

# **Reappointment, Promotion, & Tenure Guidelines**

**[Updated 2025]**

## **Contents**

- I. [Reappointment](#)
  - a. [Dossier Materials](#)
  - b. [Dossier Review](#)
    - i. [Tenured/Tenure-Eligible](#)
    - ii. [Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty](#)
    - iii. [Non-Renewal for Assistant Professors](#)
- II. [Promotion & Tenure](#)
  - a. [Non-Tenure Eligibility Faculty Promotion](#)
  - b. [Tenure Eligible Faculty Promotion](#)
  - c. [Reviews for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor](#)
  - d. [Recruiting Pre-Tenure Professors](#)
  - e. [Target of Opportunity Hiring](#)
- III. [External Evaluations](#)
- IV. [Promotion to Full Professor Reviews](#)
- V. [Budgetary Joint Appointments Reviews](#)
- VI. [RPT Committee](#)
- VII. [RPT Timeline](#)
- VIII. [Appendix A – Dossier Components](#)
- IX. [Appendix B – Detailed External Referee Selection Process](#)

## I. Reappointment

Faculty on multi-year, term appointments (including non-tenure eligible and tenure-eligible professors in their probationary period) are reviewed for renewal beginning in the penultimate year of their term. The review is based on a dossier of materials compiled by the candidate for renewal. Materials provided by candidates should be secured and submitted digitally to Northwestern's Faculty Folio platform (*powered by Interfolio*). The department advances the submission to the Dean's office for review by the school's RPT committee.

### a. Dossier Materials

The candidate's dossier should include:

- i An updated curriculum vita
- ii A narrative statement on teaching, scholarship, and service.
- iii Evidence of impact in the following areas:
  1. **Teaching:** evidence of teaching effectiveness should include sample syllabi, student evaluations, documentation of mentoring and advising activities, information about student outcomes, peer evaluations of teaching, teaching awards, etc.
  2. **Research/creative activities:** evidence of productivity and impact for research/creative activities is provided by the curriculum vita, which can be supported by sample outputs such as publications, digitized programs or photographs from productions, and digitized media products (e.g., films, sound art, interactive art). Evidence of impact such as expert reviews, counts of citations, h-index, etc. may also be included.
  3. **Service to Northwestern:** evidence of a commitment to leadership and service should include a description of any special contributions made to the administration of a program, department, school, center/institute, or university and may include information about the success of the entity and peer evaluations of effectiveness.

Detailed expectations for a candidate's dossier, may be found in [Appendix A](#) of these guidelines.

### b. Dossier Review

#### i Tenured/Tenure-Eligible

The dossier is initially reviewed by appropriate at-rank or above faculty (tenured Associate and Full Professors) from the candidate's department. As the dossier is reviewed, the faculty should consider whether the candidate should be warned of non-renewal. The faculty must vote on this question. The department chair will forward to the Dean the following:

1. Complete Dossier
2. Report of the Vote
3. Statement on the recommendation of renewal, tenure appointment, promotion, or non-renewal

#### ii Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty

In the case of non-tenured faculty appointments, the Dean considers the recommendation of the department before deciding whether to renew the appointment. Renewal may be made contingent on specific improvements to be made by the faculty member. For faculty on such "probationary appointments," it is critical that the individual work with the department chair and faculty colleagues to understand the improvements needed to make and implement them. Failure to do so is cause for the non-renewal of the probationary appointment.

#### iii Non-Renewals for Assistant Professor Appointments

In the case of Assistant Professor appointments, the Dean directs the School of Communication RPT committee to study and discuss the candidate's dossier and the department's recommendation before voting on whether the candidate should be warned of non-renewal. The RPT Committee provides its recommendation on this matter to the dean in the form of a vote and a written report outlining the reasons for recommending renewal and non-renewal. The committee is also encouraged to advise the dean regarding any concerns they have about the candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion.

The Dean then considers the dossier, the department report, the report of the RPT committee, and confidential external advisors (see section III a.) to decide whether to issue a warning of non-renewal along with a one-year, terminal contract or to provide a multi-year term contract extending through the remainder of the probationary period. The Dean communicates this decision to the candidate, the department, and the Provost.

#### iv **Named Professorships**

Faculty who hold named professorships are reviewed before being reappointed to the named professorship. The criteria for review include a continued record of excellent scholarship or artistic production, teaching, and service. Reviews are conducted by the dean.

## II. **Promotion & Tenure**

Promotion with tenure, and promotions to the next academic rank are significant milestones in a faculty member's academic career. These milestones are meant to recognize faculty who demonstrate sustained professional accomplishment that contributes to the success of their industry, department, the school and university, while demonstrating a commitment to our vision of [serious play](#) – through collaboration, research, and scholarship that creates real impact in the real world.

### a. **Non-Tenure Eligibility Faculty Promotions**

The School of Communication's [Policy on Appointment and Promotion for Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty](#) may be found on the [SoC Faculty Affairs](#) website.

### b. **Tenure-Eligible Faculty Promotions**

#### i **Reviews for tenure appointment and promotion to Associate Professor**

The recommendation to award indefinite tenure to a faculty member should be made only after a thorough study of the candidate's record and careful deliberation within the department and the RPT Committee. *The central question to be decided is whether it is in the best interest of the institution to award tenure.* The school's RPT Committee carries a special responsibility to put aside other concerns and represent the best interest of the School and the [University](#), in advising the Dean, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Trustees about each case it considers.

In considering the award of tenure, Northwestern seeks to apply the highest standards with respect to professional achievement in the areas of scholarship/creative work and teaching. Each case is evaluated on its own merits. Northwestern aims at the superlative in both teaching and research; and, when making a recommendation for tenure, a department and school must feel able to affirm that the candidate in question constitutes as good a permanent appointment in their area as we are capable of making, now or in the foreseeable future, given both the candidate's accomplishments to date and reasonable expectations as to future accomplishments.

In evaluating the case for tenure, the department, the RPT Committee, and the Dean are expected to adhere to the standards and practices described on the Provost's [website](#). Recommendations of the department and RPT Committee to the Dean, and the recommendations the Dean makes to the Provost and President, are advisory and are treated as input to a multistep university process in which the Board of Trustees is vested with the authority to award tenure and/or promotion.

## ii Recruiting Pre-Tenure Professors

Departments may recruit faculty either as pre-tenure professors, in which case they arrive with an explicit probationary period, or as associate or full professors who will be appointed to tenured positions. For pre-tenure faculty, the department may determine that it would be appropriate, with the consent of the candidate, to conduct the review prior to the last year of the probationary period. However, most reviews of pre-tenure faculty begin from late fall to early spring quarter of the year before the probationary period ends and conclude at the end of the probationary period.

The department works with the candidate to assemble the case for awarding tenure. This takes the form of a dossier that provides evidence of effectiveness in teaching quality and impact in research/creative activities, and leadership in service. It must include a curriculum vita, a statement of teaching philosophy and practice, and an overview of the candidate's research/creative aims and achievements. See [Appendix A](#) for additional details.

## iii Target of Opportunity Hiring

Off-cycle target-of-opportunity tenured hires fall outside typical search protocols and have a truncated review process by sheer nature of the opportunity. Standard things such as personal, teaching, and research statements are not required for review by the department or RPT, especially given that TOOs emerge off cycle and require that a department and the dean's office be nimble and move quickly to recruit the faculty.

Target-of-opportunity tenured hires that emerge within the context of a traditional search (e.g., a search for one person leads to a request to hire more because of the strength of the pool, etc.) will, by default, have provided cover letters that provide commentary on research and teaching, in addition to letters of recommendation, which should be sufficient for the RPT review, along with the external letters.

## III. External Evaluations

If a review involves tenure or promotion beyond the rank of Assistant Professor, **at least six** (but generally not more than eight) confidential letters of evaluation from experts in the candidate's field of research/creative activity, *all from different peer institutions*, are solicited. These expert evaluations include the assessment of the impact of the candidate's scholarly and/or artistic contributions in the field. Proposed reviewers tendered by both the candidate and faculty members must be reviewed and approved by the Dean. Once approved, reviewers are provided with the candidate's vita, personal statement, and samples of research/creative output, as well as any information about the reception and impact of the candidate's work within relevant communities (e.g., reviews, citations, h-index, etc.).

These individuals ("referees") are ideally highly respected, tenured professors working at peer institutions in a specialty area close to the candidate's own. In cases where a candidate's achievements include contributions to the arts and sciences as practiced outside universities (e.g., to theatre, game development, organizational design, etc.), the department may also nominate some distinguished nonacademic experts who are sufficiently knowledgeable about faculty evaluation that they can navigate the special demands of a promotion and tenure review.

Referees should be “at arm’s length” from the candidate, that is should not have a conflict of interest in evaluating the candidate, such as would be the case with a former mentor, collaborator, friend, current NU faculty, or someone who is known as either publicly or privately opposed to the candidate’s scholarly views or artistic/professional work. Letters should not be solicited from students.

#### a. Nominating Referees

The candidate should nominate a list of **at least** ten referees. The department should add to this their list of **at least** ten additional confidential referees. For each proposed referee, the department will submit via the [External Referee Nomination Form](#), and provide a current curriculum vita for the referee.

The Dean will review the nominees, reserving up to five referees for confidential advisement letters, these are not shared with the department or RPT committee; they are seen only by the Dean, Provost, and University President. The remaining approved names are available to the department to be solicited for reviews. The department should seek to balance the reviews it acquires, collecting an equal number of evaluations by referees drawn from the candidate’s list and the department’s list.

#### b. Department Communications with Referees

The department chair should email prospective reviewers a request to serve as a referee for the case. If the reviewer agrees, department administrators will send instructions for the evaluation including appropriate files from the dossier via Faculty Folio. Referees may ask for the dossier on paper or another physical medium such as DVD, and we will accommodate such requests in a secured, confidential manner. The [Office of Faculty Affairs](#) can address any questions regarding dissemination of case materials. **It should be noted that only the research and creative work files, CV, and personal statement sections of the dossier are disseminated for external review. The teaching and service activity files are only evaluated internally by the department, RPT committee, Dean, Provost, and President.**

### IV. Department Recommendation

Once the dossier is complete (including letters solicited from external evaluators), the tenured faculty of the department, of appropriate rank, will meet to deliberate and decide whether to recommend tenure for the candidate. If the candidate is already at the rank of associate professor, only full professors may deliberate on the case. A faculty member enjoying a close relationship with the candidate (familial, best friend, collaborator, former advisor, etc.) or with another candidate in the search should recuse themselves from the review, discussion, and vote.

All voters should have reviewed the candidate’s dossier. Voters must also read the external evaluation letters for the candidates. Faculty members will read materials securely even if they are away from campus using password secured files or secured links to materials. The faculty discuss the candidate’s qualities, their standing relative to the career cohort, and vote by anonymous ballot. The vote must be Yes-No-Abstain on the appointment of the candidate in question.

#### a. Letter of analysis for tenure recommendation

Following faculty deliberation and vote, the chair or chair appointee prepares a department recommendation to the Dean in the form of a letter. This letter of analysis for tenure recommendation is signed by all members of the department that evaluated and voted on the case, and should include the following information:

- The date of the meeting at which the case was evaluated and the names of all present who contributed to the discussion and voted on the case.
- The actual vote tally detailing the number of individuals voting for and/or against recommending promotion and tenure, the number of abstentions, and the number of absences. The letter must account for all eligible voting faculty. The letter should identify:
  - Faculty names who were present for the discussion and voted
  - Faculty names who submitted absentee votes via email
  - Faculty names who were not present, did not vote, and why (e.g. on leave).
- A summary of the strengths and weaknesses presented in the case along with a detailed consideration of the evidence provided in the dossier (and especially, the input provided by the external reviews). This summary should reflect the actual issues discussed and conclusions reached by the faculty in its meeting to consider the case.

#### **b. RPT Committee & Dean Review**

Once the department recommendation has been made, the complete dossier and department recommendation are forwarded to the Office of the Dean. The Dean will charge the RPT Committee to study the materials, deliberate and vote on whether to recommend the award of tenure and rank, and provide the Dean with a letter of analysis, reporting the vote and summarizing the committee's analysis of the case.

The Dean will study the dossier, along with the recommendations provided by the department and RPT Committee and decide whether to forward the case to the Provost with a recommendation that tenure be awarded. If the Dean decides tenure should not be awarded, the candidate and department are notified.

### **V. Promotion To Full Professor**

Promotion to the rank of professor is appropriate when the faculty member has achieved a high level of distinction, supported by clear evidence of deep and broad influence in the field and the prospect of continued excellence. Such distinction may be based in part on the work that earned tenure, but it must also be grounded in significant, well-known scholarship (or equivalent activity) accomplished since that time. The department, RPT Committee, Dean, and Provost look for a demonstration that the candidate has fulfilled the promise seen at the time of the tenure decision.

Likewise, it is expected that through steady development of talents, the candidate has attained a level of excellence in classroom teaching, advising of undergraduates, and mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows (if relevant). The candidate should also have built a record of active and productive service to SoC and the University. Such accomplishments – rather than time served or minimal satisfaction of some quantitative norm - are the measure of readiness for promotion to full professor. Each case must be considered on its own merits. The fact that Professor B has reached the same milestone as Professor A did when s/he/they were recently promoted is not sufficient grounds for promotion.

The candidate's major work completed since tenure is the heart of the review of research or other professional achievement. A faculty member best presents for promotion after that work is published unless the results of the post-tenure work have been widely disseminated and well-received before actual publication. Departments and candidates should note that it has become increasingly difficult to persuade referees to read unpublished manuscripts on short notice. Likewise, the RPT Committee raises questions about candidates whose new work has not yet had time to enter debates in the field. The Committee is skeptical of departmental promises that unpublished work is bound to be influential.



In addition, a candidate who submits an unpublished manuscript as the centerpiece of their promotion case should bear in mind that the top scholars in the field who read this draft version may not later read the final version. Therefore, one should think carefully about the timing of one's candidacy for promotion if the major work is still in manuscript.

If a candidate's research program depends on extramural funding, there must be clear evidence that they have secured such funding or is doing everything possible to do so to sustain a strong research program.

As in the case of tenure decisions, departments must carefully evaluate the readiness of the candidate for promotion to full professor. The role of the faculty is to evaluate a case for promotion against appropriately high standards and not merely to put the candidate forward when the individual feels ready.

## **VI. Budgetary Joint Appointment Reviews**

An increasing percentage of SoC faculty are hired in joint appointments that span one or more schools. Some of these joint appointments are "courtesy" and non-budgetary—that is, SoC is not responsible for paying any percentage of the base salary and benefits. Courtesy appointment letters and terms are initiated by the school offering the appointment.

Faculty may also hold budgetary joint appointments whereby some percentage of effort is paid jointly by SoC and other units, usually with a specified percentage of effort (and therefore salary and benefits) attributable to each program that participates in the appointment. In addition, some faculty who are initially not hired on joint appointments enter joint appointments after some time in service at Northwestern.

Budgetary joint appointments always reference the faculty member's "tenure home," which is the school (or schools) in which tenure is awarded. In general, the school that holds the larger percentage of a faculty member's effort serves as the tenure home, and the tenure home is responsible for carrying out any reviews for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, as well as the annual merit review.

Generally, when faculty are hired into budgetary joint appointments, the participating schools create an explicit agreement about how the school providing the tenure home will interact with the other partner(s) to arrive at recommendations about merit increases, reappointments, promotions, and tenure decisions.

Reviews for reappointment, promotion, and tenure should provide appropriate opportunities for consultation for schools that are participating in a budgetary joint appointment where SoC is the tenure home. A strategy for inclusion should be discussed and approved by the SoC dean prior to beginning the review. Some mechanisms for such consultation are:

- Soliciting nominations of external reviewers from the faculty in partner departments.
- Inviting the partner department to provide a summary evaluation of the case for use in SoC deliberations.
- Inviting the partner dean to review the dossier following receipt of the RPT Committee's recommendation and provide a recommendation on behalf of the partner school.

Where a joint appointment is not budgetary, but rather a matter of effort being assigned by SoC to a project or program outside the school (with or without compensation to SoC), it is appropriate to seek input from the other unit for annual reviews but there is no requirement to include the partner unit in reviews for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. This includes cases in which SoC faculty are:



- Committed to working in programs such as American Studies or Gender Studies (which cannot serve as tenure home),
- Appointed to teach at NUQ, and/or
- Given a reduced teaching load by virtue of appointment in a University Institute or Center.

## VII. REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE COMMITTEE

The RPT committee reviews all cases for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure coming out of the departments and provides the dean with its recommendation regarding the disposition of each case. While the review of the RPT Committee is advisory to the Dean, Provost, President, and Board of Trustees, the Committee's advice is a critical component of the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process. The committee's work is independent of the departmental evaluation and the members are charged with upholding the standards and processes of the School and the University. Committee members are elected from among the full and associate professors on appointments of at least 30% time within SoC.

RPT Committee membership is the result of an election by digital vote from tenure-eligible faculty in the three SoC Divisions:

- Division 1 includes the Departments of Theatre and Performance Studies.
- Division 2 includes the Department of Radio-Television-Film and Communication Studies.
- Division 3 consists of the Roxelyn and Richard Pepper Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders.

The committee is comprised of five members: two members from divisions 1 and 2, and one member from division 3, all elected on staggered terms. Members must be elected in such a way that every year all five departments be represented on the committee. Only faculty whose SoC home department is within a division may vote within that division. For election results to be certified as valid, at least 40% of eligible voters must return their ballots.

- For reviews of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the RPT Committee is comprised of tenured Associate Professors and Full Professors.
- For reviews of promotion to Full Professor, a subset of the RPT committee is comprised of only Full Professors.
- RPT committee members recuse themselves from the review, discussion and vote of any candidate from their home department.

Because they are required to present cases to the RPT Committee on behalf of the department, sitting department chairs are **not eligible** to serve on RPT. Faculty members are not eligible to serve on RPT while they are on leave; a faculty member who plans to be on leave during the upcoming term of office should not stand for election to RPT.

### *Deliberations of the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee*

The Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs serves as Ex Officio member of the RPT Committee to facilitate procedure and discussion. A primary reviewer is designated for each case and provides the summary to the Committee. However, each committee member is responsible for reviewing the case and participating in the discussion. As reviews across SoC are evaluated by the Committee, the committee member representing the candidate's home department is excused from the review and discussion.

RPT Committee members are also enjoined from having *ex parte* communications with the department representative about any case under discussion. The committee's deliberations are confidential and should not be discussed outside meetings, other than to report to the Dean. The committee may call upon the department chair to be available should the committee have questions about the case. Committee members should not attempt to secure such materials or carry out investigations of the case on their own.

## VIII. RPT TIMELINE

This master schedule provides guidance regarding milestones passed at each juncture in the faculty evaluation cycle. Review cycle begins in the academic year **prior** to the year of review (ex. AY25-26 review begins January 2025).



## Appendix A - Dossier Components

### Assembling a Dossier for RPT Reviews

Faculty are evaluated in terms of their effectiveness as teachers, productivity and impact as scholars or artists, and leadership in the various communities to which they contribute to service. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to assemble evidence of success in each area to make the best possible “case” for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure to the department, the RPT Committee, and the dean, provost, and president.

It is imperative that, to the greatest extent possible, materials are submitted for review in digital formats. Candidates are asked to make every effort to submit work as digital files or links to websites. Dossiers, once submitted, will be reviewed by the department chair, and subsequently moved into the review process, in accordance with our workflow. No changes are allowed to the dossier once it is sent to external reviewers, in order to prevent issues with unequal access to the same file contents or information by the different reviewing bodies. **It should be noted that only the research and creative work files, CV, and personal statement sections of the dossier are disseminated for external review. The teaching and service activity files are only evaluated internally by the department, RPT committee, Dean, Provost, and President.**

Some of the following elements are required; others are suggested and may or may not be useful depending on the candidate’s specialty area. It will be helpful if the dossier is carefully arranged. For example, all teaching materials (syllabi and evaluations) should be grouped together and arranged in chronological order. Reprints of material should indicate the source in which it appeared and the date. The goal in assembling the dossier is to present the best case, in the most convenient form, for examination at each level of review from department to provost and president

1. **REQUIRED** - Current Curriculum Vita, and should be comprised of the following elements:
  - a. Biographical and educational data
  - b. Publications (books, journal, articles, etc.) and/or artistic accomplishments (plays written, directed, designed; films or video art; interactive art; installations, etc.)
  - c. Convention papers, workshops, etc.
  - d. Honors or awards received
  - e. Grants received
  - f. Department, school, and university service activities
  - g. Disciplinary leadership and service activities

The vita may also list the following, which are not required elements:

- a. Community activities and other activities that might be pertinent to the review.
  - b. Courses taught
  - c. Course evaluations (CTECS)
  - d. Curriculum development
  - e. Supervision of post-doctoral fellows
  - f. Direction of graduate theses, MFA projects, and dissertations
  - g. Undergraduate advising activities
  - h. Clinical supervision
2. **REQUIRED** - Candidate’s [Personal] Statement: Include a statement of approximately five to ten pages. This statement should be a reflective statement summarizing past accomplishments and future strategies in the areas of a) teaching, b) research or artistic accomplishments, and c) university and professional service. The personal statement provides a roadmap to a candidate’s vita and allows the candidate to provide a meaningful interpretation of their career trajectory.

3. **REQUIRED** - Teaching Portfolio, and should be comprised of the following elements:
  - a. Copies of teaching evaluations by students: At a minimum, the four quarters preceding the viewing must be included in the dossier; ideally candidates include all evaluations from the prior 4-5 years. These evaluations should be gathered using standard NU online systems. Letters from students should not be solicited for RPT purposes or included.
  - b. Sample syllabi.
  - c. Information about participation in mentoring, advising, academic counseling, co-curricular teaching, clinical supervision, and supervision of teaching assistants.

The teaching portfolio may also comprise other items including:

- a. If a candidate wishes to have classes observed, any peer observation material may be included.
  - b. Information about informal teaching activities, such as workshops given, co-teaching, classes covered for colleagues, and the like.
  - c. Information about student success and achievements.
4. **REQUIRED** - Samples of scholarly and/or artistic contributions:
  - a. Copies of selected books, computer software, videotapes, films, which one authored/created.
  - b. Digital copies of selected journal articles, book chapters, or other publications.
  - c. Digital copies of plays or scripts that have been produced or published.
  - d. Digital copies of photographs, graphics, or film/video that constitute or depict one's work.
  - e. Published reviews of artistic, creative, or scholarly endeavors
  - f. Any other material that documents significant contributions to the candidate's discipline.
5. **REQUIRED** – Service Report: A report of service contributions to the university, department, school, the professional community, and the local community is also required.

Dossiers for previously tenured faculty for promotion to professor should recognize the increasing opportunities and expectations for the distinction and impact of their work. Department, University, and Professional distinctive leadership weigh more heavily when compared to a candidate reviewed for tenure. If an individual has devoted substantial effort to heading a program or department, administering a school or center, organizing research collaborations, building disciplinary organizations/initiatives, and the like, that person's efforts and achievements should be documented in their dossier and weighted appropriately in evaluations of the candidate for promotion to professor. A trajectory of effective, innovative, and inclusive teaching should also be included.

## Appendix B – External Reviewer Selection Process

- **Goal:** at least 5 or 6 departmental letters—plus around 2 Dean’s—per tenure/promotion case:
  - All from separate peer institutions
  - All tenured
  - All at arm’s-length from the candidate
  - All in the same field as, or a specialty area close to, the candidate’s field
- **Timeline:**
  - **Early January:** RPT cases open to candidates in Interfolio
  - **Late Feb:** External Reviewer Nominee Forms are due
  - **March-April:** Initial contacts to reviewers are made after Dean approval, additional lists submitted if needed
  - **Late April:** Candidate dossiers are due
  - **May:** Confirmed external reviewers are provided dossier materials
  - **August 15:** External review letters are typically due, there is some flexibility depending on the department’s Fall meeting schedule to discuss cases
    - **Note:** the department should NOT review or vote on cases before all confirmed external review letters are received
- **Process:**
  - The candidate should provide a list of at least 10 tenured potential referees who are at arm’s length from them (not friends, collaborators on publications or grants, former mentors, overlapped at the same institution prior)
    - **Note:** the majority of the nominees should be tenured full professors; therefore, **teaching professors, clinical professors, professors of practice would not be eligible** as those are usually not tenured faculty; some associate-level tenured professors are okay for associate cases only, but should hopefully not be the majority of reviewers in any case
  - The department should add to this their list of at least 10 additional potential confidential referees, similarly tenured and at arm’s length from the candidate
    - **Note:** in cases where a candidate’s achievements include contributions to the arts and sciences as practiced outside universities (e.g., to theatre, game development, organizational design, etc.), the **department may also nominate some distinguished nonacademic experts** who are sufficiently knowledgeable about faculty evaluation
  - Submit these names for Dean approval via the [Nomination Form](#), and provide a current CV for each referee, if available
  - The Dean will review the nominees, reserving up to 5 referees for confidential advisement letters and approving/declining others
    - **Note:** Dean’s letters are not shared with the department or RPT committee; they are seen only by the Dean, Provost, and University President
    - **Note:** we don’t want multiple reviewers from the same institution, so if the Dean approves multiple options from the same institution, you should only approach one at a time (i.e. if one declines, *then* you can move on to the next option from the same institution); if the Dean reserves a nominee from that institution, however, the department cannot approach the others, so please keep these aspects in mind when submitting multiple options from the same institution
  - The Chair or BA approaches those names approved by the Dean preliminarily, creating a preliminary list of those who have agreed to serve for Faculty Affairs’ review prior to sending any dossier materials

- After the list is okayed and finalized, and dossier materials have been turned in, the reviewers are provided the candidate's materials via Interfolio
  - **Note:** only the CV, personal statement, and research/creative work portfolio sections are sent out for review, the teaching portfolio and service report sections are only evaluated internally
  - **Note:** referees may ask for the dossier on paper or another physical medium such as DVD, and we will accommodate such requests in a secured, confidential manner; Faculty Affairs can address any questions regarding dissemination of case materials

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Related Information:

[Faculty Handbook](#)

[SoC Faculty Handbook](#)

[Policy on Tenure and Promotion Standards and Procedures, Office of the Provost](#)

#### Contacts:

You may reach out to your department chair with questions related to this policy:

- [Jeremy Birnholtz](#), Chair, Communication Studies
- [Henry Godinez](#), Chair, Theatre
- [Joshua Chambers-Letson](#), Chair, Performance Studies
- [Jacob Smith](#), Interim Chair, Radio/Television/Film
- [Bharath Chandrasekaran](#), Chair, Communication Sciences and Disorders
- [Bonnie Martin-Harris](#), Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs
- [Katherine Steinbach](#), Director of Faculty Affairs

#### Previous version:

- [SoC RPT Guidelines, 2023](#)

Policy URL: <https://nuwildcat.sharepoint.com/sites/SoC-CommPortal/SitePages/Faculty-Affairs.aspx>