STATEMENT #11 Tenure and Promotion Process, 2016-2017

Before beginning the process described below, prospective candidates and preparators should familiarize themselves with university and school policies on tenure described in the Statement on Academic Freedom, Tenure and Retirement ([http://provost.tufts.edu/policies/academic-freedom-tenure-retirement/](http://provost.tufts.edu/policies/academic-freedom-tenure-retirement/)) and Chapter 4 of the Arts, Sciences and Engineering Faculty Handbook ([http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty/handbook/tenure/index.htm](http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty/handbook/tenure/index.htm)).

GUIDELINES FOR THE APPLICATION AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION
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The following sequence of steps summarizes the application and review procedures for tenure and promotion. Article IV, Section 2 of “The Bylaws of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering,” states the rules for the faculty concerning the operation of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion (T&P). Additional practices, which are consistent with the bylaws, have been recommended by vote of the faculty or have been established by the Committee in order to carry out its functions. These procedures, designed to ensure that every case is treated equitably, represent guidelines to be followed in each case. Exceptions to these guidelines, made to meet unusual circumstances, must be made in consultation with the T&P Committee.
Calendar

In mandatory tenure cases for present Tufts faculty members, the process begins on March 1, when the candidate meets with the preparator to review the application requirements. All candidates and preparators should refer to the detailed timetable for the various steps to be completed, which is included in the preparators' packet.

In promotion-only and non-mandatory tenure cases, the candidate should declare his/her intention to apply in writing to the chair of T&P (with a copy to the appropriate dean and department chair) by March 1. At the request of the appropriate dean, the calendar for such cases may be negotiated with T&P.

The department should meet to discuss tenure and promotion cases early in the fall semester. Since the T&P Committee normally discusses promotion cases first, all case materials for promotion cases should be delivered to the appropriate individuals listed in Step 12 by the second week of October.

For lateral hires, the calendar may be negotiated with T&P. If due to late notification, the elected T&P Committee cannot review the case within the usual time frame, the chair of T&P, in consultation with the chair of the Committee on Committees and the Secretary of the Faculty, will form a 6-member ad hoc committee, consisting of available present members of T&P supplemented, if necessary, by former T&P members (preferably from the past five years) to review the case, following all requirements in the bylaws and this statement. For additional information regarding lateral hires, see Parts 3 and 4.

Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

The procedures detailed below are divided into four parts, which correspond to the four different kinds of cases. Part 1 pertains to all internal tenure and/or promotion cases, with the exception of interdisciplinary appointments, which are covered in Part 2. Lateral hires are covered in Part 3 (expedited) and Part 4 (non-expedited).

Part 1: Standard Tenure and Promotion Procedures

1. Choosing the preparator: A preparator is chosen by the department from the ranks of the tenured faculty by March 5. The preparator and the department chair jointly manage the application process on the department’s behalf.

   The candidate and the preparator together review the materials forwarded to the candidate by the Secretary of the Faculty, including the Bylaws of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion (Article IV, Section 2 c) and this statement.
2. **Preparing the application:** The candidate and the preparator prepare an application for tenure and/or promotion. If a candidate facing a mandatory tenure review decides not to apply for tenure, he or she must notify the appropriate dean in writing by June 1. If a candidate for tenure or for promotion-only wishes to withdraw the application after it has been submitted to T&P, the candidate must notify the T&P Committee and the appropriate dean in writing before the Board of Trustees makes its final decision on the case.

3. **Compiling teaching information:** It is the department’s responsibility to prepare a summary of the candidate’s teaching, including the following materials:

   a.) A tabular summary of the average rating for questions “overall rating of the professor,” the “overall rating of the course,” and, when available, “compared to other courses at Tufts, I learned…” for each course the candidate has taught at Tufts. In promotion only cases, this summary should include teaching evaluations for the most recent eight semesters of teaching, or for all semesters since promotion, whichever is shorter. The table should include course title and number; semester and year; enrollment; number of students who filled out the evaluation; and averages for the above specified course evaluation questions. The table should also provide comparison averages from other faculty teaching those same courses when the scores are available.

   b.) Accompanying the tabular summary of the candidate’s teaching, the department should also prepare a narrative statement on teaching that provides relevant information on the following: the teaching load of the candidate vis-à-vis the department; reasons for reduced or expanded teaching responsibilities, such as grants, released time, or leave of absence; and types of teaching (required vs. elective courses, labs, recitations, undergraduate vs. graduate courses, co-teaching, teaching in other programs). This narrative must be prepared prior to the department meeting.

   c.) The Secretary of the Faculty provides the chair of the Tufts Community Union (TCU) Senate Education Committee with a list of all candidates to be reviewed during the coming academic year. This chair arranges for a TCU senator to review and summarize the written commentary and statistical data on the candidate's teaching, but not to render a recommendation for or against tenure or promotion. The data, but not the mentee letters, are made available to the senator by the candidate’s department. The senator provides the department – if possible before the department meeting – with a written report signed by the chair of the Education Committee of the TCU Senate, which becomes part of the record. The candidate receives a copy of this report with its author’s name redacted. In the case of candidates who teach only graduate courses, the teaching record is reviewed by a representative of the Graduate Student Council (GSC).

   d.) One copy of the full set of teaching evaluations for the candidate should be included in the electronic case sent to the Secretary of the Faculty (see step 12(h) below).
4. **Compiling information on mentorship:** With the help of the department, the candidate prepares an annotated table of all closely mentored individuals with whom he or she has worked either in one-on-one or small-group settings, e.g., Ph.D. advisees, master’s thesis advisees, senior honors thesis advisees, Summer Scholars, lab and research collaborators, postdoctoral scholars and associates, and participants in directed performances and creative projects. The candidate should annotate this list by indicating whether the mentee is currently at Tufts, was previously at Tufts, or was never at Tufts. The candidate may also lodge any objections to soliciting a letter from a particular mentee. These comments should be included with this list, which becomes a part of the case going forward. In consultation with the candidate’s department, T&P decides whether an objection should be honored and a letter not be solicited.

The department administrator is responsible for finding contact information for each mentee. Once the table is complete, it should be submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty, who will send out letters requesting evaluations of the candidate and organize the letters as they are received. Letters from mentees no longer at Tufts or who were never at Tufts are sent to the candidate’s department for their consideration prior to the department meeting. Only T&P and relevant administrators see letters from mentees who are still at Tufts. Any mentee who is not currently or who never was at Tufts, upon request, may also be granted confidentiality from the candidate’s department.

5. **Choosing External Evaluators:** External evaluation of a candidate’s scholarly contributions is an important component of the tenure and promotion process. To this end, the department is ultimately responsible for compiling and forwarding a list of suitable External Evaluators for a given case to the T&P Committee for consideration, keeping in mind the process outlined below. The list should include names of evaluators who can objectively assess the quality of the candidate’s research while outlining the candidate’s individual contributions to the discipline. The majority of the names on the list must be individuals with whom the candidate has had no more than an arm’s length relationship and who can provide an objective assessment of the candidate’s scholarly contributions. There must be no perception of a connection that might compromise the objectivity of the letter. Evaluators may not be people who have a personal stake in the candidate’s career, such as close mentors, dissertation advisors or colleagues who within the last seven years have taught in the same department as the candidate, collaborated on a grant, or co-authored publications. Unless a substantial financial honorarium is involved, an invitation to speak in a departmental colloquium, or to speak at or participate in a conference or workshop, would not typically be assumed to compromise an "arm’s length" relationship between a candidate and a proposed External Evaluator; all such interactions between the candidate and the proposed External Evaluator must be disclosed in accordance with 5a iii below.
The process for assembling the list of External Evaluators and, in tenure cases, for choosing an outside expert for the External Subcommittee, is as follows.

a.) The candidate and the department should independently produce their own lists of potential External Evaluators who could provide an objective evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship, creative works and other professional activities. These External Evaluators should consist primarily of senior scholars in the candidate’s field from prominent research universities. In some cases, scholars at colleges and experts from other institutions are appropriate. The letters should represent a wide range of institutions in the United States and, where relevant, abroad.

The candidate’s list should include a description of his or her personal and professional relationship to each proposed External Evaluator. Neither the preparator nor the department should see the candidate’s list until after the department has met and discussed their own choices for potential External Evaluators. Departments are encouraged to secure the participation of all tenured members, including those on leave, in this and all subsequent deliberations.

The preparator provides the combined list of potential External Evaluators to the candidate, who then adds a description of his or her personal and professional relationship to each proposed External Evaluator. In consultation with the tenured members of the department, the preparator should eliminate any scholars whose objectivity might potentially be compromised by a close personal or professional connection to the candidate, as described above. This list (hereafter called “List of External Evaluators”) should include enough names to achieve a yield of at least eight External Letters in a tenure case and at least five External Letters in a promotion case. At least half of the names on the combined list should have been suggested either by the department alone or independently by both the department and the candidate. The list and, in tenure cases, the name of the outside expert, are given to the candidate. If the candidate objects to any of the department’s choices, the candidate should indicate these objections on the list sent to T&P for approval. The department is not required to make changes in response to the candidate’s objections to the list. Any objections that remain in the list finally approved by T&P (part 5(c) below) will be included in the internal administrative record and will not be sent to External Evaluators or outside expert.

The List of External Evaluators is now forwarded to the Tenure and Promotion Committee for approval and should include on the template provided in the preparator's packet the following information:

i.) a label indicating each name as having been selected by the candidate, the department or both;
ii.) the institution, department, rank, research specialization and specific detailed qualifications of each External Evaluator including information about number and type of publications, leadership positions, and awards and honors received;

iii.) a description written by the candidate of his or her personal and professional relationship to each External Evaluator.

iv) the candidate’s objections, if any.

An electronic record of all communications between the preparator, the department chair and the candidate pertaining to the preparation of the list of External Evaluators must be included as files in the pdf format in the electronic version of the case (see 12).

b.) For tenure cases, the department indicates on this list an outside expert to serve on the External Subcommittee. The choice should be made in consultation with the candidate. Keep in mind that the T&P Committee expects this person to be a knowledgeable, objective scholar who can comment on the External Letters. Unlike the other External Evaluators, this outside expert should not be asked to write a letter of evaluation, but to serve instead as an impartial interpreter of the case. The outside expert should not have a close personal or professional relationship with the candidate.

c.) The preparator must consult with the chair of T&P to finalize the list of External Evaluators and the choice of the outside expert (for tenure cases). The candidate’s CV must accompany the proposed list (see (a)) that is forwarded to T&P. T&P works with the departments to produce a mutually agreeable list of potential External Evaluators.

6. Requesting Additional Letters: The department may request additional letters – over and above the External Letters – from other evaluators, some of whom may be close collaborators with the candidate, colleagues, or administrators at Tufts. These letters are treated as a separate category, hereafter called “Additional Letters,” which need not be vetted by T&P. Also in the category of Additional Letters are letters not formally requested by the department, including those solicited by the candidate or members of the candidate’s department, and those not solicited. Prior to requesting Additional Letters, the department must notify the candidate and the Secretary of the Faculty of the identity of these letter writers. Candidates can lodge a written objection to the chair of T&P, which becomes a part of the case going forward. These written objections should be directed to the chair of T&P and sent to the Secretary of the Faculty.

All Additional Letters received by the department shall be included in the dossier of the case. Additional Letters sent directly to the Chair of T&P and/or to the Secretary of the Faculty will not be shared with the department.
If the candidate’s department is in receipt of unrequested Additional Letters, the department must notify the candidate of the author of the letter within a week of its receipt, keeping the content confidential. If the candidate wishes to submit an objection, this must be done within a week of notification. Both the letter and any objection are included in the internal administrative record (not sent to External Evaluators or outside expert). If the Secretary of the Faculty is in receipt of such a letter, the same protocol applies.

If the candidate holds a joint or adjunct appointment in another department or program within the university, the candidate and the preparator or department chair are encouraged to seek Additional Letters from relevant faculty to assure an appropriate review of the candidate's total contributions to the university.

7. Soliciting letters from External Evaluators: The preparator solicits a confidential written evaluation of the candidate's scholarly work from the list of External Evaluators using a standard letter; a template for this letter may be found in the preparator's packet. Prior to sending out the formal letter of solicitation, the preparator may make initial contact with potential referees by phone or e-mail. Care must be taken in all contact with potential evaluators not to use language that might prejudice the objectivity of the reviews. As per 12(f), all written communication becomes part of the permanent record. It is the responsibility of the preparator to solicit letters from those on the approved list in such a way as to (i) ensure the receipt of a sufficient number of letters (eight for tenure, five for promotion only) and (ii) ensure that the letters received are reasonably balanced between those from evaluators suggested by the candidate, and those from evaluators suggested by the department, or by both the department and candidate.

Those who agree to serve as External Evaluators are sent the candidate's application and CV and provided with enough material as determined by the candidate and preparator to allow assessment of the candidate's scholarship. All Evaluators should receive the same materials. The objective of the External Letters is to obtain an accurate assessment of how the candidate and the candidate’s research are perceived by leaders in the field. The letter writers must be asked to answer questions: “Would you support the candidate for tenure (and/or promotion as appropriate) at your own institution? Would the candidate receive tenure (and/or promotion as appropriate) at your institution?” In a case where the candidate has stopped his/her tenure clock, the preparator consults with the candidate concerning whether the standard letter will include language, as provided in the preparator’s packet, to guide External Evaluators consistent with university policy. Such language is included only with the approval of the candidate. If, in the opinion of a majority of the tenured members of the department, a candidate for tenure who holds the position of assistant or associate professor has an exceptional record of scholarship, teaching, and service, the External Evaluators can be asked to assess the candidate’s potential for direct promotion to professor.
8. **Departmental discussion and vote:** After receiving the requisite number of letters from External Evaluators as specified in Section 5a, and examining the opinions of these External Evaluators, all tenured members of the department must meet to assess the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and service, and shall vote on a recommendation of tenure and/or promotion for the candidate.

In those exceptional cases where the department has sought an assessment of the potential for direct promotion of an assistant professor to the rank of professor there must be two votes: the first on tenure and promotion to associate professor and the second on promotion to professor. In those cases where the department has sought assessment for promotion of a tenure-track associate professor to the rank of professor, there must be two votes; the first on tenure as associate professor and the second on promotion to professor.

All votes must be taken by secret ballot. The numerical vote(s) must be reported in the Department Statement. Only department members who were present at the meeting(s) may vote. In cases where the provost or a dean who participates formally in the tenure process at the administrative level is a tenured member of the same department as the candidate, he or she will participate in neither the department discussion nor the department vote. In cases where a member of T&P belongs to a department with a tenure and/or promotion case, that member participates in the departmental discussion and vote(s), but recuses him or herself from the T&P Committee discussion and vote (see Step 16).

In tenure cases, after the vote the tenured members of the department will select two members to serve on the External Subcommittee. The department informs the candidate of this choice by letter or e-mail. The candidate has a right to object to the choice of the department members on the Subcommittee, but the department is not obligated to make a substitution. The candidate’s objection may be filed in writing with the department, or confidentially with T&P, and becomes part of the administrative case going forward. If the department has fewer than two tenured members, T&P will direct the dean to work with the department chair to find a suitable substitute or substitutes to serve on the External Subcommittee.

If the department vote is not unanimous, T&P expects the reasons to be explained in the Departmental Statement(s) (step 9 below). Department Subcommittee members should represent the full range of opinions addressed in the Department Statement(s). For this reason the department Subcommittee members should not be appointed before the department meeting, and the Subcommittee meeting should be scheduled with this requirement in mind.

9. **Department statement:** The department prepares a statement reflecting the full range of its tenured members’ opinions as expressed in the departmental discussion, to be signed
by all members of the department who took part in the discussion and vote. If extreme circumstances prevent any tenured faculty member from participating in this discussion, the Department Statement must describe the reason for non-participation of each tenured member not present. The Department Statement(s) must preserve the confidentiality of all letter writers and all participants in the discussion. The content of this statement plays a major role in subsequent deliberations. Therefore, under the circumstance that the department cannot agree on one statement that adequately reflects its discussions, it should submit two statements signed by all voting members. For tenure cases, the statement(s) must be submitted to T&P along with the complete case; this dossier should normally be delivered within two weeks of the department statement being signed; it must be delivered no later than two weeks before a scheduled Subcommittee meeting. For promotion-only cases, the signed statement(s) must be submitted to T&P along with the complete case by the second week of October.

10. Candidate’s response to Department Statement: The department makes its statement(s) and an alphabetized list of all signers available to the candidate as soon as these are ready. The candidate must acknowledge receipt of the statement in a written response addressed to the chair of T&P (on departmental letterhead with an original signature) and sent to the Secretary of the Faculty within two weeks of receipt. This response becomes part of the administrative case going forward.

11. Selecting the T&P Subcommittee: The chair of T&P informs the candidate, the candidate’s department chair, and the preparator via e-mail which two members of T&P will serve on the External Subcommittee for his or her tenure case or on the Internal Subcommittee for promotion-only cases. The External Subcommittee consists of the outside expert, the two representatives from the department chosen after the department vote, and two T&P members. The Internal Subcommittee, for promotion-only and for expedited lateral hire cases, consists of two members of T&P. The Subcommittee is chaired by one of the two members from T&P. See step 14 for procedures to be followed if a meeting with the full T&P committee after the regular subcommittee meeting is to be requested.

12. Contents of the candidate’s dossier: The dossier for each case is assembled by the department and transmitted to T&P via the Secretary of the Faculty, and should contain the following materials:

   a.) The candidate’s Application for consideration by the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, signed by the candidate and preparator;

   b.) A current CV which includes publications categorized according to 1) refereed or non-refereed status, and 2) type, e.g., book, book chapter, articles, reviews, and so forth (Note: the bibliography and professional activities in the CV and Application should be
identical); the titles of any publications in another language should be translated into English;

c.) Reprints and other evidence of the candidate's scholarly and creative work (these should be the same works sent to External Evaluators);

d.) Letters from External Evaluators and a sample of the letters sent to them; any letters in a language other than English should be translated into English;

e.) A complete table of all considered External Evaluators, indicating which names were supplied exclusively by the candidate, exclusively by the department, and by both candidate and department; which potential External Evaluators were contacted and which were not; the responses; and any objections by the candidate.

f.) An electronic record of all email and other correspondence with potential External Evaluators, and all correspondence pertaining to the case, including email between the department chair and the candidate and between the preparator and the candidate. This correspondence should not be included in the packet sent to the outside expert. Correspondence conducted in any language other than English must be translated into English;

g.) The Department Statement(s) pertaining to the candidate's scholarship and other work, teaching, and service;

h.) The teaching materials listed in Step 3 (the tabular summary, department’s narrative, TCU (or GSC) report);

i.) Any Additional Letters (as defined in step 6) received by the department;

j.) A CV of the outside expert in tenure cases (not to be included in the outside expert’s packet).

The dossier must be delivered to the Secretary of the Faculty in the following form:

i. The original paper version of the dossier, including all signed letters;

ii. One electronic version of the entire dossier, including the electronic record of correspondence as described in (f) above, and a full set of course evaluations as per Step 3(d).

In cases requiring an External Subcommittee meeting, this dossier should normally be delivered within two weeks of the department statement being signed; it must be
delivered no later than two weeks before the scheduled Subcommittee meeting. In promotion-only cases, it should be delivered no later than the 2nd week of October.

Updates to the dossier can be submitted to T&P until the Committee votes on the case.

13. Confidential letters from the department: The bylaws require that each tenured member of the candidate’s department write a confidential letter addressed to the chair of T&P (but sent to the Secretary of the Faculty) even if the tenured faculty member did not participate in the department meeting; this includes faculty members on leave. The bylaws permit but do not require such a letter as well from non-tenured members. All such letters must be signed on departmental letterhead and can be sent via email to the Secretary of the Faculty. These letters, and any other letters not already in the file, must be received within two weeks after the Department Statement is signed. The candidate should be notified of the existence of all letters from non-tenured members by the Secretary of the Faculty on behalf of the T&P Committee, and this should be done in sufficient time to permit written objections from the candidate to be considered prior to relevant actions by the Committee. All letters become a part of the case going forward. Letters, including those from students and other mentees, will be kept secure and confidential by the Secretary of the Faculty and will be destroyed after three years, unless otherwise required by law. In cases that did not lead to tenure or promotion, all of the case materials, including letters, are kept for 12 years and then destroyed.

No additional letters or communications of any sort received after the final vote of the T&P Committee will be considered by T&P as a part of the case.

14. T&P Subcommittee meeting: For tenure cases, the preparator consults with T&P Subcommittee members and the outside expert immediately after the department vote to schedule a time and place for the Subcommittee meeting. At this meeting, the External Subcommittee reviews and discusses all of the evidence presented in a candidate's case. The Subcommittee does not vote on the qualifications of the candidate. The deliberations and the written report of the Subcommittee are confidential and only available to the T&P Committee and the administration (not to be seen by the candidate or the department). When the Subcommittee Report is approved as accurate and signed by all members of the Subcommittee, it is sent to the Secretary of the Faculty and becomes a permanent part of the case going forward.

At the request of any single member of the External Subcommittee, the External Subcommittee shall meet with all of the voting members of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion for further deliberations. Such a request may be expressed prior to the External Subcommittee meeting, in which case the larger meeting may take place immediately following the External Subcommittee meeting (for the convenience of the outside expert). Such request may also be expressed at the conclusion of the External Subcommittee meeting, in which case the larger meeting may have to take place on a
later date. Following the External Subcommittee meeting, and, if requested, the larger meeting with all voting members of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion also present, the Subcommittee Chair will prepare a written report that reflects the discussions and findings of these meetings.

For promotion cases, which have no External Subcommittee meeting, Internal Subcommittee members will review and discuss all the evidence presented in a candidate’s case with the full T&P Committee, whose members will also be familiar with the case. No written report is produced.

15. **T&P option to request additional information**: If T&P requires the advice of additional evaluators (including, if deemed useful, research collaborators of the candidate), Tufts faculty members, and/or mentees, the T&P Committee informs the candidate, the department chair and preparator of the names of any such evaluators. This should be done in sufficient time to permit written objections from the candidate to be considered prior to relevant actions by the Committee. Letters thus received by the Committee, along with any objections filed by the candidate, are forwarded to the administration as part of the case.

On behalf of the Committee, the Secretary of the Faculty notifies the candidate of any unsolicited written communications that come directly to the Committee.

16. **T&P discussion and vote**: T&P discusses the case, and its members vote on a recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion. In cases where a T&P member is from the same department as a candidate, that member does not participate in the tenure and promotion proceedings in any way other than as a member of the department. Prior to taking a final vote, T&P meets with members of the administration to discuss the merits of the case.

In the event that this recusal results in no representation from the School of Engineering or from one of the three bylaw-designated areas of A&S (humanities and arts; social sciences; natural sciences and mathematics) on a particular promotion or tenure and promotion case, then the Chair of the Committee on Committees, in consultation with the Chair of T&P and the Secretary of the Faculty, appoints a replacement from faculty members with previous service on T&P (preferably in the last five years) in order to maintain compliance with AS&E Faculty Bylaws (Article 4, section 2, part c).

T&P transmits its vote and its findings in writing by letter to the appropriate dean. At the same time, the chair of T&P reports the Committee’s vote in writing to the candidate and the candidate’s department chair and the preparator.

Prior to making its recommendation to the administration, if T&P fails to support or divides equally on a recommendation of a candidate who was supported by two-thirds or
more of the members of the department who voted, then T&P must meet with the preparator, the department chair (if different from the preparator) and, in the case of tenure cases, with department Subcommittee members. The purpose of this meeting is to explain the position of the Committee (while respecting the confidentiality of all participants) and to hear any comments from the department.

17. **T&P recommendation to table a case:** In a non-mandatory case, T&P may choose to table. The chair of T&P will report such a recommendation in writing to the candidate, department chair and preparator. If the candidate rejects the recommendation to table, the candidate must inform the chair of T&P in writing within two weeks of receiving T&P’s recommendation. In that event, T&P will vote on the case according to the usual procedures described in this document. Otherwise, the case is tabled, without prejudice, and no vote is taken. The decision to table is reported to the appropriate dean, and the Secretary of the Faculty retains all case materials for one year.

A tabled promotion-only case may be reconsidered only upon the request of the candidate, which must be submitted in writing to the chair of T&P in accordance with the standard calendar. A tabled non-mandatory tenure case may be reconsidered upon the written request of the candidate if it remains non-mandatory or it must be reconsidered once it becomes mandatory, unless the candidate withdraws the case as per step 2. If the case is reconsidered the following year, the case materials of the tabled case are used, but the candidate and department may provide updated information. The chair of T&P should be consulted well in advance if there is a substantial amount of new material, under which circumstances it may be preferable for the candidate to file a new application. If a case has been tabled for more than one year, a new application must be filed to ensure the currency of all submitted materials. T&P may not table the case a second time.

When a new application is filed in a previously tabled case, the sequence of steps described in this statement, including the timetable, must be followed in detail, unless otherwise approved by T&P.

18. **Discussion and vote by university administration and trustees:** When the above steps have been completed, the deans of the School of Arts and Sciences or the dean of the School of Engineering, the provost, and the president consider the matter. A recommendation is then sent to the Board of Trustees. Tenure and promotion become official only through trustee action. This action is reported by the Office of the Provost, via e-mail to the appropriate dean. The dean communicates with the candidate’s department chair, who then communicates with the candidate. In addition, a letter notifying the candidate of the trustee decision is sent from the appropriate dean as soon as possible after the trustee vote. The Secretary of the Faculty notifies the chair of T&P.
If the administration fails to support the recommendation of T&P, then the president of the university or his/her designee meets with T&P prior to any further action.

**Part 2: Tenure and promotion procedures for faculty with a primary appointment in one department and responsibilities in another department or program**

These tenure and/or promotion procedures will apply to any faculty member who was hired under a memorandum of understanding (henceforth “MOU”) involving a primary department and a secondary department or program. We expect the MOU to identify a single department within which the candidate’s primary appointment will reside. In addition, the MOU will specify any additional responsibilities for scholarship, teaching, and/or service within a secondary program or department (henceforth “secondary unit”). These modified T&P procedures are intended to solicit input from the secondary unit relevant to the candidate’s particular responsibilities to that unit, which must be specified in the MOU.

These procedures will also apply to any faculty member who has negotiated an MOU with the relevant units and dean by the end of their 4th year review. In promotion cases, these procedures will apply to those faculty members who have negotiated an MOU at least two years before applying for promotion. In cases of hires across schools, tenure review will be conducted by the T&P committee of the school to which the home department belongs, unless university-wide tenure processes are implemented in the future that would govern such faculty hires.

Standard procedures for tenure and/or promotion review within departments will be followed (these are outlined in Statement 11 Part 1, Steps 1-18) with the additional procedures specified below:

1) When the candidate’s application for tenure has been completed by the candidate and primary department, it should be sent to the chair or director of the secondary unit to allow that unit the opportunity to comment and suggest revisions. Approval of the final application is the responsibility of the primary department.

2) **Compiling information on teaching (Step 3) and mentoring (Step 4):** Any courses the candidate has taught in the secondary unit should be included in the TCU Senate evaluation (Step 3c), and the chair or director of the secondary unit should receive a copy of the TCU report. The secondary unit should also prepare a tabular summary (Step 3a) and a narrative statement on teaching (Step 3b). When relevant, it will assist the home department in finding current contact information for mentees (Step 4).

3) **Choosing External Evaluators (Step 5):** In cases where the MOU specifies a research component in the secondary unit, the home department must consult the chair or director of the secondary unit when considering the selection of external evaluators. The purpose of this consultation is to identify scholars with expertise as close as possible to the candidate's
research area. The final decision on the list will rest with the home department, in consultation with the T&P committee, as outlined in Statement 11.

4) Soliciting letters from External Evaluators (Step 7): The solicitation letter sent out to External Evaluators will state that the candidate has an appointment with responsibilities in a second department or program. Suggested language will be added as an option in the template for the solicitation letter.

5) Departmental discussion and vote (Step 8): The director or chair of the secondary unit will appoint and chair a subcommittee consisting of three tenured faculty members. If there are fewer than three tenured faculty in the secondary unit, then the subcommittee will be formed by the director or chair of the secondary unit in consultation with the T&P committee. Only these representatives of the secondary unit will review the dossier and prepare a statement evaluating the candidate’s contributions.

The contents of the dossier provided to the secondary unit will be governed by the candidate’s particular responsibilities as specified in the MOU. In cases where the MOU specifies a research component in the secondary unit, the subcommittee will have access to the full dossier provided to the primary department, including letters from External Evaluators. In cases where only teaching and service are included in the candidate’s responsibilities to the secondary unit the subcommittee will have access to a partial dossier: this will include relevant mentee letters but not the letters from External Evaluators.

The secondary unit will not take a formal vote, but will generate a statement evaluating the candidate's contributions in those areas relevant to that unit as specified in the MOU (e.g. scholarship, teaching, and/or service). This statement will be submitted to the home department before that department meets to discuss the case, and will be included in the case going forward. The candidate will be given a copy of the secondary unit’s statement together with the statement of the home department, and must acknowledge receipt of both statements in a written response (Step 10).

6) Contents of the candidate’s dossier (Step 12): The tenure dossier will contain the following additional materials: i) any correspondence between the candidate and the secondary unit about the case; ii) correspondence between the home department and the secondary unit about the case; iii) evaluations and a teaching statement from the secondary unit; iv) the statement on the candidate from the secondary unit together with the candidate’s response; v) the original MOU and any subsequent revisions.

7) Confidential letters from the department (Step 13): Tenured members of secondary units will not be required to write a confidential letter. However, such faculty members will receive a written invitation from the Secretary of the Faculty to submit a letter directly to the Secretary of the Faculty, but addressed to the chair of T&P. Unlike Additional Letters in standard tenure cases, these letters will be accepted into the case without the notification of the candidate.
8) **T&P discussion and vote (Step 16):** The chair of T&P will include the chair or director of the secondary unit in the communication to the candidate and primary department required in Step 16.

9) **T&P recommendation to table a case.** If a case is tabled (Step 17), the chair of the Committee will include the chair or director of the secondary unit in the communication to the candidate and primary department required in Step 17.

10) After the dean has been notified of the Trustees’ decision (Step 18) he or she will communicate that decision to the chair of the primary department, who then communicates with the candidate and chair or director of the secondary unit.

**Part 3: Expedited Lateral Hires**

There are two types of lateral hires: expedited and non-expedited. Expedited cases are meant to determine only the tenurability of someone coming to Tufts from another institution. Note that all proposed lateral faculty appointments must go through this process regardless of whether or not the person already has tenure at another institution. Non-expedited cases are concerned with tenure and possible promotion associated with an appointment (from assistant to associate, or associate to full professor). In either case, all lateral hires are handled on an *ad hoc* schedule negotiated by the chair of T&P and the appropriate deans.

Criteria for expedited review (calendar to be negotiated with T&P):

1. The candidate must already hold a tenured position at another university with standards comparable to those at Tufts;
2. The proposed Tufts appointment must not be at a higher professorial rank than is already held at the candidate’s home institution;
3. Both the department and the appropriate dean must request the expedited process.

Process for expedited review:

Please note that the steps described below differ in many instances from those described above in Part 1.

1. **Choosing the preparator:** A preparator is chosen from the ranks of the tenured faculty as soon as is feasible after the decision to hire. The preparator and the department chair jointly manage the application process on the department’s behalf.
The candidate and the preparator both review the materials forwarded to the candidate by the Secretary of the Faculty, including the Bylaws of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion (Article IV, Section 2 c) and this statement.

2. **Preparing the candidate’s statement:** The candidate is not required to submit an application, but should provide a statement on research, teaching and service, including service to the profession.

3. **Compiling teaching information:** It is the department’s responsibility to prepare a summary of the candidate’s teaching, including the following materials:

   a.) A tabular summary of the average rating for questions equivalent to the following: “overall rating of the professor,” the “overall rating of the course,” and, when available, “compared to other courses at [insert institution], I learned…” for each course the candidate has taught at another institution the most recent eight semesters (or equivalent) of teaching. The table should include course title and number; semester and year; enrollment; number of students who filled out the evaluation; and averages for the above specified course evaluation questions.

   b.) Accompanying the tabular summary of the candidate’s teaching, the department should also prepare a narrative statement on teaching that provides relevant information on the following: the teaching load of the candidate vis-à-vis the department; reasons for reduced or expanded teaching responsibilities, such as grants, released time, or leave of absence; and types of teaching (required vs. elective courses, labs, recitations, undergraduate vs. graduate courses, co-teaching, teaching in other programs). This narrative must be prepared prior to the department meeting.

   c). The preparator requests from the candidate the fullest available record of teaching evaluations from the most recent eight semesters (or equivalent) of teaching. The Secretary of the Faculty contacts the chair of the Tufts Community Union (TCU) Senate Education Committee with the name of the candidate to be reviewed. This chair arranges for a TCU senator to review and summarize the written commentary and statistical data on the candidate's teaching, but not to render a recommendation for or against tenure or promotion. The data, but not the mentee letters, are made available to the senator by the candidate’s department. The senator provides the department – if possible before the department meeting – with a written report signed by the chair of the Education Committee of the TCU Senate, which becomes part of the record. The candidate receives a copy of this report with its author’s name redacted. In the case of candidates who teach only graduate courses, the teaching record is reviewed by a representative of the Graduate Student Council (GSC).
d). One copy of the full set of teaching evaluations for the candidate should be included in the electronic version of the case sent to the Secretary of the Faculty (see step 12 below).

4. Compiling information on mentorship: With the help of the department, the candidate prepares an annotated table of all closely mentored individuals with whom he or she has worked either in one-on-one or small-group settings, e.g., Ph.D. advisees, master’s thesis advisees, senior honors thesis advisees, lab and research collaborators, postdoctoral scholars and associates, and participants in directed performances and creative projects. The candidate may lodge any objections to soliciting a letter from a particular mentee. These comments should be included with this list, which becomes a part of the case going forward. In consultation with the candidate’s department, T&P decide whether an objection should be honored and a letter not be solicited.

The department administrator is responsible for finding contact information for each mentee. Once the table is complete, it should be submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty, who will send out letters requesting evaluations of the candidate and organize the letters as they are received. Letters from mentees who were never at Tufts are sent to the candidate’s department for their consideration prior to the department meeting. Only T&P and relevant administrators will see letters from mentees who are expected to follow the candidate to Tufts from the candidate’s prior institution.

5. Choosing External Evaluators: External evaluation of a candidate’s scholarly contributions is an important component of the tenure and promotion process. To this end, the department is ultimately responsible for compiling and forwarding a list of suitable External Evaluators for a given case to the T&P Committee for consideration, keeping in mind the process outlined below. The list should include names of evaluators who can objectively assess the quality of the candidate’s research while outlining the candidate’s individual contributions to the discipline. The majority of the names on the list must be individuals with whom the candidate has had no more than an arm’s length relationship and who can provide an objective assessment of the candidate’s scholarly contributions. There must be no perception of a connection that might compromise the objectivity of the letter. With the approval of T&P, however, two outside letters may be included from those obtained during the hiring process. In this case, the letter writers should be asked explicitly to address the candidate’s qualifications for a tenured position: would the evaluator support the candidate for tenure at the writer’s institution? Would the candidate receive tenure at the writer’s institution? If this question was not asked at the time of the search, an addendum should be requested. Evaluators may not be people who have a personal stake in the candidate’s career, such as close mentors, dissertation advisors or colleagues who within the last seven years have taught in the same department as the candidate, collaborated on a grant, or co-authored publications. Unless a substantial financial honorarium is involved, an invitation to speak in a departmental colloquium, or to speak at or participate in a conference or workshop,
would not typically be assumed to compromise an "arm’s length" relationship between a candidate and a proposed External Evaluator; all such interactions between the candidate and the proposed External Evaluator must be disclosed in accordance with 5a iii below. As with internal promotions, the list of outside evaluators must be sent to the T&P Committee for approval.

The process for assembling the list of External Evaluators is as follows.

a.) The candidate and the department should independently produce their own lists of potential External Evaluators who could provide an objective evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship, creative works and other professional activities. These External Evaluators should consist primarily of senior scholars in the candidate’s field from prominent research universities. In some cases, scholars at colleges and experts from other institutions are appropriate. The letters should represent a wide range of institutions in the United States and, where relevant, abroad.

The candidate’s list should include a description of his or her personal and professional relationship to each proposed External Evaluator. Neither the preparator nor the department should see the candidate’s list until after the department has met and discussed their own choices for potential External Evaluators. Departments are encouraged to secure the participation of all tenured members, including those on leave, in this and all subsequent deliberations.

The preparator provides the combined list of potential External Evaluators to the candidate, who then adds a description of his or her personal and professional relationship to each proposed External Evaluator. In consultation with the tenured members of the department, the preparator should eliminate any scholars whose objectivity might potentially be compromised by a close personal or professional connection to the candidate, as described above. This list (hereafter called “List of External Evaluators”) should include enough names to achieve a yield of at least five External Letters. This list of five may include up to two letters that were obtained during the hiring process. These letter writers must be asked to address the question of whether they would support the candidate for tenure at their own institution and whether the candidate would receive tenure at their institution (see first paragraph step 5). At least half of the names on the combined list should have been suggested either by the department alone or independently by both the department and the candidate. The list is given to the candidate. If the candidate objects to any of the department’s choices, the candidate should indicate these objections on the list sent to T&P for approval. The department is not required to make changes in response to the candidate’s objections to the list. Any objections that remain in the list finally approved by T&P (part 5(b) below) will be included in the internal administrative record and will not be sent to the External Evaluators.
The List of External Evaluators is now forwarded to the Tenure and Promotion Committee for approval and should include on the template provided in the preparator’s packet the following information:

i.) a label indicating each name as having been selected by the candidate, the department or both;

ii.) the institution, department, rank, research specialization and specific detailed qualifications of each External Evaluator including information about number and type of publications, leadership positions, and awards and honors received;

iii.) a description written by the candidate of his or her personal and professional relationship to each External Evaluator.

iv) the candidate’s objections, if any.

An electronic record of all communications between the preparator, the department chair and the candidate pertaining to the preparation of the list of External Evaluators must be included as files in the pdf format in the electronic version of the case (see 12).

b). The preparator must consult with the chair of T&P to finalize the list of External Evaluators. The candidate’s CV must accompany the proposed list (see (a)) that is forwarded to T&P. T&P works with the departments to produce a mutually agreeable list of potential External Evaluators.

6. Requesting Additional Letters: The department may request additional letters – over and above the External Letters from other evaluators – some of whom may be close collaborators with the candidate, colleagues, or administrators. These letters are treated as a separate category, hereafter called “Additional Letters,” which need not be vetted by T&P. Also in this category of Additional Letters are letters not formally requested by the department, including those solicited by the candidate or members of the candidate’s department, and those not solicited. Prior to requesting Additional Letters, the department must notify the candidate and the Secretary of the Faculty of the identity of these letter writers. Candidates can lodge a written objection to the chair of T&P, which becomes part of the case going forward. These objections should be directed to the chair of T&P and sent to the Secretary of the Faculty.

All Additional Letters received by the department shall be included in the dossier of the case. Additional Letters sent directly to the Chair of T&P and/or to the Secretary of the Faculty will not be shared with the department.

If the candidate’s department is in receipt of unrequested Additional Letters, the department must notify the candidate of the author of the letter within a week of its
receipt, keeping the content confidential. If the candidate wishes to submit an objection, this must be done within a week of notification. Both the letter and any objection are included in the internal administrative record (not sent to External Evaluators). If the Secretary of the Faculty is in receipt of such a letter, the same protocol applies.

7. **Soliciting letters from External Evaluators**: The preparator solicits a confidential written evaluation of the candidate's scholarly work from the list of External Evaluators using a standard letter; a template for this letter may be found in the preparator's packet. Prior to sending out the formal letter of solicitation, the preparator may make initial contact with potential referees by phone or e-mail. **Care must be taken in all contact with potential Evaluators not to use language that might prejudice the objectivity of the reviews.** As per 12(f), all written communication becomes part of the permanent record. It is the responsibility of the preparator to solicit letters from those on the approved list in such a way as to (i) ensure the receipt of a sufficient number of letters (eight for tenure, five for promotion only) and (ii) ensure that the letters received are reasonably balanced between those from evaluators suggested by the candidate, and those from evaluators suggested by the department, or by both the department and candidate.

Those who agree to serve as External Evaluators are sent the candidate's statement on research, teaching and service and CV and provided with enough material to allow assessment of the candidate's scholarship. All evaluators should receive the same materials. The objective of the External Letters is to obtain an accurate assessment of how the candidate and the candidate’s research are perceived by leaders in the field.

8. **Departmental discussion and vote**: After receiving the requisite number of letters from External Evaluators as specified in Section 5a, and examining the opinions of these External Evaluators, **all tenured members of the department** must meet to assess the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and service, and shall vote on a recommendation of tenure and/or promotion for the candidate.

All votes must be taken by secret ballot. The numerical vote(s) must be reported in the Department Statement. Only department members who were present at the meeting(s) may vote. In cases where the provost or a dean who participates formally in the tenure process at the administrative level is a tenured member of the same department as the candidate, he or she will participate in neither the department discussion nor the department vote. In cases where a member of T&P belongs to a department with an expedited lateral tenure case, that member participates in the departmental discussion and vote(s), but recuses him or herself from the T&P Committee discussion and vote (see Step 16).

9. **Department Statement**: The department prepares a statement reflecting the full range of its tenured members’ opinions as expressed in the departmental discussion, to be signed by all members of the department who took part in the discussion and vote. If extreme
circumstances prevent any tenured faculty member from participating in this discussion, the Department Statement must describe the reason for non-participation of each tenured member not present. The Department Statement(s) must preserve the confidentiality of all letter writers and all participants in the discussion. The content of this statement plays a major role in subsequent deliberations. Therefore, under the circumstance that the department cannot agree on one statement that adequately reflects its discussions, it should submit two statements signed by all voting members. The statement(s) must be submitted to T&P along with the complete case; this dossier should normally be delivered within two weeks of the department statement being signed.

10. Candidate’s response to Department Statement: The department makes its statement(s) and an alphabetized list of all signers available to the candidate as soon as these are ready. The candidate must acknowledge receipt of the statement in a written response addressed to the chair of T&P (on departmental letterhead with an original signature) and sent in care of the Secretary of the Faculty, within two weeks of receipt. This response becomes part of the case going forward.

11. Selecting the T&P Subcommittee: The chair of T&P informs the candidate, the candidate’s department chair, and the preparator via e-mail which two members of T&P will serve on the Internal Subcommittee.

12. Contents of the candidate’s dossier: The dossier for each case is assembled by the department and transmitted to T&P, and should contain the following materials:

a.) The candidate's statement on research, teaching and service;

b.) A current CV which includes publications categorized according to 1) refereed or non-refereed status, and 2) type, e.g., book, book chapter, articles, reviews, and so forth (Note: the bibliography and professional activities in the CV and statement on research, teaching and service should be identical); the titles of any publications in another language should be translated into English;

c.) Reprints and other evidence of the candidate's scholarly and creative work (these should be the same works sent to External Evaluators);

d.) Letters from External Evaluators and a sample of the letters sent to them; any letters in a language other than English should be translated into English;

e.) A complete table of all considered External Evaluators, indicating which names were supplied exclusively by the candidate, exclusively by the department, and by both candidate and department; which potential External Evaluators were contacted and which were not; and the responses; and any objections by the candidate.
f.) An electronic record of all email and other correspondence with potential External Evaluators, and all correspondence pertaining to the case, including email between the department chair and the candidate and between the preparator and the candidate. Correspondence conducted in any language other than English must be translated into English;

g.) The Department Statement(s) pertaining to the candidate's scholarship and other work, teaching, and service;

h.) The teaching materials listed in Step 3 (the tabular summary, department’s narrative, TCU (or GSC) report);

i.) Any Additional Letters (as defined in step 6) received by the department.

The dossier must be delivered to the Secretary of the Faculty in the following form:

i. The original paper version of the dossier, including all signed letters;

   ii. One electronic version of the entire dossier, including the electronic record of correspondence as described in (f) above, and a full set of course evaluations as per Step 3(d).

Updates to the dossier can be submitted to T&P until the Committee votes on the case.

13. Confidential letters from the department: The bylaws require that each tenured member of the candidate’s department write a confidential letter addressed to the chair of T&P but sent to the Secretary of the Faculty even if the tenured faculty member did not participate in the department meeting; this includes faculty members on leave. The bylaws permit but do not require such a letter as well from non-tenured members. All such letters must be signed on departmental letterhead and can be sent via email to the Secretary of the Faculty. These letters, and any other letters not already in the file, should be sent to T&P within two weeks after the Department Statement is signed. The candidate should be notified of the existence of all letters from non-tenured members by the Secretary of the Faculty on behalf of the T&P Committee, and this should be done in sufficient time to permit written objections from the candidate to be considered prior to relevant actions by the Committee. All letters become a part of the case going forward. Letters, including those from students and other mentees, will be kept secure and confidential by the Secretary of the Faculty and will be destroyed after three years, unless otherwise required by law. In cases that did not lead to tenure or promotion, all of the case materials, including letters, are kept for 12 years and then destroyed.

No additional letters or communications of any sort received after the final vote of the T&P Committee will be considered by T&P as a part of the case.
14. **T&P Subcommittee:** For expedited lateral tenure cases, which have no External Subcommittee meeting, Internal Subcommittee members will review and discuss all the evidence presented in a candidate’s case with the full T&P Committee, whose members will also be familiar with the case. No written report is produced.

15. **T&P option to request additional information:** If T&P requires the advice of additional evaluators (including, if deemed useful, research collaborators of the candidate) and/or mentees, the T&P Committee informs the candidate, the department chair and preparator of the names of all additional evaluators. This should be done in sufficient time to permit written objections from the candidate to be considered prior to relevant actions by the Committee. Letters thus received by the Committee, along with any objections filed by the candidate, are forwarded to the administration as part of the case.

On behalf of the Committee, the Secretary of the Faculty notifies the candidate of any unsolicited written communications that come directly to the Committee.

16. **T&P discussion and vote:** T&P discusses the case, and its members vote on a recommendation for or against tenure. In cases where a T&P member is from the same department as a candidate, that member does not participate in the tenure and promotion proceedings in any way other than as a member of the department. Prior to taking a final vote, T&P meets with members of the administration to discuss the merits of the case.

In the event that this recusal results in no representation from the School of Engineering or from one of the three bylaw-designated areas of A&S (humanities and arts; social sciences; natural sciences and mathematics) on a particular promotion or tenure and promotion case, then the Chair of the Committee on Committees, in consultation with the Chair of T&P and the Secretary of the Faculty, appoints a replacement from faculty members with previous service on T&P (preferably in the last five years) in order to maintain compliance with AS&E Faculty Bylaws (Article 4, section 2, part c).

T&P transmits its vote and its findings in writing by letter to the appropriate dean. At the same time, the chair of T&P reports the Committee’s vote in writing to the candidate and the candidate’s department chair and the preparator.

Prior to making its recommendation to the administration, if T&P fails to support or divides equally on a recommendation of a candidate who was supported by two-thirds or more of the members of the department who voted, then T&P will meet with the preparator and the department chair (if different from the preparator). The purpose of this meeting is to explain the position of the Committee (while respecting the confidentiality of all participants) and to hear any comments from the department.
17. Discussion and vote by university administration and trustees: When the above steps have been completed, the deans of Arts and Sciences or the dean of Engineering, the provost, and the president consider the matter. A recommendation is then sent to the Board of Trustees. Tenure becomes official only through trustee action. This action is reported by the Office of the Provost, via e-mail to the appropriate dean. The dean communicates with the candidate’s department chair, who then communicates with the candidate. In addition, a letter notifying the candidate of the trustee decision is sent from the appropriate dean as soon as possible after the trustee vote. The Secretary of the Faculty notifies the chair of T&P.

If the administration fails to support the recommendation of T&P, then the president of the university or his/her designee meets with T&P prior to any further action.

Part 4: Non-Expedited Lateral Hires

The process for non-expedited lateral hires is similar to the process described in Part 3, above.

In addition:

1. External Evaluators must be asked to answer questions: “Would you support the candidate for tenure and promotion as appropriate at your own institution? Would the candidate receive tenure and promotion as appropriate at your institution?” must be asked if the candidate would receive tenure and if they would be promoted to associate or to full professor, as appropriate, at his/her own institution.

2. A full External Subcommittee, as per Part 1, steps 5(b), 11, and 14 above, will be formed if the candidate does not already have tenure elsewhere, or if the candidate is being promoted from assistant to associate, or from associate to full professor. In this case, the dossier is normally delivered within two weeks of the department statement being signed; it must be delivered no later than two weeks before the scheduled meeting of the External Subcommittee.

This version of Statement 11 was approved by the T&P Committee on February 03, 2016.