

# **Preparation and Format of Full-Time Non Tenure-Track Research Faculty Promotion Dossiers**

July 1, 2025

Office of the Provost

## Revisions:

- Updates to clarify and to remove redundancies and outdated instruction.
- Review process for institute-appointed faculty

## Table of Contents

1.0	Purpose of Document.....	2
2.0	Eligibility for Promotion Consideration .....	2
3.0	Role of Candidate in Dossier Preparation.....	2
3.1	About the Dossier .....	2
3.2	Dossier Preparation Format and Guidelines .....	2
3.3	Dossier Organization and Checklist.....	3
3.4	Detailed Instructions for Dossier Sections D, E, F, and G .....	4
	Dossier Section D – Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae .....	4
	Dossier Section E – Candidate’s Statements and Supporting Evidence.....	6
	Dossier Section F – Annual Performance Reviews .....	6
	Dossier Section G – Comprehensive List of Contents for Appendices A and B.....	6
3.5	Dossier Appendices .....	6
	Appendix A. Research/Scholarship and Professional Development: Supporting Materials .	7
	Appendix B. Service: Supporting Materials .....	7
4.0	Role of Department/College and Evaluation Committees in Dossier Preparation .....	7
4.1	Dossier Section A – Faculty Summary Sheet .....	7
4.2	Dossier Section B – Internal Recommendations .....	7
4.3	Dossier Section C – External Reviewers and Collaborators (where applicable).....	9
4.5	Submission of Completed Dossiers to the Provost .....	10
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Activities Involving Community Building (Optional) .....</b>	<b>10</b>
	Model A: Summary Sheet.....	11
	Model B.1: Model Request Letter .....	12
	Model B.2: Model Request Letter .....	14
	Model C: Dossier Checklist .....	15
	Model D: Appendices Checklist .....	16
	ADDENDUM .....	17

## **1.0 Purpose of Document**

This document provides procedural guidance in the preparation of dossiers for promotion consideration of full-time, non tenure-track research faculty members. Other FTNTT faculty titles should reference the respective document specific to them at

<https://provost.northeastern.edu/faculty-affairs/>.

(See drop-down menu for “Faculty Tenure and Promotion”.)

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 include:

Section 2.0 Eligibility for Promotion Consideration

Section 3.0 Role of Candidate in Dossier Preparation

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

Section 5.0 Activities Involving Community Building (Optional)

## **2.0 Eligibility for Promotion Consideration**

Full-time, non tenure-track research faculty members become eligible for promotion consideration as provided in the [Faculty Handbook](#), following not less than three years in their rank. Potential promotion candidates are strongly encouraged to consult regularly with their unit heads (e.g., department chairs, institute directors) and their dean and associate dean concerning their progress towards promotion. Institute-appointed research faculty should initiate the discussion on promotion with both their institute director(s) and the chair of the department or college administrator / associate dean of secondary appointment. Due dates for faculty to request promotion consideration and for units to submit promotion dossiers to the college are established by units and colleges as needed in order to meet the February 15 deadline for submission of all promotion dossiers to the Office of the Provost. The candidate’s electronic dossier submission is due October 1.

## **3.0 Role of Candidate in Dossier Preparation**

### **3.1 About the Dossier**

The dossier is your opportunity to make your 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 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 institute/department/college will solicit any external evaluations required under unit procedures; thus, except where allowed for specific reasons, 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 document 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 through Interfolio, which is available directly through [interfolio.com](https://interfolio.com) website. Interfolio is a software platform that

facilitates electronic submission and review. (After navigating to [interfolio.com](http://interfolio.com), click on the “login” hyperlink in the top menu to access the sign-in screen. Then click on the “Sign in with Partner Institution” button at the right. Search for “Northeastern” to select Northeastern University and click on the “Sign In” button to login with your NU credentials with secure single sign-on (SSO)). Your department or college will compile electronically the materials required for Sections A through C. You will provide complete materials for all other sections of the dossier that are identified in the Dossier Checklist (Model C). Sections D (Curriculum Vitae), E (Candidate’s Statements and Supportive Evidence), F (Annual Performance Reviews) and G (Comprehensive List of Supporting Materials) must be submitted electronically. Supporting materials included in the dossier’s appendices (e.g., publications and so on) should also be submitted electronically through Interfolio.

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

**The total length of the dossier, including unit and college recommendations, should not exceed 100 pages.** Candidates should consult with their institute directors, chairs and/or deans with respect to the length of their submissions. **As a general guideline, candidates should aim at submitting no more than 60 pages in total for sections D, E, F and G of the dossier.**

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 annual merit reviews, may need to be scanned for inclusion in the dossier.

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

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

Please use the dossier checklist (Model C, p.15) as you compile materials to be included in your promotion dossier. (The checklist itself 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:

**Section A. Faculty Summary Sheet (Model A)** – prepared by the Dean’s Office

**Section B. Recommendations** – added by different review committees & recommenders

**Section C. External Evaluations (if required)** – added by the promotion review committee

You will prepare and present all the following sections for review:

**Section D. Candidate’s Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae**

**Section E. Candidate’s Statements**

- a. Statement on Research/Scholarship and Professional Development

b. Statement on Service

**Section F. Annual Performance Reviews**

**Section G. Comprehensive List of Supporting Materials**

You will prepare and present all appendices materials for review:

Appendix A – Research/Scholarship/Professional Development Supporting Materials

Appendix B – Service Supporting Materials

**3.4 Detailed Instructions for Dossier Sections D, E, F, and G**

**Dossier Section D – Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae**

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

Grants (list grants as follows)

1. Active, external
2. Completed, external (since hired or last promotion)
3. Pending, external
4. Proposals submitted but not funded, external (since hired or last promotion)
5. Active, internal
6. Completed, internal (since hired or last promotion)

For each active and completed grant, please provide:

Title of project (and of your subcontract if relevant), project dates, funding agency, your role, all PIs or Co-PIs, direct costs awarded to you and the time period for those costs.

For each proposal (pending or not funded), please provide:

Title of project (and of your subcontract if relevant), proposed project dates, awarding entity, your role, all PI's or Co-PI's, total direct cost requested.

Scholarship

*Publications* – Publications should be listed in separate categories by date of publication within the following categories (arranged in order of importance in your discipline):

1. Refereed articles including proceedings and reviews
2. Non-refereed articles including reviews and commentary

3. Books
4. Book chapters
5. Abstracts
6. 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. Papers submitted to an e-print archive such as arXiv should be identified as such and included. 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 institute/department (or equivalent unit) committee chairperson. The institute/department (or equivalent unit) may then consider the work “in press” and update the dossier accordingly.

Where co-authoring is common in your field, it may be helpful to indicate that in your statement on research/scholarship. Be sure to indicate publications that are co-authored with graduate and undergraduate students. Edited volumes should be clearly identified as such.

*Other Scholarly Activity* – Achievements should be listed by date within the following categories:

1. Invited presentations where you were the speaker (conferences, symposia, workshops, institutions, industry). Provide title or topic, venue, and date.
2. Other research presentations that included a printed or electronic abstract. Provide title, venue, and date.

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

*Professional Development* – Please list any significant professional development activities that have contributed to your growth as a researcher and scholar.

### Service

Please list all significant service assignments and activities, in separate categories by date.

1. Service to the Institution
  - a. Department service
  - b. School service
  - c. College service
  - d. University service
2. Service to the Discipline/Profession
3. Service to the Community/Public

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

### **Statement on Research/Scholarship and Professional Development**

You should state 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 work and the directions it has taken, the venues in which your research and scholarship have been disseminated, and provide indications of its impact on your academic community and, if applicable, in arenas outside the academy. You should also discuss the research questions that you expect to address in the future. Candidates for promotion to research professor should focus primarily on research and scholarship since the award of last promotion. Finally, you should include in your statement significant professional development activities that have contributed to your growth as a researcher and scholar.

All supporting evidence for research/scholarship and professional development should be included in Appendix A.

### **Statement on Service**

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

All supporting evidence for service should be included in Appendix B.

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

Candidates for their first promotion at Northeastern must include all previous annual performance reviews (merit reviews) at Northeastern in the dossier.

Candidates for their second promotion who are five or fewer years beyond the first promotion must include all their post-promotion annual performance reviews in the promotion dossier. Candidates for their second promotion who are more than five years beyond the first promotion must include performance reviews from at least the most recent five years.

## **Dossier Section G – Comprehensive List of Contents for Appendices A and B.**

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

### **3.5 Dossier Appendices**

The appendices to the dossier include all additional evidence and supporting materials you wish to present regarding your accomplishments in research/scholarship, professional development

and service. You may include references to these materials in your dossier. The appendices should be compiled in electronic files separate from Sections A-G of your dossier. Be reasonable and judicious with what you include in appendices in addition to required materials.

Note that maximum upload file size is 100MB. If your appendix exceeds 100MB, divide into smaller files and name accordingly (Appendix A1, Appendix A2, etc.). Model D (p.16) provides a checklist for all appendices.

#### **Appendix A. Research/Scholarship and Professional Development: Supporting Materials**

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

#### **Appendix B. Service: Supporting Materials**

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

### **4.0 Role of Department/College and Evaluation Committees in Dossier Preparation**

The institute, department and college will add sections A, B, and C to the electronic dossier. To ensure confidentiality, the college should transmit the electronic dossier after completion from the Dean's Office to the Office of the Provost through the Interfolio software platform. The dossier and appendices checklists (Model C and D, respectively) need not be included in the dossier.

#### **4.1 Dossier Section A – Faculty Summary Sheet**

The Faculty Summary Sheet will be provided and completed by the Dean's Office. See Model A for the template.

#### **4.2 Dossier Section B – Internal Recommendations**

The suggested length for recommendations/reports is 3 pages. As specified in the [\*Faculty Handbook\*](#) "Promotion" module, at each successive level of review within the college, the candidate will be provided with the detailed evaluation / recommendation relative to the promotion criteria. The candidate will have ten calendar days to respond to each of these evaluations in writing, before the case can move to the next step. A response is optional. While the candidate's response cannot prompt revisions to an evaluation, it may address minor errors or factual inaccuracies.

*Please note: All internal recommendations should be uploaded to the "Internal Documents" section of the Interfolio software platform.*

#### **Chair's Report (where applicable)**

The chair's report 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 and should indicate



why the candidate does or does not meet the performance criteria appropriate to his or her responsibilities. The report should discuss and evaluate any extra-departmental evaluations solicited, address any issues the evaluations raise and discuss any conflicts among evaluators. All references to outside evaluations should preserve the anonymity of the evaluators.

#### Institute Director's Report (where applicable)

The Director's report 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 and should indicate why the candidate does or does not meet the performance criteria appropriate to his or her responsibilities. The report should discuss and evaluate any extra-institute or relevant departmental evaluations solicited, address any issues the evaluations raise and discuss any conflicts among evaluators. All references to outside evaluations should preserve the anonymity of the evaluators.

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

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

The department committee report should assess the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate based on the evidence in the dossier. It should be evaluative – opinions backed by information. It should discuss all aspects of the candidate's work and should indicate why the candidate does or does not meet the performance criteria appropriate to their responsibilities. The report should discuss and evaluate any extra-departmental evaluations solicited by the unit. If the dossier contains conflicting evaluations, the report should discuss and evaluate/resolve the issues raised. References to outside evaluators' comments and evaluations should preserve the anonymity of the reviewers.

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 may consider recusing him/herself from the review.

#### College Advisory Committee (where applicable)

The report should assess the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate based on 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 and should indicate why the candidate does or does not meet the performance criteria appropriate to their responsibilities. If the dossier contains conflicting evaluations, the report should discuss and evaluate/resolve the issues raised.

#### Dean's Recommendation

The dean's recommendation should provide an 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. They should assess all aspects of the faculty member's activities in light of the

faculty member's specific responsibilities and contributions to the college.

#### **4.3 Dossier Section C – External Reviewers and Collaborators (where applicable)**

For some academic units, evaluation letters from external reviewers may be required. The selection of the reviewers or any other extra-departmental evaluations solicited by the unit must follow the guidelines established in the academic unit according to its bylaws and procedures. Letters from collaborators that address contributions to projects may optionally be included.

*Please note: All materials detailed below should be uploaded to the “External Documents” section of the Interfolio software program by the department.*

##### **External Evaluators**

Promotion committees may seek letters of evaluation for promotion candidates from outside the university, according to the bylaws and procedures of the unit. Per the model request letter (Model B.1), external reviewers are provided with the candidate's curriculum vitae, several publications and a research statement, along with the college promotion procedures.

##### *Copy of Solicitation Letter*

A copy of the letter used to solicit external evaluations must follow the list of external evaluators. See Model B.1.

##### *External Evaluation Letters*

All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier.

##### **Collaborators (Optional)**

Promotion committees may seek letters of support from collaborators recommended by the candidate, who may submit the names of up to three collaborators to the promotion committee. Collaborators are defined as any individual from outside the university, with whom the candidate has worked in a professional capacity. This may include collaborators in research, scholarship, creative activity, service, or leadership. A collaborator may have any rank or title. Per the model request letter (Model B.2), collaborators are provided with the candidate's curriculum vitae, several publications and a research statement.

##### *Copy of Solicitation Letter*

A copy of the letter used to solicit external evaluations must follow the list of external evaluators. See Model B.2.

##### *Collaborator Letters*

All letters solicited must be included in the dossier.

## **Exclusion of Unsolicited Materials**

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

### **4.5 Submission of Completed Dossiers to the Provost**

With the inclusion of all external reviews, internal recommendations, and any responses made by the candidate, the promotion dossier is complete. To ensure confidentiality, the college should transmit the electronic dossier from the Dean's Office to the Office of the Provost through the Interfolio software platform. As specified by the [Faculty Handbook](#), the Provost reviews the dossier and in consultation with the President, will decide whether to recommend the candidate for promotion. Currently, the Provost or delegate also engages an advisory committee to provide additional perspectives in evaluating promotion dossiers.

### **5.0 Activities Involving Community Building (Optional)**

Candidates could consider adding to any of their statements (teaching, research and / or service) descriptions of activities that are related to belonging or community building or that foster new collaborations across academic disciplines for cross-disciplinary work. The following examples are offered to guide candidates in reflecting on their accomplishments and contributions.

*Please note that this list (below) is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive.*

Teaching and student engagement:

- Efforts to recruit and enroll students from all backgrounds.
- Pedagogy that discusses issues of belonging and building community, or complex issues from the perspective of multiple disciplines, in the classroom.

Research, scholarly or creative activity:

- Research/scholarship centered on issues related to belonging and community building.
- Recruitment of representative groups into research studies, research teams or creative activity.
- Participation in Northeastern-supported interdisciplinary research platforms or institutes.

Service to the university and to the profession:

- Participation in community efforts in the department and college and university.
- Engagement in recruitment strategies that provide a welcoming community.
- Involvement with unit or university activities to promote a welcoming environment.

**Model A: Summary Sheet**  
**Provided and Prepared by the Dean's Office**

**FULL-TIME NON TENURE-TRACK RESEARCH FACULTY SUMMARY SHEET:  
PROMOTION ONLY**

**Name:**

**Date:**

**Primary Appointment:**  
(Department or Institute)

**Highest Degree:**

**Secondary Appointment:**  
(if applicable, Department)

**Year Degree Earned:**

**Present Rank:**

**Where Degree Earned:**

**Date of Employment:**

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

**Date of previous promotion at Northeastern (if applicable):**

**Department Committee Recommendation and tally of vote:**

**School Committee Recommendation and tally of vote (if applicable):**

**College Committee Recommendation and tally of vote:**

**Dean's Recommendation:**

## Model B.1: Model Request Letter

### MODEL REQUEST LETTER FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW LETTERS

DATE

Professor Eminent  
Department of Holistic Studies  
Prestigious University

Dear Professor Eminent:

Dr. [CANDIDATE], currently a <research assistant professor / research associate professor> is being considered for <promotion to the rank of research associate professor /or research full professor> at Northeastern University (non-tenure track). In evaluating a candidate in this rank for promotion, University decision-makers consider the judgments of senior leaders in the candidate's field. We would very much appreciate your assistance in providing us with a candid, confidential evaluation of Dr. <>'s level of professional achievement in research.

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

- 1) Dr. <>'s curriculum vitae;
- 2) Copies of selected reprints from recent publications;
- 3) Dr. <>'s research statement; and
- 4) College guidelines regarding promotion for full-time, non-tenure track research faculty members.

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

- Quality and consistency of the research record
- Evidence of growth as a researcher
- Evidence of an ability to obtain funding
- Attainment of a national reputation in research
- If your institution has comparable appointments and ranks for full-time, non-tenure track research faculty members, would you recommend Dr. <> for promotion at your institution?

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

[NAME OF CHAIR]  
Chair (or Chair of the Promotion Committee)  
Title  
Department of [DEPARTMENT NAME]  
Northeastern University

## Model B.2: Model Request Letter

### MODEL REQUEST LETTER FOR COLLABORATOR REVIEW LETTERS

DATE

Professor Collaborator  
Department of Amicus Studies  
Important University

Dear Professor Collaborator:

Dr. [CANDIDATE], currently a <research assistant professor; research associate professor> is being considered for <promotion to the rank of research associate professor /or research full professor> at Northeastern University (non-tenure track). Dr. <> has identified you as a collaborator, and as such, we would very much appreciate your assistance in providing us with information as to the nature of your collaborative relationship with Dr. <>, including collaborations on joint research awards, publications, co-organization of meetings, or other types of collaboration, as well as the contributions made by Dr. <> to these efforts. Please limit your letter to one to two pages.

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

- 1) Dr. <>'s curriculum vitae;
- 2) Copies of selected reprints from recent publications; and
- 3) Dr. <>'s research statement.

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

I sincerely hope that you will be able to assist us in our review of Dr. <>'s candidacy. To expedite our deliberations, we look forward to receiving your letter by <Date>. If for any reason you are unable to provide a letter, please contact me as soon as possible.

Thank you for your generous assistance in this process.

Sincerely,

Professor <>  
Title  
Department of <>  
Northeastern University

## **Model C: Dossier Checklist**

\_\_\_\_\_ **A. Faculty Summary Sheet (Model A)** – provided and prepared by the Dean’s Office

\_\_\_\_\_ **B. Recommendations** (estimated length 3 pages each)

- \_\_\_\_\_ 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 Evaluations** (if applicable)

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. External Reviewer Bios (estimated length 3 pages)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Copy of letter soliciting outside evaluations (estimated length 2 pages)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. External Reviewer Letters (estimated length 24 pages)

\_\_\_\_\_ **D. Candidate’s Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae**

\_\_\_\_\_ **E. Candidate’s Statements**

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Research/Scholarship and Professional Development (recommended length 5 pages)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Services (recommended length 1 page)

\_\_\_\_\_ **F. Annual Performance Reviews**

\_\_\_\_\_ **G. Comprehensive list of Supporting Materials in Appendices A and B**  
(recommended length 2 pages)



## **Model D: Appendices Checklist**

### **Appendix A. Research/Scholarship and Professional Development: Supporting Documents**

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. 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.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Copies of any publications, including articles (indicating whether reviewed or non-reviewed), proceedings, books, book chapters, abstracts (indicate status of work in progress).
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Supporting materials: book chapters, 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. Letters from publisher recommending publication
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Evidence of professional development

### **Appendix B. Service: Supporting Documents**

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Evidence of contributions to department, school, college, and university committees
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Evidence of non-committee contributions to the department, school, college, or university
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Evidence of service contributions related to the discipline outside of Northeastern University
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Evidence of service contributions community/public outside of Northeastern University

**ADDENDUM**  
**Guidelines for Promotion Processes**  
**for Research Faculty whose Primary Appointment is in an Institute**

The [\*Faculty Handbook\*](#) was revised in June 2024 with new information about research faculty. This document summarizes hiring, promotion, and merit processes for research faculty hired with a primary appointment in an institute.

**Faculty Handbook module on Appointments Terms and Reappointments**

Section C for Non-Tenure Track Research Faculty, Subsection 3, Appointment and Term:

*Appointments may be made at the department (or equivalent academic “unit”) level, or within a research institute. Research Faculty members with a primary appointment in a research institute must have an appointment in a secondary academic unit. Research faculty appointments are made by the dean based on recommendations from the unit faculty (and institute leadership, where appropriate).*

<https://faculty.northeastern.edu/handbook/appointments-promotion-and-tenure/appointments-terms-and-reappointments/>

Review occurs as follows:

- 1) A promotion committee will be appointed in the institute to review the dossier. The Faculty Handbook requires a three-member committee for promotion. For research faculty this should consist of two research faculty and one faculty member from the secondary department. If an institute does not have enough research faculty members, research faculty in another institute can be asked to serve.
- 2) The institute director will review the dossier and send their written evaluation to the faculty member and to the institute promotion committee. The promotion committee will review the dossier and institute director’s letter and write their evaluation, and the dossier moves to the college committee (as currently comprised by the college or school).
- 3) The dean of the college or school will review the dossier, and their report will be added to the dossier, which will be sent to the Provost’s Office via Interfolio by February 15.
- 4) Each report (institute director, promotion committee, dean) is sent to the faculty candidate when written; they have 10 days to respond to each report, per the Faculty Handbook.
- 5) The institute promotion review must precede any college review timelines. A calendar of due dates for each level of review that occurs between October 1 (dossier submission date) and February 15 (Provost’s office submission) should be created by the institute in concert with the department and college.

During the 2025-2026 academic year, the Office of the Provost will work with the Faculty Senate to incorporate these processes into the Faculty Handbook.