Checklist for Material Requested by the Provost for Dossiers for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (Tenure Track Faculty)  
updated 2/13/12

Candidate’s Materials*
CV
Synopsis of intellectual interest, especially concerning interdisciplinary interests
Intellectual development statement
List of graduate mentoring activities
Course outlines for past three years
List of top 10 publications/contributions
Alphabetical list of collaborators

External Letters
Sample request letter
Statement identifying and describing external evaluators contacted (including contact information)
Evaluation letters
Electronic communications with evaluators
Log of additional contacts regarding the review
Unsolicited evaluations/correspondence

Committee Materials
Search committee report for external appointments only
Review committee report
Supplementary materials
Statement(s) from other units to which the candidate contributes
Description and importance of candidate’s field
Size of candidate’s field and subfield
Statement appraising quality of journal(s) and/or publisher(s)

Department Chair’s Materials
Chair’s report
Supplementary documents
Reappointment summary letter (for internal tenure cases only)
Voting policy and list of those voting
Chair’s ranking of tenured faculty (only for cases involving tenure)
Names and contact information for six additional “arm’s-length” evaluators

Dean’s Letter
Supplementary materials
Any additional materials provided by the dean
List of all departmental tenure-track and tenured faculty

Publications (items on the top-ten list)*

Published Reviews of the candidate's work*

Teaching Record
Tabular summary of teacher course evaluations
Teacher course evaluation forms

Recent Grant proposals, both pending and awarded*

Other

* = material provided by the candidate
Materials Requested by Provost for Dossiers for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (Tenure Track Faculty)

For all dossiers, the Provost requires one electronic copy in Adobe Acrobat format on a CD. Departments should check with the Dean’s Office to ascertain School requirements. The department should retain a copy of the complete dossier in its files. All material related to the candidate's evaluation, whether solicited or not, must be included in the dossier (though the CD need not have publications not available digitally; these can be included as hard copy). A complete dossier includes the items listed here. Notations will indicate cases where certain types of files do not require an item.

1. Candidate's Materials

   a. Curriculum Vitae, which should follow the standard citation format:

      1. Include department/research area for Ph.D., title of Ph.D. dissertation, and name of Ph.D. advisor.
      2. Assign marginal numbers to published works and research (corresponding to the ranked listing of most important/influential contributions and to the works provided for Item f below);
      3. List authors of collaborative research in the sequence in which they appear on published work (if disciplinary convention has authors listed in alphabetical order, please so state);
      4. Identify work published after appointment at Duke.
      5. Include external funding applications and awards.

   b. Brief synopsis that was presented by the candidate to his/her department chair describing candidate’s intellectual interest, including a description of any factors – interdisciplinary or otherwise – that the candidate believes should be taken into consideration when establishing his/her review committee.

   c. Intellectual Development Statement, describing:

      1. Research/scholarship/artistic development: Completed --In progress --Planned, including future directions and strategy
      2. Teaching: Philosophy/goals --Strategy/approaches --Course development accomplished and envisioned
      3. Service: Secondary/joint/adjunct appointments in other academic units --Participation in academic enterprises and University life --Activities within the discipline

   d. List of theses/dissertations supervised, and service as member of committee, or a statement indicating that the candidate's unit has no graduate activities

   e. Course outlines for all classes taught during the previous three years

   f. Listing, rank-ordered by the candidate, of not more than ten (total) of his/her most important and influential publications and/or professional contributions.

   g. Alphabetical list of collaborators on papers, grants, and presentations

2. External letters/evaluations of candidate's work. Dossiers are to contain the following:

   a. Sample request letter(s) and date(s) sent to external reviewers

   b. A statement identifying all evaluators contacted regarding this candidate:
1. Name and current rank, institutional affiliation, mailing address, phone number, and email address.
2. Research area, distinction in the field, and relevance to candidate's work.
3. Clear indication of those suggested by the candidate or by the review committee.

c. All external evaluations/letters received.

d. All electronic communications between university faculty/staff and any evaluators, potential evaluators, or other individuals contacted in connection with this review, including those who declined to write an evaluation. (See dossier formatting instructions) *Once the evaluation letters have been received there are to be no further communications to evaluators regarding the candidate by the reviewing unit.*

e. A fully descriptive log of all additional contacts with evaluators, potential evaluators, and any others in connection with this review, including a written report describing the substance of any telephone conversations.

If no telephone or other electronic contacts were made other than the letters of request and the responses contained in the submitted file, provide a statement so stating for the file.

f. All unsolicited evaluations and correspondence from Duke colleagues/students

**NOTES: About selection of evaluators:**

1. Evaluators must be of equal or higher rank than that for which the candidate is being reviewed.
2. Collaborators (with the exception listed below), supervisors, and present or former departmental colleagues are considered to be too closely connected to candidates to review them. For internal candidates for promotion, colleagues at UNC-CH and NCSU are also considered too close. Deans are expected to review the dossiers and return them to the originating units for additional letters when evaluators are found to be inadequately removed from the candidate. Should the department believe that there are too few qualified independent evaluators to meet the requirement specified above, there should be a full explanation in the Chair’s Report.

**NOTES: About external evaluations/letters:**

1. For initial tenure-track appointment (without tenure), at least three external letters are required.
2. For the reappointment (without tenure) of tenure-track faculty, external letters are not needed unless departmental bylaws require them.
3. For reviews of appointment with tenure, the award of tenure, and promotion with tenure, at least six external letters must be provided from competent reviewers outside of Duke who are not closely connected with the candidate. NONE of the letter-writers may have been former students or supervisors of the candidate, and NONE may have been colleagues or collaborators. For interdisciplinary work, more than six letters should be provided.
4. For reviews for initial appointment to Full Professor or internal promotion to Full Professor, the following five points must be satisfied:
   1) A minimum of six external letters is required.
   2) At least four of the external letter-writers must have never collaborated with the candidate (i.e., they must be "fully arms-length")*,
   3) Of the remaining external letters (beyond the four fully arms-length mentioned above), they may also be fully arms length, or their writers may have been colleagues or collaborators on shared projects the most recent of which must have been completed and published more than seven years ago. Such a relationship must be clearly explicit.
   4) NONE of the letter-writers may have been colleagues or collaborators in the past seven years.
   5) NONE of the letter-writers may have been former supervisors or students of the candidate.
3A. Faculty Committee Report(s) to Departmental Faculty

a. Search Committee's Report (if applicable) should contain:

1. Recapitulation of the search process
2. Candidate-by-candidate assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of short list candidates
3. A copy of the published advertisement, including where placed

b. The Faculty Review Committee's Report (for all candidates): As submitted to the voting faculty prior to its deliberations and vote and signed and dated by all members. If the Review Committee's Report is modified subsequent to the departmental discussion, provide both reports (original and modified) signed and dated by all members.

The following headings and appropriate information are to be included in all Faculty Review Committee Reports (see template):

1. Relationship and significance of the relevant broad field and subfield to the discipline (e.g., how does research in this subfield contribute to ongoing intellectual issues within the discipline? What evidence documents that this field and/or subfield continue to be intellectually vibrant and promising of important contributions?)
2. Candidate's professional development, current research interests, and likely future directions (e.g., if the candidate's work crosses disciplinary boundaries, please state which is the candidate's primary research area and which is the secondary.)
3. Significance of the candidate's research agenda in relation to recent intellectual developments in the field (e.g., if the candidate's work crosses disciplinary boundaries or uses methodologies from different disciplines, describe how interdisciplinary has influenced the quality, reception, and impact of the work--positively or negatively--in the candidate's primary field, as well as in other fields.)
4. Candidate's scholarly trajectory to date, including specific contributions contained in respective published works, their influence on the field, and the breadth of the candidate's interests
5. Individual members of the appropriate peer group within the candidate's discipline
6. Candidate's ranking within the peers named above
7. Disputes that might exist within the area or among individuals in the discipline that may be important with respect to this review
8. Nature of scholarly productivity in the discipline (i.e., what does the discipline consider indicative of productive scholars with regard to both a typical publication rate and the type of contribution--books, refereed journal articles, reviews, catalogs, electronic communications, original compositions, etc.)
9. Candidate's effectiveness as a teacher; as a contributor to the graduate program, other departments and/or academic initiatives, and his/her discipline; and as a department member
10. Recommendation to the voting faculty

3B. Supplementary documents to be appended to the Review Committee report for review and discussion by the faculty

a. A statement from the academic unit where the candidate may have a secondary/joint appointment or where the candidate may participate in interdisciplinary activities beyond the primary unit. This statement should describe the level and quality of the candidate's contributions to the secondary unit.
b. A description of the broad field in which the candidate works and the role this field plays in the discipline (e.g., is it an emerging field, or well established?)

c. Size of the candidate's field and subfield. For these purposes, it is important that the subfield not be too narrowly defined; e.g. discipline has ~30K in US/world, broad field has ~3k in US/world, subfield has ~800 in US/world, subfield has ~150 in US/world, specific research problem has ~5-10 in US/world

d. A statement of the quality of journals and publishers having accepted work by the candidate, including descriptions of the following:

1. How their submissions are refereed.
2. How the individual journals and publishers compare with the best ones in the candidate's broad field and subfield.

4. Report from Department Chair to Dean (Schools without department chairs should include this information in the section containing the Dean’s Assessment and Recommendation)

NOTE: Chair's report is confidential; it is not to be drafted by nor shared with department faculty.

a. The following headings and appropriate information are to be included in all chairs' reports (see template):

1. Procedures followed during this candidate's evaluation
2. Summary of the faculty's deliberations during departmental meeting(s), including both favorable comments and expressed concerns
3. Chair's independent opinion; a) Candidate's contributions to a substantial field, and his/her standing in this field; b) Candidate's effectiveness as a teacher, discussing the quality of his/her teaching, and how this has evolved with time; c) Candidate's teaching effectiveness compared to department's other instructors; d) Candidate as a department member; e) Candidate as a contributor to the University (including its graduate programs and other academic enterprises) and his/her profession; f) Candidate's projected future contributions to the department, the University, and the discipline; g) Chair's recommendation and basis for his/her opinion.

b. Supplementary documents to be provided by Department Chair:

1. For all candidates:
   a. A description of the unit's voting policy;
   b. The names of those present for the discussion and vote, and the vote tally (# yes, # no, # abstentions) Names of those submitting absentee votes and the tally (# yes, # no, # abstentions).
   c. Six more suggestions by the department of qualified "arms-length" non-Duke evaluators who have not already been contacted by anyone about this review nor who were suggested by the candidate. For each individual, give: name and current rank, institutional affiliation, mailing address, phone number, email address, research area, distinction in the field, and relevance to candidate's work.

2. For tenure track reappointments: A copy of the department chair’s draft reappointment summary letter (to be given to the candidate after the Provost has approved the reappointment).

3. For internal tenure candidates: A copy of the department chair's reappointment summary letter (that was given to candidate at the time of reappointment)

4. For all candidates for the award of tenure (e.g. not for internal promotions to Full Professor:)
   The department chair shall rank the candidate within the roster of all of the department's tenured faculty (not sorted by research focus.) The placement should reflect the chair's evaluation of
research and teaching, using one of the following as the basis for the ranking: the candidate's contributions to date, relative to departmental colleagues' contributions to date, or the candidate's contributions to date, relative to departmental colleagues' contributions when they were at a similar stage in their careers. The department chair must note which basis is used. NOTE: This ranking should not be retained in the department's files.

5. Dean's Assessment and Recommendation (Departments need pay no attention to this section)

a. The following headings and appropriate information are to be included in all deans' assessments (see template):

1. Ongoing intellectual agenda
2. Broad field and/or sub field in which the candidate works, including evidence concerning whether or not this field continues to be intellectually vibrant and promising of important contributions
3. Cross-disciplinary research areas/applied areas/methodologies from different disciplines relevant to this candidate's work
4. Issues presented within faculty committee report
5. Issues contained within department chair's report
6. Assessment of the department chair's positioning of the candidate relative to the tenured faculty. However, deans may, in addition, offer placements based on supplementary academic credit if so desired. (Comparative positioning not required for internal promotion to full professor. In this case, simply state “not applicable” under this heading in Dean’s report.)
7. Dean's critical perspective and independent recommendation

For schools without departments, the Deans is to include the detailed information otherwise provided by the department chair (see Item 4).

b. All supplementary information solicited by the Dean to inform the recommendation, including the Dean's request for said information.

c. Dean's list of all current departmental tenured and tenure-track faculty (not needed for reappointments):

NOTE: For the purposes of the APT Committee's consideration, the Dean should address only the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service as itemized immediately above. Any other institutional considerations are beyond the Committee’s purview. The Dean may address such considerations in a separate letter addressed to the Provost alone. In cases concerning the award of tenure to an internal candidate, such other considerations are nugatory.

6. Copies of the candidate's most important, influential publications and professional contributions, as listed in the Candidate’s Materials section and identified by numbers on the CV:

a. Provide copies of those items designated by the candidate in Item 1 as his/her most significant contributions. (NOTE: No need to provide copies of publications/contributions other than those selected by the candidate as his/her most significant. If APT would like copies of other items on the CV not already contained in the dossier, the Faculty Affairs Office will forward a specific request.)

b. Include 3 volumes of published books selected in Item 1 for APT Committee. Library copies are acceptable. (NOTE: Please do not photocopy books unless requested to do so.) Departments should check with their School’s Dean’s office to ascertain school requirements.
c. If not on the CD, include 3 photocopies of manuscripts selected in Item 1 for APT Committee. Departments should check with their School’s Dean’s office to ascertain school requirements.

7. Copies of all published reviews of a candidate’s works, if any have appeared, and press readers' reports on book manuscripts

Note: The candidate’s reviews of another’s works should be placed in the “Other Documentation” folder.

8. Candidate’s Teaching Record, which should be provided for faculty review and discussion:
   a. A tabular summary of teacher course evaluations indicating:
      1. For EACH course the faculty member has taught at Duke:
         - Course number, title, semester, and year
         - Number of students enrolled
         - Number of evaluations received
         - Individual scores for: overall course rating (Question 1) and overall instructor rating (Question 2)
         - Individual average score for “Level of Demand” (Questions 3 & 4)
         (the amount of effort students expended and the difficulty of the subject matter)
         (Note: For internal promotion to full professor only, provide summaries for those courses taught since the tenure review.)

      2. DEPARTMENTAL averages to date for all UNDERGRADUATE courses (000-199) for:
         - Overall course rating (Question 1)
         - Overall instructor rating (Question 2)
         - Level of Demand (Questions 3 & 4)

      3. DEPARTMENTAL averages to date for all GRADUATE courses (200 and above) for:
         - Overall course rating (Question 1)
         - Overall instructor rating (Question 2)
         - Level of Demand (Questions 3 & 4)

   To get these scores:
   - Go to the online assessment information pages: http://assessment.aas.duke.edu/
   - Select “Course Evaluations” from the menu on the left (in green)
   - Select “Course Evaluation Department Log-in View” under “Accessing”
   - Log in using your Net ID and password. (NOTE: you MUST have viewing rights for the evaluations. Normally the DUS, DUSA, and Department Business Manager are granted access, but it varies from department to department. If you don’t have access to the information, contact the Assessment Office.)
   - Once you’ve logged in, you should see a screen with a list of the teaching faculty in your department (on the left side of the screen) and the reports menu for the last semester.
   - To get the information for an INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBER (for Item 1), select that person from the list on the left side of the screen. Then look under “Individual Reports.” The course or courses taught by that faculty member during the last semester will appear there. Select the course listed. (When there are multiple courses listed, you must select one at a time).
   - You should see a message box asking you to either open or save the Adobe (pdf) file.
   - Open the file (click “OK”)
   - You should now see the report with the faculty scores. All you need are the OVERALL scores for Question 1 (quality of the **course**), Question 2 (quality of the **instruction** – which refers to the
faculty), and Questions 3 and 4 (which combined, give you the “level of demand” on the students). NOTE: Question 2 may contain several scores. Use the score for INSTRUCTOR 1. (If a course was team-taught or had a Teaching Apprentice, the scores for those instructors are indicated as Instructor 2, 3, and 4). You will need to get the average for Questions 3 and 4. Simply add the OVERALL score for both questions, then divide by 2. This will give you the average score. Don’t forget that you will need to select previous semesters to see all the course evaluation reports for a particular faculty member. To do this, select a different semester from the top of the faculty list.

• To get the DEPARTMENTAL averages (for Items 2 & 3), look under the DEPARTMENTAL section of the report. There are 3 options. The SECOND one (the one that ends with “APT”) is the only report you really need. It gives you the scores for Questions 1, 2, and the combined score for Questions 3 & 4. You can plug those numbers into your tabular summary. NOTE: You might want to look at the first report because it gives you the departmental scores for ALL the questions. You can see how the scores vary for majors and non majors and for small classes to large ones in case that’s important for your department. Also, there might be another question, such as “Question 5: Intellectual stimulation” that your department would like to include on the tabular summary. You CAN use this report to get the departmental averages. Just look for the OVERALL score for Question 1 (quality of the course) and Question 2 (quality of the instruction – which refers to the faculty). However, you will need to average the OVERALL scores for Questions 3 and 4. These two questions refer to the “level of demand” on the students. Simply add the two scores together, then divide the sum by 2 to get the average. Plug these scores into your Tabular Summary.

• Final tip: If you use Excel to create your Tabular Summary, then once you’ve plugged in all the individual faculty scores, you can make Excel do the averaging.

b. All teacher course evaluation forms. (Note: For internal promotion to full professor provide only evaluations for those courses taught since the tenure review.) For those courses having enrollments larger than 30, a random sample of course evaluations, with a description of how the sample was chosen and from what base, may be provided.

c. For external candidates, the department will need to use its judgment on the best way to provide information equivalent to items 1 and 2 the above.

9. Grant History/Information: Including pending and recently awarded grants. A summary sheet is acceptable

10. Other documentation, including:

Any other material considered relevant by the candidate or the department

a. All other materials received related to this evaluation

b. Explanation of any omission from this list of requested materials