

TPAC Dossier Preparation Guide

Instructions & Tips:

*Number the documents in the dossier according to the checklist below. Do not re-number the documents— skip those not required.

*Review the document “[Submitting a dossier through Interfolio](#)” for instructions on organizing and formatting the dossier

*Do you prefer to see what a well-prepared dossier looks like? Email faculty-personnel@brown.edu and we will give you access to our template dossier

Documents

	Promotion from Assistant to Associate (with tenure)	Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor (tenure previously granted)	Promotion to Senior Lecturer	Promotion to Distinguished Senior Lecturer	Promotion to Associate or Full Professor of the Practice, or (Research)	Reappointment as Assistant Professor, Lecturer, or Senior Lecturer	Reappointment (Asst, Assoc or Full) as Professor of the Practice or (Research)	Appointment as Associate Professor or Professor (with or without tenure)	Appointment as Professor of the Practice, Professor (Research), or Senior Lecturer
1. Cover memo	X	X	X	X	x	X	X	X	X
2. Department recommendation , written explanation to the candidate	X	X	X	X	x	X	X	NA	NA
3. Waiver of candidate’s right to a personal appearance before the department	X	X	X	X	x	X	X	NA	NA
4. Department review of scholarship, teaching, and service	X	X	X	X	x	X	X	X	X
5. Information on teaching See below for guidance on Spring 2020 course evals	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NA	NA
6. Candidate’s current CV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
7. Candidate’s statement	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NA	NA
8. Annual or mid-contract reviews since last action (appointment or reappoint)	X	NA	X	X	NA	X	NA	NA	NA
9. Department correspondence with the selected evaluators	X	X	X	X	X	NA	NA	X	X
10. Letters of evaluation	8	8 ¹	5 ²	5 ³	5	NA	NA	8 ⁴	5
11. Brief biographies of external evaluators	X	X	X	X	X	NA	NA	X	X
12. Minutes of the official meeting in which the department voted on the recommendation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
13. Department Standards and Criteria	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
14. Publications	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
15. Teaching Evaluations See below for guidance on Spring 2020 course evals	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

¹ **Promotion to full professor:** Five of the eight letters should be from individuals who are not close collaborators, dissertation supervisors, or otherwise conflicted. A limited number of writers from a previous action (such as the tenure case) may be included.

² **Promotion to senior lecturer:** may be a combination of letters from outside evaluators and from individuals at Brown (but not in the candidate’s department). See Handbook of Academic Administration 10.5.1 for further details.

³ **Promotion to DSL:** Five core letters should be from individuals external to Brown who serve in positions similar to the distinguished senior lecturer role or are tenured faculty engaged in pedagogical research or related programs at other institutions. Additional letters may be solicited from individuals at Brown (but not in the candidate’s department). See Handbook of Academic Administration 10.5.2 for further details.

⁴ **Appointment Associate or Full Professor, with or without tenure:** Five of the eight letters should be from evaluators who are not close collaborators, dissertation supervisors, or otherwise conflicted. Note that adjustments can be made to the number of letters required in the case of appointments without tenure (contact DOF for details).

Explanation of Requirements:

The department review for an internal reappointment, promotion, or tenure case, or a senior appointment of an external hire culminates with the preparation of a dossier presenting the evidence on which the department's recommendation is based. It should also include a description of the procedures by which the materials were obtained. The dossier is then shared with the Dean of Faculty's Office and the Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee (TPAC) for review. This guide provides details about what materials are required in the dossier and is intended to clarify the procedure.

1. **Cover memo** Please use the [TPAC Cover Memo form](#) on the Dean of the Faculty's Faculty Review and Promotion page.

The first page of the form is information about the department quorum, the vote tally, faculty in attendance, etc.

The second page is the department chair's report (see below for details)

A draft of the cover memo should be circulated to all faculty who attended the departmental meeting for their comments; the chair should inform all faculty that if any of them has a serious objection which cannot be resolved, they may communicate their views to TPAC in a separate memo. Any such minority communications must be made available to all members who participated in the consideration of the case.

Department chair's report: The purpose of this report is to provide to TPAC some context about the candidate and the departmental meeting. The summary should complement and not duplicate the department review. The chair's report should be one to two pages in length.

Briefly describe the academic unit's view of the importance and impact of the candidate's academic specialty within the larger field or discipline. Please report on any issues that were raised in the meeting relative to this candidacy and of the strengths and weaknesses of the case. Summarize the reasons for any abstentions or minority opinions. This is an opportunity to address any questions that may cause TPAC concern when reviewing the dossier, e.g. uneven teaching evaluations or reservations expressed by evaluators.

**Keep in mind that most TPAC members are not experts in the candidate's field, so it is important to explain the intellectual terrain in which the candidate's work is situated and how it impacts on the field.

2. **Department recommendation**, written explanation to the candidate

All candidates should be informed of the recommendation (not the specific vote) in a brief written statement. Note that the eligible voting faculty should have the opportunity to review this message before it is sent to the candidate. The candidate should receive the written explanation no more than one week after the department meeting. In cases that are positive but not unanimous, it may be fair and appropriate to convey something about the strength of the recommendation. For negative recommendations, the candidate should promptly receive a more detailed written explanation outlining the reasons. Please consult with DoF or ask for access to the template dossier for an example of text: faculty-personnel@brown.edu.

3. **Waiver of candidate's right to a personal appearance before the department**

Please use [this form](#) (also found on the Faculty Review and Promotion page), which the candidate should sign if she/he waives the right to appear. If a candidate chooses to appear, please include a summary of that visit in the meeting minutes. DOF staff will contact candidates about TPAC appearances.

4. **Department review of scholarship, teaching, and service**

- Commentary on scholarship and professional development
- The academic unit's view of the importance and impact of the candidate's academic specialty within the larger field or discipline

- Detailed analysis of the letters of evaluation (for tenure, promotion, and senior faculty appointment cases) – any criticisms expressed in the letters of evaluation should be thoroughly addressed
- Teaching effectiveness in both undergraduate and graduate courses
 - If the candidate supervised independent study and/or engaged in mentoring, an assessment of these activities should be included
 - Multiple modes of assessment should be used to evaluate teaching, including thorough discussion of students' qualitative evaluations (using student quotations is encouraged), comparative data, and peer evaluation (see the [Guidelines for Peer Observation of Teaching](#)). For external candidates, please provide evidence as available.
- Service expectations vary depending on department and candidate rank, but a candidate should be evaluated following departmental standards and criteria for service to the department, the University, and the profession.

For promotions to Senior Lecturer and Distinguished Senior Lecturer, the following should be included:

- Sustained and documented teaching excellence as attested by student and peer evaluations
- Service to the department, University, profession, and community
- Recognition as a role model, advisor, and mentor for undergraduate and/or graduate students as well as colleagues
- Excellent professional reputation, as demonstrated by membership and active participation in local, regional, or national professional societies (this may be demonstrated through positions of leadership in executive committees, key roles in collaborative projects, and the organization of professional and academic workshops, symposia, and invited lectures)
- A record of outstanding educational scholarship, which may take the form of instructional materials (including online materials), activities associated with the development and implementation of new assessment models, curricular innovation and configurations, publications, performances, or other works)
- Research effort within their discipline (while not normally required, this may be taken into account as appropriate).

5. Information on teaching since contract review:

- Tabular summary of teaching (see Instructions for creating teaching reports, [here](#) and on the Faculty Review and Promotion page). The tabular summary should provide an explanation for a gap in teaching (sabbatical, parental teaching relief, etc.)
- Class observations by peers, if available
- Other teaching material, such as syllabi, may be added here
- If possible, provide comparative information, i.e. how the ratings compare to those in other similar courses.

This information is not required for external candidates, but if material is available it should be provided.

Note: Spring 2020 course feedback results are excluded from course feedback reports by default due to the interruptions and consequent modifications to instruction caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The Tenure, Promotion, and Appointments Committee (TPAC) will not require that these course feedback results be included in any dossier material, and it is not required that they be included in annual or mid-contract review material. TPAC has been instructed not to disadvantage a candidate for the absence of course feedback results from this period. If a candidate wishes to include spring 2020 course feedback results as part of a TPAC dossier, annual or mid-contract review, the department should obtain the candidate's consent in writing (email is acceptable) before including the feedback in the report.

6. Candidate's current CV

There is no required format, please see the curriculum vitae guidelines [here](#) and on the Faculty Review and Promotion page

7. Candidate's statement

There is no required format; candidates may present their research plans and teaching philosophy and are encouraged to comment on other aspects of their professional profiles as relevant, for example work to increase diversity in their fields, or the research setbacks a candidate experienced due to the Covid-19

pandemic. Please note that statements 3-5 pages in length are preferred. If the statement is longer, candidates are advised to use headers for sections and a table of contents.

It is not required that external candidates provide statements, but they may be included.

8. Annual or mid-contract reviews

Annual or mid-contract reviews since last contract review should be provided. For example, a tenure case should include annual reviews since the candidate's last reappointment review. If the tenure review follows soon after a reappointment review, it may be appropriate to include the reappointment review and/or earlier annual reviews. If the candidate provided a written response to any annual reviews included in the dossier, include those written responses as well. Please consult the DOF with any questions.

9. Department correspondence with selected evaluators

Please include (in this order) a completed TPAC evaluator chart ([here](#) and on the Faculty Review and Promotion page), a sample solicitation letter, and relevant evaluator responses. Any deviations from the standard solicitation letter should be discussed with the appropriate divisional dean at the time the letter list is approved. Any correspondence between the department or committee chair at Brown and potential evaluators that discusses the candidate's qualifications or work should be included, as should all declinations. Potential evaluators who were contacted and did not respond should be included in the evaluator chart.

10. Letters of evaluation

A core number of letters should be from individuals who are not close collaborators, dissertation supervisors, or have other potential conflicts of interest. Letters from collaborators beyond that core number are permitted. The list of potential evaluators should be reviewed by the appropriate dean before letters are solicited. Please refer to the checklist above for the required number of letters for each type of case. For more details, please see the Handbook of Academic Administration, Appendix C, No. 10.

11. Brief biographies

Provide a brief biography (one paragraph) for each external evaluator who provided a letter. This biography should inform TPAC why the individual is qualified to evaluate the candidate's work. Please indicate if individuals have had a working relationship with the candidate or wrote a previous assessment.

12. Minutes of the official meeting in which the department voted on the recommendation

Minutes from earlier meetings should not be included, unless the discussion of the case took two meetings. TPAC does not review meeting notes from the review committee, hiring committee, etc. If more than one candidate is discussed at the same meeting, please redact the minutes so that each candidate's dossier includes only a discussion of the relevant case. Minutes should be a detailed summary of remarks, giving a full accounting of the issues that arose in discussions. Minutes should be anonymized, and a unique identifier given to each faculty member ("Professor A, Professor B").

13. Department Standards and Criteria

TPAC will use the Standards & Criteria to examine the arguments given by the department in support of the recommendation. Please ensure that this is the most updated version. The most current versions of all standards & criteria documents may be found on [this page](#) (accessible to department chairs and managers, or upon request from faculty-personnel@brown.edu).

14. Publications

The candidate's principal publications and/or completed work should be submitted electronically. The department chair, committee chair, and candidate should determine which publications are to be included in the dossier.

15. Course Feedback Forms

Instructions for creating teaching reports, [here](#) and on the Faculty Review and Promotion page, should be used to assemble teaching evaluations from courses taught since the last review, or since appointment. In the case of external appointments, attempts should be made to obtain evaluations from the candidate's current institution.

Note: Spring 2020 course feedback results are excluded from course feedback reports by default due to the interruptions and consequent modifications to instruction caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The Tenure, Promotion, and Appointments Committee (TPAC) will not require that these course feedback results be included in any dossier material, and it is not required that they be included in annual or mid-contract review material. TPAC has been instructed not to disadvantage a candidate for the absence of course feedback results from this period. If a candidate wishes to include spring 2020 course feedback results as part of a TPAC dossier, annual or mid-contract review, the department should obtain the candidate's consent in writing (email is acceptable) before including the feedback in the report.

Last revised: July 2, 2021