

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

July 1, 2026

Office of the Provost

Revisions:

Addition of “Campus location” to the Faculty Summary Sheets (Model C.1 and Model C.2).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Purpose of Document	3
2.0	Procedures Prior to Submission of Dossier	3
2.1	Tenure and/or Promotion Advisement.....	3
2.2	External Reviewers	3
2.3	Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers	4
2.4	Guidelines for the Selection of Collaborators.....	4
2.5	Solicitation Letter for External Reviewers	4
2.6	Solicitation Letter for Collaborators	5
2.7	Preparation and Consideration of Dossiers for Tenure on Entry	5
2.8	Preparation and Consideration of Tenure and/or Promotion Dossiers of Candidates Holding Joint Appointments.....	6
3.0	Role of Candidate in Dossier Preparation	7
3.1	About the Dossier	7
3.2	Dossier Preparation Format and Guidelines	7
3.3	Dossier Organization and Checklist.....	8
3.4	Dossier Contents	9
3.5	Dossier Appendices	13
4.0	Role of Department/College and Evaluation Committees in Dossier Preparation.....	14
4.1	Dossier Section A – Faculty Summary Sheet	14
4.2	Dossier Section B – Internal Recommendations	14
4.3	Dossier Section C – External Reviewers and Collaborators.....	16
4.4	Submission of Completed Dossiers to the Provost.....	17
5.0	Activities Involving Community Building (Optional)	17
	Model A: Model Tenure Advisement Letter	19
	Model B.1: Model Request Letter for External Tenure Reviewers for Tenure-Track Faculty ..	21
	Model B.2: Model Request Letter for External Reviewers for Tenure on Entry	23
	Model B.3: Model Request Letter for External Reviewers for Full Professor Promotion.....	25
	Model B.4: Model Request Letter for Collaborators.....	27
	Model C.1: Faculty Summary Sheet (Tenure).....	28
	Model C.2: Faculty Summary Sheet (Promotion).....	29
	Model D: Teaching Evaluation Summary Table	30
	Model E: Checklist for Dossier	31
	Model F: Checklist for Appendices.....	32

1.0 Purpose of Document

This document provides guidance for candidates and review committees in the preparation of dossiers for tenure and/or promotion, including promotion to full professor. Faculty should reference the Model T&P Dossier document 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 Procedures Prior to Submission of Dossier

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 Procedures Prior to Submission of Dossier

This section describes the processes for faculty candidate notification of eligibility, external reviewer selection, collaborator selection, letter solicitation, tenure on entry consideration, and candidates holding joint appointments that occur before submission of dossiers.

2.1 Tenure and/or Promotion Advisement

At the beginning of the calendar year preceding tenure consideration, the college dean must notify any appropriate candidates of eligibility for tenure consideration during the next academic year (Model A).

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

2.2 External Reviewers

The process of soliciting external reviewers begins in the spring term preceding the submission of the dossier by the candidate to the department. The selection of the reviewers and the solicitation letter follows the university-wide guidelines for tenure and/or promotion dossiers (below) issued in 2008.

2.3 Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers

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

1. The units will make a reasonable effort to obtain 6-8 external letters of review.
2. All letters are to be arm's length in terms of prior involvement with the candidate. An arm's length reviewer is defined as someone without a personal vested interest in the outcome of the case, which typically excludes former mentors and close or recent collaborators.
3. All external reviewers need to be high quality scholars from aspirant institutions.
4. The tenure and/or promotion committee, with appropriate consultation with the dean, makes the final selection of reviewers. The candidate may submit names for consideration for inclusion on the review list. 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 reviewers whose names they have submitted prior to or during the tenure and/or promotion review process.
5. The last question to be asked of external reviewers is "Given your assessment of candidate X, would you recommend this person for tenure and/or promotion at your institution?"

2.4 Guidelines for the Selection of Collaborators

The guidelines below provide instructions for soliciting collaborator names from the candidate, both tenure-track faculty and faculty going up for promotion to full professor.

1. The candidate should submit to the tenure and/or promotion committee the names of up to three collaborators, who will be asked to provide a letter.
2. Collaborators are defined as any individual from outside the university, with whom the faculty member 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.
3. The units will make a reasonable effort to obtain collaborator letters by sending out solicitation letters to the names provided by the faculty candidate.

2.5 Solicitation Letter for External Reviewers

After the list of external reviewers has been reviewed by the dean, the Model Request Letter for External Reviewers (Model B.1, Model B.2, or Model B.3) is to be used by the T&P Committee to solicit letters from external reviewers. These template letters should not be altered by departments or colleges. Reviewers should be supplied with the candidate's complete CV, pertinent [Faculty Handbook](#) sections, the candidate's statement on their research/scholarship/creative activity, selected recent publications, and any other appropriate materials.

The solicitation letter should be clear and accurate about the tenure status and rank for which the candidate is being evaluated (e.g., tenure and promotion to associate professor, promotion only to full professor). **If a tenure-track 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.1. and states: “Dr. Tenure-Track’s tenure clock was stopped for _____ year(s) under Northeastern’s Tenure Clock Extension Policy. Your review should be based on a full-term 5-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.” All letters solicited and received from approved external reviewers must be included in the dossier. In addition, all written communication (including emails) from solicited external reviewers that offer any reflection, positive or negative, on the candidate’s qualifications for tenure and/or promotion must be included in the dossier, whether or not the reviewer agrees to write a full evaluation. External reviewers should be informed, when their evaluations are solicited, that all such communications will be included in the candidate’s dossier.

2.6 Solicitation Letter for Collaborators

After the list of collaborators has been received, the Model Request Letter for Collaborators (Model B.4) is to be used to solicit letters from collaborators. This template letter should not be altered by departments or colleges. Collaborators should be supplied with the candidate’s complete CV, the candidate’s statement on their research/scholarship/creative activity, selected recent publications, and any other appropriate materials.

All letters solicited and received from collaborators must be included in the dossier. Collaborators should be informed, when their letters are solicited, that all such communications will be included in the candidate’s dossier.

2.7 Preparation and Consideration of Dossiers for Tenure on Entry

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

Sufficient evidence includes: the required letters from arm’s length external reviewers (in addition to letters of recommendation from colleagues and collaborators that may be received in the hiring process); the candidate’s complete *curriculum vitae* including information about graduate student supervision, if relevant, and information about institutional and professional service; a sample research publication or similar evidence of scholarly or creative activity; a sample syllabus, a list of courses taught in at least the most recent three years, and a summary of teaching evaluations over the same period in a format as close as reasonably possible to that

expected of internal candidates. Statements from the candidate about teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity and service are very helpful and, in many instances, can be derived by the candidate from their letter of application for the position at Northeastern.

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

Units planning to present newly hired faculty members for tenure on entry should consult with the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs as soon as the hire is complete about dossier requirements and submission deadlines.

For jointly appointed faculty with the expectation of tenure on entry, the process remains the same with two exceptions based on the [Faculty Handbook](#) module on "Tenure and Promotion of Jointly Appointed Faculty:" 1) For the review by the department with the primary appointment, "the committee responsible for conducting tenure or promotion reviews shall include one representative from each unit in which the candidate holds a secondary appointment;" and 2) "Both the primary and secondary unit deans shall contribute independent written evaluations of the candidate to the candidate's dossier." Otherwise, all processes remain the same for tenure on entry candidates.

2.8 Preparation and Consideration of Tenure and/or Promotion Dossiers of Candidates Holding Joint Appointments

"In assessing the candidate's achievement and promise of future professional development, it is critical to gather evidence that fully reflects the candidate's performance relative to each of the tenure criteria" ([Faculty Handbook](#), module on "[Tenure](#)"). To meet this standard for faculty holding appointments in more than one academic unit, the review process in the tenure home unit for tenure and/or promotion candidates who hold appointments in more than one unit must incorporate information and perspectives from all the units in which the candidate is appointed. Procedures for the preparation and review of tenure and/or promotion dossiers of candidates holding joint appointments may be found in the [Faculty Handbook](#) in the module on "[Tenure and Promotion of Jointly Appointed Faculty](#)."

3.0 Role of Candidate in Dossier Preparation

3.1 About the Dossier

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

The dossier is your opportunity to make your professional career come to life. It is the "snapshot" that each level of review 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. 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 requires that dossiers be submitted electronically through Interfolio, which is available through the interfolio.com website. Interfolio is a software platform that facilitates electronic submission and review. (After navigating to interfolio.com, click on "Interfolio sign in" in the top menu, then click on the "United States" hyperlink at the left to access the sign-in screen. Click on the "Sign in with Partner Institution" button at the right. Enter "Northeastern" to select Northeastern University and click on the "Sign In" button to login with NU credentials with secure single sign-on (SSO)). 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 that are identified in the Dossier Checklist (Model E). Sections D (Curriculum Vitae), E (Candidate's Statements), F (Annual Performance Reviews) and G (Comprehensive List of Supporting Materials) must be submitted electronically through Interfolio. Supplemental materials included in the dossier's appendices (e.g., raw teaching evaluations, books, publications, creative materials, etc.) should also be submitted in Interfolio. Materials that cannot be submitted electronically (hard copy book) may be submitted separately to the unit.

Your dossier must include: each year's annual performance review toward tenure (including third-year review) and merit reviews; and all other items identified in the dossier checklist (Model E).

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

The total length of the dossier, including the external letters and unit and college recommendations, should not exceed 100 pages. Thus, as a general guideline, candidates should aim at submitting 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 performance reviews, may need to be scanned for inclusion in the dossier.

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

3.3 Dossier Organization and Checklist

Please use the dossier checklist (Model E) as you compile materials to be included in your tenure and/or promotion 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 C) – prepared by the Dean's Office

Section B. Recommendations – added by internal review committees and recommenders

Section C. External Reviewer and Collaborator Letters – added by department review committee

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

Section D. Candidate's Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae

Section E. Candidate's Statements

- a. Teaching Statement and Teaching Evaluation Summary Table
- b. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity Statement
- c. Service Statement

Section F. Annual Performance Reviews

- a. Annual performance reviews toward tenure
- b. Third-year review
- c. Merit reviews

Section G. Comprehensive list of Supporting Materials in the Appendices

Appendix A – Teaching: Supporting Materials

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

Appendix C – Service and Professional Development Activities:
Supporting Materials

3.4 Dossier Contents

Dossier Section D – Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae

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

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.

Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

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

1. Reviewed articles
2. Non-Reviewed articles
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. 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 coauthoring is common in your field, please indicate that in your statement on research/scholarship, along with indicating your role in each research and scholarly work that is collaborative. Be sure to indicate publications co-authored with graduate and undergraduate students. Edited volumes should be clearly identified as such.

Presentations and proceedings should be listed separately by date. Internally published technical reports, workbooks, etc. should be separate from peer-reviewed publications.

Creative Activity - Achievements should be listed by date within the following categories:

1. Publication
2. Presentation
3. Performance
4. Exhibition
5. Projects

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

Include full citations/descriptions for all works in the *curriculum vitae* and clearly specify the status of works in progress.

Grants

Please list internal and external grants separately. It is recommended that you also list proposals that were not funded. If you list unsuccessful applications, those should be clearly differentiated from successful ones. Pending proposals should be listed with the amount requested and the notification date. For each successful grant, please identify your status – PI, co-PI, other, as well as the roles of other participants on the grant – and indicate the percentage of the grant attributed to your effort. If a grant supports collaborative, 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 (optional but recommended)

Internal

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

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). 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 (as space allows).

Supervision of Undergraduate Students – Identify all undergraduate students supervised as part of their honors thesis. Include completion dates and thesis titles (as space allows).

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.

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
4. Professional development

Dossier Section E – Candidate’s Statements and Supporting Evidence

Statement on Teaching

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

Supporting Evidence for Teaching

Candidates must include the Teaching Evaluation Summary Table, as shown in Model D, as supporting evidence of teaching.

The Teaching Evaluation Summary Table should clearly list in chronological order all courses taught, with numbers of students enrolled in each class. You should clearly identify courses taught for extra compensation. Tenure candidates must include the results of TRACE and any other university evaluations for all sections of all courses you have taught. If any evaluations are missing, explain why. Please note any additional forms of teaching evaluation (e.g., peer classroom observations) in the Teaching Evaluation Summary Table. Include reports of those evaluations in Appendix A. If your unit administers end-of-term student evaluations intended to supplement the TRACE instrument, you should include these additional teaching evaluation results in the Supporting Documents on Teaching in Appendix A.

Candidates for promotion to full professor who are seven or fewer years beyond tenure must supply information on all courses taught post-tenure in the Teaching Evaluation Summary Table.

Candidates for full professor who are more than seven years beyond tenure must supply complete TRACE information from their seven most recent years of teaching.

All other supporting evidence for teaching, including all TRACE reports, should be included in Appendix A.

Statement on Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

You should state the focus of your research, scholarship and/or creative activity. You should explain the questions that you have identified, the funding you have received to support the work (if applicable) and the directions it has taken, the venues in which your research, scholarship, or creative work has been disseminated, and provide indications of its impact on your academic community and, if applicable, in arenas outside the academy. Describe your collaborations with others, your role, and the impact of your collaborative work. You should include a discussion of any research/scholarship/creative activity you have undertaken with students or with the external community. Finally, you should discuss the questions that you expect to address in the future. Candidates for promotion to full professor should focus primarily on research, scholarship, and creative activity since the award of tenure.

All publications and other supporting evidence for research should be included in Appendix B.

Statement on Service

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

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

Dossier Section F – Annual Performance Reviews

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

Candidates for promotion to full professor who are seven or fewer years beyond the award of tenure must include all their post-tenure annual performance reviews (i.e., merit reviews) in the promotion dossier. Candidates for full professor who are more than seven years beyond the award of tenure must include performance reviews from at least the most recent seven years.

Dossier Section G – Comprehensive List of Contents for Appendices A, B, and C.

This section provides readers of your dossier with a full table of contents for all the supporting materials included in your appendices. Please organize and list your supplemental materials in a way that will enable readers of your dossier to locate supplemental items efficiently. Given space limitations, this list is typically two pages or less.

3.5 Dossier Appendices

The appendices to the dossier include all additional evidence and supporting materials you wish to present regarding your accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. You may include references to these materials in your dossier. Each appendix should be compiled in its own electronic file in Interfolio, **separate from Sections A – G**. Note that maximum upload file size is 100MB. If your appendix exceeds 100MB, divide it into smaller files and name accordingly (Appendix A1, Appendix A2, etc.). Model F provides a checklist for all appendices.

Appendix A. Teaching: Supporting Materials

Full reports of TRACE evaluations must be included for all sections of all courses taught. The [*Faculty Handbook*](#) mandates that tenure-track faculty members be evaluated each year using at least one other form of teaching evaluation in addition to the TRACE evaluations. These additional forms of teaching evaluation need not be the same for each year on the tenure track, and may include peer classroom evaluations; a teaching portfolio; a comprehensive presentation of classroom materials, including syllabi, examinations, assignments, etc. Multiple-year peer classroom evaluations are particularly helpful. In whatever format the additional teaching evaluations are conducted, the full record of those teaching evaluations must be included in Appendix A.

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

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

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

Appendix C. Service: Supporting Materials

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

4.0 Role of Department/College and 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 electronic dossier when completed from the Dean's Office to the Office of the Provost through the Interfolio software platform. The dossier and appendices checklists (Model E and F, 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. 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 – Internal Recommendations

The suggested length for recommendations/reports is 3 pages. As specified in the [Faculty Handbook](#) "Tenure" and "Promotion" modules, at each successive level of review within the college, the candidate will be provided with the detailed evaluation / recommendation relative to the tenure and or 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 is forwarded to the department committee for consideration prior to its vote. It should independently evaluate the candidate's dossier and assess the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. It should be evaluative and objective – providing opinions backed by information. It should discuss all aspects of the candidate's work: instruction, research/scholarship/creative activity and service, and should indicate why the candidate does or does not meet the established tenure and/or promotion criteria. Grant activity should be discussed in the context of available funding in the discipline and the importance of external support in conducting research/scholarship/creative activity. The report should discuss and evaluate external recommendations, address any issues the reviewers raise, and discuss any conflicts among reviews. Of course, all references to outside reviewers' and collaborators' comments and evaluations should preserve the anonymity of the reviewers. In tenure cases, the report should also discuss the candidate's role in the department/college, both in terms of their 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.

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: teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity and service, and should indicate why the candidate does or does not meet the established tenure criteria. Grant activity should be discussed in the context of available funding in the discipline and the importance of external support in conducting research/scholarship/creative activity. The report should discuss and evaluate external recommendations. If the dossier contains conflicting evaluations, the report should discuss and evaluate/resolve the issues raised.

References to outside reviewers’ and collaborators’ 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 role in the department/college, both in terms of their 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 of why the candidate is being considered early and why the department supported the candidate for early consideration, even if the department’s recommendation is negative.

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

College Advisory Committee Report (where applicable)

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

should discuss and evaluate/resolve the issues raised. References to outside reviewers' comments and evaluations should preserve the anonymity of the reviewers.

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

If members of the College Advisory Committee worked closely with the candidate (as a coauthor or co-PI), that relationship should be clearly noted. Under these circumstances, members should consider recusing themselves from the review. If members of the College Advisory Committee are faculty members in the candidate's department, they should recuse themselves from the review.

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. They should assess all aspects of the faculty member's activities – teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service – as well as the unit's long-term need. Issues raised by external reviewers may need to be clarified by the dean; if the dean has reservations about the quality or objectivity of any of the external reviewers or collaborators, 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.

4.3 Dossier Section C – External Reviewers and Collaborators

Please note: All materials detailed below should be uploaded to the "External Evaluation" section of the Interfolio software program.

External Reviewers

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

Short Bio for External Reviewers

A short biography listing the reviewer's major accomplishments in the field, evaluating the standing of the reviewer's institution or department within the discipline, and providing any other information needed for understanding why the reviewer was chosen must be supplied for each external reviewer. The page requirement on the total length of the dossier will not accommodate the inclusion of full CVs from external reviewers, thus one brief paragraph per external reviewer is recommended.

Copy of Solicitation Letter

A copy of the template letter used to solicit external reviewers should be included.

External Reviewer Letters

All letters solicited must be included in the dossier.

Collaborator Letters

All letters solicited must be included in the dossier.

Exclusion of Unsolicited Materials

As noted in the [Faculty Handbook](#), unsolicited materials from any source may not be included in the dossier or reviewed by evaluators.

4.4 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 departments for cross-disciplinary work. The following definitions and 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.
- Experiential learning coursework where students are actively working with – and learning from – members of our local communities.

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 levels to promote a welcoming environment.
- Engagement in recruitment strategies that provide a welcoming community.
- Involvement with unit or university activities that foster positive relations with local community members adjacent to our campuses.

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*](#).

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 Model Tenure and Promotion Dossier, which can be found at <https://provost.northeastern.edu/faculty-affairs/>. (See drop-down menu for "Faculty Tenure and Promotion".)

Your faculty mentor and/or department chair can also answer any questions you may have concerning your dossier preparation.

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

In order to ensure a smooth start to the tenure review process, please confirm that you wish to be considered for tenure, by signing a copy of this letter where indicated below and returning it to me no later than **May 1**. If for any reason you do not wish to be considered for tenure, please advise me promptly. If you choose not to be considered for tenure, you will receive a terminal appointment for the 20xx – 20xx 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 20xx – 20xx__ academic year. I have reviewed this letter, the department/school/college procedures regarding tenure and promotion, and the University guidelines regarding tenure and promotion in the [*Faculty Handbook*](#). I understand the policies and procedures outlined in these materials, and I am aware that they will apply during my upcoming tenure consideration.

Professor Untenured

Date

**Model B.1: Model Request Letter for External Tenure Reviewers
for Tenure-Track Faculty**

Date

Professor Eminent
Department of Holistic Studies Prestigious University

Dear Professor Eminent:

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

To assist 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;
3. Dr. Tenure-Track's research statement; and
4. The pertinent sections from Northeastern University's [*Faculty Handbook*](#) regarding tenure and promotion guidelines.

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

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

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

Your letter will be considered confidential, available only to those involved in the tenure review process. However, please note that the Supreme Court decision in *University of Pennsylvania v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission* (1990) allowed the Equal Employment

Opportunity Commission access to otherwise confidential tenure evaluations in areas where discrimination was alleged. Except in the context of an EEOC request for access, it is Northeastern University's policy to maintain the confidentiality of evaluations.

I sincerely hope that you will be able to assist us in our review of Dr. Tenure-Track's tenure and/or promotion candidacy. In order to expedite our deliberations, we look forward to receiving your evaluation by [DATE]. If for any reason you are 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 _____ year(s) under Northeastern's Tenure Clock Extension Policy. Your review should be based on a full-term 5-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.

INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING IF JOINTLY APPOINTED:

Please note that Dr. Tenure-Track is jointly appointed in two units, with a primary tenure home in [Dept name] and a secondary appointment in [Dept name], and an appointment split of XX%/YY%, respectively. We ask that you review the candidate with this consideration in mind.

Model B.2: Model Request Letter for External Reviewers for Tenure on Entry

Date

Professor Eminent
Department of Holistic Studies
Prestigious University

Dear Professor Eminent:

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

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

- Dr. <>'s *curriculum vitae*;
- Copies of selected recent publications; and
- Pertinent sections from Northeastern University's [*Faculty Handbook*](#) regarding tenure-stream faculty performance expectations.
-

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

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

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

Your letter will be considered confidential, available only to those involved in the appointment process. However, please note that the Supreme Court decision in *University of Pennsylvania v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission* (1990) allowed the Equal Employment

Opportunity Commission access to otherwise confidential tenure evaluations in areas where discrimination was alleged. Except in the context of an EEOC request for access, it is Northeastern University's policy to maintain the confidentiality of evaluations.

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

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

Sincerely,

Professor <>
Title, Department
Northeastern University

Model B.3: Model Request Letter for External Reviewers for Full Professor Promotion

Date

Professor Eminent
Department of Holistic Studies
Prestigious University

Dear Professor Eminent:

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

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

1. Dr. Tenured's *curriculum vitae*;
2. Copies of selected reprints from recent publications;
3. Dr. Tenured's research statement; and
4. The pertinent sections from Northeastern University's [*Faculty Handbook*](#) regarding promotion guidelines.

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

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

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

Your letter will be considered confidential, available only to those involved in the appointment process. However, please note that the Supreme Court decision in *University of Pennsylvania v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission* (1990) allowed the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission access to otherwise confidential tenure evaluations in areas where

discrimination was alleged. Except in the context of an EEOC request for access, it is Northeastern University's policy to maintain the confidentiality of evaluations.

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

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

Sincerely,

Professor < >

(Enclosures)

INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING IF JOINTLY APPOINTED:

Please note that Dr. Tenured is jointly appointed in two units, with a primary tenure home in [Dept name] and a secondary appointment in [Dept name], and an appointment split of XX%/YY%, respectively. We ask that you review the candidate with this consideration in mind.

Model B.4: Model Request Letter for Collaborators

Date

Professor Collaborator
Department of Amicus Studies, Important University

Dear Professor Collaborator:

Dr. Faculty Member, currently <an assistant professor without tenure; an associate professor without tenure; an associate professor with tenure > is being considered for <tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor /or full professor> at Northeastern University. 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 <>. 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 <>

Model C.1: Faculty Summary Sheet (Tenure)

**TENURE AND PROMOTION, OR TENURE ONLY, OR TENURE ON ENTRY
Provided and prepared by the Dean's Office**

Name:

Date:

Department:

(Primary appointment)

Highest Degree:

Department/ College:

(if jointly appointed)

Year Degree Earned:

Present Rank:

Where Degree Earned:

Date of Employment:

Current Visa Status:

(if not U.S. citizen)

Campus location:

Years on Tenure Track at NU (note if early tenure candidate):

Is this a Tenure-on-Entry Candidate?

Special Conditions of Employment:

(List dates and duration of all leaves or special appointments, include copies of letters granting such leaves and appointments, and indicate whether they affected the original date of tenure consideration. If the tenure clock has been stopped, include a statement that the dossier should be reviewed on a full-term 5-year tenure track without consideration of extra time or prejudice to the fact that Dr. Tenure-Track had a longer probationary record.)

Third Year Review:

Department Committee Recommendation and tally of vote:

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

College Committee Recommendation and tally of vote:

Chair's Recommendation:

Dean's Recommendation:

Model C.2: Faculty Summary Sheet (Promotion)

PROMOTION ONLY
Provided and prepared by the Dean's Office

Name:

Date:

Department:

(Primary appointment)

Highest Degree:

Department/ College:

(if jointly appointed)

Year Degree Earned:

Present Rank:

Where Degree Earned:

Date of Employment:

Current Visa Status:

(if not U.S. citizen)

Campus location:

Department Committee Recommendation and tally of vote:

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

College Committee Recommendation and tally of vote:

Chair's Recommendation:

Dean's Recommendation:

Model D: Teaching Evaluation Summary Table

Course Number	Title	Term and year	TRACE # Responded / # of Students/	Overall Mean Instructor Effectiveness Score*	Regular Load (R) or Extra Compensation (E)	Additional Form of Teaching Evaluation? (yes**/no)

* Please provide both your individual effectiveness score and that of the comparison group. *Note:* Responses are based on a 5-point Likert scale where 5 = “almost always effective,” 4 = “usually effective,” 3 = “sometimes effective,” 2 = “rarely effective,” and 1 = “never effective.”

** If yes, please note what additional form of teaching evaluation was used.

Model E: Checklist for Dossier

_____ **A. Faculty Summary Sheet (Model C)** – 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 Reviews**

- _____ 1. Short bios for external reviewers (estimated total length: 3 pages)
- _____ 2. Copy of letter soliciting external reviewers (estimated length: 2 pages)
- _____ 3. Collaborator letters (maximum of 3) (estimated length: 3 pages)
- _____ 4. External reviewer letters (estimated length: 24 pages)

_____ **D. Candidate's Comprehensive Dossier Curriculum Vitae**

_____ **E. Candidate's Statements and Supporting Evidence** (as described in this
_____ document)

- _____ 1. Teaching Statement (recommended length: 2 pages) and
Teaching Evaluation Summary Table
- _____ 2. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity Statement (recommended
length: 3 pages)
- _____ 3. Service Statement (recommended length: 1 page)

_____ **F. Annual Performance Reviews**

- _____ 1. Annual reviews toward tenure (including third-year review)
- _____ 2. Merit reviews

_____ **G. Comprehensive list of Supporting Materials in Appendices A, B, C**
(recommended length: 2 pages)

Model F: Checklist for Appendices

Appendix A. Teaching: Supporting Documents

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

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

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

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

Appendix C. Service: Supporting Documents

- _____ 1. Evidence of contributions to department, school, college, and university committees
- _____ 2. Evidence of non-committee contributions to the department, school, college, or university
- _____ 3. Evidence of service contributions related to the discipline outside of Northeastern University