## TPAC Dossier Preparation Guide

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Promotion from Assistant to Associate (with tenure)</th>
<th>Promotion from Associate to Professor (tenure previously granted)</th>
<th>Promotion to Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Promotion to Distinguished Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Promotion for Professor of the Practice, or (Research)</th>
<th>Reappointment as Assistant Professor, Lecturer, or Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Reappointment as Professor of the Practice or (Research)</th>
<th>Appointment as Associate Professor or Professor of the Practice, or (Research)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Covering memorandum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negative recommendation written explanation to candidate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Waiver of candidate's right to a personal appearance before the department</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Department review of scholarship, teaching, and service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Information on teaching since last contract review</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Candidate's current CV</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Candidate's statement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Annual or mid-contract reviews since last reappointment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Department correspondence with the selected referees</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Letters of recommendation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Brief biographies of external referees</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Minutes of the official meeting in which the department voted on the recommendation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Department Standards and Criteria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Publications</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Course Evaluations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>1</sup> At least five must be from individuals who are not close collaborators, dissertation supervisors, or otherwise have a potential conflict of interest. A limited number of writers from a previous action (such as the tenure case) may be included.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> At least five must be from individuals who are not close collaborators, dissertation supervisors, or otherwise have a potential conflict of interest.
Explanation of Requirements:
The department review for a reappointment, promotion, or senior appointment 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. **Covering memorandum** (the cover memo and the department review may be combined as one document):
   - The specific recommendation
   - Final vote (with numbers)
   - Names of faculty attending meeting at which the vote was taken
   - Names of eligible faculty *not* at this meeting
   - Stipulated quorum for such meetings
   
   Be clear about the voting procedures and the relevant electorate. Retired faculty are not eligible to vote, and should participate in the discussion only in exceptional circumstances. The quorum and official vote tally include those present and/or participating in the discussion of the case via teleconference, Skype, etc. Votes received by proxy or e-mail should be reported separately. Voting by secret ballot is preferred and taking “straw votes” in order to arrive at a consensus is not recommended; in cases where this is done, such preliminary votes should be reported.

   - A full and candid discussion of the issues raised in the meeting (relative to this candidacy) and of the strengths and weaknesses of the case.
   - Specific start and end dates of the recommended term (n.b. promotions are normally effective as of July 1)
   - A general explanation of the reasons for abstentions
   - An explanation of the views of those voting in the minority (unless the voting is done by secret ballot)
   - The academic unit’s view of the importance of the candidate’s academic specialty within the larger field or discipline
   
   While details may be difficult to provide when the vote is by secret ballot, the chair should nevertheless attempt to summarize the range of views expressed during the discussion. A draft of the memo should be circulated to all participants for their comments; the chair should inform all members 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.

   - The importance of the candidate’s academic specialty within the larger field or discipline
   
   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. As appropriate, explain how well the candidate has met the needs and expectations of the department. Provide a candid overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The purpose here is to summarize the considerations that led to the recommendation. This is an opportunity to address any questions that may cause concern when reviewing the dossier, e.g. uneven teaching evaluations or reservations expressed by referees.

2. **Negative recommendation** written explanation to the candidate

   All candidates should be informed of the recommendation (not the specific vote). In cases that are positive but not unanimous, it may be fair and appropriate to convey something about the strength of the recommendation; please consult with DOF if such situations arise. For negative recommendations, the candidate should promptly receive a written explanation outlining the reasons.

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

   This should be done in writing. If a candidate chooses to appear, please include a summary in the meeting minutes. DOF staff will contact candidates about TPAC appearances.

4. **Department review of scholarship, teaching, and service** (the department review and the cover memo may be combined as one document):
   - Commentary on scholarship and professional development
   - Teaching effectiveness in both undergraduate and graduate courses, including a discussion of students’ qualitative evaluations
   - 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. For external candidates, please provide evidence as available. See above (#1) regarding discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the case.

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), and;
- 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 (from Cognos)
- 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.

6. **Candidate’s current CV**

7. **Candidate statements**
   There is no required format; candidates may freely present their research plans and teaching philosophy. It is not required that external candidates provide statements, but they may be included.

8. **Annual or mid-contract reviews**
   - since last contract review
   - candidate’s written responses to annual reviews.
   If the tenure review follows soon after a reappointment review, it may be appropriate to include earlier annual reviews. Please consult with DOF.

9. **Department correspondence with selected referees**
   Include a sample solicitation letter and relevant evaluator responses. Deviations from the standard solicitation letter to referees should be discussed in advance with the DOF. Any correspondence that discusses the candidate’s qualifications or work should be included, as should all declinations.

10. **Letters of recommendation**
    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 referees 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 for each external referee to 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. It is helpful to provide a single-page table in this section that lists the names, institutions, and responses (accept/decline) of all persons solicited, and also indicate if they were recommended by the candidate or the department.
12. Minutes of the official meetings in which the department voted on the recommendation
   If more than one candidate is discussed at the same meeting, please redact the minutes so each candidate’s dossier includes only a discussion of his/her case. Minutes should be a detailed transcript of remarks, giving a full accounting of the issues that arose in discussions. It is not necessary to attribute remarks to specific individuals.

13. Department Standards and Criteria
   TPAC will use the Standards & Criteria to examine the arguments given by the department in support of the recommendation.

14. Publications
   The candidate’s principal publications and/or completed work can be submitted either electronically or in hard copy (which will be returned after the review).

15. Teaching Evaluations
   A Cognos course evaluation report showing courses taught since the last review, or since appointment. In the case of new external appointments, attempts should be made to obtain evaluations from the candidate’s current institution.