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CHAPTER I: OVERVIEW

Tenure is a privilege reserved for faculty who have demonstrated professional accomplishments in teaching, research and scholarship, and service that provide confidence that they will continue to contribute in all of these areas at a level of excellence that is appropriate for a senior faculty member at Boston University, a major research and teaching institution, through the indefinite future. Thus, in the course of the tenure and promotion process, we judge the quality and impact of past professional accomplishments, and reach a conclusion about the candidate’s likely professional accomplishments across the long-term future. Although tenure and promotion reviews involve reviewing the evidence of past accomplishments, the decision rests on a judgment about the future.

Promotion from the rank of associate to full professor is a privilege reserved for faculty who have continued after tenure to demonstrate professional accomplishments in teaching, research and scholarship, and service that provide confidence that they will continue to contribute in all of these areas at a level of excellence that is appropriate for a full professor at Boston University, a major research and teaching institution, through the indefinite future. In addition, we expect to see the kind of professional maturity and leadership that is appropriate for the highest regular professorial rank. Thus, in the course of promotion process, we judge the quality and impact of past professional accomplishments, and reach a conclusion about the candidate’s likely professional accomplishments across the long-term future. Although promotion reviews involve reviewing the evidence of past accomplishments, the decision rests on a judgment about the future.

Boston University policy provides a maximum of seven years from the time of appointment as a tenure-track assistant professor to earn promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure (not counting agreements to stop the tenure clock, for example, for parental leave). Assistant professors may apply earlier for tenure and promotion. They should consult with their chair and associate dean if they are considering early promotion.

Associate professors may apply for promotion to the rank of Professor when they believe their accomplishments and achievements have qualified them for promotion. Nationally, it is typical at research universities for this to occur 5-7 years after promotion to associate professor with tenure. Associate professors should consult with their department chair and, if they wish, associate dean of the faculty, to identify the right timing for them. It is CAS policy that when individuals have served as associate professor for 10 years or more, the department chair should engage in regular, preferably annual, discussions about strategies for career development that would get the faculty member back on track.

Although review of a candidate for promotion from associate to full professor takes account of the candidate’s career in a broad sense, the review focuses specifically on professional progress since the last promotion, which means that no materials should be submitted except those related to the period since the last promotion.

The formal tenure and promotion review process occurs in six stages at Boston University, beginning with the department-level review and proceeding in order with reviews by the CAS Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee; the Dean of the College; the University Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (UAPT) Committee; the Provost; and the President. The schedule for the process is circulated annually and made available on the CAS website.

The PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR process is launched in the Fall semester of the year preceding the review year, approximately 14 months before final notification. The TENURE
AND PROMOTION process is launched during the spring preceding the review year, a little more than one year before final notification. At this time candidates provide materials representing their professional accomplishments that will form much of the evidentiary basis of the review, and the department provides advice to the Dean on appropriate external evaluators through the CAS Tenure & Promotion Coordinator.

Candidates and departments (chairs, the departmental tenure and promotion coordinator, etc.) each have specific responsibilities for compiling materials. They must work together to ensure that all materials are completed according to specifications and sent to the right place according to specified deadlines for each stage of the review process. These deadlines are designed to allow us to follow the very tight deadlines required by the university process. At the department level, the department Chair is accountable for ensuring that the processes are followed properly and that all necessary materials are developed and forwarded in accordance with College and University specifications and deadlines no matter who else is assigned to carry out specific parts of the process.

Candidates may withdraw themselves from consideration from tenure and promotion or promotion to the rank of Professor at any time in the process, but anyone who is considering doing this is advised to seek advice from the department Chair or appropriate Dean.

It is crucial that the process be carried out to the highest standards as outlined in this Guide to assure that candidates for tenure and promotion or promotion only be presented in the fairest manner.

This Guide is intended to assist candidates and departments in understanding and completing the tenure and promotion process. It contains the best information available at the time of writing. It is possible that certain rules or forms may change in the interim. The CAS Office of Faculty Actions will endeavor to keep everyone informed of such changes. Please address all suggestions for improvement in the clarity, accuracy, or helpfulness of this guide to the CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator in the Office of Faculty Actions.

CHAPTER II: INFORMATION AND FORMS

Everyone associated with the tenure and promotion process, including candidates for tenure and promotion, are responsible for being up to date on appropriate standards, processes, and procedures. The Boston University Faculty Handbook (http://www.bu.edu/handbook/) contains the authoritative outline of the basic university-wide criteria, processes, and timetable for tenure and promotion, in the Appointments and Promotions section. The CAS website (http://www.bu.edu/cas/faculty-staff/faculty-staff-handbook/) details College-level criteria in the Faculty Expectations section. This handbook is an annually updated guide to the process from the CAS point of view. Tenure-track faculty should seek advice from their senior colleagues and mentors throughout their pre-tenure years, and tenured associate professors should seek advice from the time they are appointed as associate professors. All faculty are welcome to seek career development advice from the Office of the Dean.

Forms needed for the tenure and/or promotion application process are available on the Provost’s website at: http://www.bu.edu/provost/resources/forms/index.html. For questions about completing application forms, please contact the CAS Tenure and Promotion coordinator.

The Office of the Dean holds annual meetings for tenure and promotion candidates, and for department Chairs and administrators, to assist with the review process.
CHAPTER III: PREPARATIONS BEFORE THE REVIEW YEAR: CANDIDATE & DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Preparations for the review process begin when faculty members take their place as a new assistant or associate professor and continue with increasing specificity through the year before the review actually takes place. For TENURE AND PROMOTION candidates, the Mid-Tenure Review, occurring by the end of the third year, is an especially important part of the process. Candidates engage in a full and detailed self-review that gives them experience in gathering together organizing, and analyzing the evidence of their accomplishments. They then receive detailed feedback from their senior colleagues and an assessment from the Dean. Other stages of the process that precede the review year include:

1. *Candidates* for tenure and promotion should develop the habit of keeping well-organized documentation of their professional accomplishments in research, teaching and mentoring, and professional service. This includes keeping an updated academic curriculum vita. They should seek guidance and advice from senior colleagues and members of their field as they develop their careers and compile their materials for review.

2. *Department chairs* retain full accountability for ensuring that preparations and process for the tenure and review process are carried out to the highest possible standards. They ensure the mentoring processes are carried out properly. They should ensure that one department staff member serves as tenure and promotion coordinator for all cases in the department and that this person has a complete understanding of all of the deadlines, requirements, and the departmental role in the process. The chair should approve all materials prior to their submission.

3. The *mentor* of a candidate for tenure and promotion has the responsibility of offering informed guidance for preparation for tenure and promotion, and should stay fully informed about current standards and practices.

4. Departmental *tenure and promotion coordinators* ensure that the preparations for the tenure and promotion review are proceeding appropriately and in a timely way, and should review all necessary documentation prior to submission to be sure it is organized in the specified way, presented clearly, and submitted on time, although the department chair retains final accountability for the process.

3. The department should organize regular *peer teaching evaluations* in which colleagues observe the candidate’s classes *throughout the pre-tenure and pre-promotion years*. All such evaluations become part of the tenure and promotion dossier and are used for evaluation, but they should also be used as occasions for assisting assistant and associate professors to develop their craft of teaching.

4. The year before the tenure and/or promotion review, the department chair, department tenure and promotion coordinator, and the candidate(s) should meet to go over the process, division of labor, and other matters relating to ensuring the process will go smoothly. This meeting should happen early in the year so everyone can plan accordingly. *It is crucial that the candidate and everyone involved in the process have sufficient notice of the timing to be sure that they can compile all necessary materials to the highest possible standards and have time to check to make sure that they are being submitted in the best possible shape.*
CHAPTER IV: GENERATING EVALUATION MATERIALS: CANDIDATE & DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Soliciting External Evaluations

External evaluators play a critical role in the tenure and promotion process by providing an assessment of the standing and reputation of the candidate in his or her field. Prior to the review year the Office of Faculty Actions solicits letters of evaluation from leading scholars in the candidate’s field(s) in the name of the Dean and department Chair in order to obtain independent assessments of the quality of the candidate’s work. The Office of Faculty Actions sends the requests for external evaluation letters, manages response rates, acknowledges receipt, and places them on the CAS tenures promotion server as they become available. The Dean’s Office makes the final decision in choosing external evaluators.

A TENURE AND PROMOTION dossier should aim to include 10-12 high quality external evaluation letters as described here and a PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR dossier should aim to include at least 6 high quality external evaluation letters as described here. Following is a discussion of the qualities we seek in external letters, and those we should avoid. Departments should propose 20 potential external evaluators in tenure cases and the 12 potential evaluators in the case of promotion to Professor cases to assure we can collect an adequate number of letters.

The identity of individuals proposed to serve as external evaluators and the identity of those who write letters is strictly confidential and must not be revealed to candidates at any stage.

1. Preferred Characteristics of External Letters

External evaluators must be experts in the candidate’s field and broader discipline who have distinguished standing in their fields, are preferably located in the best institutions in their field, and who do not have a close personal or professional relationship with the candidate. Useful letters respond to the questions asked in the solicitation in a detailed way, citing evidence, and do not simply repeat what is in the c.v. External evaluators must represent a broad range of expertise and perspectives qualified to judge the candidate’s work and its impact.

If a candidate has a joint appointment with a second department or program or does a significant amount of work in an interdisciplinary field, the range of external evaluators should reflect the different relevant fields. Chairs should consult the chair/director of the relevant other departments or program for advice on selecting external evaluators. The department chair is responsible for describing in detail the qualifications of proposed external evaluators for serving in this capacity and for revealing any known connection between the candidate and proposed external evaluators in the form as asked.

2. Limitations and Restrictions on External Letters

The following categories of individuals should, in general, be excluded from recommended evaluator lists:

• Former mentors of the candidate, particularly graduate and postdoctoral advisors and members of the candidate’s dissertation committee.

• Co-authors of papers or books with the candidate.

• Co-investigators on grants with the candidate.
• Any individual with a close personal relationship with the candidate.

The above exclusions are not appropriate in all cases. For example, papers in some fields have scores of co-authors who do not in fact work closely together and exclusion of all co-authors of such papers would be neither necessary nor desirable. If the department Chair believes that a specific evaluator in an excluded category listed above should be used in a particular case, he or she should consult with the appropriate Associate Dean of the Faculty before submitting the list of recommended evaluators to Faculty Actions.

The list of external evaluators should include no more than three individuals recommended by the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. These external reviewers should conform to the expectations outlined above.

Under normal circumstances external evaluators must hold a position at least at the rank to which the candidate is applying to be promoted. It is preferable to avoid including multiple external evaluators for a single candidate from any one institution.

External evaluators should be active members of their profession who understand the contemporary standards, approaches and practices of their fields, which means it is preferable to avoid or at least limit the number of writers who are retired.

3. Informational Letters

It is also possible to seek additional letters that fall outside these conditions for particular purposes. For example, it is often helpful to request information from co-authors or other collaborators about divisions of labor and the candidate's specific role and contribution to particular books, papers, grant applications, or other collaborative works. Such letters will be limited to this specific information, as opposed to an assessment of the candidate's qualifications for tenure. These letters will be placed in a different section of the dossier to avoid confusing them with external evaluation letters. These letters will be solicited by the Office of Faculty Actions; an example of such a letter can be found in Appendix 1.


a. The Chair invites the candidate to suggest up to three appropriate evaluators. The candidate is not required to make suggestions. The Chair should also invite candidates to identify potential reviewers with whom the candidate has particular conflicts of interest and therefore might be unable to provide an appropriately unbiased letter. The most likely source of such conflicts of interest would involve personal relationships. Differences of view about scholarly approach or methodology do not constitute conflicts of interest. The Chair also ensures that the candidate understands what materials should be provided for the dossier and has sufficient time to compile the materials.

b. For TENURE AND PROMOTION cases the department submits a list of 20 potential external evaluators to the CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator electronically and for PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR cases the department submits a list of 12 potential external evaluators. In the case of candidates with interdisciplinary portfolios of work, the Chair/Director of the other relevant department/program should be consulted. The qualities of the external evaluators should conform to the characteristics described above. If the department wishes to
seek additional informational letters from the candidate’s collaborators as described above, the department can also submit the list of requested respondents at this time or later.

c. In consultation with the department chair, mentors, and/or senior colleagues, the candidate compiles a dossier of materials that will be forwarded to external evaluators to ensure that they have appropriate materials before them that provide evidence of the range, depth, and quality of the candidate’s work when the evaluators develop their assessment and evaluation letters. When the department Chair has determined that the dossier is complete, the departmental Tenure and Promotion Coordinator submits these to the CAS Office of Faculty Actions together with the list of external evaluators. The dossier includes:

- An electronic curriculum vita (CV): This is the only version of the CV forwarded to evaluators. Especially in the case of candidates for tenure, the Chair or mentor should ensure that the candidate understands how to compile a complete and high-quality CV in the style appropriate for the discipline.

- Portfolio of significant publications and papers: In the case of candidates for tenure this includes all significant scholarly books (other than edited volumes with the proviso below), articles, and chapters that are the basis on which the candidate’s scholarship should be judged. Especially in the case of fields that depend largely on the publication of books, candidates for tenure may also submit other significant papers or manuscripts that give external evaluators insights into projects in progress. In the case of candidates for promotion to full professor, the dossier should include only works that represent progress since the tenure review. Edited volumes are not forwarded to external evaluators unless there is a compelling reason to do so, but candidates may include copies of the title page, table of contents, and any introduction or chapters authored by the candidate. Candidates should consult with the Chair or mentor about what materials to include.

- Research and teaching statements: Candidates should submit a brief (2 pp. maximum) research statement and teaching statement that provides an overview for external evaluators of their accomplishments, approach, key goals, and future. Although evaluators access the CV and portfolio, the statement sets the context and helps provide coherence. For sample guidelines for writing a teaching statement (that also provides some guidance for a research statement, see [http://www.columbia.edu/cu/tat/pdfs/teaching%20statement.pdf](http://www.columbia.edu/cu/tat/pdfs/teaching%20statement.pdf).

d. Alternative formats for presenting the dossier to external evaluators are:

- Create a website to house the candidate’s dossier other than books: This method is highly recommended. The CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator is available to meet with department administrators to assist in creating these websites. Books will be sent to evaluators via USPS. Other materials will only be sent in hardcopy if requested by an evaluator. Two hard copies of dossier materials should be sent to the Office of Faculty Actions to enable the Office to send these materials if necessary.

- Create portfolios on CDs or USB drives: All materials on CDs or USBs must be in PDF form. CDs and USBs should also be sent to the Office of Faculty Actions.
CAS will reimburse the cost of purchasing up to 25 copies of candidates’ books that are to be included in the dossier, purchased at the author’s discounted price through the publisher. It is recommended that 20 copies be purchased initially. Of those, 3 copies of the candidate’s published book(s) will be used in the CAS and University review process and will be returned to the candidate after completion of the review.

B. Soliciting Student Letters of Evaluation (to be completed before the end of the Spring Semester): Letters of evaluation from current and former students (both undergraduate and graduate) should be solicited by the department and included in the dossier. They should represent students from different courses and teaching situations. It is preferable for the department not to rely only on students chosen by the candidate in order to get a more objective reading of student reaction. All solicited letters that are received must be included. For promotion-only cases, student letters should be solicited no later than early in the spring semester so they will be available for consideration by the department later in the spring semester. For tenure cases departments should solicit the letters before the end of the spring semester because it is difficult to contact or get responses from students during the summer. Departments should aim to include 10-12 student letters.

C. Developing a Portfolio of Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The department should arrange for periodic peer reviews of assistant and associate professors throughout their time in that rank that involved direct peer observation of teaching. These should be done by colleagues recognized for their skilled teaching, but should not be done by the same individuals each time. Reviewers should first review the syllabus of the individual they are visiting, pick an appropriate date for the visit, and inform the candidate in advance. The reviewer should be present for the entire class and seek to be as unobtrusive as possible. The reviewer should write a summary and evaluative report as soon after the observation as possible, beginning with a description of the class and class session, and moving on to a detailed evaluation of the quality of the class session, and concluding with specific suggestions for improvement. A full peer evaluation of teaching involves more than classroom observation; it also, for example, involves assessing the quality of course materials used in the session. The department should have a mechanism for providing the report to the candidate in a timely way because the chief aim of these reviews is developmental. The reports should be the basis for a discussion of goals and strategies for improvement.

CHAPTER V: CREATING THE REVIEW DOSSIER ON THE CAS TENURE AND PROMOTION SERVER

Most of the review of tenure and promotion cases relies on documentation in electronic format, therefore all relevant documentation, with the exception of hardcopy books and/or manuscripts, should be uploaded to the secure Tenure and Promotion site on the CAS Server. The server is found at: https://casapps.bu.edu/tenure-promotions/ and is accessible to the department Chair and administrator only, using their login name and Kerberos password. All information must be uploaded in PDF format. Please contact the CAS Tenure and Promotion coordinator with any questions relating to use of the server, or technical issues.

All necessary and relevant documentation be submitted in a timely fashion with careful attention to form and organization in order to assure that candidates receive a fair consideration. This takes considerable time and attention and the department should establish a clear schedule for the process, including setting deadline for the candidate to submit materials that gives the candidate
sufficient time to do prepare the materials and submit them to the departmental tenure and promotion coordinator. The schedule should also assure that the materials will be available for the departmental review. The Chair should communicate the departmental deadline to the candidate well in advance. Candidates are responsible for submitting all documentation (except course evaluations) to the department by the departmental deadline.

The department Chair and tenure and promotion coordinator and, in the case of tenure and promotion, the candidate’s mentor should be available to advise the candidate on completing this task correctly and including all appropriate materials.

The materials must be well-organized to make sure reviewers can find what they need easily. Please see Appendix 2 for instructions on naming files for upload to the server. The department administrator is responsible for posting the publications and supporting materials on the CAS T&P web server. The materials should be uploaded to the appropriate section, listed here in the order they appear on the CAS Tenure and Promotion Server:

A. Unit Actions

Each level (Department, Chair, APT, Dean, UAPT, Provost) of the tenure and/or promotion review process is responsible for recording a recommendation and, where appropriate, a tally of the votes on that recommendation.

B. Part II: Candidate’s Vita

Candidates should submit a completed “Part II: Candidate’s Vita” to the department by the date specified by the department. This is a long document requiring complete and well-organized information on every aspect of a candidate’s professional career. Although it goes by the name “vita,” it includes but is not the same as a conventional professional curriculum vita. When preparing the Part II, please take note of the following points:

- For TENURE AND PROMOTION CANDIDATES information and listings should refer to the candidate’s entire academic career, clearly indicating what has been accomplished since entering the tenure-track position at Boston University. For candidates for PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR, information and listings should refer to the candidate’s accomplishments since appointment with tenure at the rank of associate professor.

- Answer all questions, entering “n/a” or “none” when necessary. Do not leave any questions blank.

- Question 4.3 asks about “new courses or methods of instruction you have developed.” The response should include this information, but it need not be limited to this information. This is an opportunity to incorporate material the kind of points included in the “Teaching Statement” circulated to external reviewers.

- Question 5, on publications: All citations should use proper bibliographic form. If there are co-authors or co-editors the citation should be clear about who they are (unless there are more than 6 co-authors or co-editors) and in all cases candidates should be clear about where in the listing their name appears. This section should only include works that are published or in press/forthcoming; that is, works that have been formally assigned publication dates and that are in the formal production process.
• Questions 5.3, on journal articles: Indicate which journal articles appear in journals that use a fully professional academic referee process (i.e., not in-house).

• Question 5.6, on reviews: List any published reviews (not citations) of your publications or creative work.

• Question 5.7, on citations: Provide summaries of the numbers of citations for each of your publications. All candidates are asked to use the appropriate citation index (natural sciences, social sciences, humanities) compiled by the Web of Science. In addition, citation rates may be compiled from other sources, such as Google Scholar or discipline-specific citation indexes. Only citations in published works, working papers, or similar scholarly documents should be counted. Provide the h-index or other commonly used summary of citations where appropriate. Cite the source of citation rates.

• Question 5.8: “Works in progress:” first list any works that have been submitted for publication, with the requested information. Then list any works intended for publication that are substantially drafted (and therefore available for examination) and indicated whether they have been contracted or solicited and the plans for submission. Third, listed any works intended for publication that have been contracted or solicited but have not yet been substantially drafted. Distinguish among these three categories clearly.

Once “Part II: Candidate’s Vita” has been circulated to the department for the purpose of the department deliberation and vote, the document becomes final and no changes can be made to the document after this time. This version should be included in the application binder submitted to the Office of Faculty Actions and posted on the CAS T&P web server. Candidates may submit updates regarding their professional accomplishments to the section, “Candidate’s Updates.”

C. Part III: The Chair’s Report

See the discussion of the Chair’s Report below, under Departmental Review. This section of the Tenure and Promotion Server also contains the results of peer teaching reviews under the section “Classroom Visits” and the evaluation letters submitted by students under the section “Student Letters.” See the discussion of peer and student evaluation above, in Chapter IV, Generating Evaluation Materials. The Classroom Visits section should be completed by the end of the Spring semester, and should include all peer evaluations completed during the period under consideration.

D. Candidate’s Updates Section

Once the review process is underway, candidates should provide updates to their dossier as they have new professional accomplishments to report. Updates should take the form of brief descriptions of each accomplishment, e.g. “Article Y, previously listed as ‘in review’ has now been published in the Journal of X”. When relevant, new published works should also be included in the update process. Updates should be emailed to the CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator, who will ensure they reach the next level of review. Updated CVs are not included in the dossier.
E. Candidate’s Responses to the Reports Section

See comments below, at the end of the discussion of Departmental Review. Candidates’ responses should be forwarded to the CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator via email attachment.

F. Publications Section

Departments should submit to the Publications Section a table of contents page listing all works submitted to this section. Each entry should clearly indicate whether the item is “published”, “in press”, “in progress,” or “under contract.” Published means just that: it is available in published form. A work that has a firm publication date and is in the publisher’s production process is in press. Listings of works in press should identify the publisher or journal and expected publication date, and the dossier should include a letter from the publisher confirming the publication status and expected publication date. Works that are in substantial draft form but not completed are in progress. The entry should further indicate whether the work in progress is under contract or revise and resubmit. In those cases the contract should be submitted.

Reviewer comments should be provided for works that are in press, under contract, or in revise and resubmit processes whenever possible.

G. Teaching, Grant, and Service-related Materials Sections listed below should be compiled by the candidate according to the department schedule.

G1. Course Syllabi: Include course syllabi from all courses taught at Boston University (TENURE AND PROMOTION cases) or since appointment as associate professor (PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR cases).

G2. Course Materials: Include current materials and a representative sample of course materials from earlier years (~3 items per class) that demonstrate the quality of teaching and mentoring of students. These might include exams and assignments, study guides, or other materials.

G3. Grant Materials: Include copies of all grant abstracts (not the full application), peer reviews, amount of funding requested or received, and information about whether the grant is pending, was awarded, or denied.

G4. Service Materials Section: include any documentation that supports or further explains the institutional or professional service activities listed on the candidate’s CV. These may include letters recognizing the candidate for his/her service, conference programs, etc.

H. Student Course Evaluations Section

Departments should submit a table of contents page to this section listing the candidate’s course history. The candidate’s original Scantron course evaluation documents should be placed in the Course Evaluations Section in chronological order with the statistical summary of the evaluations appearing as the first page of the course evaluation file for each course. All student comments should be included for each course. For promotion only cases, if the candidate has been an associate professor for more than 6 years, only the last 6 years of evaluations should be included.
1. Candidate’s Fall Teaching Schedule and Syllabi

Candidates should submit Fall course syllabi to the CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator in August. An accompanying teaching schedule should include accurate classroom locations and highlight any guest lecturer visits, fieldtrips and examination dates. This information is used to plan classroom visits by the APT Committee. Candidates should update this information with any changes during the Fall semester.

CHAPTER VI: PREPARING AND SUBMITTING THE APPLICATION BINDER (“BLUE BINDER”)

Although the review process relies substantially on the electronic dossier uploaded to the CAS Tenure and Promotion Server, we are still required to submit paper versions of the application binder (aka the “blue binder”), which is the comprehensive summary of the tenure and/or promotion review process. These are hard copies of materials A-E that are uploaded to the CAS Tenure and Promotion Server. Further explanation of each section can be found above.

The department Chair is responsible for ensuring that the application binder and electronic dossier are submitted to the Office of Faculty Actions conforming to all specifications by the stated deadline.

The Office of Faculty Actions will provide each department with an original (dark blue) and four copy binders (light blue), which will contain copies of each external evaluator letter that has been received thus far. The department is responsible for inserting the following hard copy versions of materials, and returning the binders to the Office of Faculty Actions:

- Part I: Unit Actions sheet: The original version, hand-signed by the Chair, should be included in the original dark blue binder. Copies may be used for the other binders. See above in Chapter V for further explanation.

- Part II: Candidate’s Vita. See above in Chapter V for further explanation.

- Part III: Chair’s Report should be placed all five binders, along with copies of the classroom visits and student letters. See below under “Departmental Review” for further explanation.

- The Office of Faculty Actions will place the original external evaluator letters in the dark blue binder once it is returned from the department.

Please do not bind or staple the materials, and ensure that all copies are double-sided, wherever possible.

CHAPTER VII: THE DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

Departments are involved in a continuous review and professional development process for all assistant and associate professors throughout their career in those ranks. From the original appointment review, through the annual merit exercise, to the Mid-Tenure Review for assistant professors and regular peer teaching evaluations, there are regular opportunities for assistant and associate professors to receive valuable feedback and career advice to help them develop their professional work in the best possible manner and prepare themselves for promotion to the next rank in a timely way.
A. Preparing the Process

As previous chapters indicate, the department Chair is responsible for ensuring the quality and appropriate timing of the process at the departmental level. Chairs should consult this handbook, attend the annual meeting for department chairs involved in tenure and review, and seek information from the relevant associate dean of the faculty, the CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator, or the Director of Faculty Actions as relevant. The Office of Faculty Actions posts an annual calendar online specifying the deadlines for completing the process (http://www.bu.edu/cas/faculty-staff/procedures-forms/faculty-and-staff-actions/, under Tenure & Promotion). Both the department Chair and (for TENURE AND PROMOTION) the candidate’s mentor are responsible for making sure the candidate is well informed and completes the process in the best possible manner and in a timely way.

Every department should establish a clear process for completing the tenure and promotion reviews, and a clear set of standards for review, all of which should be communicated to assistant and associate professors. These procedures and standards should be discussed with new members of the ranks of associate and full professors to ensure that the procedures are understood by all who will join in these serious and consequential deliberations.

B. Candidates with Joint Appointments or Programmatic Roles

An increasing number of faculty have formal or informal connections with multiple departments and programs throughout the university. All of their professional work "counts" and should be documented and considered as part of the record.

- For faculty with full joint appointments where both departments lie within CAS, both departments will vote and issue their own reports on the case. Both of these reports will be filed on the CAS Tenure and Promotion Server under “Chair’s Report.” The department Chairs should consult with each other at the time that scheduling of the review procedure begins in order to coordinate on soliciting external review letters. Holding a joint appointment does not, in principle, increase the number of letters needed.

- For faculty with full joint appointments with one of the departments lying outside CAS, the Chair of the CAS department should consult with the Chair of the non-CAS department (or Dean in the case of schools and colleges that are not organized departmentally) and Office of Faculty Actions as early as possible on how to proceed with the review. Both of these reports will be filed on the CAS Tenure and Promotion Server under “Chair’s Report.” The department Chairs or Deans should consult with each other at the time that scheduling of the review procedure begins in order to coordinate on soliciting external review letters. Holding a joint appointment does not, in principle, increase the number of letters needed.

- For faculty with appointments and significant professional responsibilities in programs, centers, or institutes that are not tenure-granting units, and for faculty with secondary appointments in tenure-granting departments the home department Chair should seek a letter of assessment from the Director/Chair of the other unit that discusses the quality of the candidate’s work in the context of the work the candidate carries out in that unit, including teaching, research, service, or other relevant duties. The home department Chair should send notification to the Director/Chair of the other unit at the time of scheduling the review process to request the letter and to discuss whether it is appropriate to recognize the interdisciplinarity of the candidate in soliciting external letters. The Director’s/Chair’s letter should briefly describe the work carried out by the candidate in
the context of that unit, assess its quality and impact, and describe the process used to develop the assessment. These reports will be filed on the CAS Tenure and Promotion Server under “Chair’s Report.”

- For other faculty with significant involvement in another department or program, it is important that the Chair of the home department solicit Chair’s/Director’s letters from the faculty member’s secondary departments and programs and other documentation as appropriate in a timely way. Programs with which a candidate for tenure and/or promotion is associated should develop an appropriate method for reviewing the candidate’s professional contributions and contributing the results of that evaluation to the home department. It is important for the Chair of the home department and the Chair or Director of the other unit to consult on this as early as possible.

C. Eligibility to Participate in Department Deliberation and Vote

Tenured faculty holding an “unmodified” professorial rank higher than that of the candidate are entitled to vote in departmental decisions about tenure and promotion. Departments may extend voting rights to non-tenure track faculty holding equivalent “unmodified” titles, subject to approval by the Dean. The department Chair only votes if that person is at a higher professorial rank than the candidate. If the department Chair is an associate professor, that person is excluded from the deliberation and discussion of promotions to the rank of Professor, and a Professor should be asked to facilitate the discussions and write and sign the department report. Chairs should contact the Office of Faculty Actions if there is any uncertainty about who is eligible to vote.

Faculty who are eligible to vote, but are not present for the departmental discussion and vote, should be recorded as absent. The calendar for deliberating and voting on candidates for tenure and promotion should be announced well in advance to minimize the number of absences. Faculty who are on leave are not expected to participate in these meetings, but if they choose to do so, they should make every effort to participate in all cases during the year, and should not choose to participate in only selected cases. The Chair’s Report should include an explanation of every absence. The Chair’s Report may include comments about communications from absent colleagues, but because reasoned, collective deliberation is critical to the ability to cast a fully informed vote, only those present have their views counted in the vote.

A faculty member who has a conflict of interest in evaluating the candidate must absent him/herself from the discussion of and vote on the candidate, and should be recorded as absent because of recusal. Department members who are recused from the discussion should also refrain from discussing the case informally with colleagues outside of the meeting, and may not be party to the confidential discussions that took place inside the meeting after the fact.

D. Preparation and Deliberation

All voting members of the department are expected to review the documentary evidence as responsibly as possible to prepare themselves for the deliberation, discussion and vote. Although only a subcommittee is likely to be held responsible for reading and analyzing all evidence closely, every voting member should be familiar with the evidence of the case at least to the extent of reading the extended academic curriculum vita, the external evaluation letters, and at least a sampling of the publications.

Departments may use different methods for allowing faculty access to the dossier in preparation for the discussion and vote, but must protect confidentiality, and ensure that the candidate cannot
access any confidential materials contained within his or her dossier. Leaving confidential materials on unlocked laptops or making them easily accessible through unlocked tablets or smartphones does not adequately guarantee confidentiality. Files should be properly deleted and purged after use, especially on computers that may be shared with other users.

Faculty members should not discuss tenure and promotion candidates and cases in public places, and should not engage in email discussions of candidates and cases unless the communication is secure and necessary, as in preparing a subcommittee report.

Departments may choose different ways of organizing the discussion and deliberation of cases. The discussion of and vote on tenure and promotion cases must remain strictly confidential. It is unprofessional and unacceptable to discuss any aspect of the deliberation and vote with anyone who was not present or eligible to participate. Participants in the discussion must not quote or paraphrase what anyone said in the meeting, with or without attribution, and they should not reveal how any individual voted or the final vote to those who were not present or eligible to participate. Under no circumstance should confidentiality be breached with respect to the candidate him/herself.

Because judgments about professional productivity take account of professional accomplishments during a specific time period (e.g. since Ph.D., years in rank), participants in deliberation in tenure and promotion cases should be mindful of the fact that if a tenure clock has been extended because of parental leave or other reasons, the time during which the “clock was stopped” does not count as professional time. Candidates are not expected to have been professionally productive during that time.

E. Voting

It is acceptable, though not preferable, for departments to use secret ballots to vote on tenure and promotion.

It is important to be sure that all significant reasons for voting for or against a case are voiced during the course of deliberations. It is not good professional practice for the department discussion to proceed with no voiced negative views, and then for individual colleagues either to vote in the negative or to abstain.

Among the major responsibilities one assumes by accepting a position as a tenured member of an academic department is engaging in responsible decision-making about hiring, tenure, and promotion. Although some cases are especially difficult to decide, and one might feel personally divided about what is the right decision, this does not reduce or eliminate the importance of taking responsibility for participating in making this consequential decision. To abstain from voting is the same as not participating at all, and it leaves the difficult decision to colleagues. Members who are eligible to vote and are not on leave or prevented from participating due to reasons beyond their control should attend tenure and promotion meetings and avoid abstaining from the vote.

The exact vote, positive, negative, and abstentions, is recorded on the Part I: Unit Actions/Vote Sheet, as well as the number of absent faculty.

F. Chair’s Report
The Chair’s Report should provide (a) an accurate and judicious reflection of the department’s assessment of the candidate’s qualifications for tenure and/or promotion as discussed in the full range of the departmental deliberation of the case, (b) an accurate explanation of the reasons for the final decision where there were differences of opinion, and finally, (c) any additional reflections by the Chair. The report should help the reviewers at later stages of the process understand the department deliberation and decision. A constructive and credible report should not merely advocate for or against the candidate. Rather, it should thoughtfully address both positive aspects of the case and shortcomings in a specific and convincing way, providing a careful and accurate reflection of major department assessment of the various elements of the case (teaching, research, and service), and the case as a whole.

The report should begin with a brief summary of the candidate’s academic history, including any postdoctoral positions after his or her degree, childbirth leaves, academic leaves of absences and/or tenure review deferrals when applicable, making clear how many semesters in rank “count” toward tenure and/or promotion. The report should also include material aimed at helping evaluators outside the discipline understand the norms and practices of the discipline more clearly, where this may be useful.

The report should also indicate the reasons for absences, abstentions, and recusals where known (medical absences should be noted as succinctly as possible; no confidential medical information should be included).

With respect to research and scholarship, the Chair’s Report should emphasize the productivity and impact of the candidate’s work. It should give a succinct overview of the substantive, theoretical, and/or methodological contributions of the scholarly work. Simply listing the published works or those in progress is not sufficient to offer full clarity about productivity; in any case, that information is available elsewhere in the dossier. The report should not rely for its argument on merely quoting the praise or criticisms of the letters of evaluation, especially if these quotations do not provide clear insight into the nature of the scholarly contributions and impact. The Report should analyze.

It is helpful for the Chair’s Report to compare the dissertation and works based on the dissertation to indicate how much revision took place. The report should also evaluate and discuss the degree of overlap among different publications. Publishing one book and three articles that are substantially the same as three of the book’s chapters represents a different level of productivity from publishing one book and three articles that are substantially different from what appears in the book. Chairs should include a brief description of the norms for listing co-authors in their field: for example, are co-authors simply listed alphabetically, or does the order denote the level of input of each co-author?

In cases of a split departmental vote, the Chair’s Report should explain the different points of view with balance and care. If the Chair’s Report contains only positive observations, and there are any negative votes or abstentions, the CAS APT or the Dean will ask the Chair for an explanation of the negative votes and abstentions. In the case of secret balloting and a lack of critical discussion during the meeting, the Chair will have no explanation, which does not reflect well on the quality of deliberation in the department.

It is a good technique to use some concluding time in a tenure and/or promotion meeting to be sure that the Chair or other report writer is clear on the main elements of the reasons for the final decisions faculty made in voting.

Faculty members who were present at the departmental deliberations, dissent from the conclusion, and believe that their views are not represented adequately in the Chair’s Report may
submit separate, minority statements. Faculty are strongly advised not to submit statements to the file that repeat views discussed in the department report. Faculty members should not attempt to “lobby” any individual at the next levels of consideration. They should not send letters to the Dean or other individuals at the next levels of consideration expressing their views; these will not be read or become part of the record. Colleagues present at the meeting should have access to the Chair’s Report in a timely way to allow them to write dissents if they believe that the report does not accurately express the minority opinions.

G. Communicating the Department Decision

The Chair should promptly inform candidates in writing of the recommendation forwarded by the department. Under no circumstances should the candidate be given the final vote tally or any indication of how split the vote was. The votes of specific individuals and their views expressed during the deliberation must be protected as strictly confidential.

If a department makes a negative decision with regard to tenure and/or promotion, the case is forwarded for review at the College level in the usual way unless the candidate withdraws his or her application following the department review.

The Chair, through the department Tenure and Promotion Coordinator, submits 4 documents at the conclusion of the process.

1. The full final Chair’s report, which must be signed electronically, as well as any dissenting reports. Note that while there is space for the evaluators’ details to be included at the end of the departmental report (see Q.5 of the template), these boxes should be deleted and replaced with the sentence, “External evaluators were solicited by the Office of the Dean”. Evaluators’ details are now made available in the Dean’s report, and there is no need to replicate this information here.

2. Please contact the CAS Tenure & Promotion Coordinator if you need assistance creating an electronic signature.

3. The department Chair is responsible for submitting a redacted version of the Chair’s Report (and any minority faculty reports) to the CAS Tenure & Promotion Coordinator (kmor@bu.edu). This redacted version, which will be reviewed by the Office of Faculty Actions and the appropriate Associate Dean of the Faculty, is the version that will be sent to the candidate. If an administrator is assigned to do the redaction, the department Chair should nevertheless review the final version because some aspects of the redaction may depend on academic expertise. The CAS Tenure & Promotion Coordinator will email a redacted copy to the candidate, copying the departmental Chair, with a hard copy also being sent to the candidate’s home address. For guidelines on redacting the report please see Appendix 3.

4. The Cover Page for the Board of Trustees (http://www.bu.edu/provost/files/2012/02/Cover-Page-for-Board-of-Trustees-Template1.docx), which will be used by the Provost and President to inform the Trustees of all tenure and promotion decisions.

H. Candidate Response to the Department Report
Candidates who find errors in the Chair’s report may submit corrections in writing to the Tenure and Promotions Coordinator within five business days of receipt. **Candidates are strongly advised not to write general “responses” or answers to reports, but only to correct errors of fact.** Candidates should not write to disagree with the conclusions or interpretations of the reports, or argue that they have placed the wrong weight on different elements of the case, or disagree with their readings of the outside letters, or incorporate any other information or argument that is not, strictly speaking, a correction of fact. If a candidate’s response does go beyond corrections of error, the response will be edited by the Dean’s or Provost’s Office to eliminate all but the corrections of fact.

If a candidate wishes to respond to the Chair’s report but cannot do so in five business days due to reasons beyond their control, they should contact the Office of Faculty Actions to ask for an extension. The same process also applies to the APT Committee’s report, and the Dean’s report.

**CHAPTER VIII: THE COLLEGE REVIEW PROCESS**

**A. Review by the CAS Appointment, Promotion, & Tenure (APT) Committee**

The CAS Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee is composed of senior members of the CAS faculty, drawn from across the disciplines. It begins reviewing PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR cases in September and continues with TENURE AND PROMOTION cases in the later fall. The CAS APT has access to all materials used at the departmental level for review, plus the departmental report and vote and any updates candidates have submitted. Candidates may submit updates to their dossier throughout the process, but the APT cannot guarantee that it will review any materials that arrive after 12pm the day before the initial case discussion takes place.

Members of the APT conduct peer teaching reviews of candidates’ classes. These should be scheduled in coordination with the candidate well in advance. They will not make unannounced visits.

The APT may request that the Chair or candidate provide additional information or further clarification of the dossier when they believe information is missing or unclear. They will make these requests through the CAS Tenure & Promotions Coordinator.

The APT Committee prepares a report summarizing the Committee’s review and the Committee’s vote is entered on the Part I: Unit Actions sheet. This report is added to the dossier and made available to the Dean for review.

If the CAS APT makes a negative decision with regard to tenure and/or promotion, the case is forwarded for review by the Dean in the usual way unless the candidate withdraws his or her application following the APT review.

The Office of Faculty Actions will redact the APT report, and email it to the candidate, copying the Department Chair. A copy will also be sent to the candidate’s home address. These reports will be released as they are completed.

Candidates who find errors in the CAS APT report may submit corrections in writing to the Tenure and Promotions Coordinator within five business days of receipt. **Candidates are strongly advised not to write general “responses” or answers to reports, but only to correct errors of fact.**
Please see the discussion of “Candidate Responses to the Department Report,” above. The same principles apply here.

B. Review by the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences

The Dean has access to all materials used at previous levels of review, plus the departmental and CAS APT reports and votes, and any updates candidates have submitted. The Dean may also request that the candidate, Chair and/or APT provide additional information or further clarification of the dossier. The Dean considers updated information in the dossier up to the time she begins her analysis and writing.

The Dean’s TENURE AND PROMOTION review includes a half-hour conversation with each candidate for tenure after she has reviewed the dossier. These are scheduled once the APT review schedule is known. The interview consists of three standard questions distributed to the candidate in advance. They are: (1) How would you describe the core of your contributions and accomplishments as a teacher, a scholar, a citizen of this university, and of your larger profession thus far? (2) What do you imagine will be your contributions and accomplishments over the next 10 years or so? (3) Do you have any concerns about your experience or opportunities here, or the way you have been treated as a faculty member?

These conversations do not take place in PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR cases.

The intention of this conversation is to seek a holistic understanding of the credentials and promise of the candidate for tenure, clarify ambiguities or fill in gaps, and provide an opportunity for candidates to speak for themselves. This conversation constitutes only one modest additional piece of the evidence the Dean considers.

The Dean informs the candidate and the department Chair of her recommendation. The Office of Faculty Actions creates a redacted copy of the report and emails it to the candidate and sends a paper copy to the candidate’s home address. Beginning in 2012/13 the Office of Faculty Actions sends both the redacted and unredacted Dean’s Report to the department Chair under separate cover, marked “Confidential.” These reports should not be circulated, but remain confidential to the Chair. There may, however, be discussion in the unredacted version of the Dean’s Report that relates to the quality of the mentoring or review process in the department should therefore be discussed with the department in order to improve processes in the future.

Candidates who find errors in the Dean’s Report may submit corrections in writing to the Tenure and Promotions Coordinator within five business days of receipt. Please see the discussion of “Candidate Responses to the Department Report,” above. The same principles apply here.

If the Dean makes a negative tenure and/or promotion recommendation, she informs the Provost, but the case does not proceed forward and is considered closed unless the candidate appeals the negative decision. The Dean writes to the candidate, informing him/her of the decision and of faculty rights with respect to appeal. The candidate’s right of appeal is exercised by submitting an appeal in writing to the Provost within ten business days of receipt of the negative decision.

CHAPTER IX: THE UNIVERSITY REVIEW PROCESS

The University Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (UAPT) Committee is composed of senior members of the Boston University faculty, drawn from across the various schools and colleges. The UAPT has access to all materials used at the preceding level of review plus all votes and
reports from the preceding levels and for review, plus the departmental report and vote and any updates candidates have submitted. The UAPT may also request further information or clarification from the department Chair, the APT Committee, and/or the Dean. The UAPT only conducts classroom visits in cases where it believes there is not enough evidence in the dossier to make a decision on the teaching aspect of the case.

The UAPT reviews are completed during the spring semester and the UAPT reports are forwarded to the Provost for review, along with the candidate’s complete dossier. The UAPT does not send out redacted copies of their reports. The Provost makes a recommendation to the President, who makes the final decision and notifies the Dean of the final disposition of the case. The Dean then informs the candidate in writing.

The Provost also considers appeals of negative decisions by the Dean and informs the candidate directly.
Appendix 1: Example of a Letter to Candidate’s Co-authors.

DATE

Dear Professor [ ],

I am writing to ask for your assistance in our review of Professor X as a candidate for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor/promotion to the rank of Full Professor in our Department of X at Boston University. You have coauthored several publications/collaborated on grant applications with Professor X during his/her time as a faculty member at Boston University and we would appreciate it if you could characterize the relative contributions you and Professor X made to the conception, design and execution of these studies and/or applications.

A copy of Professor X’s curriculum vitae is attached for your reference. If possible, we would hope to receive your comments by DATE in order to include your information in the dossier.

Please note that we are not asking for the usual evaluative letter that constitutes part of a tenure and promotion dossier. Rather, we are seeking assistance with the facts regarding Professor X’s research contributions. We are grateful to you for your help with this important task.

Sincerely,

Virginia Sapiro
Dean of Arts and Sciences
Professor of Political Science
Boston University
725 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
Appendix 2: CAS Tenure & Promotion Web Server
Instructions for Uploading Documents

Part I: Unit Actions

Upload Part I as [candidate’s last name].PartI.UnitActions.pdf

Example | Smith.PartI.UnitActions.pdf

Please be sure the Unit Actions sheet includes the Chair’s name and signature, and that all vote-count boxes have been filled out, even if it is with a ‘0’ if appropriate.

Part II: Candidate’s Vita

Upload Part II as [candidate’s last name].PartII.Vita.pdf

Example | Smith.PartII.Vita.pdf

Part III: Chair’s Report

Upload the department (Chair’s) report as Part III as [candidate’s last name].PartIII.pdf

Example | Smith.PartIII.pdf

Please be sure the conclusion of the Chair’s report includes the Chair’s name and electronic signature.

In addition to the department report, Part III includes two sub-sections: Classroom Visits and Student Letters.

Classroom Visits:
Upload peer classroom visit files as [candidate’s last name].ClassroomVisit [visit #].pdf

To ensure that the files will be listed correctly, the numbers should start at “01,” not “1.” For numbers 10 or greater, it is not necessary to start with a “0.”

Example | Smith.ClassroomVisit01.pdf
…
Smith.ClassroomVisit10.pdf

Student Letters:
Upload student letter files as [candidate’s last name].StudentLetter[letter #].pdf

To ensure that the files will be listed correctly, the numbers should start at “01,” not “1.” For numbers 10 or greater, it is not necessary to start with a “0.”

Example | Smith.StudentLetter01.pdf
…
Smith.StudentLetter10.pdf
Supporting Materials

The Supporting Materials consists of 3 sections: Publications; Teaching, Grants, and Services; and Course Evaluations.

Publications:
Please create a table of contents that lists bibliographic information of all documents in this section. The publications may be ordered and organized based on the publication type, followed by the publication date. Be sure to indicate in the table of contents whether each work is published, in press, or in progress.

Begin the file name of the table of contents with the designation “00.” Subsequent documents should start with “01”, “02”, “03”, and so on.

*Example |
00.Publications.TableOfContents.pdf
01.HistoryOfBU.pdf
02.BUCAS.pdf

Teaching, Grants, and Service:
This section consists of:
• Teaching Material; divided into two sub-sections: course syllabi and course materials
• Grant Material
• Service-Related Material

Course Syllabi:
Please create a table of contents that lists all documents included in this section. The course syllabi should be placed in chronological order. For each entry within the table of contents, include the following:

1. The semester and year the course was taught
2. The course number and section
3. The course name

*Example **| Fall 2001 CAS IR 230 A1 INTRO INT’L POL
Spring 2002 CAS IR 271 A1 INTRO TO IR

Upload the table of contents as “00.CourseSyllabi.TableOfContents.pdf”.

The syllabus for each course should be listed individually. Upload each syllabus as [academic year].[semester].[course#].pdf.

*Example** | 2001.Fall.IR230.pdf

Course Materials:
Please create a table of contents that lists all documents included in this section. For each entry, include the following:

1. The semester and year the course was taught
2. The course number and section
3. The type of course material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example*</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>CAS IR 230 A1</th>
<th>Reading Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2002</td>
<td>CAS IR 271 A1</td>
<td>Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upload the table of contents as “00.CourseMaterials.TableOfContents.pdf”.

The procedure for naming and uploading course materials is the same as it is for course syllabi.

**Grant Material:**
Create a table of contents that lists all documents included in this section. Upload it as “00.GrantMaterials.TableOfContents.pdf”.

**Service-Related Material:**
Create a table of contents that lists all documents included in this section. Upload it as “00.ServiceMaterials.TableOfContents.pdf”.

**Course Evaluations:**
Please create a table of contents that lists all courses taught by the candidate. The course evaluations should be placed in chronological order. For each entry within the table of contents, include the following:

1. The semester and year the course was taught
2. The course number and section
3. The course name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example*</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>CAS HI 101 A1</th>
<th>DAWN OF EUROPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>CAS HI 102 A1</td>
<td>EMERG MOD EUROP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upload the table of contents as “00.CourseHistory.TableOfContents.pdf”.

Upload each set of evaluations, with the statistical summary sheet as the first page, as [candidate’s last name].[year].[semester].[class #].pdf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example*</th>
<th>Smith.2007.Fall.HI101.pdf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*For numbers 10 or greater, it is not necessary to start with a “0.”

**Unfortunately Fall and Spring semesters in the same calendar year will forever be reversed due to the server’s auto alphabetizing, resulting in files ordering themselves as follows:

Smith.2007.Fall.HI101.pdf
Smith.2007.Spring.HI102.pdf
Appendix 3: Guidelines on redaction

The main purpose of redaction is to remove any indices of authorship. This includes titles/names/gender/comments/institution names etc. from external evaluators, students, and/or faculty who may have attended classroom visits. Any blatant references that could disclose the identity are also to be removed.

Names/titles/gender references are replaced by [ ]
Institution names are removed and replaced by [institution]
And anything that could reveal the identity becomes [text deleted to maintain anonymity].

Here is an example using the following hypothetical sentence:

“Professor Smith, from Boston College, who once spoke with Professor CANDIDATE at a conference in Toronto, commented that he feels the candidate has had a “strong positive impact on the psychology community, as gauged by the number of citations shown for his work”.

This would become:

“[ ], from [institution], [text deleted to maintain anonymity], commented that [ ] feels the candidate has had a “strong positive impact on the psychology community, as gauged by the number of citations shown for his work”.

It is very important that all changes are done using the ‘track changes’ function.

Appendix 4: Useful links:

Tenure & Promotion calendars and general information: http://www.bu.edu/cas/faculty-staff/faculty-staff-handbook/faculty-personnel-issues/tenure-and-promotion-policies-and-practices/

External Evaluator form: http://www.bu.edu/cas/faculty-staff/forms

All other forms used in the tenure and promotion, and promotion-only review processes are available on the Provost’s website at:
http://www.bu.edu/provost/resources/forms/index.html

CAS Tenure and Promotion Server: https://casapps.bu.edu/tenure-promotions/

Wordpress site for creation of Promotion-only dossiers for evaluators:
http://www.bu.edu/cas-promotion/wp-admin/

Wordpress site for creation of Tenure and Promotion dossiers for evaluators:
http://www.bu.edu/cas-tenure/wp-admin/
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