

## Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review

---

The Northwestern University Faculty Handbook governs the tenure and promotion policies at Northwestern (see <http://www.northwestern.edu/provost/faculty-resources/faculty-handbook.html>). The purpose of this document is to describe elements of the process that are specific to Kellogg.

Tenure-line faculty whose first tenure-line job is at the Kellogg School of Management commonly undergo three professional reviews: a first review while untenured, a tenure review, and a review for promotion to full professor. Specifics of the review process may differ for faculty hired from another institution, faculty who receive an outside offer, or faculty for whom special circumstances apply.

- First review: Untenured faculty are reviewed for renewal as indicated in their appointment letter. Generally, this occurs during year three of employment or year four for those receiving appointment as a Donald P. Jacobs Scholar.
- Tenure review: The decision regarding tenure at Northwestern is typically made in the sixth year of full-time service in a regular faculty rank. For junior faculty who spend their first year as a Donald P. Jacobs Scholar, this is typically their seventh year of full-time service.
- Promotion to full professor: The review for promotion from tenured associate to tenured full professor often occurs within six years after attaining tenure, but there is no fixed timeframe.

The goal of each review is a thorough and fair assessment of the professional standing of each candidate, with every attempt made to preserve appropriate confidentiality throughout the process.

Participants at each point in the review process are reminded that for all reviews except a review of promotion from tenured associate to tenured full, the policy of Kellogg is that the standard for promotion to any given rank is independent of the time spent at previous ranks.

### Committees

At least three committees are involved in each case: a department committee, an ad hoc committee, and Kellogg's school-wide Personnel Committee.

1. The department committee.<sup>1</sup> In an internal case involving the promotion of a tenured associate professor to full professor, the departmental committee consists of all full professors in that department. For all other cases, including an external hire at any tenured level, the committee consists of all tenured professors regardless of rank.<sup>2</sup> In any year in which a department has fewer than 7 tenured professors at the rank of full professor the chair of the department will work with the senior associate dean for faculty to appoint qualified

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this document, the phrase "department" will be taken to include the Operations and MEDS divisions of the MEDS&Ops department separately.

<sup>2</sup> While it is expected that no senior hire will be made without an earlier meeting in which the input of junior faculty is solicited, this is outside of the scope of this document.

outside members who are full professors in an adjacent department so as to arrive at 7 voting-eligible members for the purpose the renewal, promotion, and tenure process. Each outside member will be involved in all renewal, promotion, and tenure cases during the time of their appointment, and will have the same rights and responsibilities as regular members of the department for the purpose of the renewal, promotion, and tenure process. Each such appointment is expected under normal circumstances to be for 3 years, except in so far as the department in question grows the number of its senior faculty. Appointments are made in staggered terms to promote continuity in the process. A person may not be an outside member of a department and a member of the personnel committee simultaneously, nor can they be a member of the ad-hoc committee evaluating anyone from within the department of which they are an outside member.

2. The three-member ad hoc committee. This committee is appointed by the chair of the personnel committee in consultation with the senior associate dean:
  - The chair of the ad hoc committee is a member of the Personnel Committee not from the candidate's department. The identity of this person is public.
  - A tenured faculty member, typically with rank greater than that of the candidate (in the case of an outside hire, typically at least equal to the highest rank likely to be contemplated) from the candidate's department. This person's identity is known only to the Personnel Committee and the Dean's office.
  - A tenured faculty member, typically with rank greater than that of the candidate (in the case of an outside hire, typically at least equal to the lowest rank contemplated), from a third department. This person's identity is known only to the Personnel Committee and the dean's office.

It is generally desirable that no member of the ad hoc committee is a coauthor of the candidate.

3. The Personnel Committee. This committee is appointed by the dean. It is comprised of a non-voting chair and six voting members, consisting of one full professor from each department, except that in the case of the smaller departments of Operations and Accounting Information and Management, a single position will alternate on a three-year cycle between the two departments. In the event that a faculty member comes up for review from either of these departments and the sitting member of the committee is not from the same department, a member from the faculty member's department will replace the sitting committee member for that case. The replaced committee member will continue to sit in on the discussion as a non-voting participant. In addition to the six departmental committee members and the chair, the dean's office is represented in committee meetings by the dean and/or senior associate dean of faculty and research, who serve as members ex officio. In the event that the chair of the personnel committee and the senior associate dean for faculty and research jointly determine that a voting member of the personnel committee has a substantial potential conflict of interest involving a case (as for example if a significant portion of the work to be evaluated is coauthored with that member of the committee), that committee member will be replaced (and absent) for the relevant case, typically by the previous personnel committee representative from that department.

Two untenured tenure-line observers typically attend Personnel Committee meetings as adjunct members of the committee. These observers are not permitted to see letters from external reviewers, they do not observe cases concerning their own department or where the committee deems their presence to be unadvisable, and they do not vote on the outcome. The observers may report to the faculty the general standards for promotion and tenure, and the nature of the process, but must maintain the confidentiality of the details of any given case.

## Chair of the Personnel Committee

The chair of the personnel committee is appointed by the dean as an impartial, non-voting member of the committee, to a three-year term. The chair works in partnership with the senior associate dean for faculty and research and reports directly to the dean.

The chair is responsible for the organization, functioning, and timely and fair facilitation of all personnel committee meetings, and for overseeing the quality and timeliness of reports and related components of the evaluation process for tenure-line faculty contract renewals, promotions, and senior hires. The chair is also responsible for periodic review of the procedures themselves, including soliciting input and developing consensus about any desirable evolution of this document.

The chair is responsible for providing recommendations on renewal and promotion decisions to the dean on behalf of the personnel committee, representing the Kellogg faculty. Additionally, the chair will consult annually with department chairs, provide on-going communication with faculty, steward the general personnel-committee process, facilitate committee meetings and outcomes, and provide on-going administrative support.

## Process

Generally the candidate submits their professional dossier; the school solicits external letters of recommendation; the departmental committee meets and makes a recommendation; the ad hoc committee meets and makes a recommendation; the Personnel Committee meets, reviews all information on the case, and submits a recommendation to the dean; and finally, the dean submits a recommendation to the provost. Many of the initial processes occur in parallel. Below is more information about these steps.

## Professional Dossier Submitted by the Candidate

At the beginning of the review process, the candidate supplies a professional dossier. The dossier will typically include at a minimum:

- a professional statement written by the candidate, covering research, teaching, and service
- a list of external reviewers selected by the candidate, as described below
- a complete set of research papers, with one or more subsets identified by the candidate that will be sent to external reviewers. Editor's letters should be included for papers that are listed on the candidates vita as having either revise and resubmit or conditional acceptance status.

An up-to-date set of the exact requirements for the complete dossier, including requirements for the list of external reviewers, may be obtained from the senior associate dean for faculty and research.

## External Letters of Recommendation

Candidates identify a set of external reviewers (four plus an alternative for untenured reviews; five plus an alternative for tenure cases); except where impracticable, this list should not include the names of dissertation committee chairs, co-chairs, or co-authors. For each reviewer, the candidate should provide complete contact information and a brief (two sentence) description of the reviewer's position and the relation of the reviewer's work to the candidate's work. Letters are requested from these reviewers.

The candidate's department chairperson will also provide a list of at least six reviewers, which may include the candidate's dissertation chairs, co-chairs, or co-authors. The ad hoc committee then solicits additional letters taking into account the departmental recommendations, which are advisory. Candidates are not informed of these reviewers.

Unsolicited letters from external colleagues and/or internal colleagues should be addressed to the senior associate dean for faculty and research. Typically, unsolicited letters will address a personal expression of the candidate's standing in the intellectual community, department, or school and/or address a particular research project, issue, or personal sentiment about the candidate's professional life. An unsolicited letter addressed to anyone other than the senior associate dean should be forwarded to the senior associate dean.

External letters, including unsolicited letters, are seen by members of the ad hoc committee and Personnel Committee, but not by members of the department committee.

## Department Meeting and Report

The department chair appoints a reading committee to report on the case. The departmental Personnel Committee representative may not serve on the reading committee. The departmental ad hoc committee representative may serve on the reading committee, but this must be stated in the ad hoc committee's report. Coauthors may serve on the reading committee, but to facilitate dispassionate review, it is suggested that the initial "write-up" on any given paper be by a member of the reading committee who is not an author of that paper.

The department chair is responsible for convening the department's case-review meeting. At a minimum, the departmental Personnel Committee representative, the members of the departmental reading committee (if applicable), and the department chair must attend. The meeting, however, should be scheduled such that as many department committee members as possible can attend. Attendance via electronic means such as Skype is allowed, as is absentee voting. But, physical attendance at review meetings is strongly encouraged, and is viewed as one of the most important obligations of senior faculty. The department report should specify who was physically present and who was electronically present at each relevant meeting, and also list who voted in absentia. A department committee member who either lacks sufficient familiarity with the case or who is undecided may abstain. Indeed, ethical considerations require that a department member who lacks sufficient familiarity with a case; e.g., one who has not read a substantial representation of the candidate's work; should abstain, even if he or she has attended the department meeting. The department chair is ultimately responsible for the quality and timeliness of the department report, but may delegate as appropriate.

The Personnel Committee ("PC") representative acts as an advocate for due process during the departmental meeting, ensures that the discussion and voting meet appropriate standards, and collects, tallies, and announces votes. The PC representative may not vote. While the PC representative will often have important contributions to make to the discussion, because of their role in representing the views of their department during the PC meeting, they should strive to avoid advocating either for or against the candidate. In the event that the PC chair is a member of the candidate's department, they should similarly exercise some restraint.

In its discussions and report, the departmental committee should fully consider research, teaching, and service, covering in depth the arguments both for and against the case. Multiple votes on the same issue are strongly

discouraged. In the event that any such vote occurs, the report must tally the outcome of all such votes (if for example, a first vote was not unanimous and a second vote was).

A faculty member who has reason to believe that they may be in possession of information deleterious to the candidate, involving, for example, academic or personal misconduct, has an obligation to bring this information to the senior associate dean for faculty and research as early as is practicable prior to the departmental meeting. The senior associate dean will determine the process to allow a fair and impartial examination of the facts, and will determine whether the information in question is appropriate for discussion during the departmental meeting.

The Appendix contains a model departmental voting process. For reasons of consistency, departments are strongly encouraged to use this process. A department that wishes to use a different process should submit a document detailing that process to the chair of the personnel committee, and, on approval, circulate the same document to all senior faculty members in the department. Any such process must guarantee the anonymity and integrity of votes, make provision for absentee votes, ensure that all tenured faculty (of both associate and full rank) are given the opportunity to discuss and to submit a “tenure/do not tenure” vote on all tenure cases, including on all senior external cases, and in all but the most obvious cases, provide the personnel committee with a vote tally on the rank above the one contemplated. The chair of the personnel committee may review any such process periodically.

## Departmental Chair Letter

For each case, the department chair shall prepare a letter that summarizes and provides context for the main points of the departmental review and discussion. The letter should elaborate the major arguments behind any split votes, taking care to describe thoroughly the character and nature of any disagreements to the extent these are not already covered in the departmental report. The need for an explicit and detailed elaboration of differences of opinion becomes increasingly important as the vote margin becomes tighter. The letter is also expected to reflect on the department chair’s own assessment of the case, addressed separately from discussion of the departmental process and outcome. This letter should be addressed to the ad hoc committee chairperson.

## Ad Hoc Committee Report

The ad hoc committee is responsible for presenting the case to the Personnel Committee. The ad hoc committee prepares a report based on its own reading of the case materials, the department report, and the assessments in the letters from external reviewers. The departmental ad hoc committee member must report his or her degree of involvement in the case, including service on the departmental reading committee, etc. Ad hoc members review only materials related to the case they are examining.

## Personnel Committee

Prior to the meeting, PC members shall review all materials for each candidate undergoing review. At the meeting, the PC hears a presentation from the ad hoc committee, and has access to the complete record, including the external letters, the department chair’s letter, the department report, and the ad hoc report.

After the ad hoc committee presentation, the two members of the ad hoc committee who are not on the Personnel Committee are dismissed, and a full and thoughtful discussion of the arguments for and against appointment, renewal and/or promotion for the case is held within the committee.

After discussion of the case is considered complete by PC members, the six voting members on the committee vote on the case. That vote then serves as a recommendation to the dean of Kellogg. The dean may, following the Personnel Committee vote, solicit clarification from existing letter writers and/or new opinions from relevant experts in the field. The information received by the dean, and the process by which it was gathered, will be documented for the tenure file. The dean then in turn makes a recommendation to the provost. The provost makes the final decision on a positive recommendation for renewal, tenure, or promotion.

## Appendix: Model Departmental Voting Process

For an intermediate review, the first vote will be between the three options “terminate,” “retain at assistant,” and “promote to untenured associate.” There can then be further discussion and votes on successively higher ranks, with, if required, tenured associates leaving the meeting prior to a discussion of full professorship. While a vote on higher ranks is not mandatory, it is strongly encouraged in any case where any ambiguity exists, and is mandatory on the request of any committee member.

For a tenure review, the first vote should be between “terminate” and “promote to tenured associate.” If there is a majority vote for tenured associate, or at the request of any full professor, tenured associates should be dismissed from the meeting, and a further discussion and vote on full professor held.

For the case of an internal promotion from tenured associate to tenured full, the vote will be between the options “do not promote” or “promote.”

In the case of an external tenured hire, whether it is contemplated that the offer will be at the associate or full level, the discussion and voting process shall consist of two stages. In the first stage, following a comprehensive discussion of the merits of the case, all tenured faculty shall submit a vote of “do not tenure” or “tenure”. Once that vote is taken, and the results are made known, the tenured associate professors shall be dismissed. The full professors shall then discuss and vote “no” or “yes” on full professor.

All voting should take place during the final meeting in which the case is discussed. If a significant issue of fact or interpretation occurs during what was ostensibly the final meeting, the vote can be delayed by majority vote of those present (including those attending by electronic means), but another meeting should be held at which there is a chance for final discussion before voting takes place. All votes cast are to be anonymously and submitted by paper ballot except as set forth below. The department’s ad hoc representative, who is anonymous, will vote, but will report this vote as part of the ad hoc committee report.

Absentee votes should be submitted prior to the meeting to the departmental administrator. At the time each vote is taken, the departmental administrator should be asked to enter the room and submit ballots representing the absentee votes, and it should be made explicit on whose behalf these votes are being submitted. Similarly, in the event of attendance via Skype or other electronic means, at the moment of a vote, the faculty member should communicate their vote electronically or by phone to the departmental administrator, who will then submit a paper ballot on their behalf, again making it explicit on whose behalf votes are being submitted. It is the obligation of the departmental administrator to keep confidential the content of any such votes. Votes should be counted by the personnel committee representative and the count verified by the department chair.