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1.0 INTRODUCTION
This document provides guidance in the preparation of the promotion dossier unique to the position of Academic Specialist in the College of Science at Northeastern. This document provides an overview of the process that must be accomplished in the preparation, submission, and evaluation of the dossier. The Provost Office’s Model Dossier provides information on the format and organization of materials within the dossier. The major sections of this document include:

Section 2.0 Procedures Prior to Submission of the Dossier
Section 3.0 Role and Responsibilities of the Candidate in Dossier Preparation
Section 4.0 Dossier Guidelines
Section 5.0 Role of Department/College & Evaluation Committees in Dossier Preparation

The purpose of this document is to outline the criteria relevant to promotion decisions for academic specialists. It is expected that assistant academic specialists will serve a minimum of three years in rank before seeking promotion to associate academic specialist. Likewise, associate academic specialists will serve a minimum of six years in rank before seeking promotion to senior academic specialist. In early spring, the College will contact the departments/programs and ask if there is an academic specialist whom the Program/Department is putting forward for consideration of promotion in the fall of that year. In interpreting these guidelines it is important to recognize that all cases must be examined individually to account for the diversity of patterns of successful professional development. The academic specialist position tends to encompass great flexibility regarding expected activity. Thus, each individual may be expected to perform a unique array of activities. Since no single pattern should be assumed, no particular set of criteria to compare individual achievements should be inferred.

1.1 The Role of the Dossier
The dossier is the candidate’s opportunity to make their 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 the promotion. Thus, it is critical that candidates approach the construction of their dossiers carefully, thoughtfully, and allow sufficient time before the dossier must be submitted to their Program/Department.

The dossier should be clear and concise. It is important that the dossier focus on the specific areas of responsibility as defined by the Department Chair, Program Chair, and/or Dean. Normally this will be teaching and service. Personal statements should be brief. Because external evaluations will be solicited as part of the review process, candidates should not solicit letters on their own, nor should they include unsolicited letters from students and colleagues. Candidates should carefully review and adhere to the format and guidelines articulated in this document, which is specific to the College of Science, but which adheres to the Provost Office’s Guidelines “Preparation and Format of the Tenure and Promotion Dossier” (January 2012). The advice of the Department Chair/Program Director may be solicited in compiling the dossier and throughout the promotion review process; if further issues arise, advice can also be solicited from the Department or Program’s Review Committee Chair (see section 2.2 for more information about the role and composition of the Review Committee), the College, or the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.

1.2 Criteria for Promotion
Promotion Evaluation of an Academic Specialist’s eligibility for promotion shall be based on (1) the candidate’s job performance to date and (2) satisfaction of the minimum time requirements for promotion from the current specialist rank to the next specialist rank by June 30 of the academic year in which he or she is eligible for consideration. To receive a positive recommendation for promotion, the candidate must present evidence of superior professional achievement during the review period, particularly demonstrating excellence in teaching (TRACE evaluations should consistently be above the Program/Department’s norms) and service.

While the initial promotion recommendation is made at the Program/Department level, the recommendation will become final only after it is reviewed and supported by the Dean and approved by the Provost. In addition to performance, the Provost may also consider University need and available funding in reviewing promotion recommendations. A negative decision on a promotion request shall not
preclude further term appointments at the specialist’s current level. Nor shall a negative decision preclude consideration for promotion at a subsequent date.

1.3 Overview of the Procedures and the Timeline for the Promotion Process

The following provides an overview of the timeline and key dates for the promotion process. Details and guidelines for each step in the process are further described later in the document.

February

The Dean’s Office contacts Department Chairs and Program Directors to find out if there are any academic specialists that the Program/Department is planning to put forward for consideration of promotion. Chairs/Program Directors are asked to consult with those individuals who are eligible for consideration of promotion based on the number of years that they have served in that position and determine whether or not they believe that these individuals should be put forward for consideration of promotion. Candidates who have the support of their Chair/Program Director and who decide to go up to promotion should notify the Dean’s office immediately of their intent to proceed with the promotion process. Those academic specialists who are not put forward by their Chairs/Program Directors can submit an appeal to the Dean’s Office. The decision by the Dean’s Office will be considered to be final for this particular academic year. Application for an appeal does not preclude the academic specialist from consideration at a future date.

March-April

Candidates who are being put forward for promotion should 1) identify potential appropriate internal and external “at-arms-length” reviewers for their dossiers and forward these lists to their Program/Department heads; and to 2) prepare their mini-dossier (CV, statements, and supplemental information such as teaching portfolio, research artifacts, service examples, etc.) for evaluation by the external reviewers (this will take place over the summer). The candidates should have input from their Department Chairs/Program Directors in this process, as the inclusion of what to include in the mini-dossier will vary depending on the requirements and expectations for the Academic Specialist’s role.

Early May

Chairs/Program Directors should begin the external review process and soliciting the internal and external reviews.

September

Candidate must submit Sections D through G and the Appendices. The exact date will be determined by the Chair/Program Director and the Program/Department Review Committee, to allow for time for the preparation of their materials and reports.

October 1

Candidate’s dossier including Chair/Program Director’s letter, external reviews, etc. are submitted for consideration by the Program/Department Review Committee.

October 15

Dossier is submitted by the Program/Department to the Dean. (The College of Science Tenure & Promotion committee does not review Academic Specialist promotion cases.)

February 15

Recommendation of the Dean is sent to the Provost’s Office.

April-May

Candidates are notified of the outcome. Promotion, if awarded, becomes active the next academic year.
2.0 PROCEDURES PRIOR TO SUBMISSION OF THE DOSSIER

2.1 Promotion Advisement
   In mid-February, the College will contact the Department Chair/Program Director to ascertain the names of those academic specialists in their Program/Department that the Program/Department plans to put forward for consideration of promotion. The Chair/Director should meet as soon as is practically possible with those individuals who are potential candidates to discuss whether the candidate’s qualifications/accomplishments to date at their current rank merit their being put forward for promotion. If the Chair/Director and the candidate decide that the candidate will be put forward for consideration of promotion, then the candidate should notify the College in writing via email that they will apply for promotion. The College should be notified of the candidate’s intent to be considered for promotion within two weeks, following the College’s initial request of names from the Program/Department.

2.2 Program/Department Review Committee
   The purpose of this departmental/program-level committee is to guide the evaluation process of the candidate’s application for promotion at the Program/Department level. This committee, together with the Department Chair/Program Director, identifies the list of internal and external reviewers who will review the candidate’s mini-dossier. (See below for more detail on the review process.)

   This committee also reviews and evaluates the candidate’s promotion materials (the dossier and supporting appendices), the reviews submitted by the internal and external referees, and the report of the Department Chair or Program Director. Following these evaluations, the Program/Department Review Committee prepares a summary report with its recommendation; this report is submitted to the Dean along with the full Dossier and Supporting Materials (the Appendices). Prior to the submission of the Report to the Dean, the candidate may review and respond to the Department Chair/Program Director’s Report and the Program/Department Review Committee’s Report. Candidates should ONLY submit written responses to the Chair’s Report or the Committee’s Report when grievous errors have been made in the written record. (However, at any stage of the review process, the candidate can choose to write a written response which will become part of the dossier.)

2.3 Internal and External Reviews
   Each candidate up for promotion must be reviewed by referees, some of whom are internal to the University (but external to the candidate’s Program/Department) and some of whom are external to the University. This section describes the process of soliciting reviewers, and provides guidelines on the selection of reviewers, the number of reviewers, procedures for contacting the reviewers, directions on preparing the mini-dossier, and information on the timeline for the review process.

2.3.1 Guidelines for the Selection of Internal and External Referees
   While the list of reviewers is ultimately selected by the Chair/Director in consultation with the Program/Department Review Committee, the candidate should prepare a list of potential reviewers to aid in the selection of the reviewers. In the end, the dossier should contain a minimum of five to six letters that represent an equal mix of both internal (internal to the university but external to the Program/Department) and external reviews. Reviewers should be selected so that they are well-known and respected individuals who can provide an arm’s-length review of the candidate’s suitability for receipt of promotion. This means that these individuals should not be former or current research mentors, collaborators or have any other close ties that might be perceived as prohibiting them from fairly evaluating the accomplishments of the specialist. Shortly after notifying the College of the candidate’s intent to apply for promotion, the Chair/Director should ask the candidate to identify a list of potential reviewers, following the guidelines provided here. In addition to the list of potential reviewers, the candidate may also provide the names of up to three individuals whom the candidate would prefer not to be used as reviewers along with an explanation for this preference. The Chair/Director and the Program/Department Review Committee will also identify potential reviewers, and the final set of reviewers will be identified and approved by the Program/Department Review Committee.

   Prior to and during the promotion review process, the candidate should not contact the referees whose names she or he has submitted as potential reviewers. Nor should the reviewers’ identities be disclosed to the candidate; the anonymity of the reviewers MUST be maintained throughout and following the promotion process.
2.3.2 Preparation of the Mini-Dossier

The candidate, working with their Chair/Program Director, should put together a mini-dossier that will be sent to the reviewers; this mini-dossier should present a representative overview of the candidate’s work at their current rank to date.

Central to the mini-dossier are several documents that are also required in the final dossier: the candidate’s curriculum vitae and the relevant required Statements on Teaching, Service, and Research. The decision regarding which statements should be included in the mini-dossier should be made in consultation with the Chair/Director and the Program/Department Review Committee. For the preparation of these documents, please refer to the guidelines in section 4.2.

The mini-dossier should also contain supplemental materials that highlight the candidate’s accomplishments in the relevant areas of teaching, service, and research (again all three may not be required in everyone’s case). Examples of useful supplemental materials for teaching include a teaching portfolio for a course that the candidate has developed/taught, inclusion of the TRACE/TCEP Course Evaluation Summary Sheet (see Section 4.2.2 and Model D for guidelines on preparing this), and representative comments from written course evaluations. Examples of useful supplemental materials for service include annual reports, annual reviews, a summary list of service, copies of materials created for Program/Department or other service, etc. Examples of useful supplemental materials for research would include sample publications, panel summaries from funded grant proposals, etc.

The candidate should keep in mind that the mini-dossier is meant to be representative of the specialist’s work and the length should be quite limited (around 50 pages, not including the teaching portfolio, if included). Lastly, if the mini-dossier is being sent out electronically (preferred), individual sections should be collated into a single electronic file in a PDF format (teaching portfolios, which are often quite lengthy, can be kept as a second electronic file).

2.3.3 The Solicitation Letter

After the list of external referees has been approved by the Dean’s office, the Chair or Program Director should use the Model Recommendation Request Letter (Model B) to solicit letters from the internal and external referees.

Reviewers should be supplied with the candidate’s job description, the candidate’s mini-dossier, and any other appropriate materials. If reviewers are being asked to comment on instruction, they should receive student and peer evaluations and instructional materials. If asked to comment on a candidate’s publications, the reviewers should be supplied with several representative publications. Reviewers should be asked to provide a succinct biosketch that outlines their academic background and professional accomplishments.

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 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.

2.3.4 Timeline for the Review Process

The following timeline is recommended, so that sufficient time is allocated to the process, and all participants in the process have enough time to complete their parts in the review process.

March The Chair should ask the candidate to identify a list of potential reviewers, both internal and external to the University.

March-April The Chair, together with the Program/Department Review Committee identify the set of reviewers who will review the dossier.

March-April The candidate should prepare the materials for inclusion in the mini-dossier, working with their Chair/Program Director for guidance as needed. See the guidelines above for preparation of the mini-dossier, and the sections on the preparation of the documents of the Final Dossier for more information regarding the preparation of the Curriculum Vitae,
the Statements of Teaching, Service and Research, and the supplemental materials such as Teaching Portfolios.

May
The Chair/Program Director should e-mail or mail copies of the mini-dossier together with an appropriately modified version of the model external reviewer request letter to the list of external reviewers identified by the Chair in consultation with the Program/Department.

Summer
The candidate should work with the Chair/Program Director to assemble their dossier following the "College of Science Guidelines for the Preparation and Format of the Academic Specialist Promotion Dossier" document.

Late-August
The Chair/Program Director should check on the progress of the external reviewers to ensure that by mid-September, the Program/Department will have a sufficient number of letters of evaluation (at least five or six) from individuals both inside the University (but outside the Program/Department) and outside the University. If needed the Chair/Program Director should stand ready to contact and request additional letters from alternate reviewers if it appears that the Program/Department will not have sufficient yield from the group of reviewers originally identified.

3.0 PREPARING THE PROMOTION DOSSIER: ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CANDIDATE
The dossier is your opportunity to present your professional life to your peers and colleagues. The dossier is the instrument that will be used to evaluate the candidate’s effectiveness at all stages of the review process, from the Department Chair/Program Director’s Report and the Program/Department Review Committee’s Report, to the internal and external reviews, the Dean’s Report, and the Provost’s final review. Thus it is imperative to present a clear, concise and accurate dossier; one that fully represents your professional activities as an Academic Specialist. Please keep in mind that the Program/Department Review Committee will solicit internal and external evaluations. Please do NOT solicit letters on your own or include unsolicited letters from students and colleagues. You should carefully review and adhere to these guidelines, and keep in mind that the dossier is due to the Program/Department Review Committee in September of the year of promotion consideration.

3.1 Dossier Preparation Format and General 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, and so on) may be submitted either in hardcopy or electronically (preferred). Your department or college will compile 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: copies of all peer reviews of teaching, each year’s annual reports and merit reviews; 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 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 external reviewer CV’s or biosketches, 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 Provost’s Office requests that the total length of the dossier, including the external letters and Program/Department and college recommendations, but not including the appendices, not exceed one hundred pages. Candidates should consult with their Chair/Program Director/Associate Dean 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-inch 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 through G—should be submitted to your department or college for review as a single PDF file that is continuously paginated. Your department or college will provide you with scanning assistance and, if needed, other technical assistance in compiling the dossier electronically.

A few very basic tips on preparing the electronic dossier efficiently: Since your portion of the dossier must be paginated continuously after it is fully compiled, you should strip all page numbers and other headers and footers out of any word-processed documents you prepare for the dossier before converting your files into PDF format. Also, to help readers navigate through the dossier easily, please be sure that each section and subsection of the major sections of the dossier (e.g., the sections on teaching, scholarship, and service in Section E) begins on a new page and is clearly labeled.

You should consult with your Chair/Program Director, Program/Department Review Committee Chairperson, and Associate Dean in preparing your dossier to ensure that it meets all the requirements of the college. The dossier requirements/guidelines outlined in this document are consistent with Provost’s Office requirements as stated in the “Preparation and Format of the Tenure and Promotion Dossier” guidelines (January 2011). Please be advised that dossiers that do not follow the format and guidelines outlined in this document WILL NOT be considered for review by the Provost.

3.2 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 Program/Department will add the first three sections of the dossier to the electronic file in the course of their review:

- **Section A. Faculty Summary Sheet (Model C)** – prepared by the Dean’s Office
- **Section B. Recommendations** – added by the relevant reviewer or committee
- **Section C. External Reviews** – added by the Program/Department Review Committee

You will prepare and submit all the following sections (sections D through G and the appendices) to your Program/Department for their review:

- **Section D. Candidate’s Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae**
- **Section E. Candidate’s Statements and Supporting Evidence**
  1. Teaching
  2. Service and Professional Development
  3. Research and Scholarship, if relevant
- **Section F. Performance Reviews**
  1. Annual reviews
  2. Merit reviews
- **Section G. Comprehensive List of Supporting Materials**

**APPENDIX**

Appendix A – Teaching: Supporting Materials
Appendix B – Service and Professional Development Activities: Supporting Materials
Appendix C – Research and Scholarship: Supporting Materials, if relevant

---

1 Academic specialists have a wide range of responsibilities including teaching, advising, service, and may include research with undergraduate students. The specific breakdown of their responsibilities is determined at the Program/Department level by the Chair of their department based on the unique instructional needs of the academic Program/Department. An academic specialist’s primary responsibility, however, is to provide quality undergraduate education, so while the Research Statement may be optional, the Teaching and Service Statements are most likely to be required. The decision about which statements are required is made by the Chair/Director in conjunction with the Program/Department Review Committee.
4.0 DOSSIER GUIDELINES: SECTIONS D THROUGH G AND APPENDIX

You should observe the guidelines below for formatting and content for each of the sections of the dossier (Sections D through G) that you prepare and submit.

4.1 Section D – Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae

Together with your department/college, you are responsible for the accuracy and clarity of your Curriculum Vitae (CV). Please ensure that a representative of your department/college reviews your CV before it is circulated.

What follows is a description of each of the elements that must be included in your Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae.

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.

Courses Taught
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 Student Work
Identify all students supervised: undergraduate students supervised as part of their Honors Thesis, Directed Study or Directed Research, etc. and graduate students supervised. Include completion dates and thesis/project titles.

Advising Activities
Identify all undergraduate and graduate advising activities.

Service and Professional Development
List all significant service assignments and activities, as well as professional development activities. These should be organized according to the following categories, and the dates/time ranges for each activity should be provided.

(1) Service to the Institution
   - Service to the Program/Department
   - Service to the College
   - Service to the University
(2) Service to the Discipline/Profession
(3) Other Service (service to the community/public, etc.)
(4) Professional Development

Research and Scholarship
If applicable, include scholarly publications, conference presentations, proposals for grants (even those that were unfunded), etc., and categorize publications according to general type (books versus edited volumes versus conference presentations, etc.). Provide full citations for each, including beginning and ending page numbers for all published work, and avoiding the use of abbreviations for journal titles. Be clear about the status of works in progress, e.g., “in press” means written, reviewed, accepted, and waiting for publication (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 Program/Department Review Committee to the Dean review, you should notify the Program/Department Review Committee Chairperson. The Committee may then consider the work “in press” and update the dossier accordingly.
If you have extensive publications, or if research/grant writing is part of your job description as an Academic Specialist, then please refer to the Provost’s Office document “Preparation and Format of the Tenure and Promotion Dossier” (January 2011) available at <www.northeastern.edu/provost_old/.../ModelTenureDossier2011.pdf> for further guidelines on citing, formatting, and organizing this section of your CV.

4.2 Section E – Candidate’s Statements and Supporting Evidence

The candidate’s Statements regarding Teaching and Service must be included in the dossier, along with summary supporting evidence (full supporting evidence should be included in the Appendices). Because appointments for Academic Specialists vary widely in their assigned duties, some of these areas (for example, the Research Statement) may not be required for inclusion in the dossier. The Department Chair/Program Director and the Program/Department Review Committee should work with the candidate in determining which statements and types of supporting evidence are relevant for inclusion.

4.2.1 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 types of experiential education.

If you have had poor or mediocre teaching evaluations, it is important that your statement address these and any other inconsistencies in your record. If your record is less than exemplary you should explain what efforts you have undertaken to address these deficiencies and concerns and provide supporting evidence such as markedly improved TRACE evaluations.

4.2.2 Supporting Evidence for Teaching

Please include as supporting evidence of teaching the TCEP/TRACE Summary Sheet (please use Model D below); a grade distribution summary sheet comparing your grade distributions in each section taught with those of other faculty members teaching the same course (if available from your department); and one sample course syllabus and class materials from that course.

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

4.2.3 Statement on Service

You should begin with a statement of your service philosophy and identify the areas in which you have made strong contributions in 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 then discuss service undertaken in each of the three areas, focusing on leadership positions held and any special projects completed.

4.2.4 Supporting Evidence for Service

Please include documentation of examples 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.
4.2.5 Statement on Research and Scholarship (if relevant)

Your statement should frame your research and scholarship activities in such a way that the reader can follow your evolution as a scholar. Your statement should clearly state the research questions that you have chosen to investigate, your accomplishments in terms of findings, funding, and presentations to date, and clearly link these to the research questions you anticipate addressing in the next 5-10 years. Your statement should provide evidence of the impact on your work on the greater Community of Practice. You should include a discussion of any research you have undertaken with students or with the external community.

Your statement should also provide a perspective on your activities as a research mentor and include information on how many students you have supervised, the number with whom you have published and/or presented, and any research awards any of your students may have won. Be sure to place this information in perspective: Are these numbers unusually high/low/average for your department and/or discipline?

4.2.6 Supporting Evidence for Research and Scholarship (if relevant)

If relevant, please include in the dossier one representative publication of your work. You can include additional publications in Appendix C. However, more is not better. Be strategic and judicious in your selection of any additional publications you choose to include in the Appendix.

4.3 Section F – Performance Reviews

All previous performance reviews (annual reviews, merit reviews, etc.) must be included in your dossier. These reviews should provide a thorough and candid assessment of your performance and progress during the probationary period.

4.4 Section G – Comprehensive List of Contents for the Appendix

This section provides readers of your dossier with a full table of contents for all the supporting materials included in your Appendix. Please organize and list your supplemental materials in a way that will enable readers of your dossier to locate supplemental items efficiently. Be sure to place copy of this list at the beginning of the Appendix to serve as a table of contents.

4.5 Dossier Appendix

The Appendix to the dossier should include any additional evidence and supporting materials you wish to present regarding your accomplishments in teaching, research and scholarship, and service. The pages in the Appendix are not counted in your 100-page limit for the dossier. That said, more is not better when it comes to the Appendix. Please do not use the Appendix as a dumping ground for course handouts, copies of your publications, etc. You should only include those materials that highlight and truly supplement the materials in your dossier proper. Because they support and supplement your dossier, you may include references to these materials in your dossier. The appendix should be compiled in a single electronic file separate from Sections A – G.

4.5.1 Appendix A, Teaching: Supporting Materials

Appendix A will include all supporting documents for your teaching activities. The following elements must be included:

(1) Teaching Statement
Include a copy of your Teaching Statement (the same one included in your Dossier) in Appendix A for ease of reference by the reviewers, so they can review your teaching philosophy as they review your other teaching materials, without having to find it again in the main body of the dossier. See Section 4.2.1 for more information about preparing the Teaching Statement.

(2) TCEP/TRACE Summary Sheet
Include a copy of the TCEP/TRACE Summary Sheet from your Dossier, for ease of reference. See Section 4.2.2 and Model D for more information about the TCEP/TRACE Summary Sheet.

(3) TCEP/TRACE Evaluations
The full reports of TCEP/TRACE evaluations must be included for all sections of all courses taught.
Second Form of Teaching Evaluations for Each Year under Review

For each year under review for the promotion, you must include at least one other form of teaching evaluation in addition to the TCEP/TRACE evaluations. These additional forms of teaching evaluation need not be the same for each year on the promotion track, and may include any combination of the following:

- **Peer teaching evaluations**: Reviews of your teaching performance by colleagues who have observed you teaching a class. (Multiple-year peer classroom evaluations are particularly helpful; any peer teaching evaluations should be included in the dossier itself; other forms of evaluation should be compiled in Appendix A.)

- **Course portfolio**: A representative presentation of classroom materials for a course that you have designed and taught that demonstrates excellence in teaching. Course portfolios typically include a copy of the syllabus, sample in-class materials that you have developed (lectures, handouts, in-class exercises and activities, slides, interactive websites, etc.), sample examinations, assignments and other methods of student assessment, copies of sample student work [only if you have permission from the student], etc. The materials in the teaching portfolio should be carefully selected to be representative of your teaching style, method, and effectiveness in this course. This should be a representative view of your course content and development, not an exhaustive one.

- **Quantitative student course evaluations administered by your Department or Program**: If your Program/Department administers quantitative course evaluations in addition to TCEP/TRACE, all records of all course evaluations should be included for each course taught.

- **Directed Study and Directed Research Projects and Papers**: Sample work of students who have worked under your supervision. [only if you have permission from the student]

- **Teaching Awards**: Any awards or nominations for excellence in teaching.

- **Student letters**: Letters or notes that reflect your influence on a student’s learning/education/professional development. Your Program/Department Review Committee may opt to elicit student reviews or letters of recommendation.

- **Sample Syllabi**: Provide sample syllabi for courses designed and taught (just provide a copy of the most recent year taught, not all years).

Other helpful documents to include in Appendix A would include things like the following:

- **A summary of all directed student work**: List all directed study, research, projects, Honors projects, experiential education, etc. While this information should be included in your comprehensive CV, a separate summary would highlight this aspect of your teaching and mentoring activities.

- **A summary of grade distributions**: Providing evidence of your grade distributions, and possibly comparing them with those of your peers in your Program/Department, would help establish that your teaching evaluations are not linked to grade inflation. The grade distribution table would include the grades assigned at the end of each term (how many of each grade were assigned: 10 A, 2 A-, 19 B+, 2 B, etc.), the total number of students enrolled in the course, the average QPA for the course, and possibly the TCEP/TRACE rating for instructor’s effectiveness. If possible, creating a second table comparing other sections of the same course, similar courses, or courses of the same level taught by other faculty would be helpful.

- **Representative sampling of student comments from course evaluations**: If your Appendix include a large number of quantitative evaluations, it might be useful to compile and synthesize a page of sample remarks that allow the reviewers to see the trends in your student evaluations without having to wade through 100s of pages of hand-written student comments.

Please keep in mind that while these items can help to document and illustrate your teaching performance, they do not replace the elements that are required, and discussed above.
4.5.2 Appendix B, Service and Professional Development: Supporting Materials

Appendix B will include all supporting documents for your service activities. Service activities should be organized in the following categories:

1. Service to the Institution
   - Service to the Program/Department
   - Service to the College
   - Service to the University
2. Service to the Discipline/Profession
3. Other Service (service to the community/public, etc.)
4. Professional Development: list seminars, conferences and workshops attended and other professional development activities.

4.5.3 Appendix C, Research and Scholarship: Supporting Materials (if relevant)

Copies of publications, final reports for grants, grant summaries, and other evidence of research and scholarship should be included in this section.

5.0 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. The Provost’s Office requests that the total length of the dossier, including departmental and college-level recommendations, not exceed one hundred pages.

5.1 Dossier Section A – Faculty Summary Sheet

The 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 Model C for the template.

5.2 Dossier Section B – Recommendations

Three levels of review within the College of Science are expected for each Academic Specialist promotion dossier. First, a review of the candidate is prepared by the Department Chair/Program Director, which is then added to the dossier and forwarded to the Program/Department Review Committee. The Program/Department Review Committee then reviews all the relevant materials and writes their report. This is included in the dossier, and then submitted to the Dean, who prepares the final report and submits the completed dossier to the Provost’s Office. The candidate may review and respond to Candidate’s response to any of these recommendations if serious errors or mis-statements have been made in the Program/Department-level reports.

5.2.1 Program/Department Chair, Program/Departmental Review Committee, and the Dean’s Reports

The Chair’s report is forwarded to the Program/Department's Review Committee for consideration prior to its vote. The Program/Department Review Committee makes its evaluation. The dossier then moves to the Dean’s Office. At each level, the Chair, Program/Department Review Committee, and Dean will independently prepare reports that evaluate the candidate’s dossier and assess the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. What will differ is the perspective of the reviewing unit. Each report will be evaluative and objective – providing opinions backed by information. All will evaluate all aspects of the candidate’s work: teaching and service (and research, if relevant), and indicate why the candidate does or does not meet the established promotion criteria. Each report will discuss and evaluate external recommendations, address any issues the reviewers raise and discuss any conflicts among reviews. Each will provide a balanced assessment of the candidate based on the record presented identifying the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses, rather than become an advocate for the candidate. Each report will draw a conclusion. At any level, if the Chair or any member of the Review committee has worked closely with the candidate (as a co-author or co-PI) must disclose that relationship.
5.2.2 Candidate’s Response
At each stage, i.e., following the issue of the Chair’s report, the Program/Department’s report, the Dean’s report, the candidate can submit a written response. This should only be done if the candidate feels that the relevant report includes grievous errors or mis-statements that should be corrected.

5.3 Dossier Section C – External Reviews
The process of selecting reviewers is outlined in Section 2.3. In Dossier Section C, the Program/Department Review Committee must prepare and include the following elements: A cover memo describing the reviewer selection and solicitation process, a copy of the solicitation letter (similar to Model B), and copies of all letters solicited.

5.3.1 Cover Memorandum: Selecting Reviewers
A short paragraph outlining 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/biosketches 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.”

5.3.2 Copy of Solicitation Letter
A copy of the letter used to solicit external referees must follow the list of external referees.

5.3.3 Internal and External Reviewer Letters
All letters solicited must be included in the dossier. All the letters should be numbered in the upper right corner and referred to in the Chair, Program/Department Review Committee, and the Dean’s report by number in their reports.

6.0 MODEL DOCUMENTS TO BE USED FOR REFERENCE IN THE PREPARATION OF THE DOSSIER
The remaining pages contain the model documents for inclusion in the Academic Specialist Promotion dossier. The following models are included:
Model A: Model Promotion Advisement Letter
Model B: Model Request Letter for Internal and External Reviewers
Model C: Faculty Summary Sheet: Academic Specialist Promotion
Model D: TCEP and TRACE Summary Sheet
Model E: Dossier Checklist
From:
Sent:
To: Candidate
Cc: Program Director/Department Chair
Subject: Promotion guidelines

Good afternoon,

The Dean's Office has been notified of your intent to be considered for promotion to Associate/Senior Academic Specialist during the 2012-2013 academic year. We ask that you familiarize yourself with the Departmental, College and University guidelines.

The dossier must be submitted as a single PDF file. The Appendix should also be submitted in electronic format as a separate PDF. Your completed electronic dossier will be due to the department in September. Be sure to check with your department for the actual date they will require the completed dossier.

I've attached the promotion dossier guidelines for Academic Specialists.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Regards,
Model B
MODEL REQUEST LETTER FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
(Provided and prepared by the Department Chair, Program Director or the Program/Department Review Committee)

Date
Address

Dear Dr. ____:

Dr. [SURNAMEx] is currently an Assistant Academic Specialist in the [DEPARTMENT or PROGRAM’S NAME] at Northeastern University. He/She is being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Academic Specialist (I’m attaching his/her CV and a mini-dossier). Academic Specialists are renewable non-tenure track faculty positions that have an associated promotion track focused on teaching and service. Dr. [SURNAMEx]’s teaching load consists of a maximum of five courses per year as well as administrative duties including student advising, undergraduate recruitment, and the supervision of undergraduate research students. In evaluating candidates for promotion in Academic Specialist positions, Northeastern considers the judgments of professionals both inside and outside the University who are familiar with the promotion candidate’s teaching and administrative activities or who have had the opportunity to work with the promotion candidate. We would appreciate your assistance in providing us with a confidential evaluation of Dr. [SURNAMEx]’s contributions to the [DEPARTMENT or PROGRAM’S NAME] in the areas of teaching and curricular development, student advising and mentoring, and program administration. Our understanding is that you’ve worked with Dr. [SURNAMEx] in one or more of these contexts.

We would really appreciate it if you could submit your letter in PDF format to me as an email attachment by [DATE]. We would also appreciate a brief (1-page) biosketch (again, in PDF format) for the benefit of those reviewers who will review Dr. [SURNAMEx]’s dossier for promotion and who may be unfamiliar with your background and accomplishments.

We very much appreciate your help and thank you in advance for your time and effort. If you have any questions or if for any reason you will be unable to provide an evaluation of Dr. [SURNAMEx] in this timeframe, please contact me as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

[NAME]
[TITLE]
Northeastern University
MODEL C
FACULTY SUMMARY SHEET: ACADEMIC SPECIALIST PROMOTION
(Provided and prepared by the Dean’s Office)

Name: Date:
Department/School: Highest Degree:
Present Level: Year Degree Earned:
Date of Employment: Where Degree Earned:
Years at Current Specialist Level Current Visa Status:
(If not U.S. Citizen)

Program/Department Review Committee Recommendation:

Department Chair/Program Director Recommendation:

Dean’s Recommendation:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Term Semester and Year</th>
<th>Number of Students Number in Class</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Overall Effectiveness 1 Individual Score</th>
<th>Compariso n Score 2</th>
<th>Load Regular (R) or Extra Compensation (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The mean score from TCEP/TRACE for the individual and comparison group for the question “What is your overall rating of this Instructor's teaching effectiveness?”. 

2 Specify the comparison group: for example “The comparison group is all courses of the same level in the department where the course was listed”. 
MODEL E
DOSSIER CHECKLIST

SECTION A. Faculty Summary Sheet (Model C, prepared by the Dean’s Office)

SECTION B. Recommendations (added by different review committees)
1. Dean’s recommendation
2. Program/Department Committee Report
3. Chairperson’s/Program Chair’s written evaluation
4. Candidate’s response to any of these recommendations (only included if grievous errors/mis-statements have been made in the written record)

SECTION C. Internal and External Reviews (added by Program/Department Review Committee)
1. Cover Memorandum – selecting reviewers
2. Copy of letter soliciting outside referees
3. Reference letters followed by reviewer’s curriculum vitae

SECTION D. Candidate’s Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vita

SECTION E. Candidate’s Statements and Summary Supporting Evidence
1. Teaching (the TCEP and TRACE Summary Sheet must be included)
2. Service and Professional Development
3. Research and Scholarship (if relevant)

SECTION F. Performance Reviews
1. Annual reviews
2. Merit reviews

SECTION G. Comprehensive List of Supporting Materials

APPENDIX A, Teaching: Supporting Materials
1. Teaching Statement
2. TCEP/TRACE Summary Sheet
3. Copies of all TCEP/TRACE Evaluations, other departmental evaluations
4. Sample Syllabi
5. Peer evaluations
6. Course portfolios
7. Other

APPENDIX B, Service and Professional Development: Supporting Materials
1. Evidence of contributions to Department, College, and/or University committees
2. Evidence of non-committee contributions to the Department, College, and/or University
3. Evidence of service contributions related to the discipline outside of Northeastern University

APPENDIX C, Research/Scholarship: Supporting Materials (if relevant)
1. Copies of publications, including articles, proceedings, books, book chapters, abstracts, etc. (indicate status of work in progress)
2. Grant activity, external and internal: identify the proposal title, status and whether funded or not; if funded, provide a summary of the grant which includes the funding source, the amount awarded, and the dates of the award.