



COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES GUIDE TO THE TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS

Table of Contents

- I. Overview.....Page 2
- II. Information and FormsPage 3
- III. Preparations before the Review Year.....Page 4
- IV. Generating Evaluation Materials: Candidate & Departmental Responsibilities.....Page 5
 - A. Soliciting External Evaluations
 - B. Soliciting Student Letters of Evaluation
 - C. Developing a Portfolio of Peer Evaluation of Teaching
- V. Creating the Review Dossier on the CAS Tenure and Promotion Server.....Page 11
 - A. Part I: Unit Actions
 - B. Part II: Candidate’s *Vitae*
 - C. Part III: The Chair’s Report
 - D. Candidate’s Updates Section
 - E. Candidate’s Responses to the Reports Section
 - F. Publications Section
 - G. Teaching, Grants, and Service-Related Materials Sections
 - H. Student Course Evaluations Sections
 - I. Candidate’s Fall Teaching Schedule & Syllabi
- VI. The Departmental Review Process.....Page 15
 - A. Preparing for the Process
 - B. Candidates with Joint Appointments or Programmatic Roles
 - C. Eligibility to Participate in Department Deliberation and Vote
 - D. Preparation and Deliberation
 - E. Voting
 - F. Chair’s Report
 - G. Communicating the Department Decision
 - H. Candidate’s Response to the Department Report
- VII. The College Review Process.....Page 22
 - A. Review by the CAS APT Committee
 - B. How the APT is Asked to Assess Cases
 - C. Review by the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences
- VIII. The University Review Process.....Page 26
- IX. Promotion to Professor of the Practice.....Page 26
 - A. Promotion Criteria
 - B. Consultation and Dossier Preparation
 - C. External Evaluation
 - D. Internal Review Process
- Appendices.....Page 30

The CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator, Alex Bellan, can be reached at 617-353-2404 or lundsted@bu.edu.

CHAPTER I: OVERVIEW

Tenure is a privilege reserved for faculty who have demonstrated professional accomplishments in teaching, research and scholarship, and service, providing confidence to the College and University 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 review 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 evaluating the evidence of past accomplishments, the decision rests on a judgment about the future.

Promotion from the rank of Associate Professor to Professor is a privilege reserved for faculty who have continued after tenure to demonstrate professional accomplishments in teaching, research and scholarship, and service, providing confidence to the College and University that they will continue to contribute in all of these areas at a level of excellence that is appropriate for a Professor at Boston University, a major research and teaching institution, through the indefinite future. In addition, we expect to see professional maturity and leadership that is appropriate for the highest regular professorial rank. Thus, in the course of the 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 evaluating 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, subject to the Dean's approval. They should consult with their department chair and divisional associate dean if they are considering an early review. *Approval to seek early tenure does not confer any guarantee that the tenure case will be successful and given the comprehensive nature of evaluation involved, should be undertaken only after careful consideration.*

Associate Professors may apply for promotion to the rank of Professor when they believe their accomplishments and achievements have qualified them for promotion. Nationally, promotion at research universities typically occurs 5-7 years after promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Associate Professors are strongly encouraged to consult with their department chair and, if they wish, divisional associate dean, before applying for promotion. The divisional associate deans will review the CV of each Associate Professor applying for promotion and discuss any potential issues that might stand in the way of promotion in the next review cycle with the chair and/or candidate. It is CAS policy that when individuals have served as Associate Professor for 10 years or more, the department chair engages in regular, preferably annual, discussions about strategies for career development aimed at developing a record of academic accomplishments meriting promotion in the near future.

Although review of a candidate for promotion from Associate Professor to 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 only materials related to the period since the last promotion should be submitted.

The formal tenure and promotion review process occurs in six stages at Boston University. The process begins with the department-level review and proceeds, 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 the start of each process, candidates submit materials representing their professional accomplishments, providing much of the evidentiary basis of the review. The department provides advice to the Dean on appropriate external evaluators through the CAS Tenure and 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 person or place according to specified deadlines for each stage of the review process. These deadlines are designed to allow us to follow the strict deadlines required by the university process. *At the department level, the 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 for 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 divisional associate dean.

It is crucial that the process be carried out to the highest standards as outlined in this *Guide* to ensure that candidates for tenure and promotion or promotion to Professor are presented and evaluated 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 Tenure and Promotion Coordinator will 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](#).

CHAPTER II: INFORMATION AND FORMS

Everyone associated with the tenure and promotion process, including candidates for tenure and promotion, is responsible for being up to date on appropriate standards, processes, and procedures. The [Boston University Faculty Handbook](#) contains the authoritative outline of the basic university-wide criteria, processes, and timetable for tenure and promotion, in the [Tenure and Promotion on the Charles River Campus](#) section. The [CAS Faculty & Staff Handbook](#) details College-level criteria in the Faculty Personnel Matters: Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty Expectations section. Departments are also expected to establish clear faculty expectations documents of their own, which help make clear for junior faculty the criteria for tenure and promotion. These Tenure & Promotion Guidelines are updated annually and provide a 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 in the [Forms library](#) or on the [CAS Forms & Instructions](#) page. For questions about completing application forms, please contact the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator](#).

The Office of the Dean holds three annual meetings for those involved to learn about the process: one for tenure and promotion candidates, one for candidates for promotion to Professor, and one for department chairs and administrators.

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, typically occurring in the sixth semester, 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. Please see the [MTR guidelines](#) for more information. Other considerations 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, mentoring, and professional service. This includes keeping an updated academic curriculum vitae. They should seek guidance and advice from their mentors, 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 for the tenure and promotion review processes are carried out to the highest possible standards. They ensure that the mentoring processes are carried out properly. They should ensure that one departmental staff member serves as the 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 the tenure and promotion review process, 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.
5. 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 helping Assistant and Associate Professors develop their craft of teaching. Please see section IV:C for more information regarding peer teaching evaluations.

6. 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 related to ensuring the process will go smoothly. This meeting should happen early in the process so everyone can plan accordingly. It is important to note that all deadlines set by Faculty Actions are deadlines for submission of materials to the college. Departments should set earlier internal deadlines to be sure they can meet the college deadlines. *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 and submit all necessary materials to the highest possible standards.*

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 CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator solicits letters of evaluation from leading scholars in the candidate's field(s), in the names of the Dean and department chair, in order to obtain independent assessments of the quality of the candidate's work. The CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator sends the requests for external evaluation letters, manages response rates, acknowledges receipt, and places them on the [CAS tenure and promotion server](#) as they become available. The Dean's Office makes the final decision in choosing external evaluators.

A tenure and promotion dossier must include 10-12 high quality external evaluation letters and a promotion to Professor dossier must include at least 6 high quality external evaluation "core" letters as described below. Departments should propose 20 potential external evaluators in tenure cases and 12-15 potential evaluators in promotion to Professor cases to ensure we can collect an adequate number of letters. In some cases, the department may have to propose additional potential external evaluators to achieve the minimum yield.

It is important that the identity of individuals proposed to serve as external evaluators and of those who write letters remains strictly confidential and is not 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 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, rather than simply repeating what is in the CV. 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 department(s) or program(s) for advice on selecting external evaluators. The department chair is responsible for describing in detail the qualifications of the 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.

Any potential evaluator who may have had minor professional interactions with the candidate (for example, interaction at a conference) should be listed as a 'Professional Colleague.' This type of relationship does not warrant exclusion from the list.

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 the exclusion of all co-authors of such papers would be neither necessary nor desirable. If the department chair believes that a specific evaluator in a category listed above should be used in a particular case, then the department chair should consult with the appropriate divisional associate dean before submitting the list of recommended evaluators to the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator](#).

In the cases of new senior hires that require tenure reviews and modified faculty promotion reviews, the department may include up to three evaluators who are not considered arm's length evaluators.

The list of external evaluators should generally be drawn from institutions that are considered peer or peer-plus. The list of [AAU institutions](#) is a good starting place for those that are usually considered peer or peer-plus. In certain cases, the best departments or best individuals in a particular field may be at peer-minus or unranked institutions. This may be particularly the case with regard to international institutions and scholars important as reference sources in promotion to Professor cases. In this situation, the case must be made for the prominence of the department and/or individual. The case should be made in the rationale section of the evaluator list form.

The list of external evaluators may include no more than three individuals recommended by the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. The candidate is not required to make suggestions. 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. For a given candidate, it is preferable

to limit the number of external evaluators from any one institution. In most cases, CAS will impose a limit of three evaluators from any one institution.

External evaluators should be research-active members of their profession who understand the contemporary standards, approaches and practices of their fields, which means it is preferable to limit the number of writers who are retired. A few emeritus and/or emerita faculty members may be included on the list, but only if they are still active in the field. In most cases we recommend including at least three evaluators from international institutions for promotion to Professor cases. An international reputation is generally expected for promotion to Professor and this is one way to help demonstrate this.

All evaluators should be well justified in the rationale section of the evaluator form. In some cases, exceptions to the above limitations can be made as long as they are justified in this section of the form.

External evaluators should also be well suited to answer the questions put forth in the solicitation letter:

1. What is the scholarly and/or creative work that has earned the candidate national or international recognition? What are the major and distinctive contributions of the candidate's research? Please provide us with an assessment of Professor XX's research productivity and the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarship.
 2. How does the candidate compare to others at similar stages in their careers and to the best scholars in the field when they were at a comparable stage? Specific comparisons are helpful to inform our understanding of the candidate's standing and impact in relevant subfields.
 3. How do you view the candidate's trajectory and future promise?
 4. What is your assessment of the candidate's service to the profession at the local, national or international level at this stage of their career?
 5. If you have firsthand knowledge of the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher or mentor, including any observations of the candidate's presentations in academic conferences and seminars, we would appreciate your insights on these activities as well.
 6. Finally, we would appreciate your candid opinion as to (a) whether Professor XX should be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure/Full Professor at Boston University and (b) whether Professor XX would be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure/Full Professor at your institution.
3. *Additional Considerations for "Core" Letters (promotion to Professor only)*

For promotion to Professor cases, "core" letter providers must be unquestionably arm's length, and their letters must address the preponderance of the questions listed above. The

department, in consultation with the divisional associate dean and CAS Tenure & Promotion Coordinator, will decide which letters are “core” once all letters are received and prior to the writing of the chair’s report. The department submits [Core Profile Forms](#) for any evaluators that are deemed “core” evaluators.

We generally limit the number of repeat evaluators from prior tenure and/or promotion cases to three to ensure that we are receiving fresh perspectives and that the emphasis is on post-tenure work, especially when the time between promotion reviews is short. We have found that some repeat evaluators barely revise the letters they sent for previous reviews and it is best to minimize the risk of receiving such letters.

4. *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 distinctly labeled to avoid confusing them with external evaluation letters. These letters will be formally solicited by the chair; a sample solicitation letter can be found in Appendix 1. Candidates must not solicit these letters directly.

5. *Summary of Process for Soliciting External Evaluation Letters*

- 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 12-15 potential external evaluators.

Chairs should consult with senior faculty in the department or with senior colleagues in cognate fields in other departments within CAS when coming up with the list of potential evaluators. It can also be helpful to consult with colleagues in the field at other institutions, but such consultation should be limited to scholars who would not otherwise be recommended as evaluators themselves. In the case of candidates with interdisciplinary portfolios of work, the chair(s)/director(s) of the other relevant department(s)/program(s) should be consulted. External evaluators should conform to the characteristics described in sections 1-3 of this chapter.

- c. In consultation with the department chair, mentors and/or senior colleagues, the candidate compiles a dossier of materials to send to evaluators. The materials included in the dossier should provide evidence of the range, depth, and quality of the candidate's work to assist the evaluators with their assessment and evaluation letters. This dossier will be sent to evaluators electronically (see section 5d of this chapter). The dossier includes:
- Electronic curriculum vitae (CV): This is the only version of the CV forwarded to evaluators. Especially in the case of candidates for tenure, the department chair or mentor should ensure that the candidate understands how to compile a complete a high-quality CV in the style appropriate for the discipline.
 - Portfolio of 5-12 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. Publications that are in substantial draft form may be included. In the case of candidates for promotion to 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 department chair or mentor about what materials to include.
 - Research and teaching statements: Candidates for tenure and promotion should submit brief (maximum 2 pp. each) research and teaching statements that provide an overview for external evaluators of their accomplishments, approach, key goals, and future. For promotion to Professor cases, candidates need only submit a research statement, but are welcome to include a teaching statement if they wish. Although evaluators will have access to the CV and the portfolio, the statements help provide context and a coherent overview of the candidate's work.
- d. Format for presenting the dossier to external evaluators:
- Create a WordPress website to house the candidate's dossier other than books and manuscripts. The CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator is available to meet with department tenure and promotion coordinators to assist in creating these websites. Manuscripts should be printed and bound in preparation for sending to the external evaluators. Books and manuscripts will be sent to evaluators via USPS. Other materials will only be sent in hard copy if requested by an evaluator.
 - CAS will reimburse the cost of purchasing up to 25 copies of each candidate's books that are to be included in the dossier, purchased at the author's discounted price through the publisher. It is recommended that for tenure and promotion dossiers 20 copies be purchased initially, and for promotion to Professor dossiers 15 copies be purchased. Of those, 3 copies of the candidate's published book(s) and manuscripts will be used in the CAS and University review processes and

will be returned to the candidate after completion of the review. Some publishers take a long time to process and ship orders, so please be sure to order books well in advance of the deadline for submission of the dossier for evaluators.

- e. Once the evaluator list has been approved by CAS and the dossier to be sent to evaluators is complete, the Tenure and Promotion Coordinator writes to all evaluators on behalf of the Dean and the chair. Follow-up emails are sent to all evaluators who do not reply to the initial request one week after the initial contact and then again another week later, if necessary. A reminder is sent to all those who agreed to write two weeks before the deadline (sometimes more reminders are sent if requested by the evaluator). If the letter has not been received one week after the deadline has passed and there has been no prior indication from the evaluator that the letter would be late, a follow-up is sent in the Dean's name. If there is no response to this message, a second follow-up is sent. This second follow-up email message can be sent by the chair directly, using a template that is approved by CAS Faculty Actions, available in Appendix 1.

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) must not be solicited by the candidate, but rather should be solicited by the department and included in the dossier. They should represent students from different courses and teaching and mentoring situations. It may also be appropriate to include letters from postdoctoral associates or other research staff reporting directly to the candidate. Candidates are encouraged to suggest students to be asked for letters, but in order to obtain a more objective reading of student opinions, the department should not rely only on students chosen by the candidate. All solicited letters that are received must be included. For promotion to Professor 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 can be 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 involve 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 read 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 teaching and apparent learning, 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 feedback to the candidate in a timely way, due to the developmental aim of these reviews. The reports should be the basis for a discussion of goals and strategies for improvement.

Tenure and promotion dossiers should include at least six peer review reports, including any that were submitted as part of the Mid-Tenure review process. Promotion to Professor dossiers should include at least three peer review reports.

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

The review of tenure and promotion cases relies primarily on documentation in electronic format. All relevant documentation, with the exception of hardcopy books and/or manuscripts, thus should be uploaded to the secure [CAS Tenure and Promotion Server](#). At the department level, the server is accessible to the department chair and departmental tenure and promotion coordinator only, using their Kerberos login name and password. All information must be uploaded in PDF format. Please contact the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator](#) with any questions relating to the use of the server or technical issues.

All necessary and relevant documentation must be submitted in a timely fashion with careful attention to form and organization in order to ensure that candidates receive fair consideration. The process takes considerable time and attention and the department should establish a clear schedule, including setting a deadline for the candidate to submit materials, so that the candidate has sufficient time to prepare the materials and submit them to the departmental tenure and promotion coordinator. The schedule should also ensure the availability of materials for the departmental review. The chair should communicate the departmental deadline to the candidate well in advance. Candidates are responsible for submitting their materials to the department by the departmental deadline.

The department chair and the departmental tenure and promotion coordinator and, in the case of tenure and promotion, the candidate's mentor should be available to advise the candidate on the timely completion and submission of materials.

The materials must be well organized to ensure reviewers can find what they need easily. Please see Appendix 2 for instructions on naming files for upload to the server and on building the table of contents for each section of supporting materials. The department administrator is responsible for posting the publications and supporting materials on the [CAS Tenure and Promotion 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. Part I: Unit Actions

Each level (Department, chair, APT, Dean, UAPT, and 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. One original copy should be hand signed by the appropriate person from each review level.

B. Part II: Candidate's Vitae

Candidates should submit a completed "Part II: Candidate's Vitae" 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 "vitae" and it includes similar information, the "Part II" is not the same as a

conventional professional curriculum vitae. 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. The form currently asks for information just since initial appointment at Boston University, but in many cases it is preferable to also include information from prior appointments. For candidates for promotion to Professor, information and listings should refer to the period since the last promotion, inclusive of the year in which the last promotion review took place.
- Answer all questions, entering "n/a" or "none" when necessary. Do not leave any questions blank.
- 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 include only works that are published or in press/forthcoming; that is, works that have been contractually assigned publication dates and that are in the formal production process.
- Question 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 publications or creative work.
- Question 5.7, on citations: Provide summaries of the numbers of citations for each publication. All candidates are asked to use the appropriate citation index (natural sciences, social sciences, or 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. If no appropriate index exists, citations can be self-reported instead. Only citations in published works, working papers, or similar scholarly documents should be counted. Citations of work prior to the last promotion that appeared since promotion are relevant for evaluating reputation and impact. Clearly identify the source(s) for the reported citation counts. Because external evaluators increasingly refer to Google Scholar metrics, candidates in relevant disciplines are strongly encouraged to create and curate their own Google Scholar profile to ensure that all of their published works are included and that no works by other authors with the same or a similar name are included.
- 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 indicate whether they have been contracted or solicited and the plans for submission. Third, list 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 Vitae” 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 after this time*. This version should be posted on the CAS Tenure and Promotion Server. Candidates may submit updates regarding their professional accomplishments by contacting the Tenure & Promotion Coordinator (see section D, below).

Please note, for new senior hire reviews that require a tenure review and modified faculty promotion reviews, the Part II form is not required. The candidate’s standard academic CV and any research, teaching, or professional statements will be substituted for the Part II form.

Please see sections F and G below, regarding submission of Supporting Materials that must be submitted by the candidate in addition to the Part II.

C. Part III: The Chair’s Report

See the discussion of the Chair’s Report below, in Chapter VI, section F. This section of the CAS 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. These sections should be completed by the chair’s report deadline and should include all student letters received and *all* peer evaluations completed during the period under consideration (please see the section in Chapter IV on Classroom Visits for minimum requirements).

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 or other relevant supporting materials should also be included in the update communication. Updates should be emailed to the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator](#), who will ensure they reach the next level of review. Updates for external evaluators can be submitted up to a week prior to the deadline for evaluations to be submitted. After this time there is no guarantee that updates will be seen by the evaluators. Updates during the internal review process can be submitted until the candidate receives the final notice of tenure and/or promotion. Updated CVs and Part II forms will not be 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 to correct factual errors should be forwarded to the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator](#) via email attachment.

F. Publications Section

For tenure and promotion reviews, all publications, including those appearing before the start of the tenure track position at Boston University, should be included in the dossier. The dossier should make clear what publications were published prior to starting the tenure-track position at Boston University. For promotion to Professor reviews (including modified

faculty), only publications since the start of the last promotion should be included, as well as any publications that have been submitted for publication and any works in progress in substantial draft form. Publications should be submitted as individual pdfs, not as one pdf containing all publications.

Departments should include in the Publications Section a table of contents page listing all works submitted in this section. Each entry should clearly indicate whether the item is “published,” “in press,” “in progress,” “under contract,” “revise and resubmit,” or “under review.” *Published* means just that: it is available in published form. A work that 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. Works that are currently in a publisher’s review process are under review.

Reviewer comments should be provided for works that are not yet published whenever possible.

Published reviews of the candidate’s work should be included in the subsection of the Publications Section, Published Reviews.

G. Teaching, Grant, and Service-related Materials Sections

All items listed below should be compiled by the candidate according to the department schedule. Each section should include a table of contents that outlines the materials included within that section. All items should be submitted as individual pdfs, not as one pdf containing all materials for a section. For promotion to Professor (including modified faculty), all materials submitted should be for the period since the last promotion, inclusive of the last promotion review year.

G1. *Course Syllabi*: Include course syllabi from all courses taught. If a candidate has taught the same course multiple times in the review period, only one version of the syllabus (usually the most recent) should be submitted. However, if substantial revisions have been made over time, the candidate may include multiple versions of the syllabus.

G2. *Course Materials*: Include a representative sample of course materials from all courses taught that demonstrate the quality of teaching and mentoring of students. These might include exams and assignments, lecture slides, study guides, or other materials. It can be helpful to include a selection of current materials and materials from previous years.

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. Grant pre-proposals can also be included in this section.

G4. *Service Materials Section (Optional)*: Candidates may include any documentation that supports or further explains the institutional or professional service activities listed on the candidate’s CV, although these materials are not required. These may include letters recognizing the candidate for his/her service, conference programs, etc. Letters from

chairs/directors from secondary departments/programs are not considered part of this section of materials, but should be included as part of the Chair's Report. Please see Chapter VI, Part B for further discussion of letters from secondary departments/programs.

H. *Student Course Evaluations Section*

Departmental tenure and promotion coordinators are responsible for including all course evaluations in the dossier. The section should begin with a table of contents page, listing the candidate's course history. Evaluations from all courses taught, including from co-taught courses, should be included and uploaded in chronological order. However, for promotion to Professor cases, if the candidate has been an Associate Professor for more than 6 years, only the last 6 years of evaluations should be included. Co-taught courses should be clearly identified as such in the dossier. For evaluations done via hard copy scantron forms, the candidate's original scantron course evaluation documents should be included in this section, with the statistical summary of the evaluations appearing as the first two pages of the course evaluation file for each course. All student comments should be included for each course. For evaluations completed electronically, the 'Course Report', including both quantitative and qualitative results, for each individual course should be included. Please note that departments may need to coordinate with other departments or interdisciplinary programs in which the candidate has taught in order to ensure all evaluations are included.

I. *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, field trips, and examination dates. The APT Committee uses this information to plan classroom visits. Candidates should update this information with any changes during the fall semester.

If the candidate intends to be on leave during the fall semester of their review year, please notify the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator](#) as early in the process as possible to ensure a classroom visit can be scheduled during the preceding spring semester.

CHAPTER VI: 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 many 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 for 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 promotion reviews, and seek information from the relevant divisional associate dean and the CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator. The CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator posts [annual calendars online](#),

specifying the deadlines for completing both the tenure and promotion and the promotion to Professor processes. Both the department chair and 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 Professors and 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 of scheduling the review process in order to coordinate on recommending external evaluators. 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 the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator](#) as early as possible on how to proceed with the review. Both departments will submit reports, which will be filed on the CAS Tenure and Promotion Server under "Chair's Report." The department chairs or Deans should consult with each other during the planning stages of the review procedure in order to coordinate on recommending external evaluators. 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 chair/director 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 chair/director 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 chair's/director'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. It is important that the chair of the home department solicits chair's/director's letters from the faculty member's secondary department(s) and program(s) 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 sharing the results of that evaluation with the home department. It is important for the chair of the

home department and the chair/director of the other unit to consult on this as early as possible.

Any letters of assessment solicited from chairs/directors from other units should be solicited by the chair. The candidate should not solicit these directly, but should inform the chair of his/her home department of any departments/programs that the candidate thinks should be asked for input. These letters should be treated as confidential and not be shared with the candidate. All letters received should be filed on the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Server](#) under “Chair’s Report.” These should not be included with the Candidate’s Supporting Service Materials.

Please see Appendix 1 for a sample letter to chairs/directors of secondary departments/programs.

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 [CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator](#) if there is any uncertainty about who is eligible to vote. Additional information is available on the [Voting on Personnel Issues page](#).

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 indicate the final vote tally, including 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 recuse themselves from the *discussion of and vote on* the candidate, and should be recorded as absent because of recusal. Examples of conflicts of interest include close personal relationships beyond what is expected of colleagues, as well as those who had a significant role in the training of the candidate (e.g., as PhD or postdoctoral advisor). Department members who recuse themselves 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 Part II form, 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. We cannot provide all departmental faculty with access to the Tenure & Promotion webserver used by the APT and Dean. 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, expectations for the candidate's professional productivity during that time should be adjusted accordingly.

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 in 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 doing so 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. *An abstention is not generally interpreted as "neutrality" in the case.*

In some circumstances, remote participation in tenure and promotion cases is possible. It is essential that any faculty member who wishes to participate in the voting process using remote means must have access to all of the materials presented to any present faculty members and must be involved in all deliberations regarding the case. For a full discussion of the policy on remote participation visit the [Voting on Personnel Issues page](#).

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. The Chair should count themselves in the vote tally, as long as they are eligible to vote. Recusals due to conflicts of interest should be counted as absences. The vote should also be stated in the Chair’s report.

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, clearly distinguished as such. 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 vote and 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).

In the section on teaching, the Chair’s Report should include a table containing all teaching evaluation scores for each course taught by the candidate and average teaching scores across the department for undergraduate and graduate courses, respectively. It can also be helpful for the teaching section to address the candidate’s performance in specific courses that have been taught by others in the department.

In the review of research and scholarship, the Chair’s Report should emphasize the impact of the candidate’s work and level of scholarly productivity. It should provide a succinct overview of the substantive, theoretical, and/or methodological contributions of the scholarly work. Simply listing the published works or those in progress does not offer full clarity about productivity, which should be evaluated in relation to norms for the candidate’s field. Likewise, the report should not rely solely on quoting the praise or criticisms from the external letters of evaluation, especially if these quotations do not provide clear insight into the nature of the scholarly contributions and impact. It is the responsibility of the department’s faculty to provide their own expert evaluation of the quality and impact of the candidate’s work.

In fields that emphasize the publication of books, 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. For all fields, the Chair should include a brief description of the norms for the field, such as expectations for co-authorship and listing of co-authors, the weights accorded to articles in refereed journals vs. articles in refereed conference proceedings, or any other field-specific information that might be valuable to others involved in the review process. For instance, are co-authors simply listed alphabetically, or does author order denote the relative contributions 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 members 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 stated at the meeting. Any minority statements should be submitted at the same time as the Chair's report. Dissents may not be used to introduce material or opinions into the record that were not put forth during the department's deliberations.

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 their application following the department review.

The chair, through the department tenure and promotion coordinator, submits the following documents at the conclusion of the process.

1. The Part I: Unit Actions form with the outcome of the departmental vote, hand signed by the chair. The original, hand signed copy should be delivered by hand to the Office of Faculty Actions and a scanned pdf should be uploaded to the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Server](#). Please do not send the confidential Part I form via Interdepartmental mail.
2. 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.

Please contact the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator](#) if you need assistance creating an electronic signature. Note that this is distinct from electronically signing a pdf document.

A pdf of the Chair's report should be uploaded to the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Server](#).

Any letters from secondary departments/programs, all classroom visit reports, student letters, and the Core Profile Forms (for Promotion cases only) are all considered pieces of the Chair's report and should also be uploaded to the server at this time.

3. The department is responsible for submitting a redacted version of the Chair's report (and any minority faculty reports) to the [CAS Tenure & Promotion Coordinator](#). This redacted version, which will be reviewed by the CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator and the appropriate divisional associate dean, 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 reports please see Appendix 3.

The redacted copy of the chair's report should be emailed to the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator](#) as a Microsoft Word document, documenting all redactions and changes using the track changes function in Word.

4. The Cover Page for the Board of Trustees will be used by the Provost and President to inform the Trustees of all tenure and promotion decisions.

The Cover Page should be emailed to the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator](#) as a Microsoft Word document.

All forms mentioned above can be found on the [Provost Forms Library site](#).

H. Candidate's Response to the Department Report

Candidates who find factual errors in the redacted Chair's report may submit corrections in writing to the CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator within five business days of receipt. *Candidates should not write general "responses" or answers to reports, but only 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.

A candidate who wishes to respond to the Chair's report but cannot do so in five business days due to reasons beyond his or her control should contact the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator](#) to ask for an extension. The same process also applies to the APT Committee's report and the Dean's report.

CHAPTER VII: 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 later in the 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 the candidate has 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 12 pm 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 department chair or candidate provide additional information or further clarification of the dossier when they believe information is missing or unclear. It will make these requests through the CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator.

The APT should reach its judgment on the basis of all evidence available to it including reviewing the major research materials.

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 their application following the APT review.

The CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator 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. The CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator also sends the unredacted APT Report to the department chair under separate cover, marked "Confidential." These reports should not be circulated, but remain confidential to the chair. In order to maintain strict confidentiality, the department should not retain these reports in either hard copy or digital form in its local faculty files. The Office of the Dean is responsible for retaining the official tenure and/or promotion dossier.

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

B. How the APT is Asked to Assess Cases

In order to help candidates prepare the best dossier possible, we include here the guidance given to the CAS APT (via their handbook) on how to assess the candidate’s record in each key area: teaching, research, and service.

How should the APT evaluate the record of teaching?

The APT’s evaluation of teaching is an evaluation of the overall quality of a candidate’s teaching, not an evaluation of any one indicator of teaching competence. Good teaching, of course, is more than a performance in front of a classroom. The ultimate measure of excellence in teaching is the degree to which students have learned and developed academically, intellectually, and personally, as a result of their experience with that teacher.

The APT review of teaching should consider all forms of relevant evidence – the quality of the construction of the candidate’s courses and the materials and learning experiences provided to the students, such as those evidenced by syllabi and other teaching and learning aids; any unique pedagogies or pedagogical tools; and the quality of the assessment tools. The APT should review student evaluations of the candidate derived from standard forms, student letters, and any other available evidence. It should consider peer reviews of the candidate’s teaching, including those derived from in-class observations done by departmental colleagues and done by members of the APT. Further guidelines to APT classroom visits appear earlier in the handbook, beginning on page 10.

The APT should consider the quality of teaching in the context of standards and any unique aspects of the discipline and the demands and challenges it poses for teaching. APT members should also consider the special demands and opportunities of the courses the candidate has taught, for example whether they are required introductory courses that many students are likely to take because they have to do so rather than that they want to, or whether the course is an advanced-level course that students are likely to prepare for and want to take.

How should the APT evaluate the record of research and scholarship?

The goal of the research review is to determine whether the candidate has a sufficient record of high quality, independent, original research and scholarship to merit tenure and/or promotion. The elements that make a “sufficient record” are:

- The work, in our judgment, is of the highest quality; that is, the research has been conducted according to the highest standards of its field; its substance – whether findings, conclusions, theories, or creative productions – offer

sufficient value added to work in its field that already exists; it should attain the highest professional standards of writing and presentation.

- The work, in the judgment of peers in the discipline or field, is of the highest quality as defined above. This means that a sufficient amount of the work should be published in books, journals, and other media that require peer review; there is other specific evidence that it is held in high regard, such as is found in book reviews, conference discussion of the work, anthologizing after the original publication, or awards and honors, among other possibilities; the confidential letters we solicit from leaders in the field offer sufficient high-quality and careful assessment that indicates the work is of the highest quality. Other evidence that peers in the discipline judge the candidate's work of high quality includes but is not limited to: inviting the candidate to lecture outside of Boston University, to serve on review or editorial boards, to engage in other professional activities that place the candidate in a position to judge the quality of peers.
- The work is sufficiently original and independent in the sense that the candidate has clearly been responsible for work that makes a significant departure from previous knowledge or approaches.
- The work is having sufficient impact, especially on other scholarship. One of the chief ways of determining this is to examine citations and citation rates. An excellent book that is just about to be published and has not appeared in part in chapter or conference paper form has not yet had detectable impact.
- The work should conform to all norms of ethical and professional conduct.
- The amount of work that conforms to these norms reaches the standard for scholars in the field at major research universities.

In fields in which extramural funding is essential to carrying out a research career at the highest levels, a consistent and current record of appropriate funding is also necessary.

The research record must also offer a high level of confidence that the candidate will remain research-active at the highest levels through the future. That is, if it seems to have taken the entire pre-tenure period to construct a "just-in-time" record of publication, and there is not clear evidence that sufficient and high-quality future research is well under way, or there is other evidence that casts doubt on whether the candidate will perform at least to the level of the past in the future, tenure and/or promotion is inappropriate.

The listing of evidence and characteristics needed for tenure and promotion here is partial and serves only as an example. The specific kinds of evidence that are required for a judgment about quality, independence, impact, etc., vary across disciplines and may require special attention to evaluate appropriately in interdisciplinary fields. The APT must also be aware of the impact of fundamental methodological or theoretical contention in particular fields that may shape assessments of particular candidates.

How should the APT evaluate the record of service?

University communities cannot carry out many important functions if faculty members do not play their role in carrying out these functions. At a research

university, all tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to be heavily engaged in research, but being engaged in research is not an appropriate excuse for avoiding service as a citizen of the university and the larger profession, especially for tenured faculty members.

In the College of Arts & Sciences we try to “protect” assistant professors from doing a lot of service because they are still building their craft of teaching and scholarship, setting up their labs, finding their first graduate students and postdocs, and building the framework for their work they will use in later years. Nevertheless, tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor requires that a candidate has participated in the necessary work of the university on a regular basis, especially at the department level. They should also have participated at a modest level on a national or international level in their profession, for example, through manuscript reviewing, serving on committees of their professional associations, or serving on conference organizing committees.

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence that candidates have taken seriously their role as more senior members of the department, university, and larger profession, including internationally. They should be participating at all levels, and have taken on leadership roles.

C. 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 the Dean writes the Dean’s report.

Upon request by the candidate, the Dean’s review may include a half-hour conversation with the candidate. If a candidate is interested in having this meeting, they should contact the Dean’s assistant early in the fall semester of their review year. This conversation allows the candidate an opportunity to describe in person their main contributions and accomplishments, and what they expect their future contributions to be, as a teacher, a scholar, and a citizen of this university and of their larger profession, as well as to discuss concerns about their experience or opportunities here as a faculty member.

The Dean informs the candidate and the department chair of the Dean’s recommendation. The CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator creates a redacted copy of the report and emails it to the candidate, copying the department chair, and sends a paper copy to the candidate’s home address. The CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator sends the 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. To maintain strict confidentiality, the department should not retain these reports in either hard copy or digital form in its local faculty files. The Office of the Dean is responsible for retaining the official tenure and/or promotion dossier. There may, however, be discussion in the unredacted version of the Dean’s report pertaining to the quality of the mentoring or review process in the department that should be discussed with the department in order to make improvements to these processes.

Candidates who find factual errors in the redacted Dean’s report may submit corrections in writing to the CAS 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, the Dean informs the Provost, but the case does not proceed forward and is considered closed unless the candidate appeals the negative decision. The Dean informs the candidate in writing of both the decision and the faculty member’s 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 receiving the negative decision.

CHAPTER VIII: 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, all votes and reports from the preceding levels, and any updates candidates have submitted. The UAPT may also request further information or clarification from the department chair, APT Committee, and/or 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. A redacted copy of the UAPT’s report is available upon request to the Provost’s office. A redacted copy of the UAPT’s report is made available to candidates automatically upon a negative decision by the Provost. 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.

CHAPTER IX: PROMOTIONS OF CLINICAL, RESEARCH, AND OF THE PRACTICE FACULTY

In the College of Arts & Sciences at Boston University, the standard professorial titles of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor are used for tenure-track and tenured appointments. Below, we describe how the College uses modified professorial titles for certain non-tenured appointments, namely: Professors of the Practice, Research Professors, and Clinical Professors.

Professors of the Practice are officers of instruction who are or have been distinguished practitioners in their respective professions and whose primary responsibilities lie in teaching, mentoring, and service to the University, starting at the rank of Associate Professor of the Practice. The rank of Professor of the Practice is intended for our most distinguished practitioners, often in fields outside of academia, who have demonstrated excellence in their respective professions; gained national or international prominence in their field; and who possess the ability to educate, advise, and mentor undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional students on the basis of their professional expertise and knowledge. Professors of the Practice contribute in important ways to their students’ education by using their accumulated and continuing experience, knowledge, and professional skills and connections to expand students’ knowledge

and professional capacities. Appointments may be made at the rank of Associate Professor of the Practice or Professor of the Practice.

Research Professors are scientists and scholars who work for the University on research, typically supported by external grants and contracts. These faculty members fulfill the research qualifications of the equivalent unmodified professorial rank. The principal criteria for these titles are scholarly productivity and recognition of original work. Research faculty are also eligible to give seminars and teach occasional courses, at the discretion of the department. Research appointments are for the stated term of the appointment with no guarantee or expectation of renewal. Appointments may be made at the rank of Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor.

Clinical Professors identify faculty members whose appointments primarily provide practical instruction and application of practical knowledge. In the College of Arts and Sciences, examples include clinical psychologists, applied mathematicians, and faculty whose expertise lies in improving pedagogy. The duties and terms of appointment are specified in the letter of appointment. In general, the applicable rank and any subsequent promotions should be determined by the relevant academic achievements, professional accomplishments, and demonstrated effectiveness of the appointee, using criteria that are defined by individual departments and approved by the College. Appointments may be made at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor.

Faculty holding these ranks may apply for promotion when they believe their achievements have qualified them for promotion. As per university policy, the eligibility for promotion is open to all full-time professorial faculty members, including these modified professorial ranks. (See [“Promotion Not Related to Tenure Review.”](#))

A. Promotion Criteria

The University outlines basic criteria for promotion amongst modified faculty ranks:

Clinical faculty: “The general criteria for promotion for Clinical faculty are a strong record of a) teaching, b) scholarly or creative work, and c) University and professional service. Promotion on the Clinical track normally requires substantive contributions to the School or College’s teaching program while exhibiting a high degree of teaching proficiency, as well as a national and/or international reputation for scholarship or educational pedagogy in the field of practical expertise. Candidates are normally expected to provide service to the profession nationally and/or internationally, as appropriate for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor, respectively.”

Research faculty: “The most important criterion for promotion for Research faculty is outstanding scholarly or creative work. A national reputation for excellence in scholarly and/or creative work is required for promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor and an international reputation for excellence in scholarly and/or creative work is normally required for promotion to the rank of Research Professor. Supporting evidence includes the record of publication, externally sponsored activities (e.g. grants, fellowships), presentations, and service to the profession. Although Research faculty commonly work as part of collaborative teams, promotion on the Research track usually requires significant evidence of leadership and independence, such as lead or corresponding authorship on publications and serving as the principal investigator on sponsored research grants. Significant weight is normally placed on the strength of these activities since the last time the faculty member was appointed or promoted.”

Of the Practice faculty: “The criteria for promotion to Professor of the Practice includes excellence in teaching, which usually is supported by strong teaching evaluations, peer observations, and leadership in course or curricular design. The candidate should also have a strong record of mentoring students with interests in the profession represented by the candidate; service to the School or College, University and the profession; and significant continuing achievement in professional activities, advancement of professional standing, and/or relevant professional experience leading to an international or, as appropriate, national reputation in the candidate’s field.”

CAS has also further defined criteria for promotion to Professor of the Practice: the criteria are similar to the standard criteria for tenured Associate Professors with unmodified titles seeking promotion. Teaching, including mentoring and advising of students, and service, including professional service and contributions at BU, will be evaluated in much the same manner as in the standard promotion process. Because professional practice is central to these positions, candidates for promotion to Professor of the Practice will be expected to show evidence of maintaining and enhancing excellence in their area of practice and continuing to contribute intellectually to that area of practice. Specific criteria for evaluation will be based on the expectations set out in the candidate’s appointment.

In each case, the internal and external evaluation of promotion candidates will focus on the following areas:

- Excellence in teaching (including mentoring and advising) at BU
- Excellence in service to BU
- Evidence of continuing achievement in professional activities, advancement of professional standing, and/or relevant professional experience since the candidate's appointment as Associate Professor of the Practice

Where appropriate, evaluation will also take into account evidence of advancement in pedagogy, curriculum-development, and/or program building, with respect to the professional area in which the faculty member was recruited as a distinguished practitioner.

Due to the varying roles held by Clinical and Research faculty members across the college, CAS has elected not to develop our own more specific criteria. Instead, we ask departments with any faculty within these ranks to develop their own clear criteria. Such criteria should conform to and expand upon the college level criteria stated above. These criteria should be developed independently of any individual promotion case and should be made available to all faculty holding that rank. For Research and Clinical faculty, it is helpful if the statement of criteria addresses the differences between promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Professor.

B. Consultation and Dossier Preparation

1. Faculty should consult with their department chair and, if they wish, divisional associate dean, to ascertain the right timing of their application for promotion.
2. Candidates should be prepared to furnish an updated CV for review during this consultation. They should provide this to the [CAS Tenure and Promotion Coordinator](#) who will share the CV with the appropriate divisional associate dean.
3. In preparing a dossier, candidates should present the evidence that best illustrates the achievement of the relevant promotion criteria outlined by their department. For

guidelines on the kinds of materials expected in a promotion dossier and instructions on preparing such materials, please see Chapter V.

C. External Evaluation

External evaluator letters will be solicited to assess the candidate's contributions and accomplishments in light of expectations for their rank and the criteria defined by the department. Toward this end, external evaluators will be provided information about the candidate's specific set of responsibilities and it may be appropriate to include the department's statement of criteria in the dossier for external evaluators. Candidates should show evidence of their ability to contribute their professional expertise to the academy at a level that is appropriate for a major research university. Where appropriate, this will include an assessment of the quality of their scholarship in their field. The evaluators will review the dossier and submit a report to BU. A minimum of 6 external letters of evaluation, including at least three that are "arm's length," are required for promotion, thus we recommend departments initially submit 12 names of evaluators. Please see the section regarding external evaluators (IV A) for information on preferred characteristics of external evaluators.

D. Internal Review Process

Candidates for promotion will undergo a modified promotion review, beginning with a review by the department, then the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, the Dean, and finally the Provost. The promotion process will begin early in the fall semester with solicitation of evaluator letters. The department will then review later in the fall semester, with the goal of submitting the dossier for college review by the end of the fall semester. The APT will review these cases in the spring semester, followed by the Dean, as the case is available. If the Dean denies promotion, the candidate has the right to appeal. Please see the appropriate section of the [University policy](#) for more information regarding the appeals process. If the Dean recommends promotion, the case is forwarded to the Provost by June 1 for final approval. The Provost makes a final decision and communicates this decision by August 1.

Please see the relevant sections on Departmental review process (VI) and College review process (VII) for more information on those procedures.

Candidates may withdraw themselves from consideration from promotion at any time in the process, but anyone who is considering doing this is advised to seek advice from the department chair or appropriate divisional associate dean.

Successful promotion does not guarantee contract renewal.

Appendix 1: Letter Templates

Please note CAS would prefer that departments use the templates provided here. Chairs should seek approval from the appropriate divisional associate dean or Tenure and Promotion Coordinator if they would like to use text that deviates substantively from the provided text.

Letter to Candidate's Co-authors

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 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,

CHAIR
DEPARTMENTAL ADDRESS

Letter to Secondary chairs/directors

Dear Professor [],

I am writing to request your assistance in the tenure/promotion case of X, who has a secondary appointment/significant involvement in your department/program.

We would appreciate your evaluation of the candidate's teaching, research, and service, as relevant, as it has contributed to your department/program.

Please note this letter will be treated as confidential and will not be released to the candidate.

Sincerely,

CHAIR
DEPARTMENTAL ADDRESS

Final follow up letter to Evaluator

Dear Professor [],

Thanks again for your willingness to assist us in our review of Professor X, who is being considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor/promotion to the rank of Full Professor at Boston University.

I understand that you agreed to provide a letter of evaluation by DATE, but our Dean's office has informed me that we have not yet received your letter. Thus, I'm writing to ask if you are still able to provide a letter, or have perhaps already sent it?

As you know, external letters of evaluation are critically important in tenure/promotion review, and some reviewers may view a low response rate as reflecting negatively on the candidate. In addition, at Boston University, a minimum number of letters is required for our tenure/promotion cases to move forward.

I know this is a busy time of year, but would greatly appreciate a quick note to indicate whether we can still expect to receive your letter. Ideally, we would like to receive it by DATE if at all possible.

Thank you once again for your assistance.

Sincerely,

CHAIR
DEPARTMENTAL ADDRESS

Appendix 2: Instructions for Uploading Documents to the CAS Tenure and Promotion Server

All documents should be uploaded as a .pdf. Please do not upload .doc, .docx, .ppt, or .pptx files.

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 is hand signed, and that all vote-count boxes have been filled out. Please enter '0' into all empty boxes.

Part II: Candidate's Vitae

Upload Part II as [*candidate's last name*].PartII.Vitae.pdf

Example | Smith.PartII.Vitae.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

External Evaluator Letters and Profile forms (Promotion to Professor only)

Once the department has designated the core and other letters, add the prefix “Core” or “Other” so that the file name reads “Core.[evaluator name].pdf” or “Other.[evaluator name].pdf”.

Upload Profile forms for all Core evaluators as
Core.[evaluator name].Profileform.pdf.

Example | Core.Smith.Profileform.pdf
Core.Smith.pdf
Other.Johnson.pdf

Supporting Materials

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

All sections of the Supporting Materials should include a table of contents.

Begin the file name of the table of contents with the designation “00.” Subsequent documents should start with “01”, “02”, “03”, and so on. For numbers 10 or greater, it is not necessary to start with a “0.”

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. Upload each publication as [#].[abbreviated publication name].pdf.

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

Published reviews of the candidate’s work should also be uploaded to the subsection of Publications, ‘Published Reviews’, using the above formatting.

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

To avoid the fall semester in a given calendar year preceding the spring semester, documents should begin with a number as discussed above for the Publications section.

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

Example **| 00.CourseSyllabi.TableOfContents.pdf
01.2001.Fall.IR230.pdf
02.2002.Spring.IR271.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

Example **| Fall 2001 CAS IR 230 A1 Reading
Assignment
Spring 2002 CAS IR 271 A1 Exam

Upload the table of contents as "00.CourseMaterials.TableOfContents.pdf".

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

Example **| Fall 2007 CAS HI 101 A1 DAWN OF EUROPE
Spring 2008 CAS HI 102 A1 EMERG MOD EUROP

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

Example** | 00.CourseHistory.TableOfContents.pdf
01.Smith.2007.Fall.HI101.pdf
02.Smith.2008.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. Additionally, all quotes from external evaluator letters must be redacted.

Names/titles/gender references are replaced by []

Institution names are removed and replaced by [institution]

The text of quotes from external evaluators and anything that could reveal their identity becomes [text deleted to maintain anonymity]. Quotes from students or BU faculty can often be left in the report, unless it includes information revealing the source of the quote.

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 “[text deleted to maintain anonymity]”.

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

Appendix 4: Useful links:

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

External Evaluator form: <http://www.bu.edu/cas/faculty-staff/procedures-forms/faculty-and-staff-actions/> (under Tenure & Promotion)

All other forms used in the tenure and promotion and promotion to Professor review processes are available on the Provost's website:

<http://www.bu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/forms-library/>

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

Wordpress site for creation of promotion to Professor 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/>