

**Preparation and Format  
of the  
Tenure and Promotion Dossier**

**March 2009  
Office of the Provost**

Changes to 2008 document:

- New guidelines for preparation of dossiers electronically in Section 3.2
- Updating to reflect new TRACE evaluation form
- Inclusion of evaluative communications from all solicited referees
- Tenure Clock Extension Policy reference in model solicitation letter
- Minor editorial changes throughout document.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

### **1.0 PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT**

### **2.0 PROCEDURES PRIOR TO SUBMISSION OF DOSSIER**

- 2.1 Promotion Advisement
- 2.2 External Referees
- 2.3 University-wide guidelines for tenure and promotion dossiers
- 2.4 Solicitation Letter

### **3.0 ROLE OF CANDIDATE IN DOSSIER PREPARATION**

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

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

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

### **Model documents to be used for reference in the Dossier preparation**

- Model A:** Model Promotion Advisement Letter
- Model B:** Model Recommendation Request Letter
- Model C.1:** Faculty Summary Sheet: Tenure and Promotion or Tenure Only
- Model C.2:** Faculty Promotion Summary Sheet: Promotion Only
- Model D.1:** TCEP/TRACE Summary Sheets
- Model E:** Dossier Checklist

## **1.0 PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT**

This document provides guidance in the preparation of the tenure and promotion dossier to the tenure candidate and to tenure review committees.

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

Section 2.0 Procedures Prior to Submission of Dossier

Section 3.0 Role of Candidate in Dossier Preparation

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

## **2.0 PROCEDURES PRIOR TO SUBMISSION OF DOSSIER**

**2.1 Tenure & Promotion Advisement** – At the beginning of the calendar year preceding tenure consideration, the College Dean must notify any appropriate candidates of eligibility for tenure and/or promotion during the next academic year (Model A). Within two weeks of notification, the candidate must notify the Department/Dean of intent (a) to be considered for tenure and/or promotion, and (b) to initiate the tenure and/or promotion review process.

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

### **2.3 University-wide guidelines for the Selection of External Referees**

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

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

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

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

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

All letters solicited and received from approved external referees must be included in the dossier.

In addition, all written communications (including emails) from solicited external referees that offer any reflection, positive or negative, on the candidate's qualifications for tenure 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.

### **3.0 ROLE OF CANDIDATE IN DOSSIER PREPARATION**

#### **3.1 About the Dossier**

The candidate's dossier is due to the unit tenure committee on September 15 of the year of tenure consideration.

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

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

#### **3.2 Dossier Preparation Format and Guidelines**

The Provost's Office requests that dossiers be submitted electronically, in order to expedite review at all levels and eliminate the costs and waste associated with submitting multiple paper copies. Supplemental materials included in the dossier's appendices (including raw teaching evaluations, books, other publications, creative materials, and so on) may be submitted in hard copy or electronically.

Your department or college will compile electronically the materials required for Sections A (Faculty Summary Sheet), B (Recommendations) and C (External Letters). You will provide complete materials for all other sections of the dossier. Sections D (Curriculum Vitae), E (Candidate's Statements), F (Performance reviews) and G (Comprehensive List of Supporting Materials) must be submitted electronically. If you are submitting your supplemental materials in hardcopy, please also provide a hard copy of Section G at the head of the supplemental materials to assist your dossier's readers.

Your dossier must include: copies of all peer reviews of teaching, each year's annual (including third-year) and merit reviews; grant summaries; leaves of absence and special appointment letters (include with Faculty Summary Sheet); and all other items identified in the Dossier Checklist. You should make copies of any supplementary materials that you believe you may need in the future – dossiers 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.

Written materials that you prepare for the electronic dossier, such as your curriculum vitae, should be formatted in 12-point font, with a 1” minimum margin. Some required materials, such as previous performance reviews or copies of published papers, may need to be scanned for inclusion in the dossier. The sections of the dossier for which you are responsible—Sections D-G—should be submitted to your department or college for review as a single pdf file 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.
- Each major section of the dossier should be preceded by a full title page (e.g., **D: Dossier Curriculum Vitae**). This will help readers navigate through the dossier easily and will serve to set off sections of scanned material. In addition, please be sure that each subsection of the major sections of the dossier (e.g., the statements on teaching, scholarship, and service in Section E) begins on a new page and is clearly labeled.

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

### **3.3 Dossier Organization and Checklist**

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

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

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

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

### **APPENDICES**

Appendix A – Teaching: Supporting Documents

Appendix B – Research/Scholarship: Supporting Documents

Appendix C – Service and Professional Development Activities: Supporting Documents

### 3.4 DOSSIER CONTENTS

#### Dossier Section D – Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae

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

#### Education/Employment History

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

#### Scholarship/Research

- **Publications** - Publications should be listed in separate categories by date of publication within the following categories:
  - Refereed articles
  - Non-refereed articles
  - Books
  - Book chapters
  - Abstracts
  - Other

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

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

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

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

- Performance
- Exhibition

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

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

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

### Grants

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

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

### Teaching and Advising

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

### Service and Professional Development

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

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

## **Dossier Section E – Candidate’s Statements and Supporting Evidence**

### Statement on Teaching

You should begin with a statement of your teaching philosophy. You should identify courses taught and discuss your involvement in curriculum development, supervision of graduate and undergraduate students, and advising. You should also discuss other indicators of your commitment to teaching, such as development of pedagogical tools or interactive pedagogical methods, and should describe actions you have taken to incorporate appropriate shared goals—e.g., goals of the major discipline and/or the NU or College Cores. Your statement should describe your efforts to integrate classroom-based and experiential education and any other involvement with co-op or other type of experiential education.

You should 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. A summary table of student evaluations is required. If your dossier includes student comments, you should address how they were obtained and whether they are representative.

Please include as supporting evidence of teaching the TCEP/TRACE Summary Sheet (below); a grade distribution summary sheet from each course (below), which includes a comparison of your grade distributions with the same course taught by other faculty (if available from your department); and one sample course syllabus and class materials from that course.

TCEP/TRACE SUMMARY SHEET (See Model D): Your teaching load 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. Please use the table in Model D as the format for presenting this information.

If your unit administers student evaluations in addition to the TCEP/TRACE instrument, you should include these additional teaching evaluation results in the Supporting Documents on Teaching.

### Statement on Research/Scholarship

You should begin with a statement of the focus of your research and scholarship. You should explain the research questions that you have identified, the funding you have received to support the research (if applicable), the directions your research has taken, the venues in which your

research, scholarship, or creative work has been disseminated, and indications of its impact on your disciplinary community. You should include a discussion of any research you have undertaken with students and with the external community. Finally, you should discuss the research questions that you expect to address in the future. Please include as supporting evidence of research/scholarship/creative activity one sample publication (or equivalent evidence in your discipline) representative of your work.

### Statement on Service

You should address the three areas of service, as applicable: service to the institution, service to the discipline/profession, and academically grounded service to the community/public. You should begin with a statement of your service philosophy and identify the areas in which you have made strong contributions. You should then discuss service undertaken in each of the three areas, focusing on leadership positions held and special projects completed. Please provide an example of evidence of work for which you were primarily responsible in a service area.

### **Dossier Section F – Performance Reviews**

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

### **Dossier Section G – Comprehensive List of Contents for appendices a, b, and c.**

This section contains the final documents in your dossier binder.

**3.5 SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS** – The Appendices to the dossier include all additional evidence and supporting materials you wish to present regarding your accomplishments in teaching, research and scholarship, and service. You may include references to these materials in your dossier. The supporting documents should be included in a binder or electronic file separate from Sections A – G.

### **APPENDIX A. TEACHING: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

- Full reports of TCEPs/TRACE evaluations must be included for all sections of all courses taught. The *Faculty Handbook* mandates that tenure-track faculty members be evaluated each year using at least one other form of teaching evaluation in addition to the TCEP/TRACE evaluations. These additional forms of teaching evaluation need not be the same for each year on the tenure track, and may include peer classroom evaluations; a teaching portfolio; a comprehensive presentation of classroom materials, including syllabi, examinations, assignments, etc. Multiple-year peer classroom evaluations are particularly helpful. We strongly discourage using department (or equivalent unit) quantitative student evaluations as the only additional form of teaching evaluation. In whatever format the additional teaching evaluations are conducted, the full record of those teaching evaluations must be included in the dossier's supporting documentation
- Advising Activity
- Sample Syllabi

- Sample Teaching Materials– Possible materials include copies of exams, evaluation methods, excerpts of class presentations, materials from new courses you have developed, and samples of student work.
- Other – Other evidence of exemplary teaching (e.g. teaching awards, student letters, etc.).

#### **APPENDIX B. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

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

#### **APPENDIX C. SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (Appendix C)**

Materials that support substantive service and professional development activities should be included here.

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

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

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

This section must clearly identify early tenure candidates.

#### **4.2 DOSSIER SECTION B – RECOMMENDATIONS**

##### **Dean's Recommendation**

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

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

##### **College Advisory Committee (where applicable)**

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

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

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

### **Department/School Committee Report (where applicable)**

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

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

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

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

### **Chairperson’s Report (where applicable)**

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

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

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

consideration.

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

## **4.3 DOSSIER SECTION C – EXTERNAL REVIEWS**

### **External Referees**

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

### **Cover Memorandum – Selecting Reviewers**

The letters section must include a cover memo indicating which reviewers came from the candidate's list and which from the unit's list. A short biography listing the reviewer's major accomplishments in the field, evaluating the standing of the reviewer's institution or department within the discipline, and providing any other information needed for understanding why the reviewer was chosen must be supplied for each external reviewer.

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

### **Copy of Solicitation Letter**

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

### **External Reviewer Letters**

All letters solicited must be included in the dossier.

## Model A

### MODEL TENURE ADVISEMENT LETTER

Date

Professor Untenured  
Department/College of \_\_\_\_\_  
Northeastern University

Dear Professor Untenured:

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

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

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

In order to ensure a smooth start to the tenure review process, please confirm that you wish to be considered for tenure, by signing a copy of this letter where indicated below and returning it to me no later than February 1. If for any reason you do not wish to be considered for tenure, please advise me promptly. If you choose not to be considered for tenure, you will receive a terminal appointment for the 200\_ - 200\_ academic year.

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

Sincerely,

Dean

I wish to be considered for tenure in the Department/College of \_\_\_\_\_ during the 200\_ - 200\_ academic year. I have reviewed this letter, the department/school/college procedures regarding tenure and promotion, and the University guidelines regarding tenure and promotion in the Faculty Handbook. I understand the policies and procedures outlined in these materials, and I am aware that they will apply during my upcoming tenure consideration.

---

Professor Untenured

---

Date

## Model B

### MODEL REQUEST LETTER FOR EXTERNAL TENURE REVIEWERS

Date

Professor Eminent  
Department of Holistic Studies  
Prestigious University

Dear Professor Eminent:

Dr. Tenure-Track, currently <an assistant professor without tenure; an assistant professor with tenure; an associate professor without tenure; an associate professor with tenure> is being considered for (tenure and/or promotion to the rank of \_\_\_\_\_) at Northeastern University. In evaluating (tenure and/or promotion) of a candidate, University decision-makers consider the judgments of nationally and internationally known leaders in the candidate's field. We would appreciate your assistance in providing us with a candid confidential evaluation of Dr. Tenure-Track's scholarly work. Northeastern University depends upon evaluations from scholars such as you to assure that tenure and promotion decisions are made fairly on the merits of the case.

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

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

Please evaluate Dr. Tenure-Track's qualifications for (tenure and/or promotion) with respect to the following criteria:

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

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

Your letter will be considered confidential, available only to those involved in the tenure and promotion decision-making process. However, as a result of the Supreme Court decision in

University of Pennsylvania v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (1990), our administration has requested that we convey the following information:

In responding to this request for evaluation, please bear in mind the recent Supreme Court decision which allowed the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission access to otherwise confidential tenure evaluations in areas where discrimination was alleged. Except in the context of an EEOC request for access, it is Northeastern University's policy to maintain the confidentiality of evaluations.

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

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

Sincerely,

Professor and Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee

(Enclosures)

INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING IF THE TENURE CLOCK HAS BEEN EXTENDED:

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

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

**FACULTY SUMMARY SHEET: TENURE AND PROMOTION OR TENURE ONLY**

**Name:**

**Date:**

**Department:**

**Highest Degree:**

**Present Rank:**

**Year Degree Earned:**

**Date of Employment:**

**Where Degree Earned:**

**Lateral Entry Credit:**

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

**Years on Tenure Track at NU:**

**Special Conditions of Employment:**

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

**Third Year Review:**

**Department Committee Recommendation:**

**School Committee Recommendation** (if applicable):

**College Committee Recommendation:**

**Dean's Recommendation:**

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

**FACULTY SUMMARY SHEET: PROMOTION ONLY**

**Name:**

**Date:**

**Department:**

**Highest Degree:**

**Present Rank:**

**Year Degree Earned:**

**Date of Employment:**

**Where Degree Earned:**

**Lateral Entry Credit:**

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

**Years on Tenure Track at NU**  
**Or Date Tenure Received at NU:**

**Department Committee Recommendation:**

**School Committee Recommendation** (if applicable):

**College Committee Recommendation:**

**Dean's Recommendation:**



**DOSSIER CHECKLIST**

**Included**

- \_\_\_\_\_ **A. Faculty Summary Sheet** (Model C) – provided and prepared by the Dean’s Office
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ **B. Recommendations**
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Dean’s recommendation (College and School, as applicable)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2. College Advisory Committee report
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Department Committee report
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Chairperson or academic unit head’s written evaluation
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Candidate’s response to any of these recommendations
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ **C. External Reviews**
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Cover memorandum – selecting reviewers
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Copy of letter soliciting outside referees
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Reference letters followed by reviewer’s curriculum vitae
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ **D. Candidate’s Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae**
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ **E. Candidate’s Statements and Supporting Evidence**
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Teaching (including TCEP Summary Sheet)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Research and Scholarship
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Service
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ **F. Performance Reviews**
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Annual reviews
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Merit reviews
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Third-year reviews
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ **G. Comprehensive list of Supporting Materials**

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A -- Teaching: Supporting Documents

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Teaching evaluations (TCEPs, TRACE evaluations, other departmental evaluations)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Advising Activity
  - undergraduate
  - graduate
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Sample syllabi
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Sample teaching materials
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Other

### Appendix B -- Research/Scholarship: Supporting Documents

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Copies of publications, including articles (indicating whether refereed or non-refereed), proceedings, books, book chapters, abstracts (indicate status of work in progress)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Grant activity, external and internal: identify the proposal title, status and whether successful; and provide a summary of the grant which includes the funding source, the amount awarded, and the dates of the award.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Supporting materials: books, reviews, newspaper citations, and other citations of scholarship.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Co-author letters: attesting to extent of candidate's contribution to research and writing (in fields where co-authoring is atypical).
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Recommendation for publication
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Other letters of support
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Research awards and honors

### Appendix C -- Service and Professional Development Activities: Supporting Documents

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