exceed the number chosen by the candidate.**

E. Include all other correspondence or communications with the referees. Non-written communications should be recorded or summarized in writing.

F. Copy of letter soliciting external comments. (Be sure to include the appropriate University statements on all letters requesting comments from external referees-see below.)

G. Per the Provost's April, 2023 memo - Bearing in mind the goal always of obtaining arms-length objective assessments from demonstrably leading scholars, deans will explicitly review and sign off on all letter-writers in advance of letters being solicited. In the rare cases where any exceptions to the Provost's guidelines may be warranted, heads can petition deans, who will make the Provost's Office aware in advance of any exceptions being granted, along with a detailed justification.

External Referee Letter Requirements:

Letter-writers must be explicitly asked "to comment on the suitability of the candidate for a tenured appointment at the level of [Associate Professor/Professor, as appropriate] at an institution whose goal is to be recognized as a top five U.S. public research university." Additional language that must be used in the instructions to letter-writers is included below and as a reminder, all prospective letter-writers' credentials as leading scholars must be clearly and factually summarized.

Some candidates for promotion and tenure will have received an extension of the tenure clock by virtue of University policy. Under these circumstances, the criteria for promotion and tenure are the same as those expected for a faculty member who has not received a tenure clock extension. The same is true for those being considered earlier than is typical. To ensure that our external referees are aware that we hold all Supersedes Memoranda dated April 22, 2021 West Lafayette Campus Promotion and Tenure Policy Purdue University 3 promotion cases to the same criteria, *the following statement must be included in every request for an external review letter for a candidate for tenure*:

> Please note that length of service in rank by itself is not a factor in promotion and/or tenure decisions at Purdue. Our criteria clearly state: "...issues of timing should not be paramount, and discussions should focus instead on the question of whether the faculty member has provided evidence of a sustainable and impactful record that warrants promotion and/or tenure..." We do not designate any promotion nomination to be "early" (records are ready for promotion or they are not), nor are any extensions of the tenure clock granted to a faculty member to be considered in the decision.

University regulations require that the following paragraph be included in all requests for outside evaluations of present and potential faculty and administrators:

> Candidates may request a summary of all evaluations in their file, however sources remain confidential. We cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or government agency will not require the disclosure of the source of confidential evaluations. Purdue University will endeavor to protect the identity of the authors of letters of evaluations to the fullest extent allowable under law.

If a promotion document includes a Professional COVID-19 Impact Statement, then this language should be included in the letter to the external referees:

> Purdue University acknowledges the differential and negative impacts that the COVID-19 pandemic may have had on faculty career development. In carrying out decisions about promotion and tenure, we will evaluate each candidate's research, teaching, service, and engagement activities within the context of the pandemic. To this end, candidates have had an opportunity to include in their document a Professional COVID-19 Impact Statement, which documents how the pandemic has affected their professional accomplishments in discovery, teaching, and engagement, as well as their service obligations. To assist in your

evaluation, we include this statement in the promotion document with which you have been provided. It presents information about what obstacles were faced by this candidate during the COVID year and how they overcame them, and helps to put their impact during that year into the context of what was possible.

VIII. *Minority Department Letter*

Candidates with more than one departmental appointment should provide a letter from the minority department evaluating the case for promotion. The letter is usually written by the department head in consultation with their department's faculty and/or primary committee.