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INTRODUCTION

This document provides guidance in the preparation of the promotion dossier unique to the position of full-time Lecturer 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 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 procedures relevant to promotion decisions for lecturers and to outline the materials and organization for the candidate’s dossier for promotion. It is expected that lecturers will serve a minimum of three years in rank before seeking promotion to senior lecturer. This means that the process could start in the spring of the third year of service with the dossier being submitted for consideration of promotion in the fall of the candidate’s fourth year of service. Likewise, senior lecturers must serve a minimum of three years in rank before seeking promotion to principal lecturer. In January each year, the College will contact the departments/programs and ask if there is a lecturer whom the Program/Department is putting forward for consideration of promotion in the fall of the year. Given the number of Lecturers on the faculty who have served for varying periods of time in rank, in the initial few years following the creation of ranks in the Lecturer track (2013), the College will temporarily limit the number of Lecturers who can be considered for promotion in any one year to a maximum of 25% of the full-time Lecturers in the College as a whole.

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 make the case for outstanding teaching. The teaching statement should be brief. Because internal 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 2013). 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 lecturer'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 lecturer rank to the next lecturer 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).

While the initial promotion recommendation is made at the Program/Department level, the promotion 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 lecturer’s current level. Nor shall a negative decision preclude consideration for promotion at a subsequent date.
Lecturers who are not put forward by their Chairs/Program Directors can submit an appeal to the Dean’s Office by the end of January after the candidate learns whether the Chair/Program Director is going to recommend going forward for promotion. 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 lecturer from consideration at a future date. Lecturers who are not put forward by their Chairs/Program Directors can submit an appeal to the Dean’s Office.

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. 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. Details and guidelines for each step in the process are further described later in the document.

January
The Dean’s Office contacts Department Chairs and Program Directors to find out if there are any lecturers 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.

March
The Chair should ask the candidate to identify a list of potential reviewers, internal to the University but external to the Program/Department.

March-April
The Chair, together with the Program/Department Review Committee identify the set of internal “at-arm’s-length” reviewers who will review the mini-dossier. The list of reviewers should be sent to the Dean’s Office for review and approval by the Dean of the College and the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs.

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 Teaching Statement and the supplemental materials such as Teaching Portfolios. 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 lecturer’s role.

Early May
Chairs/Program Directors should begin the internal review process and soliciting the internal reviews. The Chair/Program Director should e-mail or mail copies of the mini-dossier together with an appropriately modified version of the model internal reviewer request letter to the list of internal reviewers identified by the Chair in consultation with the Program/Department and approved by the College.

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 Lecturer Promotion Dossier” document (this document).

August
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.

Late-August
The Chair/Program Director should check on the progress of the internal reviewers to ensure that by mid-September, the Program/Department will have a sufficient number of
letters of evaluation (at least three) from individuals inside the University but outside the Program/Department. 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.

September 1  Candidate’s dossier including Chair/Program Director’s letter, internal 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 lecturer 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 following academic year.

2.0 PROCEDURES PRIOR TO SUBMISSION OF THE DOSSIER

2.1 Promotion Advisement
   In January, the College will contact the Department Chair/Program Director to ascertain the names of those lecturers 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 decides to put the candidate forward for consideration of promotion, then the Chair/Director should notify the College in writing via email within two weeks, following the College’s initial request of names from the Program/Department.

   Given the number of Lecturers on the faculty who have served for varying periods of time in rank, in the initial few years following the creation of ranks in the Lecturer track (2013), the College will temporarily limit the number of Lecturers who can be considered for promotion in any one year to a maximum of 25% of the full-time Lecturers in the College as a whole.

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 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 Reviews
   Each candidate up for promotion must be reviewed by referees, who are internal to the University but external to the candidate’s Program/Department. 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 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 three letters. Letters must be obtained in support of the promotion of lecturers from internal to the university but external to the Program/Department. Reviews should 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 lecturer. 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 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. The final approved list of reviewers should be sent to the Dean’s Office for review and approval by the Dean of the College and the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs.

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, in early spring, working with their Chair/Program Director, should put together a mini-dossier that will be sent to the reviewers over the summer; 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 two documents that are also required in the final dossier: the candidate’s curriculum vitae and teaching statement. The mini-dossier should also contain supplemental materials that highlight the candidate’s accomplishments in teaching. 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, student and peer evaluations and sample instructional materials.

The candidate should keep in mind that the mini-dossier is meant to be representative of the lecturer’s work and the length should be quite limited (around 25 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 internal 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 referees.

Reviewers should be supplied with the candidate’s job description, the candidate’s mini-dossier, and any other appropriate materials. Reviewers should be asked to provide a succinct biosketch that outlines their academic background and professional accomplishments.

All letters solicited and received from approved referees must be included in the dossier. In addition, all written communications (including emails) from solicited internal 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. Referees should be informed, when their evaluations are solicited, that ALL such communications will be included in the candidate’s dossier.

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 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 a Lecturer. Please keep in mind that the Program/Department Review Committee will solicit internal 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 (Internal Letters). You will provide complete materials for all other sections of the dossier. Sections D (Curriculum Vitae), E (Candidate’s Statement), F (Performance reviews) and G (Comprehensive List of Supporting Materials) must be submitted electronically. If you are submitting your supplemental materials in hardcopy (this practice is strongly discouraged), 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; dossier 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.

Candidates should consult with their Chair/Program Director/Associate Dean with respect to the length of their submissions. Shorter is always better.

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 section on teaching 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 2013). 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 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:
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Section A. Faculty Summary Sheet (Model C) – prepared by the Dean’s Office
Section B. Recommendations – added by the relevant reviewer (Chair or Program Director) or committee
Section C. Internal 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
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 – Professional Development Activities: Supporting Materials

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.

Professional Development (if relevant)
List all significant professional development activities. The dates/time ranges for each activity should be provided.

4.2 Section E – Candidate’s Statements and Supporting Evidence
The candidate’s Statement regarding Teaching must be included in the dossier, along with summary supporting evidence (full supporting evidence should be included in the Appendices). The Department Chair/Program Director and the Program/Department Review Committee should work with the candidate in determining which 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. 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.

Since promotion for a lecturer is based on the lecturer’s ability to provide high quality instruction, it is critical that the candidate address any poor or mediocre teaching evaluations and any other inconsistencies in the instructional record in your teaching statement. 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 TCEP/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 have taught during the period you have served at your present rank. 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.

4.3 Section F – Performance Reviews

All previous performance reviews (annual reviews, merit reviews, etc.) must be included in your dossier. These reviews should provide a through 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. Please do not use the Appendix as a dumping ground for course handouts, 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.
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.
- **Qualitative/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.
- **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 solicit 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 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, Professional Development: Supporting Materials (if relevant)**
Appendix B will include all supporting documents for your professional development activities.

**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.

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 Lecturer promotion dossier.

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 the candidate’s teaching, and indicate why the candidate does or does not meet the established promotion criteria. Each report will discuss and evaluate internal reviews, 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.

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 – Internal 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 standing in the department or program, and providing any other information needed for understanding why the reviewer was chosen must be supplied for each internal reviewer. Supporting letters from Northeastern colleagues may be included by the candidate in the dossier’s supplemental materials in teaching. 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 internal referees must follow the list of internal referees.

5.3.3 Internal 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 Lecturer Promotion dossier. The following models are included:
Model A: Model Promotion Advisement Letter
Model B: Model Request Letter for Internal 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 Senior/Principal Lecturer during the 2014-2015 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 Lecturer.

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

Regards,
Date

Address

Dear Dr. _____:

Dr. [SURNAME] is currently a Lecturer in the [DEPARTMENT or PROGRAM'S NAME] at Northeastern University. He/She is being considered for promotion to the rank of Senior/Principal Lecturer (I'm attaching his/her CV and a mini-dossier). Lecturers are renewable non-tenure track faculty positions that have an associated promotion track focused on teaching. Dr. [SURNAME]'s teaching load consists of a maximum of six courses per year. In evaluating candidates for promotion in Lecturer positions, Northeastern considers the judgments of professionals inside 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. [SURNAME]'s contributions to the [DEPARTMENT or PROGRAM’S NAME] in the area of teaching and curricular development. Our understanding is that you've worked with Dr. [SURNAME] 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-paragraph) biosketch (again, in PDF format) for the benefit of those reviewers who will review Dr. [SURNAME]’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. [SURNAME] in this timeframe, please contact me as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

[NAME]
[TITLE]
Northeastern University
MODEL C
FACULTY SUMMARY SHEET: LECTURER 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 Lecturer Rank: 
Current Visa Status:
(if not U.S. Citizen)

Program/Department Review Committee Recommendation:

Department Chair/Program Director Recommendation:

Dean’s Recommendation:
### Model D

**TCEP AND TRACE SUMMARY SHEET**

<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>Comparison 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>
<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 Reviews (added by Program/Department Review Committee)
  1. Cover Memorandum – selecting reviewers
  2. Copy of letter soliciting referees
  3. Reference letters followed by reviewer’s biosketch

SECTION D. Candidate’s Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vita

SECTION E. Candidate’s Statement and Summary Supporting Evidence
  1. Teaching (the TCEP and TRACE Summary Sheet must be included)

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, Professional Development: Supporting Materials (if relevant)