

# Guidelines for Candidates for Tenure and Promotion

## 2022-2023

### Policy for the Grant of Tenure

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 research and teaching. Weinberg College aims for the superlative, and each case is evaluated on its own merits. When making a positive 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. Tenure is not awarded for competent service, solid research, and adequate teaching.

#### Research

In most cases, professional achievement takes the form of research activity that results in scholarly publications or creative works that are published or publicly displayed. 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 and/or discipline. 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 and international reputations through their research, writing, and/or creative work. In all regards, the standard is a high level of excellence.

#### Teaching

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.

#### Service

A candidate's record of service is demonstrated by participation in activities related to governance of the academic community at any level of the organization: department, College, or University. Assistant professors, like other members of the tenure-line faculty, are expected to share in the duties of faculty governance, although they may have concentrated their service within the department. Moreover, some individuals demonstrate additional service to their disciplines.

### **The stages of review: reappointment and tenure review**

In almost all cases, candidates for tenure will have undergone formal review at the time of reappointment, typically in the third year of the probationary term. 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 discussions. 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.

### **When to apply for tenure review**

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, the Dean's Office instructs departments and review committees to hold the candidate to the same standards as any other faculty member in the sixth probationary year and not to some more stringent standard.

### **Stopping the tenure clock**

Northwestern will permit faculty members to request extensions of their probationary term in cases where particular circumstances have arisen to interfere substantially with the research and/or other projects the faculty member intends to submit as part of their tenure review. Such circumstances may include parental responsibilities relating to the birth, adoption or rearing of a child; personal or family emergencies, for example, chronic illness of the faculty member or a member of the immediate family; or the failure of the University to meet a commitment with regard to research facilities (e.g., promised space is not made available). Although the decision on each request will depend on the specific circumstances, requests to prolong the probationary term by one year for circumstances relating to the birth or adoption of a child will automatically receive favorable consideration; requests related to childrearing will generally receive favorable consideration. (Application should be made after the birth or adoption.) Except in unusual circumstances, clocks will not be stopped during a year of research or employment elsewhere, nor does this policy apply to situations that arise normally as a faculty member's program expands and evolves (e.g., the faculty member wishes to obtain additional space; an important grant application is turned down; the member embarks on a new line of research). Please consult the University policy about [Faculty Family Leave](#) and on [Extending the Probationary Period for Tenure-Track Faculty](#).

Before September 1st of the year of tenure review, the faculty member writes a letter to the chair of their academic unit stating specifically how circumstances interfere with their progress and might justify an extended probationary period. In requests for extensions related to childrearing, the letter

must state explicitly that the faculty member in question is at least an equal partner in the childrearing. The letter must also state explicitly that the faculty member understands that they “will not enjoy an entitlement or stronger claim to tenure by virtue of continued membership on the faculty beyond the customary probationary period.”

The chair must evaluate the circumstances in relation to those faced by other assistant professors and provide a recommendation to the Dean. Requests based on personal reasons are not subject to debate or vote by the department. The chair forwards that evaluation and the original letter to the Dean. Should the Dean not approve the request, the faculty member may apply directly to the Provost for a review of the decision.

### **COVID-19 tenure clock extension**

In March 2020, in response to the unprecedented disruptions caused by the worldwide outbreak of COVID-19, Northwestern offered a one-year COVID-19 Tenure Clock Extension to all tenure-track probationary faculty then on the faculty. Any faculty members who were in their probationary period during Academic Year 2019-20, and whose tenure review had not yet begun, were eligible for and received this extension. In April 2021, Northwestern offered a one-year COVID-19 Tenure Clock Extension to tenure-track probationary faculty who started at Northwestern in 2020-2021.

An Opt-Out procedure was established for faculty who received the automatic one-year COVID-19 probationary period extension but who wish to opt out of it. Eligible probationary faculty who wish to opt out must follow any established procedures in the College for requesting tenure review, and should also inform their department chair, the Dean’s Office, and the Office of the Provost by May 15 prior to the Academic Year in which they wish to be reviewed for tenure. For more information on this policy and related procedures, please consult the [FAQs on COVID-19 Tenure Clock Extensions](#).

### **Mentorship for tenure candidates**

Senior members of the department are typically available to offer guidance and advice about publication strategy, allotment of time, and other matters pertaining to the development of a scholarly career, the improvement of teaching, the tenure process, and other matters. Some departments assign “mentors,” and some take a more informal approach. For scholars with an interdisciplinary bent, senior colleagues in a Center or Program may be sources of guidance. The Associate Dean for Faculty is also available to discuss professional concerns. It is the responsibility of the candidate to seek out such advice when needed.

## **Policy for the Grant of Promotion to Full Professor**

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 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. 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.

In cases where a book is to be presented as a major component of the promotion dossier, it is best if it has been published and reviewed. Unpublished proofs and galleys may be submitted as part of a candidate's promotion materials. Some candidates do submit unpublished typescripts, accompanied by a contract from a press, along with readers' reports and, if applicable, author's responses. In such cases, it is expected that significant work beyond the scope of the book project has already appeared and had time to enter into debates in the field.

If a candidate's research program depends on extramural funding, there must be clear evidence that they have secured such funding or is doing everything possible to do so in order to sustain a strong research program.

## **The Review Process for both Tenure and Promotion: Stages and Timing**

### **Department-level review**

In the year before the promotion review, the department chair and candidate should settle on a timetable for submitting the various materials in the dossier. It may be necessary to present some items in the spring preceding the departmental vote so that the chair may solicit letters from external authorities over the summer. If a candidate's field expects a book for promotion, ideally it 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. Late submission 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 – particularly by candidates for tenure – is often viewed with skepticism since this may create the impression that they needed the "fire" of an impending tenure decision to bring work to completion.

The department conducts the initial review of the candidate. It calls upon external authorities for evaluation of the candidate's work and standing, sending them the CV and offering copies of publications. No more than half of such referees may be named by the candidate. The referees should not be former

advisors, post-doctoral supervisors, close personal friends, or others having a relationship with the candidate that might reduce objectivity. Individual members of the department may also provide formal assessments to their voting colleagues. In the fall, the department discusses the promotion, votes, and forwards its recommendation to the Dean. When that recommendation is positive, the department must also submit a dossier of materials, some of which are supplied by the candidate. These materials are due in the Dean's Office in October (cases for tenure) or November (cases for promotion to full professor). (The due dates appear on pages 6-7 of this document.) The dossier should be assembled with care.

**Applicable to tenure cases: departmental recommendation against the grant of tenure**

When the department votes not to recommend a candidate for tenure in their final probationary year, the department must submit to the Dean a letter explaining the basis of that evaluation and the nature of the departmental review. This letter 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, including an account of the department vote. Strengths and weaknesses are presented, and minority opinions are represented either in the text of the letter or in a minority report. The department's letter is accompanied by the candidate's vita, personal statement, and the external referees' letters collected by the department.

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](#)).

**Candidates' communication with the Dean's Office during the review period**

During the review beyond the level of the department, the candidate may communicate with the Dean's Office through the department chair and/or a senior colleague whom the candidate names as their faculty representative. Likewise, the Dean's Office will be in touch with both the chair and the designated representative if questions or requests arise in the review process. A candidate should not designate a representative who will be on leave during the period of the promotion review.

**Applicable to tenure cases: confidential ad hoc committees**

The Dean sets up an ad hoc committee for each tenure candidate who has been recommended positively (ad hoc committees in promotions to full professor were discontinued in 2010). Such committees typically have three members. Committee members always come from outside the candidate's department. They normally work in related fields or have special knowledge of the candidate's field. The identities of the members remain confidential and the committee operates through the agency of the Dean's Office. The committee reviews material submitted by the department and seeks the advice of authorities in the field and former students of the candidate. (Sample letters can be found in Appendices 3-6.) The committee selects the referees and determines how the candidate's field should be described to referees. The evaluations gathered from external authorities are fundamentally important in the College's assessment of the quality and influence of a candidate's work and of the strength of their scholarly reputation. The ad hoc committee generally delivers its report and recommendation to the Dean in February, the department is informed of the recommendation, and senior members may read an edited version of the report. (The department does not see the letters collected by the ad hoc committee.) If appropriate, the department may submit a response.

### **The Committee on Tenure and the Committee on Promotion**

In March and April (usually), the College's elected Committee on Tenure and Committee on Promotion meet to examine all Weinberg College cases for tenure and for promotion to full professor, respectively. The charge of each Committee is to monitor the quality of recommendations made by departments and ad hoc committees and to ensure that consistent standards are applied across the College. The twelve members of the Committee on Tenure and the six members of the Committee on Promotion serve in equal numbers from the three Divisions; they are elected for staggered three-year terms. A Committee member does not participate in the discussion of candidates from their own department and does not review those files. Like the ad hoc committees, the Committee on Tenure and the Committee on Promotion see the materials submitted by the department. Members also read letters from external referees and letters from students. The Committee on Tenure reads redacted versions of the ad hoc report. In a large number of cases, the Committee has questions which are not answered by the dossier, and it will invite a delegation from the department to meet with it. The candidate's representative is one member of the delegation. At the end of the deliberations, the appropriate Committee votes on each case, such votes serving as advice to the Dean. A positive vote requires two-thirds of voters to favor promotion. These votes are not reported to departments.

### **The Dean's recommendation**

The Dean receives recommendations from the department, the ad hoc committee (in tenure cases), the Committee on Tenure or the Committee on Promotion in the form of votes and, more importantly, written and oral comments. All three bodies are advisory to the Dean; none enjoys primacy by virtue of sequence in the process or number of voters. The Dean reviews each file and decides whether to recommend promotion. The Dean then submits the positive recommendations to the Provost for approval and reports the names of those candidates whom he has decided not to promote. The Provost and President will likely respond in late May or early June, at which point each candidate is notified of the decision. Promotions usually take effect the following September 1<sup>st</sup> after ratification by the Board of Trustees.

The process is long and thorough. Candidates should not feel anxious because of its length; the several stages – not difficulties in any case – dictate the timetable.

### **Timetable and Due Dates**

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 department should collect 3-6 letters.) The candidate completes the dossier and may update materials supplied earlier in the year.

#### October.

- By October 10<sup>th</sup>, the department should vote on all candidates for tenure. (*If October 10<sup>th</sup> falls on a weekend, then the due date is the following Monday.*)
- By October 15<sup>th</sup>, the tenure candidate's portion of the dossier is submitted to the Dean's Office. (*If October 15<sup>th</sup> falls on a weekend, then the due date is the following Monday.*)

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

#### November.

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

The general timeline from 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 and students 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.

## **Dossiers for both Tenure and Promotion Reviews**

### **General contents**

The dossier submitted to the Dean's office contains items provided by the candidate and by the department:

#### **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 required by discipline norms)
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 Student Referees
5. External Referee Letters to the Department
6. Sample Request Letter from the Department to External Referees
7. Copies of the Replies of External Referees who declined
8. CTECs (The recommended CTEC Instructor Reports are the administrator's version with student comments pulled from CAESAR/Blue)
9. Peer Classroom Observations (optional)
10. **THREE** copies each of a candidate's published books in tenure cases, and **ONE** copy each of published books in promotion cases. (Normally, promotion candidates provide only books published since tenure. In addition, please note that the Dean's Office normally does not send edited volumes to external reviewers. Contact the Assistant Dean for Faculty Advancement if you have any questions regarding this policy.)

**The items above** (except published books) should be uploaded to the College's dedicated tenure or promotion review site, Faculty Folio RPT (Review, Promotion, and Tenure). Information about this review site will be provided to candidates and departments by the Dean's Office. (SCANS should be 600 dpi resolution.)

The candidate prepares their documents and submits them to the department; the chair will advise regarding department-level timetables and numbers of copies. So that the department may seek external letters, it may be necessary for the candidate to turn in key publications and a copy of the vita in the spring before the year of review. In this way, external authorities can be polled over the summer. The candidate may then submit updated copies of these materials in the fall before the department's vote.

**Department letter**

The chair and other senior members of the department provide a letter evaluating the candidate's teaching, research, service, and standing in the field. It is prepared by the chair and signed by several other members of the department. It also suggests the names of potential external referees and student referees.

**External referees:** The department suggests at least eight distinguished scholars typically at leading universities to whom the ad hoc committee (in tenure cases) and the Dean (in promotion cases) may turn for advice. Departments should try to avoid naming external referees from the same department (an exception may be necessary when two exceptional authorities are in the same department. However, such exceptions should be justified in writing). In assembling the list of referees, the department may consult with the candidate, but the department is instructed that no more than half of the list be composed of authorities named by the candidate. Proposed 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 reasonably close to the candidate's, although they should not all be in the same narrowly-defined subfield. External evaluators must be able to provide an objective evaluation of the work. They should not be former advisors, collaborators, post-doctoral supervisors, close personal friends, or others having a relationship with the candidate that might reduce objectivity. It is essential that those generating the list of prospective external referees 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 must indicate why each person named is an appropriate referee and must note any special distinction of the individual or special relationship between the candidate and a suggested referee (a former colleague, dissertation adviser, etc.). On its list, the department should star those referees whom it regards as the most essential. In tenure cases, the ad hoc committee will be asked to take into account the department's request but will make the final determination of which external referees are invited to write. In promotion cases, the Dean will ensure that the scholars starred by the department 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. The ad hoc committee (in tenure cases) and the Dean (in promotion cases) otherwise chooses to write to some or all of the suggested referees. The ad hoc committee (in tenure cases) also consults qualified individuals who are not on the list. The identities of all external referees remain confidential, and no one in the department sees the letters collected by the ad hoc committee.

**Student referees:** With the advice of the candidate, the department provides 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 or graduate students (the distribution to be determined by the academic focus of the department and candidate). The Dean usually writes to a randomly selected set of approximately twenty-five former students and advisees in addition to five to seven of those proposed by the department.

**Benchmarks:** Following changes in the Provost's policies, beginning in 2021-2022, the College no longer requires the identification of benchmarks. Instead, external evaluators may be asked to compare the candidate's scholarly achievements with those of other scholars of similar rank whom they deem to be top scholars in the field. Normally, these comparisons should be made to scholars appointed in programs considered to be among the very best nationally in the discipline.

**External letters collected by the department.** The department forwards to the Dean's Office copies of all external evaluations it has received.

**Curriculum vitae.** The candidate prepares a vita in line with the model attached (Appendix 1). Our format calls for information about teaching and service which is not ordinarily included in a professional CV. The vita is sent to all external referees. For that reason, it should be prepared with care and checked for accuracy. Unrealistic publication dates for forthcoming work decrease the credibility of the candidate. The candidate should also be scrupulous in indicating which unpublished papers are "in preparation," "submitted," "under revision" and "accepted/forthcoming/in press." Updates may be submitted during the course of the review for the use of the various committees and Dean. We do not send updated CVs to external referees.

It is to the candidate's advantage to include in the vita a short technical narrative describing current or forthcoming research plans as part of the vita. Many referees ask for information about the

direction of the candidate's work. It is also helpful to reviewers if the candidate identifies their dissertation mentor, postdoctoral adviser(s), and collaborators who are their students.

**Statement by the candidate.** Whereas any narrative in the vita should be written for experts, a separate non-technical statement of self-assessment (approximately 5-10 pages, double-spaced) is needed for the faculty promotion committees within Weinberg College. This document gives the candidate an opportunity to make a case for their accomplishments in teaching, research, and service. Plans for the future should be discussed as well as past and present work. **The statement should be addressed to a non-specialist audience: the ad hoc committee, the appropriate promotion committee, the Dean, and the Provost.** Members of the various committees find clear, concise statements to be extraordinarily helpful in evaluating a case for promotion.

**Research:** Unlike a technical research description, the statement requires that the candidate lay out the content, originality, and significance of their work in terms accessible to an educated lay reader. Necessary technical descriptions should follow from this more general account. Included should be a definition of the candidate's field and the candidate's place in it. The candidate may want to discuss several of their most important publications or experiments, describing how this work has influenced the direction of the field. Current and planned research should be described in relation to what has already been accomplished. The focus of the review will be the work done since appointment to a faculty position or since the last promotion.

Please note that the letter to external referees asks about the candidates' "contributions to [specified] field." The ad hoc committee in tenure cases and the department (usually) in promotion cases will specify the final wording of this sentence, and the candidate's statement is helpful in guiding them.

**Teaching:** The committees and Dean would particularly like to know about the candidate's approach to education and goals in teaching. 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, and respect for students. The candidate may discuss in which ways their teaching has been most successful and, particularly in tenure cases, how that teaching may have improved over the previous four or five years. Curricular innovations should be discussed as well as diverse contributions to instruction (e.g., training of teaching assistants, advising).

**Service:** The candidate should discuss significant service to the University or profession.

**Special Issues:** The faculty committees often ask about the candidate's role in collaborations, the reason for continued collaborative work with graduate school or postdoctoral mentors, the difference between the dissertation and the book, low rates of publication in refereed journals, and the specific contingencies from a press if a manuscript is "under contract." In the sciences and those social science fields where external support is needed for research, committees ask how candidates without such funding will be able to conduct research. You may wish to address any such issues in the statement.

**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. All publications should be included, not just those completed since the last promotion or review, and they should be numbered as on the vita. Work-in-progress should be included when it has reached a sufficient state of readiness to make evident its likely final form and importance to the candidate's advancing research program. Please do not submit copies of papers that are not yet ready to be seen by outside readers.

Book reviews written by the candidate need generally not be supplied unless they are broad review articles. If the candidate has received patents for their work, information about those should be included with publications.

**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. 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. (Please note that we recommend inclusion among the key publications sent to external reviewers no more than one unpublished shorter work, such as an article or book chapter that has been accepted for publication but has not yet appeared.) 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. Referees will be sent other publications if they so request.

Please check over your manuscripts carefully to make sure that all the pages are present and that the copies are legible. The Dean's Office does not have time to check each candidate's publications for errors before sending materials to referees. The version submitted to the Dean's Office in mid-October (for tenure cases) and in early November (for promotion cases) is the version that will go out to referees. Revisions to a manuscript beyond this point cannot be considered in the review.

**Supporting materials about teaching.** Copies of CTEC course evaluations are required and will be submitted by the department. Course syllabi are provided by the candidate. (The recommended CTEC Instructor Reports are the administrator's version with student comments pulled from CAESAR/Blue.) 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 also submitted as appropriate.

**Materials about relative standing in the field and current research.** *Ad hoc* committees and the Committee on Tenure and the Committee on Promotion interest themselves in all evaluative materials and in materials relating to the candidate's current research.

- Published reviews of the candidate's work.
- Readers' reports of a candidate's manuscript from a university press; copy of contract if book is unpublished.
- Grant proposals (current), both approved and pending. One should not include information about unsuccessful proposals. (Cover sheet, abstract, budget pages, reviewers' comments only.) Candidates may include "pink sheets" at their discretion. (Please remove sensitive personal data such as SSN and passport # from copies of grant

- applications.)
- Citations of the candidate's publications as referenced by the *Science Citation Index*, the *Social Sciences Citation Index*, the *Arts and Humanities Index* 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.

**Additional materials; appropriate procedure.** The candidate may supply materials not listed above but which bear on the evaluation of their work. Materials that become available during the review year (for example, *vita* updates, new publications, a reader's report from a press) can be added to a dossier at any time. All such should be routed to the Dean's Office through chairs and/or representatives so that the department is also informed of changes in the dossier. Any inquiries about the process from candidates should similarly be routed through the department.

### **Budgetary joint appointments**

A special protocol applies to the departmental review of a candidate with a budgetary joint appointment between two departments, two schools, or a department and a program. A copy is available from the Dean's Office.

### **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 to the extent legally possible. Candidates are likewise asked to observe the need for confidentiality and not, for example, attempt to contact referees to see if they have submitted letters or have been asked to submit letters, or to discuss any aspect of the department deliberations. 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 inform the department chair so that such a conversation does not interfere with the conduct of a full and confidential review beyond the department. Faculty members involved in the process who breach confidentiality may be subject to disciplinary action.

Weinberg College Dean's Office  
Revised June 2022

## Judd A. and Marjorie Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences

### Preparing a *Curriculum Vitae* for Promotion Review

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 (at the very least when they are first cited).

- **DATE**

The CV should be up-to-date and should carry the date, month, and year when it was prepared.

- **NAME**

Optional: local address, phone, etc.

- **MAJOR PROFESSIONAL INTEREST(S)**

E.g., low-temperature physics; econometrics; twentieth-century Chinese American literature.

- **EDUCATION**

Colleges and universities attended, degrees, and dates. It is helpful to reviewers if the candidate identifies her/his/their dissertation mentor and, if applicable, postdoctoral adviser(s) as well.

- **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.

- **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, etc.

- **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.

- **RESEARCH SUPPORT**

PAST, PRESENT, PENDING: An itemized, complete list of projects supported by grants from Northwestern University 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.

- **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). The number of a publication on the CV should correspond to the number used in the publication’s naming convention (for example, Smith\_publication\_14). We are asking that publications be arranged in chronological descending order in case a new publication comes in during the review period. The idea is to add the latest publication to the top of the list instead of having to renumber every item, which means that the publications in Faculty Folio RPT would also need to be renumbered – a time-consuming task if a dossier consists of many publications.

If you have many categories of publications, you may wish to arrange the items by categories, then by chronological order within each category.

Here’s an example from a mock CV with many categories of publications:

**Books**

16. *ABC* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021)

15. *DEF* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015)

**Peer-reviewed journal articles**

14. “GHI,” *Journal A* 130 (2022): 215-245

13. “JKL,” *Journal B* 129 (2020): 111-133

If a new book is published during the review year, then the book will be assigned the highest number in an updated CV (or in the example above as item 17). If the new publication is a peer-reviewed journal article, in the example above the new item would be listed as item 14B.

● **WORK NOW IN PROGRESS**

Titles 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.

● **PROFESSIONAL TALKS**

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

● **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).

● **PEER- REVIEW AND RELATED ACTIVITIES**

Memberships on panels evaluating research proposals; editorships; committees considering colleagues for honors; readerships for scholarly journals or presses; etc.

- **MAJOR CONSULTANCIES IN THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS**

- **PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS AND SERVICE**

Memberships, offices, and related activities, e.g., the planning and convening of scholarly conferences.

- **OTHER MATTERS RELATED TO RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION**

- **TEACHING AND ADVISING**

The detail in this category would be unusual in a routine CV, but full particulars are required of candidates for the grant of tenure or promotion to full professor.

- Areas of undergraduate and graduate teaching during the last five years.
- Specific courses taught in at least the last three years: titles, levels, formats, etc. (individual 399s should be listed separately; see below).
- Curriculum development, the establishment of new or improved courses, etc., during at least the last five years.
- Names of students in tutorial or advisory registrations in at least the last three years (398s, 399s, 490s, 590s).
- Names of M.A. and M.S. candidates on whose preparing and examining committees you have served during the last five years.
- Names and dates of Ph.D.s for whose doctoral work you have been chief adviser. Affiliation of those now graduated.
- Names of Ph.D. candidates for whom you have been an adviser, committee member, dissertation reader, etc., in at least the last five years, with specific roles indicated.
- Other activities related to the teaching and advising of undergraduate and graduate students, in department, College or University level.
- Teaching awards and honors.

**DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE (over at least the last five years)**

- Memberships and offices on department and program committees.
- Memberships and offices on standing and *ad hoc* committees of the Weinberg College faculty.
- Memberships and offices on committees of the University Senate.
- Student relations, e.g., Master or Faculty Associate of a residential college.

**COMMUNITY WORK: PUBLIC OFFICES, ETC.**

rev. June 2022

## NAMING CONVENTION

When candidates and their department upload their documents to the dedicated promotion review site, please use the naming conventions below for electronic files (using the surname Smith as an example):

### Candidate Documents (for the candidate to provide and upload)

- 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

### Department Documents (for the department to provide and upload)

- Smith\_department\_letter
- Smith\_internal\_department\_report (on scholarship or teaching, if they exist)
- Smith\_list\_of\_suggested\_external\_referees
- 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

(Sample email request to potential referee)

Dear Professor Z:

Northwestern University is currently reviewing Barney Stone for the grant of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor of Celtic Languages. I am writing in advance of Dean Randolph's formal letter to find out whether you would be willing to serve as a referee in this case. If so, or if you would like to see the vita before deciding, we will send you the full request. We hope to have letters of evaluation by February 1.

As you may know, Professor Stone works in the field of Celtic folklore. We have copies of his new book, "Y," along with several recent articles, and would be happy to send you whatever you would like to read. The Dean's advisory committee is interested in hearing not only from experts who are already conversant with Mr. Stone's publications, but also from 'outsiders' who can provide a broader perspective or who can comment on only part of the work.

Finally, I wonder whether you might be able to suggest 2 or 3 other senior authorities in the field whom I might contact.

We would be grateful for any assistance you can give us in this important decision.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Kim

-----  
Elizabeth Kim  
Assistant Dean for Faculty Advancement  
**Northwestern University** | Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences  
1918 Sheridan Road  
Evanston, IL 60208  
U.S.A.  
tel: 847.467.0578

(sample letter to the College's external referees in tenure cases)

Date

Professor XYZ  
Department of LMO  
University of ABC

Dear Professor Z:

Thank you for your assistance in our deliberations concerning the promotion of a member of our faculty. The Department of [DEPT] has recommended that [CANDIDATE], now an assistant professor, be promoted to the rank of associate professor, a promotion that confers tenure. An ad hoc committee considering this recommendation has asked me to request your opinion of Professor [LAST NAME]'s professional work and standing as well as their future promise as a scholar.

The committee and I would appreciate having your views about the quality and the importance of Professor [LAST NAME]'s contributions to the study of [CANDIDATE'S FIELD]. How much impact has their scholarship had? Which, if any, of the works constitute fundamental and original contributions to the field? If the arguments are controversial, are they well-formulated and well-supported by both evidence and reasoning? Are there weaknesses we should be aware of? What do you regard as distinctive about Dr. [LAST NAME]'s work? What are the specific intellectual contributions to any collaborative work? How would you characterize their choice of publication venues? What is your expectation of their future career trajectory? If this candidate were a member of your department, would they be granted tenure at this time? Would you yourself vote for such a promotion in your department?

We would be especially grateful, moreover, for your comparative assessment of Professor [LAST NAME]'s scholarly achievements with those of scholars of similar rank whom you deem to be among the best in the field. Although such estimates are often not easy or comfortable to make, we often find them valuable.

Please be aware that the Provost of Northwestern University occasionally grants extensions to the mandatory review period in keeping with University policies. We therefore evaluate the productivity of each candidate who has been granted a tenure-clock extension as if they had been in probationary status for the normal duration.

Enclosed you will find a copy of Professor [LAST NAME]'s *curriculum vitae*, statement, and selected publications. If you need other information, please contact me or Elizabeth Kim, Assistant Dean for Faculty Advancement, at (847) 467-0578; we shall do our best to see that you get what you need quickly. Should you wish to use e-mail, please use the following special address reserved for promotion matters: [wcas-deanpromotion@northwestern.edu](mailto:wcas-deanpromotion@northwestern.edu).

We are grateful for your advice and will look for your letter by February 1<sup>st</sup>. Your response will play a valuable part in our important decision.

Sincerely,



Adrian Randolph  
Dean

(sample letter to the College's external referees in promotion cases)

Date

Professor XYZ  
Department of LMO  
University of ABC

Dear Professor Z:

Thank you for your assistance in our deliberations concerning the promotion of a member of our faculty. The Department of [DEPT] has recommended that [CANDIDATE], now an associate professor, be promoted to the rank of professor. The case will now be reviewed by a faculty committee, which will then make a recommendation to me. We would appreciate your help in assisting us in our deliberations considering this promotion. Specifically, we are seeking your candid opinion about this candidate's professional work and standing, as well as future promise.

According to our standards, 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 advisory committee and I would appreciate having your views about the quality and the importance of Professor [LAST NAME]'s contributions to the field of [CANDIDATE'S FIELD]. How much impact has their scholarship had? Which, if any, of the works constitute fundamental and original contributions to their field? If the arguments are controversial, are they well-formulated and well-supported by both evidence and reasoning? Are there weaknesses we should be aware of? What do you regard as distinctive about Professor [LAST NAME]'s work? How would you characterize the choice of publication venues? What is your expectation of their future career trajectory? If this candidate were a member of your department, would they be promoted at this time? Would you yourself vote for such a promotion in your department?

We would be especially grateful, moreover, for your comparative assessment of Professor [LAST NAME]'s scholarly achievements with those of other scholars of similar rank whom you deem to be among the best in the field. Although such estimates are often not easy or comfortable to make, we often find them valuable.

Enclosed you will find a copy of Professor [LAST NAME]'s *curriculum vitae*, statement, and selected publications. If you need other information, please contact me or Elizabeth Kim, Assistant Dean for Faculty Advancement, at (847) 467-0578; we shall do our best to see that you get what you need quickly. Should you wish to use e-mail, please use the following special address reserved for promotion matters: [wcas-deanpromotion@northwestern.edu](mailto:wcas-deanpromotion@northwestern.edu).

We are grateful for your advice and will look for your letter by March 1<sup>st</sup>. Your response will play a valuable part in our important decision.

Sincerely,



Adrian Randolph  
Dean

(sample letter to candidate's former students)

Dear Ms. XYZ:

Professor Katy Dids of the Department of Entomology in the Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences is now being considered for promotion by a small confidential committee of College faculty members who are not in her department. This is part of our standard procedure for conducting promotion reviews. On behalf of that committee, I am writing to ask you, as a student who has taken one or more classes with this candidate, to write a letter evaluating her as a teacher. When a Northwestern faculty member is considered for promotion, success in teaching is taken seriously into account, and it is therefore important that students have an opportunity to assist in our decisions.

How would you assess Professor Dids' strengths and weaknesses as a teacher?

- Among other things, did she convey ideas and information clearly?
- Was the course well organized and the instructor well prepared?
- Were discussions conducted respectfully and did they advance the intellectual goals of the class?
- Did you master a significant body of material in the class?
- Were you challenged to think or work in new ways?
- Did you receive constructive feedback on your work?

The committee would welcome any other observations you deem relevant.

Beyond classroom presentations, teaching may be understood to include grading, guiding and advising students, directing independent study, and other related activities. The committee and I would welcome your comments on any of these activities, as appropriate.

Your identity as a correspondent of this confidential committee will be held in the strictest confidence. Your name will not be known to the faculty member in question or to anyone in her department. Only the members of the committee and I will see your letter. If you have questions about our procedures, by all means call Elizabeth Kim, Assistant Dean for Faculty Advancement, at (847) 467-0578 or me at (847) 491-3276. E-mail messages may be sent to [weinberg\\_assistdeanfacultyadvancement@northwestern.edu](mailto:weinberg_assistdeanfacultyadvancement@northwestern.edu).

We will be greatly obliged if you will write directly to me by January 5<sup>th</sup>. Your frank remarks will play a valued part in the committee's deliberations, and whatever help you can give us will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,



Adrian Randolph  
Dean