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A. THE GRANT OF TENURE.

1. POLICY.

Northwestern’s policy with regard to tenure seeks to foster a faculty of unqualified excellence. It calls for application of the highest standards with respect to professional achievement and promise in both research and teaching. The Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences aims for the superlative, and each case is evaluated on its own merits. When making a recommendation for tenure, a department must feel able to affirm that the candidate in question is as good a permanent appointment in their area as Northwestern is capable of making, now or in the foreseeable future, given both accomplishments to date and reasonable expectations as to future achievements. This same standard must be employed by others who participate in the review. Tenure is not awarded for competent service, solid research, and adequate teaching.

In most cases, professional achievement takes the form of research activity that results in scholarly publications or artistic works that are publicly displayed. Occasionally, a colleague will present a dossier of outstanding professional accomplishment in methodologies whose originality and theoretical sophistication significantly advance or redefine work in the discipline. Departments—and subsequently ad hoc committees and the Weinberg College Committee on Tenure, acting with the advice of external referees—evaluate the quantity, but above all, the quality, creativity, importance, and influence of such work. They look for evidence of superior achievement relative to peer scholars, recognition of that achievement by senior colleagues both within and beyond the campus, and the promise of a career trajectory that will continue to affect the direction of their field. A positive recommendation to confer tenure should offer strong evidence supporting claims about
the high quality of a candidate’s work, the distinctiveness of their voice, and the degree of influence on the field. Candidates for tenure are expected to have established national reputations through their research, writing, and/or artistic work. In all regards, the standard is a high level of excellence.

The quality of a candidate’s teaching and their potential as a teacher are major factors affecting the decision to grant tenure to a faculty member. Teaching is defined broadly; it means not simply the ability to lecture, but also the faculty member’s role vis-a-vis students in various contexts, from seminars or independent study to advising. Advising undergraduate students is a significant part of teaching since conveying to students what may be the best academic course for them to follow, given their interests and goals, is to help educate them. Mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows (if relevant) is a highly significant part of teaching, as it involves nothing less than the preparation of the next generation’s intellectual leaders, both within and beyond the academy. An institution devoted to instruction must weigh the quality of teaching in all decisions regarding its faculty.

Assistant professors, like other members of the tenure-line faculty, are expected to share in the duties of faculty governance. During the probationary period, the candidate may concentrate their university service at the departmental level. Departments should take care not to place overly heavy administrative duties on untenured faculty; nevertheless, the expectation is that assistant professors will contribute to the smooth functioning of the department.

Positive reviews or assessments during the probationary period do not commit the University to a positive decision on tenure. En route assessments are based on progress to date and are not a premature evaluation of the case for tenure. Indefinite tenure may be granted only after thorough review of the candidate's dossier of materials, beginning with the crucial vote of the candidate's department, which draws on external assessments and internal discussion. If the department recommends the grant of tenure, additional authorities in the candidate's field, the candidate's ad hoc committee, the Weinberg College Committee on Tenure, and the Dean will all have had the opportunity to evaluate the record of achievement and promise of continuing excellence.

Assistant professors should consult the document Guidelines for Candidates for Tenure and Promotion, which highlights policies, procedures, and standards relating to the grant of tenure in the College, along with an outline of the stages and timing of the process.

2. DEPARTMENTAL VIGILANCE.

Maintenance of high standards must begin at the departmental level. The role of the faculty is to evaluate a case for tenure (or for promotion) against appropriately high standards and not merely to put the candidate forward when the individual feels ready. A department damages its credibility by recommending candidates for tenure or promotion if the record is not sufficiently strong.
If a department has its own written statements about tenure and promotion policy, the chair must ensure that such statements accord with College policy.

3. “EARLY” TENURE DECISIONS.

Decisions about tenure need not be taken until the final year of the individual’s probationary term. Departments and candidates alike should view it as normal that an individual takes the full number of years available to establish the influence of their scholarship, and the excellence of their teaching and service. There must be no presumption that an early recommendation for promotion is necessary to prove a candidate’s strength. Tenure-track faculty should not be pressured to rush to a review that may prove to be premature. It is useful for the department chair to discuss any “early” reviews with the Associate Dean for Faculty to understand concerns that often arise in such circumstances.

When a faculty member has been granted an extension of the probationary period of one or more years, it is vital that the department think in terms of the number of probationary years the person has served rather than the number of calendar years. Thus, when a colleague is in their fifth probationary year, the department should not expect that person to come forward for a tenure decision even if it is the sixth year of appointment. To encourage or pressure an assistant professor to be reviewed for tenure before the sixth probationary year would cancel the equalizing effect that the extension policy is intended to achieve. Equally important, candidates with a year’s extension are expected to have achieved the same productivity as any other faculty member in the sixth probationary year and not meet some more stringent standard. The ad hoc committees and Committee on Tenure are also instructed to consider what has been achieved during the probationary term and not in “X number of years” since hiring or since the PhD. For conditions under which the tenure clock may be stopped for a year, see subsection IV.B.

B. PROMOTION TO THE FULL PROFESSORSHIP: POLICY.

While candidates can and should seek out advice about when to present themselves for consideration for promotion to the rank of full professor, the decision to initiate this process rests with the candidate. However, candidates should bear in mind that promotion to the rank of professor is appropriate when the faculty member has achieved a high level of distinction, supported by clear evidence of deep and broad influence in the field and the prospect of continued excellence. Such distinction may be based in part on the work that earned tenure, but it must also be grounded in significant, well-known scholarship (or equivalent activity) accomplished since that time. The department, Committee on Promotion, Dean, and Provost look for a demonstration that the candidate has fulfilled the promise seen at the time of the tenure decision.

Likewise, it is expected that through steady development of talents, the candidate has attained a level of excellence in classroom teaching, advising of undergraduates, and mentoring of
graduate students and postdoctoral fellows (if relevant). The candidate should also have built a record of active and productive service to Weinberg College and the University. Such accomplishments—not time served or minimal satisfaction of some quantitative norm—are the measure of readiness for promotion to full professor. Each case must be considered on its own merits. The fact that Professor B has reached the same milestone as Professor A did when they were recently promoted is not sufficient grounds for promotion.

The candidate’s major work completed since tenure is the heart of the review of research or other professional achievement. Faculty members best present themselves for promotion after that work is published, unless the results of the post-tenure work have been widely disseminated and well-received before actual publication. Departments and candidates should note that it has become increasingly difficult to persuade referees to read unpublished manuscripts on short notice. Likewise, the Committee on Promotion raises questions about candidates whose new work has not yet had time to enter into debates in the field. The Committee is skeptical of departmental promises that unpublished work is bound to be influential. It is rare that a candidate’s work published at the time of tenure is of sufficient accomplishment and influence to establish them as one of the true leaders of the field. In addition, a candidate who submits an unpublished manuscript as the centerpiece of their promotion case should bear in mind that the top scholars in the field who read this draft version may not later read the final version. Therefore, one should think carefully about the timing of one’s candidacy for promotion if the major work is still in manuscript.

Finally, if a candidate’s research program depends on extramural funding, there must be clear evidence that the candidate has secured such funding or is doing everything possible to do so in order to sustain a strong research program.

As in the case of tenure decisions, departments must evaluate carefully the readiness of the candidate for promotion to full professor. The role of the faculty is to evaluate a case for promotion against appropriately high standards and not merely to put the candidate forward when the individual feels ready.

PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSORSHIP: NOTE ON PROCEDURE.

Associate professors should consult the document Guidelines for Candidates for Tenure and Promotion, which highlights policies, procedures, and standards relating to the process for promotion to the highest rank, along with an outline of the stages and timing involved.

C. OPTIONAL AND REQUIRED ACTIONS.

A faculty member acquires tenure in their seventh year of continuous full-time paid service in a tenure-eligible professorial rank at Northwestern, provided that, during the sixth year, the seventh year was not designated as a terminal year. (In cases where the probationary term has been extended, notification must come by the end of the sixth probationary year.) In the College, assistant professors are not issued reappointments that entail tenure unless they are also
promoted to the rank of associate professor. Moreover, it is very unusual for an assistant professor to be promoted to the rank of associate professor without the grant of tenure. With rare exceptions, full professors with full-time, non-visiting appointments have tenure.

A department always has the option of recommending the promotion of a tenured associate professor to the rank of professor. An untenured associate professor on the tenure track or an assistant professor may similarly be recommended for the grant of tenure, the latter with promotion to the rank of associate professor, at any time in their probationary terms.

For candidates who are in the last year of their probationary term, however, action must be taken, and these are the possibilities:

An untenured associate professor on the tenure track must be considered for either the offer of tenure or the offer of a year’s notice, i.e., a final year on the faculty. (An untenured associate professor on the tenure track recommended for the grant of tenure may also be recommended for promotion to the rank of professor.)

An assistant professor must be considered for either the offer of tenure with promotion to the rank of associate professor, or the offer of a year’s notice, i.e., a final year on the faculty.

D. BUDGETARY JOINT APPOINTMENTS.

In cases where a candidate for promotion has a budgetary joint appointment with another department, program, or school, special arrangements may need to be made for joint action by the two bodies. Typically, such candidates are provided with a statement about procedures when they are hired and these procedures govern the steps in the review. Chairs should be in touch with the Associate Dean for Faculty or the Assistant Dean for Faculty Advancement in the spring before the proposed promotion review.

E. LENGTH OF PROCESS AND SCHEDULE.

The process is long. No decisions should be expected before June, with the recommended actions to take effect the following September 1st (normally). Chairs should inform candidates of this fact in order to allay unnecessary anxiety. Here is an approximate timetable. (Please note that if a due date falls on a weekend, then the due date is the following Monday):

Winter and spring of preceding year. The chair works with the candidate to establish deadlines for materials for the department-level review.

Summer and early fall. The department solicits letters from external reviewers for use by department voters. The candidate completes the dossier and may update materials supplied earlier in the year.
October.

- By October 10th, the department should vote on all candidates for tenure. (*If October 10th falls on a weekend, then the due date is the following Monday.*)
- By October 15th, the tenure candidate’s portion of the dossier is submitted to the Dean’s Office. (*If October 15th falls on a weekend, then the due date is the following Monday.*)
- By October 25th, the department’s portion of the dossier for tenure candidates is submitted to the Dean’s Office. (*If October 25th falls on a weekend, then the due date is the following Monday.*)
- Also by October 25th, the department should vote on all candidates for promotion to full professor. (*If October 25th falls on a weekend, then the due date is the following Monday.*)

November.

- By November 5th, the promotion candidate’s portion of the dossier is submitted to the Dean’s Office. (*If November 5th falls on a weekend, then the due date is the following Monday.*)
- By November 15th, the department’s portion of the dossier for promotion candidates (full professor) is submitted to the Dean’s Office. (*If November 15th falls on a weekend, then the due date is the following Monday.*)
- By November 30th, the department submits a letter and supporting materials in those tenure cases where the vote of the department was negative. (*If November 30th falls on a weekend, then the due date is the following Monday.*)

November through February/March. The tenure ad hoc committee (through the agency of the Dean’s Office) requests letters of evaluation from external authorities and students. The tenure ad hoc committee then delivers a report to the Dean. The Dean’s Office solicits letters from senior authorities in promotion-to-full cases.

March. Committee on Tenure usually meets.

April. Committee on Promotion usually meets.

April-May (usually). The Dean sends their positive recommendations to the Provost and President for their decision and informs them about any negative decisions. When the Provost responds, the Dean then informs the candidates of the recommended action. Approval by the Board of Trustees follows in the summer.

September 1. Recommended changes in status are normally effective with the beginning of the academic year.

F. ADVANCE PLANNING.
In the winter and spring of the year before the promotion review, the chair should work with the candidate to establish due dates for materials. In order to give the department's external referees time to familiarize themselves with the candidate's dossier, it may be necessary to send out publications and the CV over the summer, and therefore the candidate may need to supply these items in May or June. In fields where external referees may be away from their institutions over the summer, it may be prudent to contact them before the end of their academic year. The candidate should have adequate advance notice of any such deadline. The materials that the candidate provides in, say, June can be resubmitted in revised form in the fall for the use of the ad hoc committee and the referees they select.

If a candidate’s field expects a book for tenure, ideally it should be published prior to the start of the tenure review. If it is not, the final form of the manuscript should be accepted for publication by the time of the department vote; that is to say, the manuscript should at least be “in press” and readers’ reports should be available. Late submission of a manuscript almost always leads reviewers and committee members to wonder about the candidate’s productivity and their ability to bring future projects to completion. Such concerns are acute if press readers’ reports are absent from the dossier that is sent to the review committees. Also, a last-minute publication surge is often viewed with skepticism—particularly for a candidate for tenure—since this may create the impression that the candidate needed the “fire” of an impending tenure decision to bring work to completion.

When a tenure candidate's case is weak, and it is likely the department will not vote a positive recommendation to promote, the chair should consult the Associate Dean for Faculty about ways to approach the situation.

G. LETTERS FROM EXTERNAL REFEREES.

The department must collect at least three and no more than six letters from external referees to assist in its internal deliberations. The department should take care to allow the ad hoc committee and Dean’s Office to initiate contact with many of the leading scholars in the field. A department that requests too many letters or exhausts the field of experts may impede a careful review by others beyond the department.

The department collects letters only for its own use. It should not direct other referees to send letters to the Dean.

No more than half the referees consulted may be those named by the candidate. The others should be selected independently by the department. The department should not seek evaluations from former advisors, post-doctoral supervisors, close personal friends, or others having a relationship with the candidate that might reduce objectivity. If a candidate publishes co-authored works in a field where co-authorship is not the accepted norm, and the department wishes to call on one of the co-authors to comment on the candidate’s dossier, it should clarify why it is necessary or desirable to do so.
The department should draft a letter asking specific questions that reflect high standards. (A sample of the letter used at the Dean's level may be obtained from the Assistant Dean for Faculty Advancement.) Normally, benchmark comparisons should be requested. Along with the letter, the department should send each referee the candidate's full vita (specifically supplied by the candidate for the promotion review). The department should also supply copies of publications, as needed. Often the most efficient tack is to send out a standard packet of the most important publications resulting from work at Northwestern and to make other items available upon request.

Referees should be scholars (or artists) at comparable institutions. Referees’ responses must be in writing, via mail, fax, or email. Care should be taken to preserve the confidentiality of all letters. External opinions may not be gathered by means of oral conversations either in person or by phone.

The department must include copies of all responses (including declines) as part of the documentation sent to the Dean’s Office and indicate which referees were named by the candidate.

H. DEPARTMENT MEETING AND VOTE.

1. DELIBERATIONS.

Over the summer or early in the Fall Quarter, the chair compiles a complete dossier for each candidate and submits the materials for consideration by a departmental committee comprising all tenured members above the rank of the candidate. Discussions of promotions, as of other personnel matters, should be treated as confidential. Please take special care in sending any confidential materials to faculty who are away from campus.

Even if the department has a subcommittee on promotions, all voters should familiarize themselves with the candidate’s dossier and read at least a sample of the candidate’s work before the meeting at which the promotion is discussed. Departments should make the dossier available to voters in a timely fashion. The dossier includes the materials provided by the candidate along with any evaluative materials from internal and external reviewers, students, the departmental subcommittee, partner programs, or individual colleagues.

The expectation is that all eligible voting members in the department will participate in the discussion of the candidate's case for promotion. In the event that an eligible voting member cannot attend the meeting in which the candidate's case is discussed, the department should make a good faith effort to facilitate a Zoom session, video conference, or teleconference with the absent faculty member so they can participate. Absentee voters, if unexcused, will be understood as abstentions.
Department members enjoying a close relationship with the candidate (familial, former advisor, etc.) should recuse themselves from all stages of the review process.

2. THE VOTE.

After deliberation and in accordance with departmental bylaws for voting (see also V.H.3), the department votes by secret ballot. (Untenured associate professors on the tenure track may participate in the discussion of an assistant professor but may not vote. Tenured associate professors may vote on tenure cases of untenured associates on the tenure track. When the candidate is an associate professor, either tenured or untenured [on the tenure track], only the full professors may participate in the discussion and vote.) By the required date, the chair sends the Dean a letter indicating the complete and exact vote total: (1) the number of Yeses, (2) the number of No’s, (3) the number of Abstentions, and (4) the number Not Voting due to illness, travel, last year on the faculty, etc.). The department vote also includes the names of eligible voting members who voted, the names of those who did not vote, and the reason for their not voting. The chair then informs the candidate of the departmental recommendation.

3. MAJORITY.

Departments should establish rules for what constitutes a majority before any individual case is at issue. The size of the margin (simple majority, three-fifths, two-thirds) and the base of the count (all eligible voters, all present and voting, or only yes versus no votes) should be specified in writing in the departmental statutes and should be noted in the department letter to the Dean when the vote is less than unanimous. In making its rules, the department should consider what level of support is appropriate for making a permanent appointment to the faculty. The Dean’s Office strongly prefers that the bar for approval be set at two-thirds or some other fraction well above a simple majority. Fifty-one percent approval is not a very strong endorsement of the candidate.

A vote that fails to reach the specified margin is considered negative. The Department should consult section T below about the next steps. The College rarely proceeds to a full review if the Department does not endorse promotion.

4. SURROGATE DEPARTMENTS.

A department must have at least three voters in residence in order to make a recommendation about promotion. In cases where a department lacks this number, the Dean will form a surrogate department to evaluate the candidate and vote a recommendation. Surrogate department voters are excused from further involvement in the case on an ad hoc committee, the Committee on Promotion, or the Committee on Tenure. The Dean will also establish a surrogate pool of voters when a program is called upon to participate in a promotion review.
I. CONFIDENTIALITY.

Promotion reviews are considered confidential. Departments are asked not to discuss the departmental deliberations beyond the pool of eligible voters. Departments and the Dean’s Office strive to maintain the confidentiality of referee letters. Candidates are likewise asked to observe the need for confidentiality and not, for example, attempt to contact referees to find out whether they have submitted letters or have been asked to submit letters, or to discuss any aspect of the department deliberations. In particular, neither the candidate nor colleagues should launch a “campaign” by inviting outside authorities to comment on the case outside the standard procedures. If a candidate wishes to discuss matters related to the promotion with a colleague outside the department—for example a former adviser—the candidate should first inform the department chair so that such a conversation does not interfere with the conduct of a full and confidential review beyond the department.

J. DOSSIERS: LEGALITIES, CONTENTS, DEADLINE.

For legal and other reasons, the dossiers of all candidates should include the same categories of supporting materials. The department should retain one copy of the complete file for ready reference during the review year. Beyond that, evaluative materials, not including publications, syllabi, etc., should be retained in the candidate’s departmental file—for three full years in the case of a candidate who is not recommended for tenure, indefinitely in other cases. Materials should not be returned to candidates. Books may be returned after they have been checked carefully to make sure there are no confidential notes. No illegal copies of copyrighted materials are permitted in promotion dossiers.

All members of a department voting on a given promotion should have access to and be directed to review all materials listed below before the vote is taken, and materials should be held in the departmental office throughout the year.

The deadline for delivering candidates’ complete dossiers to the Dean’s Office cannot be extended. If a department has multiple cases, the chair is encouraged to forward them one by one, as soon as each is fully completed. This greatly accelerates the process of checking and distributing materials to the review committees. For the specific due dates, please see subsection V.E.

The dossier submitted to the Dean’s Office contains (in general terms):

- department’s letter of evaluation and both internal and external letters collected by the department
- candidate’s CV and candidate’s statement
- publications or related artistic work
- materials about standing in the field and research
- materials about teaching and advising
• materials about citizenship and service

For CANDIDATES FOR TENURE, the Dean’s Office requires the documents listed below in electronic format (see also Required Materials for Tenure Review).

We no longer require binders of printed materials. All required materials (except for published books) should be uploaded to Faculty Folio RPT (Review, Promotion, and Tenure), Weinberg’s dedicated tenure review site beginning in 2020-2021. Information about and access to this dedicated tenure review site will be shared with candidates and departments at the appropriate time. Three copies of each published book (for tenure candidates) will still need to be delivered to the Dean’s Office.

Candidate Documents (for the candidate to provide)
1. CV
2. Statement (research, teaching, service)
3. Full Corpus of Publications (including book manuscripts and proofs)
4. Key Publications drawn from the Full Corpus (for external reviewers)
5. Citation Index Listings (if applicable)
6. Grant Proposals and Reviews (if applicable)
7. Book Contracts (if applicable)
8. Readers’ Reports (if applicable)
9. Book Reviews (if applicable)
10. Course Syllabi
11. Awards (if applicable)

Department Documents (for the department to provide)
1. Department Letter
2. Internal Reports on Scholarship/Teaching (if available)
3. List of Suggested External Referees
4. List of Suggested Benchmarks
5. List of Suggested Student Referees
6. External Referee Letters to the Department
7. Sample Request Letter from the Department to External Referees
8. Copies of the Replies of External Referees who declined
9. CTECs (The recommended CTEC Instructor Reports are the administrator’s version with student comments pulled from CAESAR/Blue)
10. Peer Classroom Observations (optional)
11. THREE copies each of published books

Upload electronic versions of EVERYTHING above (except published books) to our dedicated tenure review site, Faculty Folio RPT. SCANS should be 600 dpi resolution.

For CANDIDATES FOR FULL PROFESSOR, the Dean’s Office requires the following documents in electronic format (see also Required Materials for Promotion Review).
Exactly as for tenure candidates, except only **ONE** copy each of published books is required. **Upload** electronic versions of EVERYTHING above (except published books) to our dedicated promotion review site, Faculty Folio RPT. SCANS should be 600 dpi resolution.

**NAMING CONVENTION FOR ELECTRONIC FILES** *(using the surname Smith as an example):*

- Smith_cv
- Smith_statement
- Smith_publication_1 (etc., corresponding to the list of numbered publications in the CV)
- Smith_key_publication_1 (these key publications are sent to external referees)
- Smith_citations
- Smith_grant_information
- Smith_book_contract
- Smith_readers’_reports
- Smith_book_reviews
- Smith_syllabi
- Smith_awards
- Smith_department_letter
- Smith_internal_department_report (on scholarship or teaching, if they exist)
- Smith_list_of_suggested_external_referees
- Smith_list_of_suggested_benchmarks
- Smith_list_of_suggested_student_referees
- Smith_external_referee_letters_to_the_department
- Smith_sample_letter_to_external_referee
- Smith_copies_of_external_referees_declined_department
- Smith_CTECs
- Smith_peer_classroom_observation

The dossier should be assembled with care.

**K. MATERIALS SUPPLIED BY THE CANDIDATE.**

These items are prepared specifically by the candidate for the department and then passed on to the Dean’s Office. For a complete list of items supplied by the candidate, please see subsection V.J.

**1. CURRICULUM VITAE.**

The candidate’s CV should contain the information described in subsection V.W. The vita is routinely sent to external referees. For that reason, it should be prepared with care and checked for accuracy. It is to the candidate’s advantage to include a technical narrative describing current or forthcoming research plans since many referees are interested in the anticipated direction of the candidate’s work. Increasingly, referees are asking to see detailed
descriptions of a candidate’s research presented in a separate, stand-alone document. An alternative would be to send out the more general statement described below.

2. STATEMENT BY THE CANDIDATE.

Whereas any narrative in the vita should be written for experts in the field, a separate non-technical statement of self-assessment is needed for the faculty promotion committees within Weinberg College. The chair solicits from the candidate a description of their past and present work and plans for the future. It is an opportunity for the candidate to make a case for their accomplishments in teaching, research, and service. The statement should be typed, be no more than five-to-ten pages double-spaced, and be addressed to educated, non-specialist readers (i.e., not colleagues in the candidate’s home department). Members of the Committee on Promotion or the Committee on Tenure and of individual ad hoc committees find clear, concise statements to be extraordinarily helpful in evaluating a case for promotion.

3. OTHER MATERIALS.

Other items to be provided by the candidate should include the full corpus of publications, several key publications drawn from the full corpus (see subsection V.K.4), copies of the readers’ reports and book contracts (if a candidate’s field expects a book for promotion), published reviews of the candidate’s work, grant proposals (current, approved, and pending), citations of the candidate’s publications, course syllabi, and names of student referees. The names of student referees are to be submitted by the department in consultation with the candidate (see subsection V.L.10). For a complete list of items supplied by the candidate, please see section V.J.

4. KEY PUBLICATIONS

In both tenure and promotion cases, a candidate will select key publications for the Dean’s Office to send to external referees as part of the review packet. Candidates should take care in selecting these key publications: articles published in peer-reviewed journals are helpful, although it’s generally not useful to send an article that roughly duplicates the material in a major book project that is also included in the key publications. Published work that is part of a candidate’s next major project would be important to include since it points to how a candidate’s research program is advancing. The suggested number of key publications, including books, is five or six. Candidates might consider consulting with a senior colleague or two about the selection of key publications.

L. DEPARTMENT LETTER.

The letter should report the departmental vote and describe the kinds of assessments that cannot be reflected in bare vote totals. The letter should define the role of the candidate’s teaching and their subfield of research in the present and future functioning of the department. The letter must demonstrate that appropriately high standards have been applied and that the
candidate meets these standards. This requirement does not mean that the candidate should be presented as being without flaws. Strengths and weaknesses should be discussed as well as directions in which the candidate should be expected to grow as a scholar and teacher. This letter should be written and signed by a chair of the committee and a small subset of the department members who voted. Please note that the letter should be made available in the department office to all voters before it is sent to the Dean’s Office. It is imperative that a full and candid account of departmental discussion, both positive and negative, be included in the department letter. (On the submission of minority reports, see section V.U.)

1. DEPARTMENTAL VOTE.

Complete and exact vote totals (including abstentions, absences, and those not voting), the number of eligible voters, and the names of eligible faculty who voted and those who did not should be specified. Absentee voters, if unexcused, will be understood as abstentions. If the vote is not unanimous, the department should specify how large a majority constitutes recommendation to promote (see subsection V.H.3). If a straw vote is taken before the final vote, that vote and any discussion of it should be reported as well.

2. EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE’S SCHOLARSHIP OR EQUIVALENT CREATIVE ACTIVITY.

The department letter should assess dispassionately the content, quality, and importance of the candidate’s work. It should describe the productivity of the candidate and give some indication of the scholarly norms of their field. It should evaluate the candidate’s success in attracting necessary financial support for scholarly projects and the likelihood that they will continue to compete successfully for funding. The department letter must compare the candidate with a cohort of leading scholars, by name and affiliation, who have similar rank and service in that field. That cohort will, in most cases, include the benchmark scholars (see subsection V.L.8).

The department indicates which of the candidate’s works and achievements are of particular significance and the ways in which they are significant. If accompanying evaluative materials are highly technical or if the methodology is controversial, the department letter should include a clear explanation of the candidate’s work in terms accessible to non-specialists.

In a tenure review, the department evaluates first and foremost the work completed during the probationary period at Northwestern or at a peer institution. Earlier accomplishments that have enduring influence on the field should also be highlighted, but the candidate’s potential for intellectual leadership rests on their independent scholarship.

If the work that is most important to the promotion is newly-published or not yet published, the department should discuss the timing of the promotion. If a candidate’s field expects a book for promotion, ideally the work should be published prior to the start of the review. If it is not, the final form of the manuscript should be accepted for publication by the time of the
department vote; that is to say, the manuscript should at least be “in press” and readers’ reports should be available. In addition, it is imperative that the department evaluate the evidence of progress on a second major project beyond the candidate’s doctoral work, which is a requirement for tenure in "book fields."

The letter should recount in ample detail the lines of discussion in the department meeting, including reservations and rebuttals. Minority arguments, whether for or against the candidate, should be given an adequate hearing, either in the text of the letter or through submission of a signed minority report(s).

3. CANDIDATE’S FIELD.

The letter to external reviewers asks about the candidate’s “contributions to [specified] field.” The department may recommend wording, as may the candidate, but the ad hoc committee has final authority to word the question.

4. ISSUES OF SPECIAL CONCERN TO THE COMMITTEES ON TENURE AND PROMOTION.

In the letter the department should address any features of the case that might raise questions in later stages of the process. Below are a few issues that the Committee on Tenure and/or the Committee on Promotion often worry about.

- Early promotion to tenure. If the candidate is not in their final probationary year, the department should explain why promotion at this point is appropriate.
- Extensive co-authorship. If the candidate's publication record since joining Northwestern contains many jointly authored publications, the department should specify the candidate's distinctive contribution to the joint work, in terms of both research and analysis.
- Continued collaboration with former mentors. If the candidate's publication record since joining Northwestern includes many publications with former graduate or postdoctoral mentors, the department should indicate the reasons for this and specify the candidate's distinctive contribution to the joint work.
- Unpublished book. In "book fields," if a department recommends promotion before a book has been published or at least reached the final stages of copy editing, it should explain why the review is appropriate at this point. Late submission of a manuscript by a tenure candidate leads reviewers and committee members to wonder about the candidate’s productivity and their ability to bring future projects to completion.
- Under Contract. If a book is “under contract,” what are the contingencies to be satisfied before publication?
- The "dissertation book." If the book is based on the dissertation, in what ways does it go beyond the earlier work? Is there additional research? How many chapters were substantially rewritten? How many are brand new?
• Choice of press in book fields. If the candidate does not place their book with a top academic press, with rigorous peer review, the department should explain in detail the rationale for the candidate’s choice.
• Duplication in published work. If published articles overlap with the book (or with each other), how substantial is the overlap?
• Low publication in refereed journals. If the candidate has not published in major refereed journals, the department should explain why.
• Progress on the second book. In tenure cases, is there evidence of significant progress on a second major publication project beyond the candidate's doctoral work?
• Last-minute publication surge. If there is a substantial gap in a candidate’s publication record followed by a burst of publishing activity just prior to the onset of promotion review, the department should explain why. Otherwise, reviewers and committee members may view the impending promotion/tenure decision as the candidate’s primary motivation for bringing work to completion.
• Lack of funding in the sciences and those social sciences where external support is needed for research. If the candidate lacks current or future funding, how will they be able to conduct leading-edge research and advance an important scholarly program? How will graduate students be supported? Is there evidence of appropriately aggressive application for funding?
• Lack of evidence about undergraduate teaching. In particular, the committees are concerned when a colleague has not taught undergraduates and mentored their work.

5. SOLICITED REFEREES’ OPINIONS AT THE DEPARTMENT LEVEL.

The department must include the original letters—three to six—that it has collected from external authorities. As stated above, the department should not seek evaluations from former advisors, post-doctoral supervisors, close personal friends, or others having a relationship with the candidate that might reduce objectivity. If a candidate publishes co-authored works in a field where co-authorship is not the accepted norm, and the department wishes to call on one of the co-authors to comment on the candidate’s dossier, it should clarify why it is necessary or desirable to do so.

The department should also include one example of the letter it sent to referees stating the relevant questions along with copies of the replies of the authorities who declined to participate in the review. See V.G.

6. EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE’S TEACHING AND ADVISING.

There is no simple formula for good teaching, but effective instructors are often described in terms of imagination, high standards, conscientiousness, clarity, a feel for what is important and original, respect for students, and an ability to motivate students to do their best work. This may be seen in classroom style, course development, guidance provided to TAs, and mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows (if relevant). Improvement in quality of
instruction during a faculty member’s years here should be taken into account, as should the ability to engage students actively rather than just to impart information.

The letter should include an account of the department’s enrollment patterns and enrollments in the candidate’s courses, with explanations of any of the latter that are atypically high or low. Mainly, the department letter should present an evaluation of the candidate’s teaching, referring whenever possible to evidence such as teaching materials (syllabi and examinations), reports of classroom visits by senior faculty, CTEC forms (the recommended CTEC Instructor Reports are the administrator’s version with student comments pulled from CAESAR/Blue), a brief narrative in the department letter that contextualizes CTEC statistical summaries, information about teaching innovations and course development, evidence of teaching awards, etc. Any letters solicited from students should be attached, together with a statement as to how the writers were chosen and a copy of the requesting letter, if any. The department should evaluate the candidate’s performance as an adviser of students, undergraduate and graduate, and as a supervisor of teaching assistants.

If the candidate’s teaching is less than excellent, the letter should specify actions already taken to improve performance and note the degree of success so far achieved.

7. CITIZENSHIP AND SERVICE.

The department should evaluate the candidate’s citizenship and their service on departmental and other committees, as well as their performance of other non-teaching responsibilities.

8. BENCHMARKS.

The department letter includes the names of scholars, normally three or four, with whom external referees could be asked to compare the candidate. (The department suggests benchmarks, although the chair may consult the candidate. The ad hoc committee (in tenure cases) makes the final determination of benchmarks. In promotion cases, the Dean generally defers to the department’s suggested benchmarks.) This group is the cohort, or a subset of the cohort, with whom the candidate was compared earlier in the department letter (see subsection V.L.2).

a) DESCRIPTION.

These persons should be the leading scholars in the candidate’s subfield and should be slightly more advanced. They must be tenurable at Northwestern and normally already hold the rank for which the candidate has been recommended. Referees will be asked to compare candidate and benchmark at equivalent points in their careers. The letter should indicate the exact current title and departmental and institutional affiliation of each, along with a short description of each benchmark’s achievements and standing in the field.
b) SCHOLARLY FIELD OF BENCHMARKS.

The field of the candidate should not be construed so literally and narrowly that only scholars working exactly in it can be recommended. By way of hypothetical example, a candidate working in mid-seventeenth-century French agrarian history need not be compared only with scholars in precisely that area but is quite appropriately compared with any historian whose field is post-medieval, pre-Revolutionary French history. In short, outside referees should be asked to compare a candidate with leading scholars who are in roughly the same area or a closely cognate area.

c) STATURE OF BENCHMARKS.

The list of benchmarks allows comparison of the candidate with the leaders in their field who are slightly more advanced. The purpose of the comparison is to establish whether the candidate is a likely leader in their field. Benchmarks are expected to be at the best universities in the country. If, for some special reason, a leading member of the field is at a lesser institution, that person’s name may be added to those of individuals at top-rated institutions.

d) USEFULNESS OF BENCHMARKS.

In 1985-86, responding to questions raised at various stages of the promotion process, the Dean’s Advisory Council on Tenure and Promotion Issues (DACTPI), a subcommittee of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, strongly affirmed the value of benchmarks as a means of obtaining information about candidates’ qualifications.

DACTPI agreed that variances from this procedure would be acceptable only in the most unusual circumstances, but acknowledged that in rare instances the specifying of benchmarks in letters to outside referees might be seriously misleading or difficult. If a chair is convinced that such would be the case, they should so recommend and explain fully. The department’s discussion will be considered by the ad hoc committee and Dean; if they find it persuasive, the letters to outside referees will not name benchmarks but will request that the referees themselves suggest comparable figures and make the comparisons. If the ad hoc committee and Dean do not find the case persuasive, benchmarks will have to be supplied.

9. EXTERNAL REFEREES.

The department letter should name at least eight external referees who have not already been contacted by the department. Because Weinberg College aims to tenure faculty members of the highest quality and who would qualify for appointment at any school in the country, departments should name referees from top departments and universities (an exception may be necessary in the case of a recognized authority in a more specialized field who happens to be located at a less prestigious school). These referees must be known to have tenure. For a promotion to the rank of professor, the referees should be full professors. Care should be taken that their research interests are close to the candidate’s.
Departments should not leave it to the ad hoc committee or the Dean’s Office to unearth on its own the most appropriate referees. On its list the department should star those referees whom it regards as the most essential. The Dean will ensure that these scholars are solicited for an evaluation. Additionally, the department may flag those referees (up to 3-4) who should not be contacted. The Dean will ensure that these scholars are not solicited for an evaluation.

For each referee, please indicate the standing of the individual and their appropriateness to evaluate the candidate. Because external evaluators must be able to provide an objective evaluation of the work, it is essential that departments ascertain the relationship of those individuals with the candidate so that letters will not be sought from persons who cannot provide an arm’s-length evaluation. The department should not seek evaluations from former advisors, post-doctoral supervisors, close personal friends, or others having a relationship with the candidate that might reduce objectivity. If a candidate publishes co-authored works in a field where co-authorship is not the accepted norm, and the department wishes to call on one of the co-authors to comment on the candidate’s dossier, the department should clarify why it is necessary or desirable to do so.

Full, exact mailing and email addresses and departmental telephone numbers are needed (frequently the Dean’s Office needs to be in touch with a referee or with their office by phone). See subsection V.G about letters from external referees at the departmental level.

In assembling the list of referees, the department may consult with the candidate. But the department must make an independent effort to discover who the leading figures are in that field and should derive no more than half its names from the candidate’s own choices. The submitted list should include an indication of which names were provided by the candidate.

10. STUDENT REFEREES.

With the advice of the candidate, the department should provide the names and current email addresses (and, if known, the course number and title and the term in which the student was enrolled), of at least five former undergraduate and graduate students (the distribution to be determined by the academic focus of the department and candidate). If the department wishes to solicit letters from students before making its recommendation, those letters should be attached to the department letter, and other students named for the Dean’s Office list. The Dean’s Office writes to a randomly selected set of approximately twenty-five former students and advisees as well as to those proposed by the department.

M. SUPPORTING MATERIALS: PUBLICATIONS OR EQUIVALENT MATERIALS.

Articles and books that have been completed—and have appeared in print, are in press, or have been submitted for publication—are preferred. (If a book manuscript is unpublished, a copy of the contract from the publisher must be presented.) All publications are needed, not just
those completed since the last promotion or review. Work-in-progress should be included if it has reached a sufficient state of readiness to make evident its likely final form and importance to the candidate’s advancing research program. If the candidate has received patents for their work, those should be included with publications.

Candidates should check their manuscripts carefully to make sure all pages are legible and that no section is missing. The version of the manuscript presented to the Dean’s Office in the dossier is the one that will be sent to reviewers, although this version may include any revisions the candidate may have made subsequent to submitting their manuscript for the departmental review a few months earlier. Revisions to the manuscript beyond this point cannot be considered in the review.

If the candidate is presenting web-based scholarship as part of the dossier, it is their responsibility to make sure that reviewers can access it. This may mean supplying passwords or checking that the site can be read from a variety of platforms and browsers.

N. SUPPORTING MATERIALS ABOUT TEACHING.

Copies of CTEC course evaluations for every course taught during the review period (the recommended CTEC Instructor Reports are the administrator’s version with student comments pulled from CAESAR/Blue) and course syllabi are required. Evidence of awards; information about course development; course examinations; reports of classroom visits by senior faculty; letters from students to the instructor; descriptions of the role the candidate played in advising students; post-Northwestern affiliations of former advisees, etc., are submitted as appropriate.

O. MATERIALS ABOUT RELATIVE STANDING IN THE FIELD AND CURRENT RESEARCH.

All College review committees interest themselves in all evaluative materials and in materials relating to the candidate’s current research; these should be copied and included in the dossier of materials:

- Published reviews of the candidate’s work
- Readers’ reports of a candidate’s manuscript from a university press
- Grant proposals (current), both approved and pending. (Cover sheet, abstract, budget pages, reviewers’ comments only.) Candidates may include “pink sheets” at their discretion.
- Citations of the candidate’s publications as referenced by the *ISI Web of Knowledge, ISI Web of Science, Scopus, PubMed, Science Citation Index, Social Sciences Citation Index, Arts and Humanities Index, Google Scholar,* or alternative computer-generated source. Any third-party comments about the candidate’s research in such essays as “The Year’s Work in …” or “Recent Work in …” are also useful. The College review committees use
citations to judge how widely the candidate’s work is used, and the most useful citation indices indicate both how often the candidate’s work is cited and by whom.

P. CANDIDATE’S FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE.

In the fall, the Dean’s Office will ask each candidate to designate a representative from among the departmental faculty eligible to vote on their case. During the year, the candidate may communicate with the Dean’s Office through the department chair and/or the representative. In turn, the Dean’s Office will be in touch with the chair and representative if questions or requests arise in the process. A candidate should not designate a representative who will be on leave during the period of the promotion review. (For further expected duties of the representative, see V.R.)

Q. ADDITIONAL MATERIALS; APPROPRIATE PROCEDURE.

Additional materials (for example, vita updates, new publications, readers’ reports from a press) can be added to a dossier at any time for the use of the Dean and appropriate committees. All such should be routed to the Dean’s Office through chairs and/or representatives. Any inquiries about the process from candidates should similarly be routed. Please note that external referees will not be sent updates to materials once they have received the letter and packet from the Dean’s Office.

R. AD HOC COMMITTEE; COMMITTEE ON TENURE; COMMITTEE ON PROMOTION.

For the Dean’s instructions to tenure ad hoc committees, sample letters to external and student referees, and statement about our procedures, see the document *The Ad Hoc Review: a summary*. The department is informed of the vote of the ad hoc committee, is invited to read the redacted report, and may respond when appropriate. The department does not see the letters collected by the ad hoc committee or the Dean’s Office. The department is not informed of the vote of the Committee on Promotion or Committee on Tenure.

Should a delegation be called to appear on behalf of the candidate before the Committee on Promotion or the Committee on Tenure, the candidate’s representative must be included in the delegation. The Committee on Tenure and the Committee on Promotion call delegations for about forty percent of candidates. The request for a delegation should be regarded as routine. It is an occasion for productive discussion with colleagues from other departments.

S. CANDIDATES WHO DECLINE TO BE REVIEWED FOR TENURE.

If faculty members in the final year of their probationary term decline to be reviewed for tenure, they will be offered a terminal year on the faculty at their current rank.
T. DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION AGAINST THE GRANT OF TENURE.

When a department recommends against conferring tenure, the letter from the chair focuses on a full statement of the department’s discussion of the candidate’s record in research, teaching, and service along with an indication of the procedures followed in the departmental review. Strengths and weaknesses should be presented: Minority opinions should be adequately represented either in the text of the letter or in a minority report. An account of the departmental vote must be included (as in subsection V.H and subsection V.L.1), and the letter must be signed by several senior faculty members. Along with the letter, the department should submit the candidate’s complete CV and statement. The external referees’ letters collected by the department must be included (evaluation by phone is not permitted). Copies of publications, materials about teaching, grant proposals, etc. that were used in the departmental review should be held in the department and available for review by the Dean should that be appropriate.

The Dean invites the candidate to submit a response. The Dean then evaluates the departmental recommendation and the nature of its review process before deciding whether to uphold the departmental recommendation or—in exceptional circumstances—to proceed with a College-level review. Normally, the candidate is informed of the decision in December or January.

U. LETTERS FROM FACULTY MEMBERS; MINORITY REPORTS.

Any faculty member may write to the Dean about any candidate. Whether the department recommends for or against the grant of tenure or promotion, any dissenting member or members of the candidate’s department or program may submit a minority report. Minority reports become part of the dossier considered by the Dean and, if appropriate, the Provost. A writer of such a letter in a tenure case should expect it to be submitted to the ad hoc committee (except in truly unusual circumstances) but may specify whether it should be edited for confidentiality before being seen by the larger Committee on Tenure. In promotions to professor, the writer may issue the same instruction before their letter is seen by the Committee on Promotion.

If the chair of the department wishes to submit a personal opinion about the case, they should make it clear that the letter does not represent the sentiment of the department or any fraction of it.

V. APPEALS OF A NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION OR DECISION.
The authority to make negative decisions about tenure or promotion rests with the Dean. The dossiers of these candidates are not forwarded to the Provost and President. The central administration may also turn down a candidate recommended by the Dean.

1. DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION.

The candidate wishing to appeal a negative recommendation by their department should promptly address a letter to the Dean outlining the case for promotion and discussing the departmental action. Should the Dean then uphold the department’s recommendation and decide to deny the application for tenure, the candidate has recourse to the University Faculty Appeals Committee (see the Northwestern University Faculty Handbook).

2. DEAN’S OR PROVOST’S DECISION.

When a promotion is turned down by the Dean or Provost at the end of the year-long review, the candidate is typically informed by June. The candidate may request a meeting with the Dean (or Provost, when appropriate) and, following that meeting, a written statement of reasons for the decision. The candidate then has recourse to the University Faculty Appeals Committee (see the Northwestern University Faculty Handbook), which hears appeals based on violations of academic freedom, procedural flaws ("inadequate consideration") or alleged discrimination, but not on issues of substance. Appeals must be filed within sixty days of the official notification to the candidate of a negative decision.

W. PREPARING A CV.

The mores of a discipline will in some measure determine the form and content of a faculty member’s professional CV—on which a number of items mentioned below would likely not appear. But when a faculty member is being considered for reappointment, promotion, or the grant of tenure, all the information noted here should be included, whether or not this particular arrangement is followed. The CV should be a reasonably self-sufficient document for a non-specialist reader. Abbreviations of professional organizations, journal titles, etc., should be spelled out in their first appearance at least. Please supply a copy of the vita as an electronic attachment if at all possible. A PDF version of these guidelines is available at https://www.weinberg.northwestern.edu/faculty/documents/preparing-a-curriculum-vitae.pdf.

1. DATE. The CV should be up-to-date and should carry the date (month and year) when it was prepared.
2. NAME. Optional: local address, etc.
3. MAJOR PROFESSIONAL INTEREST(S). e.g., low-temperature physics; econometrics; eighteenth-century French literature.
4. EDUCATION. Colleges and universities attended, degrees, dates. It is helpful to reviewers if the candidate identifies their dissertation mentor and, if applicable, postdoctoral adviser(s) as well.
5. PRE-DOCTORAL AWARDS, HONORS, AND FELLOWSHIPS—WITH DATES. e.g., Phi Beta Kappa; Fulbright Fellowship for graduate research in Italy, National Science Foundation Graduate Fellowship, etc.

6. POSTDOCTORAL RECOGNITIONS—WITH DATES. Awards, honors, and fellowships, e.g., National Institutes of Health Research Career Development Award, National Endowment for the Humanities Senior Fellowship, National Book Award, American Academy of Arts and Sciences membership.

7. EMPLOYMENT. This should be an itemized list, with affiliations and dates. It is advisable to account for all of the time since the undergraduate degree: military service, work in industry, postdoctoral and other research appointments, faculty appointments (including ranks). Joint faculty appointments in other departments, schools, or centers, etc., should be included.

8. RESEARCH SUPPORT: PAST, PRESENT, PENDING. An itemized, complete list of projects supported by grants from Northwestern and elsewhere, each item to include co-investigators if any (principal investigator first), full title, source of funds, dollar amount, dates active, etc.—with the same details for pending grant applications.

9. PUBLICATIONS (OR ANALOGOUS ACTIVITIES IN THE ARTS). Each item describing a scholarly book or monograph, textbook, article, review, edition, translation, etc. should be full and clear. All authors should be named, together with the complete title of each publication (when first mentioned at least): the name, volume number, issue number, and date of the journal or publisher, and the inclusive pagination of the item. Please check these items for accuracy. If a publication has multiple authors, please indicate whether co-authors are students or postdocs by underlining their names and providing a key at the beginning of the “Publications” section (e.g.:“underlined names indicate student or postdoc co-authors”) or by starring these names and inserting a footnote (e.g.:“*starred names indicate student or postdoc co-authors”). Finally, publications supplied in the dossier should be presented in chronological order with the most recent publication at the top. The publications should be numbered consecutively (do not repeat numbers) in descending order (i.e., the most recent pub assigned the highest number) and the corresponding numbers written on the publications.

10. WORK NOW IN PROGRESS. Title and status of the papers. Also a paragraph or more describing work underway or in advanced stages of planning. This section should be written for an audience composed of scholars in the field.

11. PROFESSIONAL TALKS. Lectures, colloquia, panel appearances, talks, seminars, etc., with particulars: what, where, when, auspices, etc.

12. LEAVES OF ABSENCE. Dates, substantive research topics, sources of support, dollar amounts, locales where research was undertaken (name of library, laboratory, etc.). Only research leaves should be listed (and not medical, childbearing, adoption, childrearing, and other types of leaves).

13. PEER-REVIEW AND RELATED ACTIVITIES. Memberships on panels evaluating research proposals; editorships; committees considering colleagues for honors; readerships for scholarly journals or presses; etc.

14. MAJOR CONSULTANCIES IN THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS.
15. PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS AND SERVICE. Memberships, offices, and related activities, e.g., the planning and convening of a scholarly conference.

16. OTHER MATTERS RELATED TO RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION.

17. TEACHING AND ADVISING. The detail in this category would be unusual in a routine CV, but some attention to these matters is requested of candidates for appointment, and full particulars are required of candidates for reappointment, the grant of tenure, or promotion. A) Areas of undergraduate and graduate teaching during the last five years; B) specific courses taught in at least the last three years: titles, levels, formats, etc. (individual 399s should be listed separately; see below); C) curriculum development, the establishment of new or improved courses, etc., during at least the last five years; D) names of students in tutorial or advisory registrations in at least the last three years (398s, 399s, 490s, 590s); E) names of M.A. and M.S. candidates whose preparing and examining committees you have served on during the last five years; F) names and dates of PhDs for whose doctoral work you have been chief adviser. Affiliation of those now graduated; G) names of PhD candidates for whom you have been an adviser, committee member, dissertation reader, etc., in at least the last five years, with specific roles indicated; H) other activities related to the teaching and advising of undergraduate and graduate students, in department, College or University level; I) teaching awards and honors.

18. DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE. This should cover at least the last five years. A) Memberships and offices on department and program committees; B) memberships and offices on standing and ad hoc committees of the Weinberg College faculty; C) memberships and offices on committees of the University Senate. D) Student relations, e.g., Master or Faculty Associate of a residential college.

19. COMMUNITY WORK: PUBLIC OFFICES, ETC.