

**Guidelines for Candidates for Promotion and Tenure  
2009-2010**

**The grant of tenure: policy.** Northwestern's policy with regard to tenure aims for 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. Weinberg College aims for the superlative, and each case is evaluated on its own merits. A recommendation of tenure implies that the candidate in question constitutes as good a permanent appointment in his or her area as Northwestern is capable of making now or in the foreseeable future, given both accomplishments to date and reasonable expectations about his or her future achievements. Tenure is not awarded for competent service, solid research, and adequate teaching.

In most cases, professional achievement takes the form of research activity that issues in publication or artistic work that is publicly displayed. Departments—and subsequently *ad hoc* committees, acting with the advice of external referees, and the Weinberg College Tenure Committee or Promotion Committee—evaluate the quantity, but above all, the quality, creativity, importance, and influence of such work. These bodies 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 his or her 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 his or her 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 his or her potential as a teacher are major factors affecting the decision to grant tenure. 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 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.

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.

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 junior faculty member to seek out such advice when needed.

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 his or her influence in the field. 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 and should approach an early review with a great deal of caution.

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.

**Promotion to the full professorship: policy.** 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. 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, review committees, 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 teaching. 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.

The candidate’s major work completed since tenure is the heart of the review of research or other professional achievement. A faculty member best presents himself or herself for promotion after that work is published, unless the results of the post-tenure work have been widely disseminated before actual publication. It has become increasingly difficult to persuade referees to read unpublished manuscripts on short notice. Likewise the Promotion Committee raises questions about candidates whose new work has not yet had time to enter into debates in the field.

**Stopping the tenure clock.** A tenure-track faculty member may request that one year be exempted from his or her probationary term (see the *Weinberg College Faculty Handbook*) in cases where particular circumstances have arisen to interfere substantially with the research or other projects which the faculty member intends to submit as part of his or her tenure review. Such circumstances may include parental responsibilities relating to the birth, adoption or rearing of a child; personal or family emergencies; 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. 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; he or she embarks on a new line of research). University policy about parental leaves and extensions may be found at [www.northwestern.edu/provost/faculty/work\\_life\\_family.html](http://www.northwestern.edu/provost/faculty/work_life_family.html)

*Before September 1 of the year of tenure review*, the faculty member writes a letter stating specifically how circumstances interfere with his or her progress and might justify an extended probationary period and gives it to the department chairperson. The letter must also state explicitly that the faculty member understands that he or she “will not enjoy an entitlement or stronger claim to tenure by virtue of continued membership on the faculty beyond the customary probationary period.” The chairperson comments on the request and forwards it to the Dean for further transmittal to the Provost. Should the Dean turn down a request, the faculty member may appeal to the Provost. (As a courtesy to the Department, such a request should preferably be made by June first before the year of mandatory consideration for tenure.)

**The review process: stages and timing.** In the year before the promotion review, the department chairperson 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 chairperson may solicit letters from external authorities over the summer. 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 almost always leads reviewers and committee members to wonder about the candidate's productivity and his or her 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 ad hoc committee.

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. 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, many of which are supplied by the candidate. These materials are due in the Dean's Office in late October (cases for tenure) or mid-November (cases for promotion to full professor). When the department votes not to recommend a candidate for tenure in his or her 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 may write directly to the Dean to appeal the recommendation.

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 his or her representative. Likewise the Dean's Office will be in touch with both the chairperson and the designated representative if questions or requests arise in the review process.

The Dean sets up an *ad hoc* committee for each candidate who has been recommended positively. In tenure cases, the committee typically has three members; when tenure is not an issue the committee has two members only. 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 2-4.) The committee selects the referees and benchmarks 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 his or her 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.

In March and April, 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 Tenure Committee and the six members of the Promotion Committee 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 his or her own department and does not review those files. Like the *ad hoc* committees, the Promotion Committee and the Tenure Committee see the materials submitted by the department. Members also read letters from external referees and redacted versions of the *ad hoc* report and letters from students. 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 receives recommendations from the department, *ad hoc* committee, the Promotion Committee or the Tenure Committee 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 June, at which point each candidate is notified of the decision. Promotions usually take effect the following September 1 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.

**Dossiers: legalities, contents, deadline.** The dossier submitted to the Dean's office contains:

- department's letter of evaluation
- letters collected by the department, including external referee reports, student letters, letters from colleagues, and reports of a departmental subcommittee or a partner program
- candidate's CV (paper and electronic)
- 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

Many of these items are prepared by the candidate and submitted to the department; the chairperson will advise regarding 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 staff have been briefed on the preparation of dossiers; candidates should consult them about exact formats (e.g. the Dean's Office needs publications to be numbered). The chairperson and other senior members of the department add a letter evaluating the candidate's teaching, research, service, and standing in the field.

*Department letter.* The letter prepared by the chairperson and signed by several other members of the department provides an evaluation of the candidate's teaching, research, and service. It also suggests the names of potential external referees, student referees, and benchmarks.

**External referees:** The department suggests at least eight distinguished scholars typically at leading universities to whom the *ad hoc* committee may turn for advice. 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. 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.). The department is welcome to identify which of the potential external referees **must** be asked to contribute an assessment. The *ad hoc* committee otherwise chooses to write to some or all of the suggested referees. The committee 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, full addresses of at least five former undergraduate or graduate students (the distribution to be determined by the academic focus of the department and candidate). Each student should be identified by the date when he or she was the candidate's student, the level of the course, its size, and its subject. *Ad hoc* committees usually write to a randomly selected set of twenty or twenty-five former students and advisees in addition to five or six of those proposed by the department.

**Benchmarks:** The department letter includes the names of scholars, normally three or four, with whom external referees may be asked to compare the candidate. They should be the leaders in the candidate's field who are slightly more advanced than the candidate and who have already attained the rank proposed for the candidate. Referees are asked to compare candidate and benchmarks at equivalent points in their careers. The department suggests benchmarks, although the chair may consult the candidate. The *ad hoc* committee makes the final choice.

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

*Curriculum vita.* The candidate prepares a vita in line with the model attached and submits both paper and electronic versions. Our format calls for information about teaching and service which is not ordinarily included in a professional CV. The vita—or the section related to research and publication—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.

*Statement by the candidate.* Whereas any narrative in the vita should be written for experts, a separate non-technical statement of self-assessment is needed for the faculty promotion committees within Weinberg College. This document gives the candidate an opportunity to make a case for his or her 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. (These statements are sent to external reviewers only in response to a specific request.) Members of the various committees find clear, concise statements to be extraordinarily helpful in evaluating a case for promotion. The Dean's Office has on file several samples which candidates may consult.

**Research:** Unlike a technical research description, the statement requires that the candidate lay out the content, originality, and significance of his or her 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 his or her 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 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 his or her 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.

The statement should be roughly five-to-ten double-spaced pages in length.

*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 his or her work, information about those should be included with publications.

The Dean's Office routinely sends a packet of materials to referees and consults the candidate about what should be included. 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 around the beginning of November is the version that will go out to referees. Revisions to a manuscript beyond this point cannot be considered in the review.

A faculty member may prefer to set up a web page specifically for the review. This web page should include the cv and electronic versions of publications at a minimum. In the fall, this page will be transferred to the Dean's Office server in order to maintain the confidentiality for referees accessing the material. If the candidate is presenting a website as part of the dossier, it is his or her responsibility to make sure that reviewers can access the site. This may mean supplying passwords or checking that the site can be viewed from a variety of platforms and browsers.

*Supporting materials about teaching.* Copies of CTEC course evaluations (both the statistical summaries and summaries of comments) are required, as are course syllabi. Evidence of awards; information about course development; course examinations; reports of classroom visits by senior faculty; letters from students to the instructor; descriptions of role played in advising students, post-Northwestern affiliations of former advisees, etc., are also submitted as appropriate. One copy of all grade sheets for the last three years in residence should be submitted; they provide the *ad hoc* committee with names of possible student referees.

*Materials about relative standing in the field and current research.* *Ad hoc* committees and the Committee on Promotion and the Committee on Tenure 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.

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. *Ad hoc* 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 his or her 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 chairpersons 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 treated as confidential. Departments are asked not to discuss the departmental deliberations beyond the pool of eligible voters, and departments and 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 see if they have submitted letters, 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.

Weinberg College Dean's Office  
August 2009

These guidelines are drawn from the more detailed information in the *WCAS Policies and Procedures 2009-10* (formerly the *Chairperson's Handbook*). Each department office should have one copy of the current *Policies and Procedures* readily available for reference (*WCAS Policies and Procedures 2009-10* will be available in late September 2009).

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 nonspecialist reader. Abbreviations of professional organizations, journal titles, etc., should be spelled out in their first appearance at least.

- A. DATE. The CV should be up-to-date and should carry the date (month and year) when it was prepared.
- B. NAME. Optional: local address, marital status, children, birthdate, etc.
- C. MAJOR PROFESSIONAL INTEREST(S): e.g., low-temperature physics; econometrics; eighteenth-century French literature.
- D. EDUCATION. Colleges and universities attended, degrees, dates.
- E. 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.
- F. 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.
- G. 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.
- H. 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.
- I. 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.* Finally, publications supplied in the dossier should be numbered consecutively (**do not** repeat numbers) and corresponding numbers written on the publications.

- J. 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.
- K. PROFESSIONAL TALKS. Lectures, colloquia, panel appearances, talks, seminars, etc., with particulars: what, where, when, auspices, etc.
- L. LEAVES OF ABSENCE. Dates, substantive research topics, sources of support, dollar amounts, locales where research was undertaken (name of library, laboratory, etc.)
- M. PEER-REVIEW AND RELATED ACTIVITIES. Memberships on panels evaluating research proposals; editorships; committees considering colleagues for honors; readerships for scholarly journals or presses; etc.
- N. MAJOR CONSULTANCIES IN THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS.
- O. PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS AND SERVICE. Memberships, offices, and related activities, e.g., the planning and convening of a scholarly conference.
- P. OTHER MATTERS RELATED TO RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION.
- Q. 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.
1. Areas of undergraduate and graduate teaching during the last five years.
  2. Specific courses taught in at least the last three years: titles, levels, formats, etc. (individual C99s should be listed separately; see below).
  3. Curriculum development, the establishment of new or improved courses, etc., during at least the last five years.
  4. Names of students in tutorial or advisory registrations in at least the last three years (C98s, C99s, D90s, E90s).
  5. Names of M.A. and M.S. candidates on whose preparing and examining committees you have served during the last five years.

6. Names and dates of Ph.D.s for whose doctoral work you have been chief adviser. Affiliation of those now graduated.
7. 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.
8. Other activities related to the teaching and advising of undergraduate and graduate students, in department, College or University level.
9. Teaching awards and honors.

R. DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE. This should cover at least the last five years

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

S. COMMUNITY WORK: PUBLIC OFFICES, ETC.

(Email request to potential referee)

Dear Professor XYZ:

Northwestern University is currently reviewing Rupertina Stonehenge for the grant of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor of Celtic Languages. I am writing in advance of Dean Mangelsdorf'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 Stonehenge works in the field of Cornish vernacular literature. We have copies of her new manuscript, "View from the End of the World," 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 Ms. Stonehenge'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,

(After the person has agreed to write)

Date

Professor XYZ  
University of

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 his/her professional work and standing as well as his/her 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 his/her scholarship had? Which, if any, of the published works constitute fundamental and original contributions to the field? If his/her arguments are controversial, are they well-formulated and well-supported by both evidence and reasoning? Are there weaknesses we should be aware of? What is your expectation of his/her future career trajectory? If this candidate were a member of your department, would s/he 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 Prof. [LAST NAME] with the very best scholars in the field who are roughly of the same seniority or slightly more advanced. Whom would you consider to be the foremost figures in that group? I have been told that benchmark1, benchmark2, and benchmark3 are appropriate benchmarks. Making appropriate allowances for differences in stages of careers, how does Prof. [NAME] stand in relation to them? If other scholars might better be compared with [NAME], please specify them and compare their work and promise with his/hers. Although such estimates are often not easy or comfortable to make, we often find them valuable.

A copy of Prof. [NAME]'s *curriculum vitae* is enclosed along with selected publications. If you would like other materials, we would be happy to send you whatever you need. Please place a collect call to me or Steven Cole, Director of Faculty Evaluation, at (847) 467-0578; we shall do our best to see that you get what you need quickly. If you would prefer to fax us your response, our number is (847) 491-4289. Should you wish to use e-mail, please use the following special address reserved for promotion matters: dean@wcas.northwestern.edu.

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

Sincerely,

(letter to students)

Dear Ms. XYZ:

Professor Raoul Stonehenge of the Department of Celtic Languages 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 his 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 him 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 Professor Stonehenge's strengths and weaknesses as a teacher? Among other things, did he 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 his department. Only the members of the committee and I will see your letter. If you have questions about our procedures, by all means call Steven Cole, Director of Faculty Evaluation, at (847) 467-0578 or me at (847) 491-3276. E-mail messages may be sent to [s-cole@northwestern.edu](mailto:s-cole@northwestern.edu).

We will be greatly obliged if you will write directly to me by January 5. 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 yours,