Summary of Procedures
The Ad Hoc Review

In November, the Dean’s Office supplies each ad hoc committee with its candidate’s materials. The committee chairperson should call the committee together promptly to review the files. If anything is missing or inadequate (for example, explanation of candidate’s work, suggested benchmarks), please notify Steven Cole, Assistant Dean for Faculty Advancement (7-0578; fax 1-4289; email s-cole@northwestern.edu) at once so that he can request additional materials from the department.

Within 7-10 days of receiving the dossier, please send the Dean’s Office a list of referees (at least an initial set), benchmarks, and the candidate’s field as it should be specified in the letter. We now tell departments to star the crucial referees. We will automatically write to those so marked. It is imperative that we get the letters out quickly. Referees and benchmarks should be affiliated with top-rated schools (based on NRC rankings, for example). In unusual circumstances, owing to the specialized nature of a discipline or subfield, some top referees or benchmarks may be at less stellar schools; care should be taken to explain the choice of such persons.

Ad hoc committees should try to come up with the names of additional referees over and above those supplied by the department. If you need help coming up with names of referees, benchmarks, or their addresses, the Dean’s Office can help.

Special urgency: when a candidate’s major work (especially a book) is unpublished or has just appeared, it may be necessary to request that some referees undertake to read much material with which they are unfamiliar. These referees must be lined up promptly, before they are overwhelmed with like requests from other schools.

The ad hoc committee report is a crucial element in the promotion review, especially since its members read the referees’ letters in an unedited form, an advantage not accorded the department. It is essential that the report

- analyze the letters and other materials to make a case why a candidate has or has not met the high standards for promotion;
- demonstrate that the committee canvassed a strong set of referees who are not all in the candidate’s narrowly defined subfield;
- evaluate carefully the candidate’s record as an educator;
- indicate both strengths and weaknesses of the case as reflected in the materials, but especially the letters from external evaluators. It is especially important not to gloss over negative comments in the letters. The committee should thoughtfully consider all such views and present a detailed analysis of such opinions in the report.

Each member of the ad hoc committee votes YES or NO. If the committee wishes to use a scale of its own to indicate the strength of its convictions, it may do so, as long as the meaning of its scale is spelled out clearly. If there are doubts about the excellence of the work, the appropriate vote is no. The report should indicate how many members (but not who) voted at each level of enthusiasm.

Ad hoc committee reports are requested in early February to allow sufficient time for departments to review them and to respond if a recommendation is split, equivocal, or negative.

If the Dean’s Office finds that the report is likely to be questioned by the Committee on Tenure, the Dean’s Office will provide the ad hoc committee with a request for additional information or analysis.
To:    Members of Confidential Ad Hoc Committees

From:  Adrian Randolph, Dean

This paragraphs below are intended to describe some guidelines and official procedures regarding the review for
tenure. The guidelines are suggestions, intended to help orient colleagues in performing their work. They have been
generated by colleagues over the years and help steer colleagues who may be new to the process. The section on
“procedures” defines the official procedures that define our process. These are regulations as opposed to advice or
guidelines.

GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

I. Role of the Confidential Ad Hoc Committee

The report of the ad hoc committee is a vital part of the promotion review. The Committee on Tenure, the Dean,
and the Provost all rely on the report for a thorough discussion of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses as a
teacher-scholar, his or her standing relative to the benchmarks, and whether the candidate meets the standards for
promotion. It should discuss the nature of the candidate’s most important work, address the likelihood of the
candidate continuing to make truly exceptional contributions, and include some discussion of the breadth of the
candidate’s influence. The opinions of specific referees should be discussed in the body of the report, but the report
must be more than a synopsis of referee opinion. The best reports present the committee's collective deliberations
and conclusions. The committee must convey through synopsis the opinions of specific referees, using these as the
basis for a description of the committee’s collective deliberations. All members should sign the report before
delivering it to the Dean or arrange to stop by and sign it shortly thereafter.

II. Standards

Tenure. A recommendation of tenure implies the claim that the candidate in question constitutes as good a
permanent appointment in his or her area as the College is capable of making, now or in the foreseeable future. Such a
judgment must be based both on the candidate’s accomplishments to date and on the evidence that informs
expectations about future achievement. Tenure is not awarded for competent service, solid research, and adequate
teaching. (See Enclosure 6 for the full statement of standards from the Chairperson’s Handbook.)

The committee evaluates first and foremost the work completed during the probationary period at Northwestern or
at a peer institution. Earlier accomplishments that have enduring influence on the field should also be highlighted but
the candidate’s potential for intellectual leadership rests on his or her independent scholarship.

In its appointments to tenure, the College aims at the superlative. Apart from the fundamentally important activities
of meeting classes and doing research, a faculty member will influence students in many other ways, will play a
considerable role in the work of colleagues, and will affect the directions in which the institution develops. From a
different perspective, the dollars that are committed to a faculty member who makes his or her career at Northwest-
ern can be spent in no other way. We cannot afford to compromise the highest standards.

Please note that some candidates for tenure have been granted an extension of the probationary term. Because
extensions are intended to compensate for external factors that take time away from scholarship (illness, parenthood,
e.g.) such candidates should be held to the same standards as those without extensions and not to some higher
threshold.

Teaching, research and citizenship. The quality of a candidate’s teaching and his or her potential as a teacher are
major factors affecting the decision to promote. Teaching is defined broadly; it means not simply the ability to
lecture, but also the faculty member’s role vis-à-vis undergraduates and graduate students in various contexts, from
lecture halls and seminars to independent study and advising. Mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral
fellows (if relevant) is of course a highly significant part of teaching, as it involves nothing less than the preparation of the next generation’s intellectual leaders, both within and beyond the academy. An institution devoted to instruction must weigh the quality of teaching in all decisions regarding its faculty. There is no simple formula for good teaching, but effective instructors are often described in terms of imagination, high standards, conscientiousness, clarity, a feel for what is important and original, and respect for students. This may be seen in classroom style, course development, and guidance provided to TAs. Improvement in quality of instruction during a faculty member’s years here should be taken into account, as should the ability to engage students actively rather than just to impart information.

Excellent teaching and excellent research are not opposed alternatives. Northwestern’s standing as a university permits it to require excellence in both.

Candidates are also evaluated with respect to their research and creative achievement. In most cases, this takes the form of activity that issues in publication. In areas such as art, analogous forms of professional achievement can readily be identified. While the quantity of a candidate’s completed work must be considered, the ad hoc committee is asked, above all, to assess its quality and its influence on the field.

In addition, the quantity and quality of achievement must be regarded as evidence for the degree of commitment to, and mastery of, a field of knowledge, as well as for the quality of the candidate’s mind. On this basis one can venture inferences about future professional accomplishments.

The university depends on the good citizenship and service of its faculty members. Note should be taken of participation in various activities relating to governance of the academic community.

III. Procedures

Confidentiality. Identities of ad hoc committee members are confidential, known only to each other and the Dean. Please do not reveal your role to other colleagues or to external referees. In order to preserve the anonymity of the committee’s members, the Dean corresponds on its behalf with the candidate’s department and with external and student referees. Identities of all referees are likewise held in confidence. If you need additional information from a referee, please ask Steven Cole to call for you.

First Meeting. The chair of the committee promptly calls the other members to meet and discuss referees, benchmarks, and other matters related to the case.

Materials. Each member of an ad hoc committee will have on-line access to the department letter, external letters collected by the department, candidate’s CV, statement, teaching materials, course evaluations, articles, etc. Books will be delivered to each member’s departmental mailbox.

• If the committee needs to know more about a candidate’s research, service, or teaching and advising, the Dean’s Office will forward the request promptly to the department.

• If the department letter is insufficiently informative, the committee can request amplification.

• If the committee judges the referees or benchmarks to be insufficiently strong, it can ask the department to provide other names.

Recommendation to withdraw. Normally, the confidential ad hoc committee advises on the strength of a candidate for promotion. For candidates who are not in their year of mandatory consideration for tenure, however, the committee has the further option of advising that the candidate’s department consider postponing its recommendation to a later year. If, in the committee’s view, the evidence suggests prima facie that this latter course may be appropriate, the committee should bring that possibility to the Dean’s attention in the fall before soliciting letters from faculty and student referees.
Soliciting letters from external referees

**Timing:** Please give Steven Cole the go-ahead to line up referees within 7-10 days of receiving access to the file. The sooner letters to referees go out, the more likely a committee is to get an adequate response, especially from the more distinguished referees. When the candidate’s promotion hinges on an unpublished manuscript, the urgency becomes acute. The Dean’s Office attempts to get all letters out before Winter break, hoping to get responses by the end of January. (See “Mechanics,” below.)

**Selecting and contacting external referees.** The committee should select referees from among those named by the department and generate names of additional referees on its own. We now allow departments to flag the most essential referees and we promise that these scholars will be invited to write. Many ad hoc committees give less weight to letters that the department has received simply because of the lower level of confidentiality. Letters sent directly to the Dean will not be discounted on the basis that some were identified by the department.

In recent years, many committees have collected so many letters that the Central Administration has deemed them to be excessive. In the absence of special conditions – e.g. the candidate works in two fields, mixed letters at the departmental level, contradictory information in the file – the committee should try to restrict the number of letters to eight per candidate. The committee should prioritize referees so that the Dean’s Office can quickly poll a second wave of referees if those in the initial set decline. Of course, the numbers of potential referees who will need to be invited to write will be larger than eight. Although referees should be close enough to the candidate’s work to be competent judges, they should not all be from the same narrowly defined subfield as the candidate. Particularly when a candidate has been recommended for promotion to full professor, it is reasonable to expect that his or her work has influenced a broader group of scholars. Moreover, most of the referees should come from top-rated departments or otherwise be leaders in the field. They should be full professors, or exceptionally in tenure cases, be stellar associate professors.

Because external evaluators must be able to provide an objective evaluation of the work, it is essential that ad hoc committees ascertain the relationship of those individuals with the candidate so that letters will not be sought from persons who cannot provide an arm’s-length evaluation. The ad hoc committee should not seek evaluations from former advisors, post-doctoral supervisors, close personal friends, or others having a relationship with the candidate that might reduce objectivity. If a candidate publishes co-authored works in a field where co-authorship is not the accepted norm, and the ad hoc committee wishes to call on one of the co-authors to comment on the candidate’s dossier, it should clarify why it is necessary or desirable to do so.

- The ad hoc committee emails (s-cole@northwestern.edu) to the Dean’s Office the names and affiliations of proposed referees, along with the candidate’s “specific field” and names of benchmarks, both of which are included in the letter to referees.

- The Dean’s Office emails each referee asking for his or her participation. Significant publications (especially books and unpublished manuscripts) are offered at that time. (See Enclosure 2) Each referee receives a packet of publications designated by the candidate.

- The Dean’s Office informs the committee of the status of the responses and passes along recommendations regarding additional potential referees.

- The Dean sends a formal letter like Enclosure 3. The ad hoc committee may wish to rephrase it in light of the particular concerns in a given case, such as a high rate of collaboration. A copy of the CV is included with the letter, as are requested publications.

**Paid readers.** The Dean’s Office can offer a small honorarium to a few external referees for evaluating a candidate’s work if a completed manuscript has not yet been published or a published book has not yet been reviewed. Please let Steven Cole know which referees should be approached as “paid readers.” A sample letter is in Enclosure 4.
Student referees. Faculty legislation (November 1976) stipulates that each ad hoc committee solicit from former students of the candidate “written assessments of his or her teaching comparable to those required of the academic referees.” Names of some students are provided by the department. The Dean’s Office routinely selects a sample of 25 additional graduate and undergraduate students from various of the candidate’s classes and from among advisees. If the committee has special instructions – about polling a large number of graduate students, for example – please communicate those preferences to the Dean’s Office. Normally a committee should end up with 8-12 responses. Enclosure 5 goes to the candidate’s former students.

A candidate who was evaluated recently. If the candidate has been considered for promotion (or appointment) during the past three years, the ad hoc committee may see the letters from external referees that were solicited at that time. The committee should seek letters from other referees to supplement those; it may also draft letters (for the Dean’s signature) to the previous referees requesting an evaluation of work since that time.

Mechanics

Publications. The candidate supplies originals and eventually they will find their way back to him or her. Members of the committee are asked not to mark or write on them.

Distinction of referees. The Dean’s Office needs a brief description of the importance of each referee not on the department’s list. If the committee chooses benchmarks not on the department’s list, then we will need a brief comment on them as well.

Criteria for benchmarks. Only persons who would be given serious consideration for an appointment at Northwestern should be benchmarks. They should be leaders in the candidate’s field who are slightly ahead in academic age and who have already attained the rank proposed for the candidate. If the committee would like information about the qualifications of those benchmarks suggested by the department, the Dean’s Office will request it from the department. If the department’s letter argues that naming specific benchmarks is not appropriate for the candidate, and if the committee accepts that argument, external referees will be asked to specify comparable scholars (see the alternative paragraph in Enclosure 3).

Second wave of letters. If the response rate is low or if names of additional referees come to light, letters may be sent out until mid-January. The Dean’s Office will report to the committee in January about the state of responses, noting who has received the candidate’s publications.

IV. The Report

Due date. The committee’s report, which must be signed by all members, is submitted to the Dean in early February.

Content. The report should demonstrate that a thorough review was undertaken and that the candidate’s work and promise have been measured against high standards. The following items should be incorporated into the report.

- The nature of the candidate’s professional contributions.
- The strengths and the weaknesses of the candidate’s research, teaching, and service as reflected in the materials, especially the letters from external and student evaluators.
- The status and potential of ongoing work or “the second project,” as these relate to the candidate’s trajectory.
- Overall comparison of the candidate to the benchmarks in light of referee comments.
- The breadth of the candidate’s influence and likelihood that the candidate will make (or continue to make) exceptional contributions to the field.
Enclosure 2
Sample email to EXTERNAL REFEREES

- Quotations from external and student referees and an indication of whether some opinions carried more weight than others. The candidate’s department does not read the letters, so it is important that the ad hoc report quote significant negative views as well as positive comments. Please use the terms “referee A” or “student 3” rather than naming names in the report.

- The vote, number for and against promotion. Do not indicate who voted which way if the vote is split. If the committee wishes to use a scale of its own to indicate the strength of its convictions, it may do so, as long as the meaning of its scale is spelled out clearly. If there are doubts about the excellence of the work, the appropriate vote is no.

- The degree of the committee’s conviction in making its recommendation. In the case of a split vote, the committee may submit one report that reflects both the positive and negative positions or the members may choose to submit majority and minority reports.

Whatever the committee’s recommendation, its report should set forth the merits of the case objectively and dispassionately. The Dean, Provost and Committee on Tenure all rely on the analysis, standards, and evidence set forth by the ad hoc committee.

Who reads the report?

In addition to the Dean and Committee on Tenure, senior members of the department are allowed to read a redacted copy of the ad hoc report. They may not see the letters from external scholars or students. Accordingly, the report should include a full digest of and brief quotations from external referees’ letters. Students’ opinions should be similarly treated. Departments rely heavily on the report to gain insight into the candidate’s performance and standing. When an ad hoc committee’s vote is split or negative, it is especially important that the report give a full accounting of external opinion and the committee’s reasoning. Department readers, as well as the Committee on Tenure, ask that the report specify the opinions of any referee or referees that have weighed heavily in the committee’s decision, and explain why.

In a few cases where individuals have appealed a negative decision by the Dean, the College has been required to release the edited ad hoc committee report to the candidate, along with other materials.

After turning in the report.

Reports will be reviewed by the Dean’s Office with an eye to the kinds of questions the Committee on Tenure often raises. If necessary, the Dean’s Office will ask the ad hoc committee to clarify or amplify points in the report. (Not incidentally, the Committee on Tenure has complained about the brevity and vagueness of some ad hoc committees’ observations about the quality of candidates’ teaching.)

When the final decisions have been made, the Dean’s Office will notify you of the outcome of the case.

Thank you for participating in these important reviews.
Dear Professor Budge:

Northwestern University is currently reviewing Rupertina Stonehenge for the grant of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor of Celtic Languages. I am writing in advance of Dean Randolph’s formal letter to find out whether you would be willing to serve as a referee in this case. If so, or if you would like to see the vita before deciding, we will send you the full request. We hope to have letters of evaluation by January 13, 2020.

As you may know, Professor Stonehenge works in the field of Cornish vernacular literature. We have copies of her new manuscript, "View from the End of the World," along with several recent articles and her first book "Cornish Pasties in Literature and Song," and would be happy to send you whatever you would like to read. The Dean's advisory committee is interested in hearing not only from experts who are already conversant with Ms. Stonehenge's publications, but also from 'outsiders' who can provide a broader perspective or who can comment on only part of the work.

Finally, I wonder whether you might be able to suggest 2 or 3 other senior authorities in the field whom I might contact.

We would be grateful for any assistance you can give us in this important decision.

Sincerely,

Steven W. Cole  
Assistant Dean for Faculty Advancement  
Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences  
Northwestern University  
1918 Sheridan Road  
Evanston, IL 60208  
tel: 847.467.0578  
fax: 847.491.4289
Date

Professor Guernsey Hereford
Department of Decision Sciences
Utopia University
Alligator, Iowa 12345

Dear Professor Hereford:

Thank you for your assistance in our deliberations concerning the promotion of a member of our faculty. The Department of Managerial Economics has recommended that Cilkin Samarkand, now an assistant professor, be promoted to the rank of associate professor, a promotion that confers tenure. An ad hoc committee considering this recommendation has asked me to request your opinion of his professional work and standing as well as his future promise as a scholar.

The committee and I would appreciate having your views about the quality and the importance of Professor Samarkand's contributions to the study of toads in Market Forecasting. How much impact has his scholarship had? Which, if any, of the published works constitute fundamental and original contributions to the field? If his arguments are controversial, are they well-formulated and well-supported by both evidence and reasoning? Are there weaknesses we should be aware of? What is your expectation of his future career trajectory? If this candidate were a member of your department, would s/he be granted tenure at this time? Would you yourself vote for such a promotion in your department?

We would be especially grateful, moreover, for your comparative assessment of Prof. Samarkand with the very best scholars in the field who are roughly of the same seniority or slightly more advanced. Whom would you consider to be the foremost figures in that group? I have been told that benchmark1, benchmark2, and benchmark3 are appropriate benchmarks. Making appropriate allowances for differences in stages of careers, how does Prof. Samarkand stand in relation to them? If other scholars might better be compared with Samarkand, please specify them and compare their work and promise with his. Although such estimates are often not easy or comfortable to make, we often find them valuable.

A copy of Prof. Samarkand's curriculum vitae is enclosed along with selected publications. If you would like other materials, we would be happy to send you whatever you need. Please place a collect call to me or Steven Cole, Assistant Dean for Faculty Advancement, at (847) 467-0578; we shall do our best to see that you get what you need quickly. If you would prefer to fax us your response, our number is (847) 491-4289. Should you wish to use e-mail, please use the following special address reserved for promotion matters: dean@wcas.northwestern.edu.

We are grateful for your advice and will look for your letter by January 13, 2020. Your response will play a valuable part in our important decision.

Sincerely,

Adrian Randolph
Dean

---

[Curriculum Vitae] [Selected Publications]
Date

Professor S. Nicholas  
Department of Antarctic Literatures  
Subtropical University  
Icecap, Mississippi 33333

Dear Professor Nicholas:

I appreciate your willingness to let us have a critical reading of Cranston Lamont's *Scripto Redux*. Enclosed are Professor Lamont's vita, a statement about confidentiality, and—so that you will know about our procedures—a draft of the letter we normally send to external referees when relevant writings by the candidate have been published and familiarity with them can be assumed.

Your evaluation of this work will be very important in our deliberations. As the committee is not expert in Lamont's special field (nor am I), we are greatly dependent on you for informed opinion and would appreciate your indicating some of the reasons for your conclusions. How would you characterize the significance of the work's topic? Its contribution to our understanding of that topic? How do you assess the research lying behind it, its approach, organization, and writing? Should it be regarded as a text, a review and synthesis, or an original contribution to scholarly research? We would appreciate your evaluating the manuscript/book as though you were judging it for initial publication by a leading academic or trade press.

We are interested above all in the candidate's quality of mind as that is disclosed by such things as the imaginativeness, power of evidence and argument, and clarity of the work at hand. Do you judge these things to be of very high quality? Are the quality of this work and, in some measure, the quantity of all the author's work (as reflected in the vita) such that you can say with confidence that s/he should be promoted to the rank of [associate, full] professor in the Department of Antarctic Literatures of a major research university?

If you could address some of the questions in the enclosed draft letter—the comparative assessment of Professor Lamont with the persons noted there, for example—we should be obliged.

We shall look for your statement by January 13, 2020 if at all possible. Please include the enclosed form for your social security number and home address; your stipend will then be processed promptly. Thank you again for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Adrian Randolph  
Dean

Enclosures
Date

Ms. Cadenza Foozle
Elder Hall 54321
Evanston Campus

Dear Ms. Foozle:

Professor Raoul Stonehenge of the Department of Celtic Languages in the Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences is now being considered for promotion by a small confidential committee of College faculty members who are not in his department. This is part of our standard procedure for conducting promotion reviews. On behalf of that committee, I am writing to ask you, as a student who has taken one or more classes with this candidate, to write a letter evaluating him as a teacher. When a Northwestern faculty member is considered for promotion, success in teaching is taken seriously into account, and it is therefore important that students have an opportunity to assist in our decisions.

How would you Professor Stonehenge’s strengths and weaknesses as a teacher? Among other things, did he convey ideas and information clearly? Was the course well organized and the instructor well prepared? Were discussions conducted respectfully and did they advance the intellectual goals of the class? Did you master a significant body of material in the class? Were you challenged to think or work in new ways? Did you receive constructive feedback on your work? The committee would welcome any other observations you deem relevant.

Beyond classroom presentations, teaching may be understood to include grading, guiding and advising students, directing independent study, and other related activities. The committee and I would welcome your comments on any of these activities, as appropriate.

Your identity as a correspondent of this confidential committee will be held in the strictest confidence. Your name will not be known to the faculty member in question or to anyone in his department. Only the members of the committee and I will see your letter. If you have questions about our procedures, by all means call Steven Cole, Director of Faculty Advancement, at (847) 467-0578 or me at (847) 491-3276. E-mail messages may be sent to s-cole@northwestern.edu.

We will be greatly obliged if you will write directly to me by January 13, 2020. Your frank remarks will play a valued part in the committee’s deliberations, and whatever help you can give us will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Adrian Randolph
Dean
Standards for promotion

The Grant of Tenure: Policy

The policy aims to have Northwestern’s faculty be of unqualified excellence. Any tenure decision calls for application of the highest standards with respect to professional achievement and promise in both research and teaching. The Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences aims for the superlative, and each case is evaluated on its own merits. When making a recommendation for tenure, a department must feel able to affirm that the candidate in question is as good a permanent appointment in his or her area as Northwestern is capable of making, now or in the foreseeable future, given both accomplishments to date and reasonable expectations as to future achievements. This same standard must be employed by others who participate in the review. Tenure is not awarded for competent service, solid research, and adequate teaching.

In most cases, professional achievement takes the form of research activity that issues in publication or artistic work that is publicly displayed. Occasionally, a colleague will present a dossier of outstanding professional accomplishment in methodologies whose originality and theoretical sophistication significantly advance or redefine work in the discipline. Departments—and subsequently ad hoc committees and the Weinberg College Committee on Tenure, acting with the advice of external referees—evaluate the quantity, but above all, the quality, creativity, importance, and influence of such work. They look for evidence of superior achievement relative to peer scholars, recognition of that achievement by senior colleagues both within and beyond the campus, and the promise of a career trajectory that will continue to affect the direction of his or her field. A positive recommendation to confer tenure should offer strong evidence supporting claims about the high quality of a candidate’s work, the distinctiveness of his or her voice, and the degree of influence on the field. Candidates for tenure are expected to have established national reputations through their research, writing, and/or artistic work. In all regards, the standard is a high level of excellence.

The quality of a candidate’s teaching and his or her potential as a teacher are major factors affecting the decision to grant tenure to a faculty member. Teaching is defined broadly; it means not simply the ability to lecture, but also the faculty member’s role vis-a-vis students in various contexts, from seminars or independent study to advising. Advising is a significant part of the teaching since conveying to students what may be the best academic course for them to follow, given their interests and goals, is to help educate them. Mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows (if relevant) is a highly significant part of teaching, as it involves nothing less than the preparation of the next generation’s intellectual leaders, both within and beyond the academy. An institution devoted to instruction must weigh the quality of teaching in all decisions regarding its faculty.

Assistant professors, like other members of the tenure-line faculty, are expected to share in the duties of faculty governance. During the probationary period, the candidate may concentrate his or her university service at the departmental level. Departments should take care not to place overly heavy administrative duties on untenured faculty; nevertheless the expectation is that assistant professors will contribute to the smooth functioning of the department.

“Early” Tenure Decisions

Decisions about tenure need not be taken until the final year of the individual’s probationary term. Departments and candidates alike should view it as normal that an individual takes the full number of years available to establish his or her influence in the field. There must be no presumption that an early recommendation for promotion is necessary to prove a candidate’s strength. Tenure-track faculty should not be under pressure to rush to a review that may prove to be premature.
When a faculty member has been granted an extension of the probationary period of one or more years, it is vital that the department thinks in terms of the number of probationary years the person has served rather than the number of calendar years. Thus, when a colleague is in his or her fifth probationary year, the department should not expect that person to come forward for a tenure decision even if it is the sixth year of appointment. To encourage or pressure an assistant professor to be reviewed for tenure before the sixth probationary year would cancel the good that the policy is intended to achieve. Equally important, candidates with a year’s extension are expected to have achieved the same productivity as any other faculty member in the sixth probationary year and not meet some more stringent standard.

The guidelines and procedures, enclosures, and standards for promotion outlined above are current as of July 2019. Minor changes may be made after dissemination. Members of the faculty will be consulted if there are significant changes in procedures or standards.

July 2019