

**Preparation and Format
of
Tenure and/or Promotion Dossiers**

**January 2015
Office of the Provost**

Changes to 2014 document:

- Minor editorial updates
- Updated reference to *Faculty Handbook* module on review of faculty holding joint appointments

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT

2.0 PROCEDURES PRIOR TO SUBMISSION OF DOSSIER

- 2.1 Promotion Advisement
- 2.2 External Referees
- 2.3 University-wide Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion dossiers
- 2.4 Solicitation Letter
- 2.5 Preparation and Consideration of Dossiers for Tenure on Entry
- 2.6 Preparation and Consideration of Dossiers for Jointly Appointed Candidates
- 2.7 Consideration of Completed Dossiers by the Provost

3.0 ROLE OF CANDIDATE IN DOSSIER PREPARATION

- 3.1 About the Dossier
- 3.2 Dossier Preparation Format and Guidelines
- 3.3 Dossier Organization and Checklist
- 3.4 Dossier Contents
 - Dossier Section D – Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae
 - Dossier Section E – Candidate’s Statements and Supporting Evidence
 - Dossier Section F – Performance Reviews
 - Dossier Section G – Comprehensive List of Contents
- 3.5 Dossier Appendices
 - Appendix A: Teaching: Supporting Documents
 - Appendix B: Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity: Supporting Documents
 - Appendix C: Service: Supporting Documents

4.0 ROLE OF DEPARTMENT/COLLEGE & EVALUATION COMMITTEES IN DOSSIER PREPARATION

- 4.1 Dossier Section A – Faculty Summary Sheet
- 4.2 Dossier Section B – Recommendations
 - Dean’s Recommendation
 - College Advisory Committee
 - Department/School Committee Report
 - Chairperson’s Report
- 4.3 Dossier Section C – External Reviews
 - Cover Memorandum
 - Copy of Solicitation Letter
 - External Reviewer Letters
 - Exclusion of Unsolicited Materials

Model documents to be used for reference in the Dossier preparation

- Model A:** Model Tenure Advisement Letter
- Model B.1:** Model External Referee Request Letter for tenure
- Model B.2:** Model Referee Request Letter for tenure on entry
- Model B.3:** Model Referee Request Letter for promotion to full professor
- Model C.1:** Faculty Summary Sheet: Tenure and Promotion or Tenure Only
- Model C.2:** Faculty Promotion Summary Sheet: Promotion Only
- Model D.1:** TRACE Summary Sheets
- Model E:** Dossier Checklist

1.0 PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT

This document provides guidance for candidates and review committees in the preparation of dossiers for tenure and/or promotion, including promotion to full professor.

This document is organized by the chronological order of specific activities and not by the order of the materials assembled in the final dossier. Its major sections are:

Section 2.0 Procedures Prior to Submission of Dossier

Section 3.0 Role of Candidate in Dossier Preparation

Section 4.0 Role of Department/College & Evaluation Committees in Dossier Preparation

2.0 PROCEDURES PRIOR TO SUBMISSION OF DOSSIER

2.1 Tenure and/or Promotion Advisement – At the beginning of the calendar year preceding tenure consideration, the College dean must notify any appropriate candidates of eligibility for tenure consideration during the next academic year (Model A).

Tenured associate professors may request a review for promotion to full professor in any academic year. Normally, associate professors who maintain excellent momentum following the award of tenure may become ready for promotion consideration in five to seven years. Potential promotion candidates are strongly encouraged to consult regularly with their unit heads and their dean concerning their progress towards promotion. Due dates for requesting promotion consideration and for the submission of promotion dossiers are established by units and colleges as appropriate in order to meet the February 15 deadline for submission of all tenure and/or promotion dossiers to the Office of the Provost.

2.2 External Referees – The process of soliciting external referees begins in the Spring term preceding the submission of the Dossier by the candidate to the Department. The selection of the reviewers and the solicitation letter follows the University-wide guidelines for tenure and/or promotion dossiers (below) issued in 2008.

2.3 University-wide guidelines for the Selection of External Referees

The guidelines below, which represent the position of the academic deans and the Provost's Office on selecting appropriate referees, are an elaboration of the present Faculty Handbook guidelines on tenure and promotion.

- 1) The units will obtain 6-8 external letters of review.
- 2) All letters are to be arm's length in terms of prior involvement with the candidate.
- 3) All external reviewers need to be high quality scholars.
- 4) The tenure and/or promotion committee, with appropriate consultation with the dean, makes the final selection of reviewers. The candidate may submit names for consideration for inclusion on the review list. If both committee and candidate choose a reviewer, it is considered a committee nomination. The candidate may also provide the names of up to three individuals whom the candidate would prefer not to be reviewers along with an explanation for this preference. The candidate should not contact the referees whose names she or he has submitted prior to or during the tenure and/or promotion review process.
- 5) The last question to be asked of external reviewers is "Given your assessment of candidate X, would you recommend this person for tenure and/or promotion at your institution?"

2.4 Solicitation Letter – After the list of external referees has been reviewed by the dean, the Model Recommendation Request Letter (Model B) is to be used to solicit letters from external referees. Reviewers should be supplied with the candidate's complete CV, pertinent *Faculty Handbook* sections, the candidate's statement on his or her research/scholarship/creative activity, and any other appropriate materials. A reviewer asked to comment on a candidate's publications should be supplied with a range of publications. If reviewers are being asked to comment on instruction, they should receive student and peer evaluations and instructional materials.

The solicitation letter should request that the reviewers discuss the quality as well as the quantity of the candidate's contributions to the field. The solicitation letter should be clear and accurate about the tenure status and rank for which the candidate is being evaluated: e.g., tenure and promotion to associate professor, promotion only to full professor. The solicitation letter may not include statements such as "...though this person carries a heavy teaching load, we would

like your opinion on the research record.”

If a candidate is being evaluated after receiving a tenure clock extension, the term of service for which the candidate is being evaluated must be stated in the recommendation request letter. Suggested language is provided in Model B.

All letters solicited and received from approved external referees must be included in the dossier. In addition, all written communications (including emails) from solicited external referees that offer any reflection, positive or negative, on the candidate’s qualifications for tenure and/or promotion must be included in the dossier, whether or not the referee agrees to write a full evaluation. External referees should be informed, when their evaluations are solicited, that all such communications will be included in the candidate’s dossier.

2.5 Preparation and Consideration of Dossiers for Tenure on Entry

When senior faculty members are hired at Northeastern with the expectation of tenure on entry, the fundamental requirements of Northeastern’s tenure review process, including the preparation of a dossier; its review by a faculty tenure committee, the dean, the Provost and the President; and a tenure vote by the Board of Trustees, remain in place. Some elements of the dossier’s documentation and review may be condensed in consideration of the hiring timeline and the differences of procedure and documentation involved in moving from one institution to another. All tenure on entry dossiers, however, must provide sufficient evidence in the three areas of teaching, scholarship and service to support a positive tenure recommendation.

Sufficient evidence includes: the required letters from arms’-length external reviewers (in addition to letters of recommendation from colleagues and collaborators that may be received in the hiring process); the candidate’s complete *curriculum vitae* including information about graduate student supervision, if relevant, and information about institutional and professional service; a sample research publication or similar evidence of scholarly or creative activity; a sample syllabus, a list of courses taught in at least the most recent three years, and a summary of teaching evaluations over the same period in a format as close as reasonably possible to that expected of internal candidates. Statements from the candidate about teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity and service are very helpful and, in many instances, can be derived by the candidate from her or his letter of application for the position at Northeastern.

In addition, the dossier must include (in departmentalized colleges) the department chair’s recommendation, the report of the departmental tenure and promotion committee, and the dean’s recommendation.

Units planning to present newly hired faculty members for tenure on entry should consult with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs as soon as the hire is complete about dossier requirements and submission deadlines, especially for cases intended for Board consideration at the beginning of the academic year.

2.6 Preparation and consideration of tenure and/or promotion dossiers of candidates holding joint appointments

“In assessing the candidate’s achievement and promise of future professional development, it is critical to gather evidence that fully reflects the candidate’s performance relative to each of the tenure criteria” (*Faculty Handbook*, “Tenure,” p. 5). To meet this standard for faculty holding

appointments in more than one academic unit, the review process in the tenure home unit for tenure and/or promotion candidates who hold appointment in more than one unit must incorporate information and perspectives from all the units in which the candidate is appointed.

Procedures for the preparation and review of tenure and/or promotion dossiers of candidates holding joint appointments may be found in the *Faculty Handbook* at

<http://www.northeastern.edu/facultyhandbook/pdfs/tenure-promotion-joint-appointments.pdf> .

2.7 Consideration of completed dossiers by the Provost

The addition of the dean's recommendation (along with any response made by the candidate) completes the tenure and/or promotion dossier. As provided by the Faculty Handbook, the dossier is then forwarded to the Provost, who after reviewing the dossier and in consultation with the President will decide whether to recommend the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. Currently, the Provost also engages an advisory committee to provide additional perspectives in evaluating tenure and/or promotion dossiers. The current membership of the advisory committee includes four senior faculty members in whose selection the Provost seeks the advice of the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee, the academic deans, and the academic vice provosts.

A list of current and former faculty members serving on the Provost's advisory committee may be found at <http://www.northeastern.edu/provost/faculty/advisory-committee.html>.

3.0 ROLE OF CANDIDATE IN DOSSIER PREPARATION

3.1 About the Dossier

Tenure candidates' dossiers are due to the unit tenure committee by October 1 of the year of tenure consideration. Candidates for promotion to full professor and their unit heads should consult with their colleges for due dates. All dossiers for tenure and/or promotion must be received in the Provost's Office by February 15 of the year of consideration.

The dossier is your opportunity to make your professional career come to life. It is the "snapshot" that each reviewer will carefully examine and evaluate in coming to a fair and objective recommendation regarding your candidacy for tenure and/or promotion. It is critical that you build your dossier carefully, thoughtfully, and in sufficient time before it must be submitted.

Your dossier should be clear and concise. There is no room for errors, omissions or inaccuracies in the dossier – they may diminish your credibility and undercut your case. Your department/college will solicit external evaluations; thus, we ask that you not solicit letters on your own or include unsolicited letters from students and colleagues. We ask that you carefully review this model dossier and adhere to the format and guidelines below.

3.2 Dossier Preparation Format and Guidelines

The Provost's Office requests that dossiers be submitted electronically as pdf files, in order to expedite review at all levels and eliminate the costs and waste associated with submitting multiple paper copies. Supplemental materials included in the dossier's appendices (including raw teaching evaluations, books, other publications, creative materials, and so on) may be submitted either in hardcopy or electronically. Your department or college will compile electronically the materials required for Sections A (Faculty Summary Sheet), B (Recommendations) and C (External Letters). You will provide complete materials for all other sections of the dossier. Sections D (Curriculum Vitae), E (Candidate's Statements), F (Performance reviews) and G (Comprehensive List of Supporting Materials) must be submitted electronically. If you are submitting your supplemental materials in hardcopy, please also provide a hard copy of Section G at the head of the supplemental materials to assist your dossier's readers.

Your dossier must include: each year's annual (including third-year) and merit reviews; grant summaries; leaves of absence and special appointment letters (include with Faculty Summary Sheet); and all other items identified in the Dossier Checklist. You should make copies of any supplementary materials that you believe you may need in the future; tenure and promotion materials may be retained by the Provost's Office for two years or more if a candidate requests arbitration or judicial review of a negative recommendation.

Please do not include in the dossier letters of appointment, annual appointments and confirmations of compensation and benefits, or other items not identified on the dossier checklist. These items will not be considered in the review process.

The total length of the dossier, including the external letters and unit and college recommendations, should not exceed one hundred pages. Candidates should consult with their chairs and/or deans with respect to the length of their submissions.

Written materials that you prepare for the electronic dossier, such as your curriculum vitae, should be formatted in 12-point font, with a 1" minimum margin. Some required materials, such as previous performance reviews or copies of published papers, may need to be scanned for

inclusion in the dossier. The sections of the dossier for which you are responsible—Sections D-G—should be submitted to your department or college for review as a single pdf file following the order of the Dossier Checklist (Model E). Your department or college will provide you with scanning assistance and, if needed, other technical assistance in compiling the dossier electronically.

You should consult with your chair/associate dean in preparing your dossier to ensure that it meets any additional dossier requirements of your department/college. Academic unit dossier requirements/guidelines should be consistent with Provost's Office requirements as outlined in this document. **Please be advised that dossiers that do not follow the Model Dossier's format and the order of the Dossier Checklist WILL NOT be considered for review by the Provost.**

3.3 Dossier Organization and Checklist

Please use the dossier checklist as you compile materials to be included in your tenure and/or promotion dossier. The checklist itself (Model E) need not be included in the dossier. Your unit will add the first three sections of the dossier to the electronic file in the course of their review:

- A. Faculty Summary Sheet (Model C)** – prepared by the Dean's Office
- B. Recommendations** – added by different review committees & recommenders
- C. External Reviews** – added by department review committee

You will prepare and present all the following sections to your unit for their review:

- D. Candidate's Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae**
- E. Candidate's Statements and Supporting Evidence**
 - 1. Teaching
 - 2. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity
 - 3. Service
- F. Performance Reviews**
 - 1. Annual reviews
 - 2. Merit reviews
 - 3. Third-year reviews
- G. Comprehensive list of Supporting Materials**

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Teaching: Supporting Materials

Appendix B – Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity: Supporting Materials

Appendix C – Service and Professional Development Activities: Supporting Materials

3.4 DOSSIER CONTENTS

Dossier Section D – Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae

Together with your department/college, you are responsible for the accuracy and clarity of your CV. It should observe the guidelines below for content and formatting. Please ensure that a representative of your department/college reviews your CV before it is circulated.

Education/Employment History

You should provide a brief chronological account of your higher education history and all post-baccalaureate employment relevant to your academic discipline.

Scholarship/Research/Creative Activity

- **Publications** - Publications should be listed in separate categories by date of publication within the following categories (arranged in order of importance in your discipline):
 - Refereed articles
 - Non-refereed articles
 - Books
 - Book chapters
 - Abstracts
 - Other

Please provide full citations (please do not abbreviate journal titles), including beginning and ending page numbers. Be clear about the status of works in progress, e.g., “in press” means written, reviewed, accepted, and waiting for publication. Please include anticipated date of publication. Work “currently under review” (i.e., not yet accepted for publication) should be included if the work is complete and has been submitted for review. Work currently under development but not yet submitted should not be included.

If a work under review is accepted for publication before your dossier has been forwarded by the department (or equivalent unit) to the next level for review, you should notify the department (or equivalent unit) committee chairperson. The department (or equivalent unit) may then consider the work “in press” and update the dossier accordingly.

Where co-authoring is extensive and **not** typical in the field, a major collaborator should be invited by the tenure and/or promotion committee to indicate in a letter the contributions made by the candidate to the joint work (one letter may address multiple publications by the team, if applicable). Where coauthoring is common in your field, it may be helpful to indicate that in your statement on scholarship. Be sure to indicate publications co-authored with graduate and undergraduate students. Edited volumes should be clearly identified as such.

- **Creative Activity** - Achievements should be listed by date within the following categories:
 - Publication
 - Presentation
 - Performance

- Exhibition
- Projects

If creative works do not fit into the above categories, please clearly group creative achievements under categories that best characterize your work and are broadly accepted in your discipline and academic community.

Include full citations/descriptions and clearly identify the status of works in progress.

- Presentations and proceedings should be listed separately by date within the following categories:
 - International
 - National
 - Regional/local

Internally published technical reports, workbooks, etc. should be separate from publications.

Grants

Please list internal and external grants separately. It is recommended that you also list proposals that were not funded. If you list unsuccessful applications, those should be clearly differentiated from successful ones. Pending proposals should be listed with the amount requested and the notification date. For each successful grant, please identify your status – PI, co-PI, other, as well as the roles of other participants on the grant—and indicate the percentage of the grant attributed to your effort (as reported on the grant Proposal Processing Form). If a grant supports programmatic or group work, you should clarify your precise role in the work. You should indicate the amount received (total direct costs and annual budget) and the coverage period of successful grants, as well as the funding agency and the title of the proposal.

- External
 - Funded
 - Pending
 - Not-funded (recommended but optional)
- Internal
 - Funded
 - Pending
 - Not-funded (recommended but optional)

Teaching and Advising

- Courses – Please list all courses taught, year, quarter/semester, number of students. Identify courses taught for extra compensation (e.g. overloads, summer courses, courses at other schools, etc.). Please identify any new courses you have developed.
- Supervision of Graduate Students - Identify all masters and doctoral candidates supervised, completion dates, and thesis/dissertation titles.
- Supervision of Undergraduate Students - Identify all undergraduate students supervised as part of their honors thesis. Include completion dates and thesis titles.
- Advising Activities – Identify all undergraduate and graduate advising activities.

Service and Professional Development

Please list all significant service assignments and activities, as well as professional development activities, in separate categories by date.

- Service to the Institution
 - Department service
 - School service
 - College service
 - University service
- Service to the Discipline/Profession
- Service to the Community/Public
- Professional Development

Dossier Section E – Candidate’s Statements and Supporting Evidence

Statement on Teaching

You should begin with a statement of your teaching philosophy. You should identify courses taught and discuss your involvement in curriculum development, supervision of graduate and undergraduate students, and advising. Your statement may place quantitative student evaluations in context, for example by comparing your evaluations with those in similar-sized courses in your discipline, with other courses at the same level, courses taught mainly for majors/non-majors, and so forth. You should also discuss other contributions to teaching, such as development of pedagogical tools or interactive pedagogical methods, and should describe actions you have taken to incorporate appropriate shared learning goals—e.g., goals of the major discipline and/or the NU or College Cores. Your statement should describe your efforts to integrate classroom-based and experiential education and any other involvement with co-op or other type of experiential education.

Supporting Evidence for Teaching

Tenure candidates must include as supporting evidence of teaching the TRACE Summary Sheet (please use Model D below) and one sample course syllabus and class materials from that course.

The TRACE summary should clearly list in chronological order all courses taught, with numbers of students enrolled in each class. You should clearly identify courses taught for extra compensation. Tenure candidates must include the results of TRACES and any other University evaluations for all sections of all courses you have taught. If any evaluations are missing, explain why. If your unit administers student evaluations in addition to the TRACE instrument, you should include these additional teaching evaluation results in the Supporting Documents on Teaching.

Candidates for promotion to full professor who are seven or fewer years beyond tenure must supply information on all courses taught post-tenure on the TRACE Summary Sheet. Candidates for full professor who are more than seven years beyond tenure must supply complete TRACE information from their most recent seven years of teaching.

Statement on Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

You should state the focus of your research, scholarship and/or creative activity. You should explain the questions that you have identified, the funding you have received to support the work

(if applicable) and the directions it has taken, the venues in which your research, scholarship, or creative work has been disseminated, and provide indications of its impact on your academic community and, if applicable, in arenas outside the academy. You should include a discussion of any research/scholarship/creative activity you have undertaken with students or with the external community. Finally, you should discuss the questions that you expect to address in the future.

Candidates for promotion to full professor should focus primarily on research, scholarship and creative activity since the award of tenure.

Supporting Evidence for Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

Please include in the dossier one sample publication (or equivalent evidence in your discipline) representative of your work. Other samples can be included in the Appendix, with the exclusion of this selected one. Candidates for promotion to full professor should not include in the dossier or its appendices publications or other works that appeared prior to the award of tenure.

Statement on Service

You should address the three areas of service, as applicable: service to the institution, service to the discipline/profession, and academically grounded service to the community/public. You should begin with a statement of your service philosophy and identify the areas in which you have made strong contributions. You should then discuss service undertaken in each of the three areas, focusing on leadership positions held and special projects completed. Candidates for promotion to full professor should focus primarily on service contributions since the award of tenure.

Supporting Evidence for Service

Please include documentation of an example of your service to Northeastern or to your academic community. If you are documenting your service to a committee or a collaborative effort, you should include evidence of your individual contribution.

Dossier Section F – Performance Reviews

Candidates for tenure must include all previous performance reviews (annual reviews, merit reviews and the midcourse review) in the dossier. These reviews should provide a thorough and candid assessment of the candidate's performance and progress during the probationary period.

Candidates for promotion to full professor who are seven or fewer years beyond the award of tenure must include all their post-tenure performance reviews in the promotion dossier.

Candidates for full professor who are more than seven years beyond the award of tenure must include performance reviews from at least the most recent seven years.

Dossier Section G – Comprehensive List of Contents for appendices A, B, and D.

This section provides readers of your dossier with a full table of contents for all the supporting materials included in your appendices. Please organize and list your supplemental materials in a way that will enable readers of your dossier to locate supplemental items efficiently.

3.5 DOSSIER APPENDICES – The Appendices to the dossier include all additional evidence and supporting materials you wish to present regarding your accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. You may include references to these materials in your dossier. The appendices should be compiled in a binder or an electronic file **separate from Sections A – G.**

APPENDIX A. TEACHING: SUPPORTING MATERIALS

- Full reports of TRACE evaluations must be included for all sections of all courses taught. The Faculty Handbook mandates that tenure-track faculty members be evaluated each year using at least one other form of teaching evaluation in addition to the TRACE evaluations. These additional forms of teaching evaluation need not be the same for each year on the tenure track, and may include peer classroom evaluations; a teaching portfolio; a comprehensive presentation of classroom materials, including syllabi, examinations, assignments, etc. Multiple-year peer classroom evaluations are particularly helpful. In whatever format the additional teaching evaluations are conducted, the full record of those teaching evaluations must be included in Appendix A.
- Advising Activity
- Sample Syllabi
- Sample Teaching Materials– Possible materials include copies of exams, evaluation methods, excerpts of class presentations, materials from new courses you have developed, and samples of student work.
- Other – Other evidence of exemplary teaching (e.g. teaching awards, student letters, etc.).

APPENDIX B. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE ACTIVITY: SUPPORTING MATERIALS

Publications, creative works, final reports for grants, grant summaries, and other evidence of research, scholarship and creative activity should be included in this section.

APPENDIX C. SERVICE: SUPPORTING MATERIALS

Materials that support substantive internal and external service activities should be included here.

4.0 ROLE OF DEPARTMENT/COLLEGE & EVALUATION COMMITTEES IN DOSSIER PREPARATION

The department and college will add sections A, B, and C as pdf files to the electronic dossier. To ensure confidentiality, the college should transmit the complete electronic dossier from the Dean's Office to the Office of the Provost via CD or flash drive rather than email.

If the dossier's appendices are also in electronic form, they should be saved in a separate file from the dossier itself in order to keep the dossier file at a reasonable size.

4.1 DOSSIER SECTION A – FACULTY SUMMARY SHEET – will be provided and completed by the Dean's Office. All data should be accurate, particularly start dates, lateral credit, leaves, and current rank. See Models C.1 and C.2 for templates.

This section must clearly identify early tenure candidates.

4.2 DOSSIER SECTION B – RECOMMENDATIONS

Dean's Recommendation

The dean's recommendation should provide a well-reasoned, independent assessment of the candidate that builds upon the reports of the department and college committees. To add value to the evaluation process, the dean should provide a perspective on matters that may not have been obvious at the previous levels. He/she should assess all aspects of the faculty member's activities – instruction, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service – as well as the unit's long-term need. Issues raised by external reviewers may need to be clarified by the dean; if the dean has reservations about the quality or objectivity of any of the external reviewers, they should be discussed here. If the department chair has not commented on the quality and appropriateness of the journals in which the candidate has published, the dean should provide this evaluation. If disciplinary rankings of the journals exist, they can be used. References to outside reviewers' comments should preserve the anonymity of the reviewers.

A balanced assessment of the candidate based on the record presented will be more convincing than a statement filled with superlatives unsupported by documentation. The dean should identify the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, rather than become an advocate for the candidate. The recommendation should draw a conclusion.

College Advisory Committee (where applicable)

The college report should build upon, not repeat, the department's report and reviewers' letters. This report should assess the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate on the basis of the evidence presented in the dossier. It should be evaluative, providing judgments backed by information. It should discuss all aspects of the candidate's work— instruction, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service—and should indicate why the candidate does or does not meet the established tenure criteria. Grant activity should be discussed in the context of available funding in the discipline and the importance of external support in conducting research/scholarship/creative activity. If the dossier contains conflicting evaluations, the report should discuss and evaluate/resolve the issues raised. References to outside reviewers' comments and evaluations should preserve the anonymity of the reviewers.

As appropriate, the college report should also discuss the candidate's fit in the department and

college, both in terms of his/her ability to fill a need and in terms of quality: Does the person offer expertise in areas needed by the department/college? Will the person improve the quality of the department/college? The criteria used in making the decision should be indicated.

If a member of the Advisory committee has worked closely with the candidate (as a co-author or co-PI), that relationship should be clearly noted. Under these circumstances, the member should consider disqualifying him/herself from the review.

Department/School Committee Report (where applicable)

The department committee report should assess the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate on the basis of the evidence in the dossier. It should be evaluative – opinions backed by information. It should discuss all aspects of the candidate’s work: instruction, research/scholarship/creative activity and service, and should indicate why the candidate does or does not meet the established tenure criteria. Grant activity should be discussed in the context of available funding in the discipline and the importance of external support in conducting research/scholarship/creative activity. The report should discuss and evaluate external recommendations. If the dossier contains conflicting evaluations, the report should discuss and evaluate/resolve the issues raised. References to outside reviewers’ comments and evaluations should preserve the anonymity of the reviewers. The department committee report should place quantitative teaching evaluations into an appropriate context, assessing the candidate’s evaluations in comparison with those of instructors teaching the same or similar courses.

In tenure cases, the report should also discuss the candidate’s fit in the department/college, both in terms of his/her ability to fill and appropriate need and in terms of quality: Does the person offer expertise in areas needed by the department/college? Will the person improve the quality of the department/college? The criteria used in making the decision should be indicated.

In early tenure cases, there should be an indication of why the candidate is being considered early and why the department supported the candidate for early consideration, even if the department’s recommendation is negative.

If a member of the committee has worked closely with the candidate (as a co-author or co-PI), that relationship should be clearly noted. Under these circumstances, the member should consider disqualifying him/herself from the review.

Chair’s Report (where applicable)

The chair’s report is forwarded to the department committee for consideration prior to its vote. It should independently evaluate the candidate’s dossier and assess the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. It should be evaluative and objective – providing opinions backed by information. It should discuss all aspects of the candidate’s work: instruction, research /scholarship/creative activity and service, and should indicate why the candidate does or does not meet the established tenure criteria. Grant activity should be discussed in the context of available funding in the discipline and the importance of external support in conducting research/scholarship/creative activity. The report should discuss and evaluate external recommendations (copies will be provided to the chair by the department committee), address any issues the reviewers raise and discuss any conflicts among reviews. Of course, all references to outside reviewers’ comments and evaluations should preserve the anonymity of the reviewers.

In tenure cases, the report should also discuss the candidate’s fit into the department/college, both in terms of his/her ability to fill an appropriate need and in terms of quality: Does the person

offer expertise in areas needed by the department? Will the person improve the quality of the department? The criteria used in making the decision should be indicated.

In early tenure cases, the chairperson should indicate why the candidate is being considered for early tenure, and whether the chairperson supported the candidate proceeding with early tenure consideration.

If the chair of the department has worked closely with the candidate (as a co-author or co-PI), that relationship should be clearly noted.

4.3 DOSSIER SECTION C – EXTERNAL REVIEWS

External Referees

As specified in Section 2.2, the selection of external reviewers and the solicitation letter follow the university-wide guidelines issued in 2008.

Cover Memorandum – Selecting Reviewers

A short biography listing the reviewer’s major accomplishments in the field, evaluating the standing of the reviewer’s institution or department within the discipline, and providing any other information needed for understanding why the reviewer was chosen must be supplied for each external reviewer. The 100-page guideline on the total length of the dossier will not accommodate the inclusion of full CVs from external referees.

Supporting letters from Northeastern colleagues may be included by the candidate in the dossier’s supplemental materials in teaching, scholarship, or service, as relevant. They may not be included in the Section C of the dossier and they may not be referred to as “reviewers.”

Copy of Solicitation Letter

A copy of the letter used to solicit external referees must follow the list of external referees.

External Reviewer Letters

All letters solicited must be included in the dossier.

Exclusion of Unsolicited Materials

As provided in the *Faculty Handbook*, unsolicited materials from any source may not be included in the dossier or reviewed by evaluators. Reviewing committees should return all submissions of unsolicited materials to their authors.

Model A

MODEL TENURE ADVISEMENT LETTER

Date

Professor Untenured
Department/College of _____
Northeastern University

Dear Professor Untenured:

As indicated in your initial (DATE) appointment to Northeastern, you will become eligible for tenure consideration in (next academic year). Enclosed are copies of the (department's/school's /college's) tenure and promotion procedures for your review. These policies include information regarding such matters as who serves on the Tenure Committee, voting procedures, and the vote required for a positive recommendation. The policy identifies the criteria that the Tenure Committee will evaluate in reviewing your dossier and discusses other specifics concerning your tenure consideration. We ask that you also familiarize yourself with the University tenure and promotion procedures included in the Faculty Handbook (<http://www.northeastern.edu/facultyhandbook/>).

You will be responsible for submitting a dossier that will represent and reflect the work you have done at Northeastern during your tenure-track period. In preparing, compiling and assembling your dossier, please be sure to follow the enclosed Model Tenure and Promotion Dossier distributed by the Provost's Office. Your faculty mentor, Professor _____, can also answer any questions you may have concerning your dossier preparation.

You may review your dossier both before and after the college/school/departmental (or other academic unit) vote. However, external letters and/or other documents (including other solicited letters) used or developed with the understanding and/or expectation that they would be confidential must of course remain confidential and you will not have access to them.

In order to ensure a smooth start to the tenure review process, please confirm that you wish to be considered for tenure, by signing a copy of this letter where indicated below and returning it to me no later than May 1. If for any reason you do not wish to be considered for tenure, please advise me promptly. If you choose not to be considered for tenure, you will receive a terminal appointment for the 201_ - 201_ academic year.

If you have any further questions concerning tenure and promotion procedures, please feel free to contact me at any point during the process.

Sincerely,

Dean

I wish to be considered for tenure in the Department/College of _____ during the 201_ - 201_ academic year. I have reviewed this letter, the department/school/college procedures regarding tenure and promotion, and the University guidelines regarding tenure and promotion in the Faculty Handbook. I understand the policies and procedures outlined in these materials, and I am aware that they will apply during my upcoming tenure consideration.

Professor Untenured

Date

Model B.1

MODEL REQUEST LETTER FOR EXTERNAL TENURE REVIEWERS

Date

Professor Eminent
Department of Holistic Studies
Prestigious University

Dear Professor Eminent:

Dr. Tenure-Track, currently <an assistant professor without tenure; an associate professor without tenure> is being considered for tenure <and promotion to the rank of associate professor> at Northeastern University. In evaluating a candidate for tenure, University decision-makers consider the judgments of nationally and internationally known leaders in the candidate's field. We would very much appreciate your assistance in providing us with a candid confidential evaluation of Dr. Tenure-Track's scholarly work.

To assist in you in this task, I am enclosing the following materials:

1. Dr. Tenure-Track's curriculum vitae,
2. Copies of selected reprints from recent publications, and
3. The pertinent sections from Northeastern University's Faculty Handbook regarding tenure and promotion guidelines

Please evaluate Dr. Tenure-Track's qualifications for tenure <and promotion> with respect to the following criteria:

1. Quality and significance of research/scholarship/creative activity;
2. Reputation as an independent scholar or investigator;
3. Promise of growth and continued productivity;
4. Other professionally noteworthy achievements;
5. Comparison with other individual scholars in the field of _____ who are at approximately the same stage in their careers.
6. Given your assessment of Dr. Tenure-Track, would you recommend this person for tenure/promotion at your institution?

We would also appreciate your sending us, along with your letter, an abbreviated version of your own vita for the benefit of evaluators from other fields who may be unfamiliar with your background and accomplishments.

Your letter will be considered confidential, available only to those involved in the tenure review process. However, please note that the Supreme Court decision in *University of Pennsylvania v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission* (1990) allowed the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission access to otherwise confidential tenure evaluations in areas where discrimination was alleged. Except in the context of an EEOC request for access, it is

Northeastern University's policy to maintain the confidentiality of evaluations.

I sincerely hope that you will be able to assist us in our review of Dr. Tenure-Track's tenure and/or promotion candidacy. In order to expedite our deliberations, we look forward to receiving your evaluation by _____. If for any reason you will be unable to provide an evaluation or cannot evaluate Dr. Tenure-Track within this time frame, please contact me as soon as possible.

Thank you very much for your generous assistance in assessing Dr. Tenure-Track's work.

Sincerely,

Professor and Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee

(Enclosures)

INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING IF THE TENURE CLOCK HAS BEEN EXTENDED:

Dr. Tenure-Track's tenure clock was stopped for _____ years under Northeastern's Tenure Clock Extension Policy. Your review should be based on a full-term 6-year tenure track without consideration of extra time. We request that your review be performed without prejudice to the fact that Dr. Tenure-Track had a longer probationary record.

Model B.2

MODEL REQUEST LETTER FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR TENURE ON ENTRY

Date
Professor Eminent
Department of Holistic Studies
Prestigious University

Dear Professor Eminent:

Dr. <>, is being considered for a tenured appointment as <rank in unit > at Northeastern University. In evaluating a candidate for such a senior appointment, University decision-makers consider the judgments of nationally and internationally known leaders in the candidate's field. We would very much appreciate your assistance in providing us with a candid and confidential evaluation of Dr. <>'s scholarly work.

To assist in you in this task, I am enclosing the following materials:

- Dr. <>'s curriculum vitae,
- Copies of selected recent publications, and
- Pertinent sections from Northeastern University's Faculty Handbook regarding tenure-line faculty performance expectations.

Please evaluate Dr. Tenure-Track's qualifications for this appointment with respect to the following criteria:

- Quality and significance of research/scholarship/creative activity;
- Reputation as an independent scholar or investigator;
- Promise of growth and continued productivity;
- Other professionally noteworthy achievements;
- Comparison with other individual scholars in the field of who are at approximately the same stage in their careers.
- Given your assessment of Dr. <> would you recommend this person for a tenured appointment at the rank of <> at your institution?

We would also appreciate your sending us, along with your letter, an abbreviated version of your own vita for the benefit of reviewers from other fields who may be unfamiliar with your background and accomplishments.

Your letter will be considered confidential, available only to those involved in the appointment process. However, please note that the Supreme Court decision in *University of Pennsylvania v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission* (1990) allowed the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission access to otherwise confidential tenure evaluations in areas where discrimination was alleged. Except in the context of an EEOC request for access, it is Northeastern University's policy to maintain the confidentiality of evaluations.

I sincerely hope that you will be able to assist us in our review of Dr. <>'s candidacy. In order

to expedite our deliberations, we look forward to receiving your evaluation by <>. If for any reason you will be unable to provide an evaluation or cannot evaluate Dr. <> within this time frame, please contact me as soon as possible.

Thank you very much for your generous assistance in assessing Dr. <>'s accomplishments.

Sincerely,

Professor <>

(Enclosures)

Model B.3

MODEL REQUEST LETTER FOR EXTERNAL FULL PROFESSOR PROMOTION REVIEWERS

Date

Professor Eminent
Department of Holistic Studies
Prestigious University

Dear Professor Eminent:

Dr. Tenured, currently an associate professor with tenure, is being considered for promotion to the rank of Professor at Northeastern University. In evaluating candidates for promotion, the University considers the judgments of nationally and internationally known leaders in the candidate's field. We would appreciate your assistance in providing us with a candid confidential evaluation of Dr. Tenure-Track's scholarly work.

To assist in you in this task, I am enclosing the following materials:

1. Dr. Tenured's curriculum vitae,
2. Copies of selected reprints from recent publications, and
3. The pertinent sections from Northeastern University's Faculty Handbook regarding promotion guidelines.

Please evaluate Dr. Tenured's qualifications for promotion with respect to the following criteria:

1. Quality and significance of research/scholarship/creative activity;
2. Reputation as an independent scholar or investigator;
3. Growth and continued productivity since Professor Tenured's most recent promotion;
4. Other professionally noteworthy achievements;
5. Comparison with other individual scholars in the field of _____ who are at approximately the same stage in their careers.
6. Given your assessment of Dr. Tenured, would you recommend this person for promotion to Professor at your institution?

We would also appreciate your sending us, along with your letter, an abbreviated version of your own vita for the benefit of evaluators from other fields who may be unfamiliar with your background and accomplishments.

Your letter will be considered confidential, available only to those involved in the appointment process. However, please note that the Supreme Court decision in *University of Pennsylvania v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission* (1990) allowed the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission access to otherwise confidential tenure evaluations in areas where discrimination was alleged. Except in the context of an EEOC request for access, it is Northeastern University's policy to maintain the confidentiality of evaluations.

I sincerely hope that you will be able to assist us in our review of Dr. Tenured's promotion candidacy. In order to expedite our deliberations, we look forward to receiving your evaluation by _____. If for any reason you will be unable to provide an evaluation or cannot evaluate Dr. Tenured within this time frame, please contact me as soon as possible.

Thank you very much for your generous assistance in assessing Dr. Tenured's work.

Sincerely,

Model C.1
Provided and prepared by the Dean's Office

FACULTY SUMMARY SHEET: TENURE AND PROMOTION OR TENURE ONLY

Name:

Date:

Department:

Highest Degree:

Present Rank:

Year Degree Earned:

Date of Employment:

Where Degree Earned:

Lateral Entry Credit:

Current Visa Status:
(if not U.S. Citizen)

Years on Tenure Track at NU:

Special Conditions of Employment:

(list dates and duration of all leaves or special appointments, include copies of letters granting such leaves and appointments, and indicate whether they affected the original date of tenure consideration. If the tenure clock has been stopped, include a statement that the dossier should be reviewed on a full-term 6-year tenure track without consideration of extra time or prejudice to the fact that Dr. Tenure-Track had a longer probationary record.)

Third Year Review:

Department Committee Recommendation and vote:

School Committee Recommendation and vote (if applicable):

College Committee Recommendation and vote:

Dean's Recommendation:

Model C.2
Provided and prepared by the Dean's Office

FACULTY SUMMARY SHEET: PROMOTION ONLY

Name:

Date:

Department:

Highest Degree:

Present Rank:

Year Degree Earned:

Date of Employment:

Where Degree Earned:

Current Visa Status:
(if not U.S. citizen)

Date Tenure Received at NU:

Department Committee Recommendation and vote:

School Committee Recommendation and vote (if applicable):

College Committee Recommendation and vote:

Dean's Recommendation:

**Model D.1
TRACE SUMMARY**

Course Number	Title	Term and year	# of Students/ # Responded	Overall Mean Instructor Effectiveness Score* (please provide both your individual effectiveness score and that of the comparison group)	Regular Load (R) or Extra Compensation (E)

Note: responses are based on a 5-point Likert scale where 5 = "almost always effective", 4 = "usually effective", 3 = "sometimes effective", 2 = "rarely effective", and 1 = "never effective"

DOSSIER CHECKLIST

Included

- _____ **A. Faculty Summary Sheet** (Model C) – provided and prepared by the Dean’s Office

- _____ **B. Recommendations**
 - _____ 1. Dean’s recommendation (college and school, as applicable)
 - _____ 2. College Advisory Committee report
 - _____ 3. Department Committee report
 - _____ 4. Chairperson or academic unit head’s written evaluation
 - _____ 5. Candidate’s response to any of these recommendations

- _____ **C. External Reviews**
 - _____ 1. Cover memorandum – selecting reviewers
 - _____ 2. Copy of letter soliciting outside referees
 - _____ 3. Reference letters followed by reviewer’s short biography

- _____ **D. Candidate’s Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae**

- _____ **E. Candidate’s Statements and Supporting Evidence**
 - _____ 1. Teaching (including TRACE Summary Sheet)
 - _____ 2. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity
 - _____ 3. Service

- _____ **F. Performance Reviews**
 - _____ 1. Annual reviews
 - _____ 2. Merit reviews
 - _____ 3. Third-year reviews

- _____ **G. Comprehensive list of Supporting Materials**

APPENDICES

Appendix A -- Teaching: Supporting Documents

- _____ 1. Teaching evaluations (TRACE evaluations, other departmental evaluations)
- _____ 2. Advising Activity (undergraduate, graduate)
- _____ 3. Sample syllabi
- _____ 4. Sample teaching materials
- _____ 5. Other

Appendix B -- Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity: Supporting Documents

- _____ 1. Copies of publications, including articles (indicating whether refereed or non-refereed), proceedings, books, book chapters, abstracts (indicate status of work in progress)
- _____ 2. Grant activity, external and internal: identify the proposal title, status and whether successful; and provide a summary of the grant which includes the funding source, the amount awarded, and the dates of the award.

Creative work materials such as writing, design projects, music scores, media productions, performances, artwork, etc. Include media reviews as well as evidence of presentation at gallery/museum, festival, concert or completion of project in case of design work.
- _____ 3. Supporting materials: books, reviews, newspaper citations, and other citations of scholarship.
- _____ 4. Co-author letters: attesting to extent of candidate's contribution to research and writing (in fields where co-authoring is atypical).
- _____ 5. Recommendation for publication
- _____ 6. Other letters of support
- _____ 7. Research awards and honors

Appendix C -- Service: Supporting Documents

- _____ 1. Evidence of contributions to Department, School, College, and University committees
- _____ 2. Evidence of non-committee contributions to the Department, School, College, or University
- _____ 3. Evidence of service contributions related to the discipline outside of Northeastern University