



## UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES FOR CANDIDATE FILES (TENURE TRACK)

**(All materials in the dossier must follow the format and exact order listed below.)**

### Part I

#### Coversheet with:

- School name
- Full name of the candidate and terminal degree(s)
- Candidate's current rank and title
- Proposed action and candidate's proposed rank and title
- Proposed effective date, must be "September 1" of the following academic year, "upon approval of the board," or the effective date must coincide with the faculty member's date of hire
- Overall assessment by school-based review committee of scholarship, teaching and service for candidate's proposed tenure and/or promotion, including the vote for each assessment (if applicable)
- Overall vote by school-based faculty review committee (if applicable). **NEW!** Please note the following:
  - **Abstention** – should be used when a voting member chooses not to vote on the question but still might participate in its consideration
  - **Recusal** – should be used when a voting member recuses themselves and does not participate in the consideration of the question and does not vote
  - **Unanimous Vote** – should be used only when all voting members choose to vote AND vote in the same way

#### Dean's Letter (please follow the format below in the exact order):

- Introductory paragraph with proposed recommendation, candidate's full name and terminal degree(s), proposed rank, and effective date (must be "September 1" of the following academic year, "upon approval of the Board," or the effective date must coincide with the faculty member's date of hire). **Faculty who arrive prior to Board approval MUST carry the title of Acting Professor or Acting Associate Professor**
- Process/chronology paragraph summarizing the appointment/review process
- If faculty member holds a joint appointment, **NEW!** identify the candidate's tenure home (there can only be one), and explain how the appointment letter informs the tenure and promotion standard (if applicable)
- If the candidate is going up for tenure and/or promotion early (e.g., before the last year on the tenure track or before the minimum time in rank for promotion to full), please provide a justification (e.g., retention, far surpasses relevant standards, etc.)
- External reviewers' summary paragraph: **The relationship to the candidate must be at arms-length (see page three) otherwise, address any potential conflicts of interest that exist.** Selected reviewers should be from disciplinary peer institutions or peer aspirational institutions. **If the reviewer is at the associate professor rank, you must justify the reviewer's expertise.**
- Candidate's background:
  - Educational history; include major/focus of study and graduating year for each degree
  - Previous faculty positions held, include the name(s) of the institution, faculty position and years employed there. If the candidate earned tenure at a previous institution, please include the year candidate received tenure. **NEW!** If the candidate held recent positions outside of academia, include the name(s) of the organization(s), position(s) held and years employed at each organization. Briefly describe the candidate's transition to their current faculty role
  - Broad field and subfield
  - Please include details regarding candidate's discipline/research and how it aligns with both the school and university's strategic priorities
  - H-index (if applicable). If H-index is not relevant to the discipline, please note that and provide a brief explanation of how scholarship is measured

- Funding history (if applicable) - include current grants with funding amounts, total awards, number served as PI or Co-PI, etc., and funding amount. **NEW!** Only include funded grants on the funding history template (aspirational grants should not be included). **Schools should provide a brief, written description of the candidate's funding in the Dean's Letter and must include the template on page four in the Dean's letter**
- Publishing record (indicate how many as first or senior author, and number of publications in rank)  
**If the recommendation is for promotion to Full Professor, include the number of publications post tenure.**
- Identify and address any issues in the school-based faculty committee report (if applicable)
- Identify and address any issues in the department chair's report (if applicable)
- Dean's critical perspective and independent recommendation. This should include:
  - an assessment of the candidate's scholarship (**Dean must explicitly note that the candidate has met the school and department requirements**)
  - an assessment of the candidate's teaching (**Dean must explicitly note that the candidate has met the school and department requirements**)
  - an assessment of the candidate's service **must note whether candidate has met the school's requirements**
  - brief description of the cohort within which the candidate was evaluated
  - **for internal tenure candidates**, an assessment of whether the dean would hire this candidate laterally (and why) and the candidate's expected career trajectory
  - **identification of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, particularly those highlighted by the school-based faculty committee (if applicable) or external reviewers. NEW!** If the candidate received a split vote at the department or school level, provide an explanation for the negative votes (if known) and address those concerns
  - the value of the candidate to the unit and the University

#### Supporting Materials:

- Letter from school-based faculty committee to the dean (if applicable)
- Letter from department chair/division to the dean (if applicable)
- Candidate's one-page summary curriculum vitae (CV)
- External reviewers:
  - Copy of **initial** solicitation letter/email to one of the external reviewers
  - Copy of the school's most recent tenure and promotion guidelines shared with the external reviewers
  - Brief biographical description for each external reviewer who submitted a review letter, **including a description of relationship to the candidate (maximum two pages)**
  - External reviewer letters (**minimum of six**) and signed External Reviewer Forms preceding each letter.
  - Review letters from internal reviewers (if applicable)
- Candidate's personal statement (**maximum of five pages**) on scholarship, teaching and service
- Candidate's COVID impact statement (if applicable)
- Candidate's full curriculum vitae (CV)

#### **PART II**

- Teaching dossier (please follow the format and **exact order** listed below)
  - teaching statement
  - peer assessments and reviews
  - numerical teaching evaluation summary sheets
  - course creation total
  - student evaluations
  - teaching awards
  - sample syllabi demonstrating pedagogical innovation
  - other teaching-related materials
- Service dossier
  - service statement
  - service activities
  - other service-related materials
- Copy of the selected scholarly work submitted to external reviewers

#### **PART III**

- External Reviewer Tracking Form

## EXTERNAL REVIEWER BEST PRACTICES

External reviewers should be leaders in their field. In the main, **these reviewers should be at the full professor level** or equivalent. **Uniquely qualified tenured associate professors may be appropriate and should be explained in the dean's letter.** The list of potential external reviewers **must not** consist of evaluators who have solely been recommended by the candidate. Instead, the final list of recommended reviewers should be developed with input from the candidate and various voices within the department. This may include faculty within the candidate's field, the department's tenure and promotion committee, and the chair of the department. Best practice in quality assurance also ensures that external reviewers are at arm's length from the candidate under review. This means that reviewers/consultants are not close friends, current or recent collaborators, former supervisors, advisors or colleagues.

Arm's length does not mean that the reviewer must never have met or heard of the candidate. It does mean that reviewers should not be selected who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the candidate. Please see some examples of what does and does not constitute a close connection that would violate the arm's length requirement.

Examples of what **may** violate the arm's length requirement:

- A previous member of the same program or department as the candidate at the same time
- Received a graduate degree from the same program as the candidate at the same time
- A regular co-author and research collaborator with the candidate within the past seven years, and especially if that collaboration is ongoing
- Close family/friend relationship with the candidate
- The candidate's doctoral supervisor

Examples of what **does not** violate the arm's length requirement:

- Appeared on a panel at a conference with the candidate
- Served on a granting council selection panel with the candidate
- Author of an article in a journal edited by the candidate, or a chapter in a book edited by the candidate
- Presented a paper at a conference held at the university where the candidate is located
- Invited candidate to present a paper at a conference organized by the reviewer or to write a chapter in a book edited by the reviewer
- Received a bachelor's degree from the same university
- Co-author or research collaborator with the candidate more than seven years ago
- Presented a guest lecture at the university of the reviewer
- Reviewed for publication a manuscript written by the candidate

## EVALUATION OF TEACHING FOR LATERAL CANDIDATES AND SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS

Teaching is a core function of Emory University's tenure-stream faculty. It is expected that faculty who are granted tenure will hold a record of outstanding teaching. TPAC's review includes a thorough assessment of teaching based on standards articulated by the schools. Lateral candidates and senior administrators recruited to Emory may come from institutions with different processes and/or criteria for evaluating teaching excellence. Expecting lateral candidates' teaching dossiers to match our exacting internal standards would be inappropriate for those candidates. This may be particularly true for those candidates who have held administrative positions at their previous institutions whose teaching record may not be as robust or as contemporaneous with traditional, internal promotion and tenure candidates.

Assessments of teaching are based on the quality of the available evidence provided in the candidate's dossier, not merely the quantity. Importantly, quantity **alone** should not negate a finding of teaching excellence or perception that the candidate's teaching falls below Emory standards. Strong indicia of teaching excellence may include, depending on discipline, positive peer assessments and reviews, student evaluations, teaching awards, and a sample of syllabi demonstrating pedagogical innovation. For senior administrators, it is appropriate to consider evidence of teaching evidence that pre-dates their administrative position, though failure to have such materials should not be a barrier to advancing the case.

## OUTSIDE REVIEWS FOR NAMED/ENDOWED PROFESSOR-LEVEL SENIOR HIRES

When hiring senior laterals, obtaining external reviewer letters can present a number of challenges. If the candidate is truly eminent in the relevant field, finding reviewers who are at arms-length can be a problem. Schools should avoid selecting reviewers whose relationship to the candidate exhibit sharp conflicts, such as being a co-author and/or research collaborator within the past seven years, colleague at the same institution during the same period, or holding joint interests in intellectual property. Any conflict that appears on the reviewer form **must** be addressed in the Dean's letter, however.

**Funding History Template**

\*This template must be included as part of the Dean's letter to outline candidate's funding history. Please cut and paste as needed.

<b>Research Project</b>	<b>Award Period</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Funder</b>	<b>Type of Award</b>	<b>Total Funding Amount</b>	<b>Renewal Date (If Applicable)</b>
Drug Abuse in Children	2020 - 2023	Principal Investigator	NIH	R01	\$700,000	9/1/2024