Checklist for Material Requested by the Provost for Dossiers for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Regular Rank, Non-Tenure Track Faculty – Updated 9/15/11

Candidate’s Materials*
- CV
- 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 (if solicited)
- Sample request letter
- Statement identifying and describing external evaluators contacted, if applicable (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), publisher(s) and artistic venue(s)

Department Chair’s Materials
- Chair’s report
- Supplementary documents
  - Voting policy
  - List of those voting
  - Draft reappointment review summary

Dean’s Letter
- Supplementary materials
  - Any additional materials provided by the dean

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

*=materials to be provided by candidate
Materials Requested by Provost for Dossiers for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Regular Rank, Non-Tenure Track Faculty

For reappointment and/or promotion of regular rank, non-tenure track faculty, the Provost requires one electronic copy saved in Adobe PDF. (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. 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 higher degree, title of thesis/dissertation, and name of 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 e 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 produced after appointment at Duke.
5. Include external funding applications and awards.

b. 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

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

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

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

f. Alphabetical list of collaborators

2. External letters/evaluations of candidate's work, if solicited.

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

b. If evaluators have been contacted, a statement identifying them all:

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 and 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.

d. A fully descriptive log of all additional contacts with evaluators, potential evaluators, and any other individuals contacted 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.

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

NOTES: About selection of evaluators:

1. Evaluators are expected to hold, at least, the rank for which the candidate is being reviewed.
2. Normally co-authors, co-investigators, dissertation and/or postdoctoral supervisors, and former department colleagues (and, for internal candidates, colleagues at universities in the Research Triangle area) are considered to be too closely connected to candidates under review. Deans are expected to return files to the originating academic units for additional letters when evaluators are found to be closely connected with the candidate. Should the department believe that there are too few qualified independent evaluators to meet the requirement specified above, the department chair should explain this situation fully in his/her report.

NOTE: About external evaluations/letters:

University policy requires external evaluations only for appointments/reappointments/promotions to the full rank, in which case at least three independent external evaluations are required.

3A. Faculty Committee Report(s) to Departmental Faculty

a. Search Committee's Report should contain:

1. Recapitulation of the search process
2. Candidate-by-candidate assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of short list candidates
3. Published ad, indicating in which journals it was placed

b. 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 are to be included in all Faculty Review Committee Reports (template available):

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/artistic 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 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/artistic 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, publishers, and artistic venues having accepted work by the candidate, including descriptions of the following:

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

4. Report from Department Chair to Dean

NOTE: Chair's report is confidential; not to be drafted by or shared with department faculty.

a. The following headings are to be included in all chairs' reports (template available):

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 reappointment candidates: A draft summary of the review for the candidate, to be reviewed by the Dean and Provost
2. 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).

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

   a. The following headings are to be included in all deans' assessments:
      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. Dean's critical perspective and independent recommendation

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

   b. All supplementary information solicited by the Dean to inform his/her recommendation, including the Dean's request for such information.

6. Provide copies of the candidate's most important, influential publications and professional contributions, as listed in Item 1e above and identified by numbers on the CV

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

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 since his/her last review:
         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)

      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/](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 since his/her last 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. Place a copy of the individual course summary evaluation returned with the individual evaluations themselves at the beginning of each set of evaluations that use the new, computer-scannable forms. Write on this summary sheet the instructor's name, the semester, the year, and the catalogue course number for the
following packet of evaluations. For example, Political Science has identified evaluations in a dossier for course number 2004 as those for Professor _____, PS 142, fall 2001.

d. 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, both pending and recently awarded – *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