

**PROMOTION AND TENURE INFORMATION INCLUDING INSTRUCTIONS  
TO PREPARE A DOSSIER FOR REGULAR FACULTY  
(REVISED – February 6, 2026)**

**Table of Contents**

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Promotion and Tenure Calendar Deadlines.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Promotion and Tenure Criteria .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Promotion and Tenure Review Procedures.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Promotion and Tenure Levels with Associated Committees .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Department Level - Independent Faculty.....</i>	<i>3</i>
Faculty Letters .....	3
Department Recommendation .....	3
<i>College / School / Area Level - Local Promotion and Tenure Committee.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Dean Level – College / School Dean .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>University Level - Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Provost Level - University Provost.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>President Level - University President .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<b>Dossier Preparation .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Presentation Format of Materials for Dossier.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Dossier Table of Contents .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Instructions for Completing the Dossier .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1.0    <i>Introductory Information .....</i></b>	<b>9</b>
1.1    Promotion / Tenure Proposal Form .....	9
1.2    Checklist / Table of Contents .....	9
1.3    Curriculum Vitae .....	9
1.4    Department and/or College / School Criteria.....	10
<b>2.0    <i>Teaching Data.....</i></b>	<b>10</b>
2.1    Candidate’s Teaching Philosophy Statement.....	10
2.2    Course List Table.....	10
2.3    Graduate Student Committee History Table .....	11
2.4    Mentoring Table.....	12
2.5    Student Letters .....	12
2.6    Department Policy on Peer Review of Teaching.....	14
2.7    Peer Review Evaluations .....	14
2.8    Teaching Grants, Awards, and Honors .....	14
2.9    Teaching Summary Statement.....	14
<b>3.0    <i>Scholarship Data.....</i></b>	<b>14</b>
3.1    Candidate’s Scholarship Philosophy Statement .....	14
3.2    List of Publications and Creative Work .....	15
3.3    Publication Outlet Evaluation and Citation Count .....	15
3.4    List of Presentations .....	16
3.5    Scholarly Awards and Honors.....	16
3.6    Scholarly Grants .....	16
3.7    External Reviewer Letters .....	16
3.8    Scholarly Publications .....	19
3.9    Scholarship Summary Statement .....	20

<b>4.0</b>	<b><i>Service Data.....</i></b>	<b>20</b>
4.1	Candidate’s Service Philosophy Statement .....	20
4.2	List of Service Activities .....	20
4.3	Service Summary Statement.....	20
<b>5.0</b>	<b><i>Additional Letters, Reviews, and Recommendations.....</i></b>	<b>20</b>
5.1	Third-year and Annual Reviews.....	21
5.2	Faculty Letters .....	21
5.3	Department Evaluation with Recommendation.....	21
5.4	Local (Area/College) Committee Evaluation with Recommendation .....	21
5.5	Dean Evaluation with Recommendation .....	21
<b>6.0</b>	<b><i>Addendum Materials.....</i></b>	<b>22</b>
6.1	Candidate Addendum.....	22
6.2	Updates to Existing Materials.....	22
<b>APPENDIX A Promotion / Tenure Proposal Form.....</b>		<b>23</b>
<b>APPENDIX B Checklist / Table of Contents.....</b>		<b>24</b>

**PROMOTION AND TENURE INFORMATION INCLUDING INSTRUCTIONS  
TO PREPARE A DOSSIER FOR REGULAR FACULTY  
(REVISED – February 5, 2026)**

**Introduction**

This document provides information about the promotion and tenure process and is intended for **regular** faculty going through the process as well as those who participate in the review process at any of the following levels: department, Local (local is defined as college/school or area), Dean, university, Provost, and President.

The instructions in this document, unless otherwise specified, are mandatory directives approved and issued by the Provost in the Provost's authority as Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. As such, they are binding on all promotion-and-tenure committees, Deans, Department Chairs, dossier preparers, and candidates. They are not intended to alter the substantive criteria for promotion and/or tenure, but rather to elaborate on how a candidate's satisfaction of these criteria is to be systematically and rigorously demonstrated and assessed.

The University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure (University Committee) hopes to clarify the process through this document and to answer questions that commonly arise. With that said, however, there are other important documents that must be carefully reviewed such as the *Faculty Handbook*. These documents can be found on the Provost's [website](#).

**Promotion and Tenure Calendar Deadlines**

Promotion and Tenure [deadlines](#) are promulgated by the Office of the Provost in March of each year. Dossier preparers should review the timeline carefully.

**Promotion and Tenure Criteria**

University criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure are provided in the [Faculty Handbook](#) (See Chapters 301, 302, 303 and 304). The information contained herein neither supersedes nor repeats information found in the [Faculty Handbook](#), but rather, it is supplemental. Committee members and candidates must review the statutes and apply the criteria in a rigorous fashion.

University criteria supersede college or department specific criteria. College and department criteria provide an interpretation of the University criteria. They are formulated by faculty, approved and signed by the Dean, submitted to the University Committee for review with respect to congruence with University statutes, and submitted to the Office of the Provost with evidence of University Committee endorsement for final approval. New faculty must be clearly apprised of these criteria by the Department Chair or Dean. College and department criteria must be explicitly stated so that faculty going through the process, as well as those on review committees, are able to evaluate where each faculty member stands in relation to these expectations. In general, highly ambiguous statements are to be avoided in favor of statements with greater specificity, however, caution is advised about developing statements that are too specific.

Departmental, college, and university promotion and tenure decisions must apply the written criteria that are published in the unit and within the university statutes. Unwritten or undocumented criteria cannot be applied.

## **Promotion and Tenure Review Procedures**

In terms of helping faculty know where they stand relative to promotion and/or tenure:

- All untenured assistant professors on the tenure track must receive annual reviews as well as a comprehensive review at or near the end of the third year assessing progress toward promotion to associate professor. A copy of the [third-year review](#) evaluation and recommendation is to be submitted to the Office of the Provost by the Dean within 30 days of completion.
- Associate professors with tenure must receive regular feedback, every 2-3 years if not annually, regarding their progress toward promotion to professor.

Assistant professors are time bound after their sixth year at Marquette. As such, they must go up for promotion and tenure at that time. Faculty members who are not approved for tenure in their time bound year will receive timely notice that the upcoming year is a terminal year.

Assistant professors may apply for promotion to associate professor with tenure prior to the time bound year if the criteria as set forth in the [Faculty Handbook](#) as well as those articulated within their college or department have been unambiguously met. Candidates should not, however, apply for promotion and tenure prior to the 3<sup>rd</sup> year review, the results of which should help guide future decision making. Exceptions may apply in cases where a faculty member spent time in a tenure track position at another institution or in a commensurate position within an organization outside the academy. Assistant professors whose case for early promotion to associate professor is turned down may reapply in subsequent years.

There is no time bound year established for tenured associate professors. Associate professors may apply for promotion to the rank of professor when the criteria as set forth in the [Faculty Handbook](#) as well as those articulated within their college or department have been met.

Candidates turned down for promotion to the rank of professor may reapply, however a candidate should not apply the following year, except under extraordinary circumstances. Significant new data clearly evidencing that the criteria for promotion have been met, must be garnered before a candidate should consider reapplying for promotion to the rank of professor.

Faculty members may be nominated or may self-nominate for review for promotion and/or tenure. Once nominated the following sequence is typical, although some departments and colleges may have additional steps.

- A dossier is completed for each faculty member up for tenure and/or promotion.
- Each department (except in colleges without departments) reviews the dossier and provides a recommendation to the local committee.
- The local committee reviews the dossier and provides a recommendation to the Dean.
- The Dean reviews the dossier and provides a recommendation to the University Committee.
- The University Committee reviews the dossier and provides a recommendation to the Provost.
- The Provost reviews the dossier and provides a recommendation to the President.
- The President reviews the dossier and makes a determination whether or not to confer tenure and/or promotion.

The promotion and tenure review at each level considers the recommendations at all previous levels. All recommendations are advisory. The President's determination is final.

## **Promotion and Tenure Levels with Associated Committees**

The proceedings of the promotion and tenure review at all levels are to be honored by strict confidentiality, except as otherwise noted herein. A breach in confidentiality may lead to removal from a committee or other, more consequential disciplinary actions.

### **Department Level - Independent Faculty (*units without departments - skip this section*)**

In colleges and schools where departments exist, the Department Chair normally facilitates a departmental vote after all evidence has been gathered. Faculty members within the department thoroughly review the dossier of each candidate and subsequently render an independent recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure.

Normally associate professors and professors vote on promotion to the rank of associate professor, but only professors vote on promotion to the rank of professor. Situations that require a different voting group must be approved in advance by the Dean of the college and explained in the dossier. If the candidate has made prior unsuccessful attempts at promotion and/or tenure, those attempts, deficiencies, and remedies must be noted in the *Department Evaluation with Recommendation* section of the dossier (Section 5.3) or, for units without departments, in the *Local (Area/College) Committee Evaluation with Recommendation* (Section 5.4).

Faculty Letters - All departmental faculty, including the Department Chair, who cast a ballot regarding the promotion and/or tenure of a particular candidate must write a letter for inclusion in the dossier (Section 5.2) clearly noting their particular vote and articulating the reasons, including both positive and negative aspects of the case, that the candidate did or did not meet the criteria for promotion. Voting faculty are expected to perform a thorough assessment of a candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service and are to acquaint themselves fully with the candidate's dossier before writing their letters. *If any faculty member who is eligible to participate and vote on a particular candidate chooses not to do so, their omission must be clearly explained by the Department Chair.* Only current faculty vote and write letters. Retired and emeriti faculty typically do not participate in the promotion and tenure process. If unusual circumstances warrant the inclusion of a letter from a retired or emeritus faculty member, justification must be provided in the dossier.

The Department Chair should meet with the candidate to communicate the outcome of the departmental vote, indicating whether there was a positive or negative vote, *if* the candidate requests such knowledge. However, no further information, including the actual vote count, should be shared with the candidate by the Department Chair.

Department Recommendation (not required in units without departments) - The Department letter is written on behalf of the department by the dossier preparer and is meant to summarize the discussion and vote of department faculty members. The letter must include the vote and articulate the extent to which the candidate meets stated departmental criteria across teaching, scholarship, and service. In situations where the vote is not unanimous, the minority view(s) must be explained in the summary letter, including as specifically as possible, an assessment of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service.

### *College / School / Area Level - Local Promotion and Tenure Committee*

After the department vote has been completed, the local committee reviews the dossiers of all candidates and renders the official unit (i.e., college, school or in the case of the Way Klingler College of Arts & Sciences, the area) judgment on whether or not the candidate meets stated criteria for tenure and/or promotion.<sup>1</sup> Local promotion and tenure committees must provide an impartial and thorough analysis of each case. Issues raised by internal or external evaluators, faculty colleagues, and students are to be fully debated and addressed in the local committee report. At the discretion of the local committee chair, Department Chairs and/or dossier preparers may be invited to the meeting to answer questions from the local committee. All members of the local committee are required to vote. Abstentions are not permitted unless a conflict of interest exists.

For colleges and schools without departments, all members of the college or school committee who cast a ballot regarding the promotion and/or tenure of a particular candidate must write a letter for inclusion in the dossier (Section 5.2) clearly noting their particular vote and articulating the reasons they determined the candidate did or did not meet the criteria for promotion. Voting faculty are expected to perform a thorough assessment of a candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service and are to fully acquaint themselves with the candidate's dossier before writing their letters. *If any faculty member who is eligible to participate and vote on a particular candidate chooses not to do so, their omission must be clearly explained by the Committee Chair.* Only current faculty vote and write letters. Retired and emeriti faculty do not participate.

Normally associate professors and professors vote on promotion to the rank of associate professor, but only professors vote on promotion to the rank of professor. Situations that require a different voting group must be approved in advance by the Dean of the college and explained in the dossier. Ideally, the chair of the local committee should not simultaneously be a sitting Department Chair or Associate Dean.

The chair of the local committee writes a letter on behalf of the committee that notes committee membership and presents the vote of the committee and its evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service (Section 5.4). In units without departments, the letter should note any prior unsuccessful attempts at promotion and/or tenure by this candidate and explain those attempts, deficiencies, and remedies. In situations where the vote is not unanimous, the minority view(s) must be explained in the summary letter, including as specifically as possible, an assessment of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service.

When a local committee votes not to support a candidate for promotion and/or tenure, it must provide a reasonable explanation of its action in its letter, i.e., one that is sufficiently specific to enable the candidate to make appropriate plans which may include the decision to reply to the Committee's critique in a special addendum (Section 6.1) at the end of the dossier or withdraw his/her nomination from consideration.

### *Dean Level – College / School Dean*

After the local vote has been completed, the Dean reviews the dossier including determinations made at the department and local levels. The Dean may seek clarification about a case from the department

---

<sup>1</sup> Dean's may begin reviewing dossiers at the same time as the local committee, however the Dean should not discuss the case with anyone until after the local committee has voted on the case and added their letter to the dossier.

chair or chair of the local committee as needed. The Dean then makes an independent recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure and writes a letter (Section 5.5) addressing the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service. In doing, the Dean should specifically address any weaknesses identified by faculty, students, or external reviewers. The Dean (or Dean's delegate) is then required to communicate the outcome of the local vote to the candidate, indicating whether there was a positive or negative vote and provide a detailed explanation as to the basis for the vote. Within the discretion of the Dean, the actual vote of the local committee may be provided. The Committee letter, however, should not be shared with the candidate. At the same time, the Dean must communicate his or her own recommendation. A candidate may include an addendum in the dossier (Section 6.1) if the Dean does not recommend promotion and/or tenure, regardless of the vote at the local committee. For additional information, please see the section titled, Presentation Format of Materials for Dossier (page 6) and Section 6.1 (page 20).

#### *University Level - Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure*

The University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure is chaired by the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and is comprised of the chairs of each local committee. Because the University Committee regularly makes recommendations concerning promotion to the rank of professor, committee members must normally hold the rank of professor themselves. University Committee members may not be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure while serving on this Committee. For a more detailed description of this committee, refer to Article 4 - Section 2.01 of the University Academic Senate Statutes as articulated in the [\*Faculty Handbook\*](#). The narrative below explains University Committee procedures when it gathers to consider faculty candidates for promotion and/or tenure (normally in late November or early December of each year).

Candidates are grouped and reviewed by college and by department. The local committee member from the candidate's college or school briefly introduces the case to the committee by providing an impartial summary of dossier contents, highlighting candidate strengths and weaknesses along with the recommendations of prior level votes. Members of the University Committee discuss each case, addressing all issues and questions brought forth by committee members. After the case has been discussed, the college Dean and Department Chair of the candidate may be asked to join the University Committee to answer questions. The Dean is the sole representative for units without departments. When these discussions conclude, the Dean and Department Chair are excused, and the University Committee considers all information before voting.

Voting is anonymous and facilitated by providing a ballot to each member on the University Committee. All members vote, with the exception of the Committee Chair. All votes are collected and the tally is announced to committee members before moving to the next candidate. Voting results are provided to the Provost but otherwise are kept strictly confidential.

Following the meeting, the University Committee Chair prepares a synopsis of the main points of the discussion and the Committee's vote on each candidate for the Provost.

#### *Provost Level - University Provost*

The Provost reviews the dossier, along with notes provided from the University Committee, and makes an independent judgment on the case. The Provost may seek clarification from the University Committee, the Dean, or the Department Chair as deemed necessary. The Provost makes an independent recommendation to the President on each case under consideration.

## *President Level - University President*

The President makes the final decision to promote or not to promote and to award tenure or not to award tenure. There may be occasions when the Provost or President decides not to follow the recommendation of the University Committee. In such cases, the Provost will meet with the University Committee to explain the decision. The University Committee will also be apprised of final decisions made by the President prior to public announcement.

### **Dossier Preparation**

Review for promotion and/or tenure of regular faculty requires preparation of a comprehensive dossier providing evidence that the candidate has met published criteria. The burden of proof in matters of tenure and/or promotion lies with the candidate and with those who prepare the dossier. All claims, therefore, must be substantiated with evidence. As a matter of longstanding practice, if there are significant concerns, questions, or doubts that are not satisfactorily addressed in the dossier, a negative decision will most likely be rendered.

Although materials invited and received for inclusion in the dossier may not be modified or culled, material that was not explicitly requested may be excised if it is not pertinent or was offered in error. Any omissions of this nature must be noted with an accompanying explanation.

The dossier must note any leaves of absence (or other delays to the time-bound year) granted to a particular candidate, excluding research/scholarly (normally in Section 5.3, or, for units without departments, in Section 5.4 or 5.5). The candidate is not expected to produce evidence of progress in teaching, scholarship, or service during the time of an approved leave of absence.

Each dossier must contain a rigorous and comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service. Some evaluative letters, such as those from faculty and the Dean, must address all three areas. Other evaluative letters may focus more narrowly on one of these areas (e.g., letters from students should focus on teaching, while letters from external reviewers should focus on scholarship). The local and university committees evaluate all three areas rigorously in accordance with local and university criteria. The dossier is to be carefully compared with the Dossier Table of Contents (see p.8) for compliance before submission to the next level. Any missing data should be added and evaluated before advancing the dossier.

### **Presentation Format of Materials for Dossier**

One original hard copy dossier for each candidate containing original letters and signatures on the *Promotion / Tenure Proposal* form (Appendix A) and the *Checklist / Table of Contents* (Appendix B) must be delivered to the Office of the Provost on or before the due date. An electronic dossier must be completed for each candidate at the same time. Care must be taken to economize a candidate's supporting materials so as to keep dossiers to a reasonable length.

- Responsibility for preparation of the dossier belongs to the Dean, but it may be delegated to the Department Chair, a senior faculty member in the department, or other faculty member as deemed appropriate.
- A new dossier must be prepared in the event the candidate is making a successive attempt at promotion and/or tenure. In such cases, the new dossier may include relevant material from the



previous dossier(s), as well as new material that evidences how teaching, scholarship and/or service have changed since the prior review and now meet criteria. With regard to external reviewer letters, either all letters from the previous dossier should be used or all new letters should be solicited from different reviewers. If the successive attempt is three or more years after previous attempt, new letters should be obtained. Previous dossier(s), in full, will be made available to the University Committee, the Provost, and the President. Department Chairs and dossier preparers should consult with their University Committee representative as needed to address questions that arise.

- The original hard copy dossier for the Provost must be double-sided and submitted in a one-inch binder that is three-holed punched on the left side of the page. The name of the candidate is to be affixed to the binding edge. The document must be printed in readable fashion (12pt font), carefully edited, indexed, tabbed, and paginated within subsections. The Provost's copy must remain unmarked by annotations from any readers.
- Confidential letters and evaluations must remain confidential. Letters inviting student reviews as well as external reviews are to indicate that their letter will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by a judicial or adjudicatory body or unless the reviewer specifies the conditions under which its contents may be disclosed to the candidate.
- The candidate must not prepare the dossier but may be asked to provide and may have access to factual material in the dossier to ensure it is complete and factually accurate. While atypical, the candidate may add material in an "Addendum," a discrete section at the end of the dossier (Section 6.1). A detailed explanation of why the material was added must be provided by the candidate at the beginning of this section. Candidates are encouraged to discuss their desire to create an "Addendum" with the individual charged with preparing the dossier before doing so.

Most typically, an addendum is included only when either the local committee or the Dean or both do not recommend the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. A candidate who wishes to include information in an addendum must do so at least three days prior to the date dossiers are made available to the University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure (see Promotion and Tenure Calendar Deadlines). Candidates should have no less than one week from their meeting with the dean to write an addendum. Exceptions to the addendum deadline, as referenced in this paragraph, will be granted only when the meeting with the dean does not provide sufficient time (e.g., one week) for the candidate to write the addendum.

- Separately, a candidate may work with the dossier preparer to add updates about existing materials (e.g., a grant award, journal acceptance, etc.) in Section 6.2. Material added to this section should come from the dossier preparer and include a date to indicate when it has been added so that those responsible for reviewing the dossier can determine which level(s) would have had access to these updates. Material may be added to this section until three days prior to the date dossiers are made available to the University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure (see Promotion and Tenure Calendar Deadlines). Dossier preparers should communicate with the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs to add these materials to the dossier.
- A candidate who wishes to withdraw their dossier from consideration for promotion and/or tenure must notify the college or school dean at least three days prior to the date dossiers are made available to the University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure (see Promotion and Tenure Calendar Deadlines).

## **Dossier Table of Contents**

The following table of contents must be strictly adhered to when compiling a dossier. Each section is described in greater detail on the pages that follow.

**Key: R = Required**

**A = As Applicable**

<b>Item</b>		<b>R/A</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b><i>Introductory Information</i></b>	
1.1	Promotion / Tenure Proposal Form (Appendix A)	<b>R</b>
1.2	Checklist / Table of Contents (Appendix B)	<b>R</b>
1.3	Curriculum Vitae	<b>R</b>
1.4	Department and/or College / School Criteria	<b>R</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b><i>Teaching Data</i></b>	
2.1	Candidate's Teaching Philosophy Statement	<b>R</b>
2.2	Course List Table	<b>R</b>
2.3	Graduate Student Committee History Table	<b>A</b>
2.4	Mentoring Table	<b>A</b>
2.5	Student Letters	<b>R</b>
2.6	Department Policy on Peer Review of Teaching	<b>R</b>
2.7	Peer Review Evaluations	<b>R</b>
2.8	Teaching Grants, Awards, and Honors	<b>A</b>
2.9	Teaching Summary Statement	<b>R</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b><i>Scholarship Data</i></b>	
3.1	Candidate's Scholarship Philosophy Statement	<b>R</b>
3.2	List of Publications and Creative Work	<b>R</b>
3.3	Publication Outlet Evaluation and Citation Count	<b>R</b>
3.4	List of Presentations	<b>R</b>
3.5	Scholarly Awards and Honors	<b>A</b>
3.6	Scholarly Grants (applied for and received)	<b>R</b>
3.7	External Reviewer Letters	<b>R</b>
3.8	Scholarly Publications (Electronic Dossier Only)	<b>R</b>
3.9	Scholarship Summary Statement	<b>R</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b><i>Service Data</i></b>	
4.1	Candidate's Service Philosophy Statement	<b>R</b>
4.2	List of Service Activities	<b>R</b>
4.3	Service Summary Statement	<b>R</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b><i>Additional Letters, Reviews, and Recommendations</i></b>	
5.1	Third-year and Annual Reviews	<b>R</b>
5.2	Faculty Letters	<b>R</b>
5.3	Department Evaluation with Recommendation	<b>R</b>
5.4	Local Committee Evaluation with Recommendation	<b>R</b>
5.5	Dean Evaluation with Recommendation	<b>R</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b><i>Addendum Materials</i></b>	
6.1	Candidate Addendum	<b>A</b>
6.2	Updates to Existing Materials	<b>A</b>

## **Instructions for Completing the Dossier**

The dossier is to be prepared electronically in accordance with the Table of Contents (above) and using the process described in the following pages. *All Table of Contents items should be included in the dossier, using exact numbers and titles, each as a separate pdf* (each pdf should have its own page numbering, beginning with page 1). Sections that are “as applicable” should still be included with a page noting “*This Item is Not Applicable*” if the candidate has no information to include.

One original paper copy of the dossier must be submitted to the Office of the Provost. The University Committee will work from the electronic dossier, located on the SharePoint site that the Office of the Provost will provide.

### **1.0      *Introductory Information***

Include the proposal form, checklist, curriculum vitae, and relevant local criteria.

### **1.1      *Promotion / Tenure Proposal Form (Required)***

Please complete the form located in *Appendix A* in its entirety. This form must be printed for signatures and then scanned and uploaded to the dossier. Place the original, signed document in the binder for the Provost.

### **1.2      *Checklist / Table of Contents (Required)***

Please complete the form located in *Appendix B* in its entirety. This form must be printed, signed and then scanned and uploaded to the dossier. Place the original, signed document in the binder for the Provost.

### **1.3      *Curriculum Vitae (Required)***

A current copy of the candidate’s curriculum vitae (CV) must be included. Candidates may use *Faculty Success* to create the CV or use an alternative style if desired. In either case, particular attention should be paid to the following points:

- For each listing of items, begin with the most current and work back toward the earliest works.
- Distinguish between scholarly work completed prior to arriving at Marquette and scholarly work completed at Marquette. Candidates seeking promotion to (full) professor must clearly indicate which publications, grants, awards and so forth occurred after promotion to associate professor.
- Clearly distinguish between scholarship that is peer reviewed and that which is not peer reviewed by using separate headings.
- Manuscripts in press may be noted under publications and clearly identified as such.
- Work in progress should be listed separately after the listing of published and in-press works.
- Delineate the “level” of presentations: local, regional, national, or international; invited vs. refereed, as appropriate.
- Place refereed and non-refereed conference *publications* into separate categories.
- Place refereed and non-refereed conference *presentations* into separate categories.
- Include all authors in published order and provide inclusive page numbers of all publications.

## **1.4 Department and/or College / School Criteria (Required)**

Please include the criteria used to evaluate the dossier. Note that some areas use department criteria exclusively; others rely on both departmental and college criteria; finally, some use only college criteria. On a cover sheet preceding the criteria, please indicate that the criteria were used consistently during the evaluation of the dossier and that all who assessed the dossier (including external reviewers) used this set of criteria. In accordance with the *Policy on the Applicability of Revised Promotion and Tenure Standards in Academic Units* in the Faculty Handbook (Section 303.04), please check to ensure the correct set of departmental or college standards have been applied to the faculty member in question.

## **2.0 Teaching Data**

Teaching is an integral part of the Marquette faculty experience and as such a thorough evaluation is expected for all candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. The dossier must provide a full evaluation of teaching effectiveness including several pieces of evidence that are more fully articulated below in sections 2.1 through 2.9.

### **2.1 Candidate's Teaching Philosophy Statement (Required)**

The candidate's statement should articulate core beliefs about teaching and how the candidate has enacted them. Candidates must indicate the ways in which their teaching efforts have developed over time, addressing improvements made (e.g., as a result of shortcomings noted in annual or 3<sup>rd</sup> year reviews) along with a description of the innovative methods employed to enhance student learning and keep teaching fresh. Candidates may include information in the teaching statement related to the way(s) in which their teaching was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic or any other factors beyond the candidate's control.

### **2.2 Course List Table (Required)**

Please use "Instructor Profile (MOCES) – Promotion and Tenure" report in *Faculty Success* created by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis to generate this section. The table below includes a sample entry. For candidates seeking the rank of professor, the table must include data from at least the twelve most recent semesters (or less as applicable if the candidate is seeking promotion in fewer than twelve semesters since being promoted to associate professor). For candidates seeking the rank of associate professor, the table must include data for the entire probationary period. An explanation is to be provided if course evaluations were not administered in any classes.

## Instructor Profile - Marquette Online Course Evaluation System (MOCES)

Click [here](#) for more information on interpreting your results

Term	Class <sup>1</sup>	Mode <sup>2</sup>	Total Enroll	Total Respond	Response Rate	Core Items Median <sup>3</sup>	Department Comparison <sup>4,5</sup> (same course level)		College Comparison <sup>4,5</sup> (same course level)	
							20 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> -80 <sup>th</sup> Percentiles	Total Classes	20 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> -80 <sup>th</sup> Percentiles	Total Classes
Fall 2022	<a href="#">PSYC 1001 101</a>	IP	17	15	88.2%	5.3	5.1 - 5.6 - 5.9	50	5.0 - 5.5 - 5.9	75
Fall 2022	<a href="#">PSYC 1001 701</a>	IP	12	10	83.3%	5.5	4.3 - 5.4 - 5.8	46	4.1 - 5.3 - 5.4	137
Spring 2022	<a href="#">PSYC 2101 101</a>	IP	20	12	60.0%	4.9	4.5 - 5.4 - 5.7	42	4.3 - 5.4 - 5.7	624
Spring 2022	<a href="#">PSYC 3210 701</a>	IP	6	6	100.0%	5.1	4.5 - 5.4 - 5.7	42	4.3 - 5.4 - 5.7	624

<sup>1</sup> Click the link for each class to access the course profile for the class. Course profiles are uploaded into the Scheduled Teaching section of the Faculty Activities Database at the end of teach term. You must be logged into to your FAD account to access these reports.

<sup>2</sup> Mode describes which instrument was used to evaluate the class IP = [In-Person](#); DS = [Distance](#); BL = [Blended](#).

<sup>3</sup> Core item median combines the responses to the four core items. These are: How was this class as a whole? How was the content of this class? How was the instructor's contribution to this class? How effective was the instructor in this class?

<sup>4</sup> The comparisons are based on classes evaluated within the last two academic years in the same department/college & course level. Comparison data are not available for all classes. Please see <https://www.marquette.edu/institutional-research-analysis/moces/profile-interpretation.php> for more information.

<sup>5</sup> Course evaluations did not occur in the Spring 2020 semester therefore are not included in any comparison data. Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 evaluation results may not be consistent with previous or subsequent results because of the substantial changes to class schedules and modalities due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

<sup>6</sup> In spring 2023, as a result of a technical issue with the vendor's software, some students were unable to complete evaluations on the final day they were open. The overall response rate was about 3 percentages points lower than the previous four semesters, so course scores may be based on fewer students than in past semesters.

## 2.3 Graduate Student Committee History Table (As Applicable)

Provide a history of service on theses and dissertations committees noting role as director where applicable. This table can be generated using the "P&T 2.3 – Graduate Student History Table" report in *Faculty Success*.

Student Name and Institution if other than Marquette	Years on Committee	Master's Thesis Committee: Served as Director	Doctoral Dissertation Committee: Served as Director
Bob Johnson	2020 - present	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Mary Williams	2019 - present	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Sue Jones (UWM)	2017 - 2020	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
John Smith	2016 - 2017	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

## 2.4 Mentoring Table (As Applicable)

Include items such as post doc, graduate, and undergraduate scholarship support (including work in a lab), professional projects, independent studies, McNair advising, etc. Do not repeat graduate student committee work noted in Section 2.3 (above). This table can be generated using the “P&T 2.4 – Mentoring Table” report in *Faculty Success*.

Student Name	Year(s) Mentored	Type of Mentoring Provided
Megan O’Conner	2020	McNair Mentor
Kevin Gordon	2019	Directed Master’s Capstone Project
Xavier Gonzalez	2017	Directed Independent Study

## 2.5 Student Letters (Required)

Students asked to write letters must be randomly selected by the department or college and must have received a grade of “C” or higher in the course. Dossier preparers should submit a “Student Data Request – Individual Student Data” via the Office of the Registrar’s website listing [Forms for Faculty and Staff](#). Simply complete the required fields, entering “N/A” in the “Request data for term” section, “See below” in the “Data Requested” section and select “Yes” for “Is Promotion and Tenure Report Required?” Include the candidate’s name and MUID number in the “Promotion and Tenure” field. This report will include a list of all qualified students who were enrolled in the faculty’s courses, along with their email address information, if available. The sampling of students approached for teaching assessment should be representative of the candidate’s teaching career and typically include both undergraduate and graduate students familiar with the candidate’s teaching. Normally 10 to 15 letters from undergraduate students and 5 to 10 letters from graduate students is sufficient. Since 20 percent or fewer of solicited students typically respond, a large number of students will need to be contacted to obtain the desired number of letters. Students for whom the candidate has directed a thesis, dissertation, or other major work, whose names appear in Tables 2.3 and 2.4 may also be asked to submit a letter. A statement must be included describing how all student letters were solicited, the number solicited, and the number received.

Sample language for requesting student letters, and basic formatting for a student’s response, are included below.

### Student Solicitation Letter

*Date*

*Student Name*

Dear *Student Name*:

Dr. *Candidate Name*, rank in the *Department Name* at Marquette University, is currently being considered for promotion to *Proposed Rank*. As part of the review process, the department is preparing Dr. *Candidate's Name* dossier and will submit this file of information to various committees at the University. An essential part of the dossier is the inclusion of student evaluation letters. You have been identified as a former student of Dr. *Candidate's Name* and have been randomly selected to provide an assessment.

Your candid commentary on Dr. *Candidate Name's* attributes, skills, style, effectiveness, and so forth **as an instructor** would be greatly appreciated and vitally important to the review process. Specific examples to illustrate key points are especially valued. Your comments (preferably in letter form but an e-mail response is acceptable) will be held in confidence unless a judicial or adjudicatory body orders disclosure.

Please submit your comments to me no later than *SPECIFY DEADLINE*. A sample guide for your reply is provided below for your consideration.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in this very important matter on *Dr. CANDIDATE'S NAME* behalf.

Sincerely,

*Name, Title*

*Contact Information*

### Student Reply Guide

*Date*

Dear University Committee on Faculty Promotions & Tenure

Indicate your status (current student or alumnus) as well as your undergraduate major or graduate degree, etc. Note the specific course(s) in which you had *Dr. CANDIDATE'S NAME* as an instructor.

Provide comments and specific examples concerning the attributes, skills, style, effectiveness, and so forth of *Dr. CANDIDATE'S NAME* as an instructor.

Your signature (if responding by letter)

## **2.6 Department Policy on Peer Review of Teaching (Required)**

Please include the department or college peer review policy and guidelines used to review teaching. Peer review affords evaluation by an experienced faculty member with recognized proficiency in teaching and as such the reviewer must not simply provide a summary of activities but rather critically assess the instructor and provide suggestions for improvement. Peer reviews must include a classroom visitation (unless the course is online in which case alternative plans should be made in lieu of an in-person visit). Useful information may be available from student surveys, course materials (syllabi, tests, assignments, teaching rubrics, etc.), and faculty development projects.

## **2.7 Peer Review Evaluations (Required)**

Comprehensive peer reviews of teaching are required in dossiers for all candidates for promotion to associate professor and professor, annually for non-tenured regular faculty and periodically for tenured faculty. Dossiers for regular faculty seeking promotion to professor must contain at least three peer reviews conducted since promotion to associate professor with at least one completed in the two years leading up to the candidacy.

## **2.8 Teaching Grants, Awards, and Honors (As Applicable)**

List all grants, awards (internal and external) and other honors associated with teaching. This section can be generated using the “P&T 2.8 – Teaching Grants, Awards, and Honors” report in *Faculty Success*.

## **2.9 Teaching Summary Statement (Required)**

This section should include an overall summary of the teaching evidence provided in sections 2.1 - 2.8. Be sure to include a thorough discussion of both positive and negative aspects of the candidate’s teaching.

## **3.0 Scholarship Data**

Scholarship is an integral part of the Marquette faculty experience and as such a thorough evaluation is expected for all candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. The dossier is to provide a full evaluation of scholarship applying the criteria articulated in departmental, local and university standards.

## **3.1 Candidate’s Scholarship Philosophy Statement (Required)**

The candidate’s statement on scholarship describes the philosophy as well as scholarly efforts and plans for future scholarship. Work with postdoctoral associates, undergraduate and graduate students and proposed funding agencies should be articulated as appropriate. Note any scholarly works of particular significance. Candidates may include information in the scholarship statement related to the way(s) in which their scholarship was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, federal actions and a shifting research funding landscape beyond the institution, or any other factors beyond the candidate’s control.



### 3.2 List of Publications and Creative Work (Required)

A full list of scholarly publications and creative work must be provided. For easy reference in Section 3.3 (below), please number all publications. Clearly distinguish between work that is published, has been accepted for publication, that is under review, or in preparation. Also, be sure to clearly distinguish between works that were peer-reviewed and those that were not peer reviewed. Some creative works may fall outside the boundaries of traditional outlets, such as scholarly journals and books. In these instances, provide a thorough and comprehensive review together with supporting evidence. Work is not necessarily creative or original simply because it is non-traditional. When presented as grounds for tenure and/or promotion, creative work must be subject to rigorous peer review by professionals. Furthermore, since this peer review is not standard, the process itself must be clearly explained.

Publications include but are not limited to: books, book chapters, monographs, journal articles, and conference proceedings. When listing publications please adhere to the following set of guidelines:

- For books, indicate what stage the book is in using these definitions:
  - *Published*, if electronic give DOI
  - *In Production* (page proofs being prepared from copy submitted by the author, copy editing, or in press)
  - *Accepted* (positive editorial decision)
- For journal articles, distinguish those that are forthcoming/in press from those already published. Manuscripts under review and works in progress may be listed under a separate heading.
- Distinguish between scholarly work completed prior to arriving at Marquette and work completed at Marquette.
- For faculty being considered for promotion to (full) professor, clearly identify those scholarly works completed after promotion to associate professor.
- Distinguish between scholarship that went through a peer review process and scholarship that did not.
- Distinguish between refereed and non-refereed conference proceedings.
- Indicate works that were specifically invited (as applicable).
- Include all authors in published order and provide inclusive page numbers for all publications. Provide some indication of context with regard to local norms around authorship, co-authorship, and author order on publications.

### 3.3 Publication Outlet Evaluation and Citation Count (Required)

Note that the burden of proof for demonstrating the quality of the candidate's scholarship is with the candidate and dossier preparer. In addition to providing information in the table below, external reviewers may serve as good sources for evidencing the quality of publication outlets. Adjustments may be made to the table as necessary (e.g., to account for two sources of citation or impact factor).

Publication # (from list in Table 3.2)	Type of Publication (book, journal, etc.)	Department Ranking (if applicable)	Citation Count & Source	Impact Factor & Source	Journal Acceptance Rate	Candidate's Percent Contribution	Nature of Contribution
Publication #1	Journal article	AB	23 – Google Scholar	2.378 – Journal Citation Reports	15%	50%	Collaborator
Publication #2	Book	N / A	145 / Google Scholar	N / A	N / A	100%	N / A
Publication #3	Journal article	B	75 – Google Scholar	1.015 – Journal Citation Reports	22%	10%	Data Analysis
Publication #4	Journal article	A	43 – Google Scholar	3.961 – Journal Citation Reports	10%	100%	N/A

### 3.4 List of Presentations (Required)

A full list of scholarly presentations must be provided. Presentations include but are not limited to those delivered at: disciplinary conferences, invited meetings, universities, and community settings. Clearly distinguish between refereed and non-refereed conference presentations as well as invited and non-invited. Finally, indicate the presentation “level” such as local, regional, national or international. This section can be generated using the “P&T 3.4 – List of Presentations” report in *Faculty Success*.

### 3.5 Scholarly Awards and Honors (As Applicable)

List all awards and other honors associated with scholarship. This section can be generated using the “P&T 3.5 – Scholarly Awards and Honors” report in *Faculty Success*.

### 3.6 Scholarly Grants (Required)

With regard to grant applications, distinguish grants received from grants applied for but not received, as well as those that were internal to Marquette versus those that were external. In addition, the candidate’s role on each grant must be indicated (e.g., PI, Co-PI, or collaborator) as well as the amount, duration, funding source and type of grant. The nature of collaborative contributions and/or responsibilities with respect to co-authored grants must also be noted. This section can be generated using the “P&T 3.6 – Scholarly Grants” report in *Faculty Success*.

### 3.7 External Reviewer Letters (Required)

Letters are to be obtained from external reviewers who are asked to evaluate both the quality and quantity of a candidate’s scholarly publications in relation to department or college criteria. If the candidate’s publication has already been evaluated at one level (i.e., for promotion to associate professor), then that publication must not be evaluated again (i.e., for promotion to professor). All reviewers are to be asked to provide their evaluation of the overall quality of the candidate’s scholarship, with particular attention paid to whether the scholarship meets the relevant criteria at Marquette. As such, departmental and/or college criteria must be made available to reviewers.

Include a statement describing the process by which external reviewers were solicited and ultimately selected. Please include the solicitation letter along with a brief paragraph describing each reviewer’s professional accomplishments (do not include reviewer CVs). Reviewers should be tenured faculty and recognized authorities in their fields of study.

For the review of a faculty member being considered for promotion to professor, reviewers must be tenured and hold the rank of professor. Professors emeriti who remain actively engaged in their disciplines may be used as needed.

For the review of a faculty being considered for promotion to associate professor, reviewers must be tenured and hold the rank of professor or associate professor. Professors emeriti or associate professors emeriti who remain actively engaged in their discipline may be used as needed.

Although it is reasonable and expected for a candidate to be acquainted with the experts in his or her field, external reviewers must not have ties to the candidate that would create an undue risk of bias or constitute a conflict of interest (where the candidate's promotion would benefit the reviewer in some way). For example, it is not appropriate to solicit letters from the candidate's dissertation advisor or post-doctoral supervisor, or from current or past collaborators or co-authors. Nor is it appropriate to solicit letters from colleagues in a department where the candidate previously worked. If personal or professional ties do exist, these must be explained. Candidates may recommend up to two names of potential external reviewers. Should reviewers meet the criteria and be able to serve, dossier preparers may use no more than one identified by the candidate. Dossier preparers should avoid duplication between the candidate's list and the departmental list. The department or local committee is responsible for the final selection of reviewers. Because a negative conflict of interest may exist for the candidate, either for personal or professional reasons, candidates must be allowed, a priori, to identify up to two potential reviewers to exclude from consideration.

Letters from at least five, but not more than six external reviewers are to be obtained.<sup>2</sup> In rare cases, dossiers with four external reviewers may be acceptable, however the circumstances for failing to secure the necessary five reviewers must be explained in detail. Dossiers with fewer than four external reviewers will not be considered.

No more than one of the eventual external reviewers are to come from candidate recommendations. Any reviewer suggested by the candidate must be clearly distinguished from those selected by the department or local committee.

Reviewers who provided letters for a candidate's promotion to associate professor generally should not be asked to provide an evaluation for that candidate's promotion to professor. Any deviation must be thoroughly explained.

The candidate's scholarly works are to be included as follows. For candidates seeking promotion to the rank of associate professor, all works published during the probationary period at Marquette University are to be made available to reviewers. For candidates seeking promotion to the rank of professor, all works published since promotion to associate professor are to be made available to reviewers. Scholarly works must be scanned and uploaded to the electronic dossier; hard copies of scholarly works are NOT to be included in the paper dossier. Books or other scholarly evidence that cannot be scanned must be made available to external reviewers.

The candidate may choose to include her/his Scholarship Philosophy Statement (Section 3.1), however, this is not a requirement, as it may be normative in some, but not all disciplines. If it is sent to external reviewers, care must be taken to ensure the same document is included in the dossier. A revised statement should be included in the dossier if something substantial changed after the original was sent to external reviewers, and the nature of any changes should be noted. Candidates are urged to check with dossier preparers when considering whether or not to send their Scholarship Philosophy Statement to external reviewers.

---

<sup>2</sup> The University Committee believes that care must be taken to use some economy when selecting external reviewers. Since Marquette University does not offer a stipend to accompany the external reviews, some reviewers are reluctant to undertake such work. This may affect future candidates. Thus, in the usual case, there is no need for more than five external reviewers.

### Sample Description of External Reviewer Selection Process

The candidate identified two potential reviewers, both of whom were familiar with the candidate's work. The candidate also identified, a priori, one individual who was perceived to have a conflict and thus asked that this individual be excluded from consideration. The Department Chair (who prepared the dossier) along with senior faculty in the department, identified eight additional potential reviewers whose names were not shared with the candidate. Eight of the ten potential reviewers were asked to provide evaluations, one was chosen from those suggested by the candidate and seven were chosen from those suggested by the department.

All reviewers were contacted by the Department Chair to determine if they were willing to conduct the evaluation. Five agreed to do so, four from those identified by the department and one from those identified by the candidate. After agreement, departmental criteria, candidate publications, and the candidates curriculum vitae were made available to reviewers electronically. All five reviewers submitted reviews by the due date. Biographical information for the five reviewers is provided below.

### Sample External Reviewer Solicitation Letter

*Dr. Reviewer Name*

*Department and Institution Name*

*Address*

Dear Dr. *Reviewer Name*:

Dr. *Candidate Name*, rank in the *Department Name* at Marquette University, is currently being considered for promotion to *Proposed Rank*. As part of the review process, the department is preparing Dr. *Candidate's Name* dossier and will submit this file of information to various committees at the University. An essential part of the dossier is the inclusion of evaluation letters from experts outside the University. You have been identified as a person who is qualified to provide an assessment of Dr. *Candidate's Name* scholarly accomplishments. If you agree, please keep in mind that we are interested in your assessment of the extent to which Dr. *Candidate's Name* has met the *scholarly* expectations at Marquette University.

To assist you in making your evaluation, I have enclosed our departmental criteria for promotion and tenure at the *Proposed Rank* as well as Dr. *Candidate's Name* curriculum vitae. If you are able to review, I will make Dr. *Candidate's Name* publications available as well. The due date for the review is *Date*.

Please note that Dr. *Candidate's Name* will not have access to your letter unless a judicial or adjudicatory body orders disclosure. In addition, if you are able to review, but believe a conflict of interest may exist, please note the nature of the conflict in your response along with your willingness to assist, so that a determination can be made one way or another.

I understand the commitment of valuable time required to accommodate this request and would be sincerely appreciative of your positive response. If, however, you are not able to participate in this vital process, please notify me as soon as possible and perhaps recommend a colleague who might be willing and available.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

*Name, Title*

*Contact Information*

### Sample Letter to External Reviewer after Agreement

*Date*

*Dr. Reviewer Name*

*Department and Institution*

*Address*

Dear Dr. *Reviewer Name*:

Thank you for agreeing to write a letter of review for Dr. *Candidate's Name* dossier for promotion to *proposed rank*. I have attached three files, one containing Dr. *Candidate's Name* curriculum vitae, one containing departmental criteria for promotion (please see *pages X-X* for details of scholarly expectations), and one containing Dr. *Candidate's Name's* scholarly publications. If you need any additional information, please let me know.

In preparing your response to this request, note that we are exclusively interested in your evaluation of Dr. *Candidate's Name* scholarly profile and quality of work. Please consider the following suggestions related to format and content:

- Typed on letterhead, 2-3 pages in length.
- With the salutation, "To the Marquette University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure".
- Please include identifying information such as (e.g., title, academic rank, degrees, and other relevant credentials or accomplishments).
- Identify your relationship to the candidate, if any.
- Provide an evaluation pertaining to the nature of Dr. *Candidate's Name* scholarship, its quality, quantity and contributions to the field, and the extent to which Marquette's criteria for scholarship have (or have not) been met. For candidate's seeking the rank of professor, please only consider their post-tenure scholarly works. Please note, we are NOT requesting a specific recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion.
- Either mail your letter in the return envelope provided, or print, sign, scan, and email your letter as an attachment to: *e-mail address*.
- Please complete and return your review by *Date*.

Note Dr. *Candidate's Name* will not have access to your letter unless a judicial or adjudicatory body orders disclosure.

Thank you again for your time and energy. I am very grateful.

Sincerely,  
*Requester*

### 3.8 Scholarly Publications (Required Only in the Electronic Dossier)

This section is only for the electronic dossier and should NOT be included in the hard copy binder submitted to the Provost. Upload electronic copies of all scholarly works *published since appointment to current position*. In some cases, for example when a candidate comes to Marquette having served in rank elsewhere, works published prior to coming to Marquette University may be

included. These scholarly works will be sent to external reviewers as well. Scholarly works (such as books) that cannot be uploaded electronically must be made available to external reviewers. Note: A *single* continuous PDF of the candidate's scholarly works must be uploaded to this section of the dossier, not separate PDFs.

### **3.9 Scholarship Summary Statement (Required)**

This section should include an overall summary of the scholarship evidence provided (since hire or tenure) in sections 3.1 - 3.8. Be sure to include a thorough discussion of both positive and negative aspects of the candidate's scholarship. A thorough explanation must be provided in cases where the candidate has experienced a late surge in scholarship.

## **4.0 Service Data**

Service is very important in the life of a Marquette faculty member and as such a thorough evaluation is expected for all candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. The dossier must provide a full evaluation of service including several pieces of evidence that are more fully articulated below.

### **4.1 Candidate's Service Philosophy Statement (Required)**

The candidate's service philosophy statement must reflect the candidate's approach to service in the candidate's department, college, university, community and profession. This may include, but need not be limited to, the ways in which service is connected to the candidate's teaching and scholarship. Candidates may include information in the service statement related to the way(s) in which their service was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic or other factors beyond the candidate's control.

### **4.2 List of Service Activities (Required)**

Include service activities within the candidate's department (where departments exist), college and university. Also include professional/disciplinary activities which might include reviewing manuscripts and/or grants, organizing and participating in professional meetings at national or international levels, and membership on editorial or professional boards. Finally, also include service to the larger community, including community and corporate engagement (as applicable). In doing so, identify the nature of the work along with the extent to which students or other university constituents were involved. This section can be generated using the "P&T 4.2 – List of Service" report in *Faculty Success*.

### **4.3 Service Summary Statement (Required)**

This section should include an overall summary of the service evidence provided in sections 4.1 - 4.2. Be sure to include a thorough discussion of both positive and negative aspects of the candidate's service.

## **5.0 Additional Letters, Reviews, and Recommendations**

Include faculty letters, the candidate's reviews (annual and third-year reviews for tenure, or regular periodic reviews for promotion to professor), and evaluations with recommendations from the department, local committee and Dean.

### **5.1 Third-year and Annual Reviews (Required)**

Include all reviews in chronological order (most recent review last) conducted since appointment to current position.

### **5.2 Faculty Letters (Required)**

All departmental faculty who cast a ballot regarding the promotion and/or tenure of a particular candidate must write a letter for inclusion in the dossier, clearly noting their particular vote, and articulating the reasons they determined the candidate did or did not meet the criteria for promotion. Voting faculty are expected to perform a thorough assessment of a candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service and are to fully acquaint themselves with the candidate's dossier before writing their letters. *If any faculty member who is eligible to participate and vote on a particular candidate chooses not to do so, their non-participation must be clearly explained in the dossier by the dossier preparer.*

### **5.3 Department Evaluation with Recommendation (Required except for units without departments)**

The Department letter is written on behalf of the department. The letter must include the vote and articulate the extent to which the candidate meets stated departmental criteria across teaching, scholarship, and service. Be sure to include a thorough discussion of both positive and negative aspects of the case. Note any leaves of absence or other extensions to the time-bound year granted to a candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure, excluding research/scholarly leaves. If the candidate has made prior unsuccessful attempts at promotion and/or tenure, those attempts, deficiencies, and remedies must be noted in the letter. Where the departmental vote is not unanimous, minority view(s) must be explained. In cases where a significant minority exists, a more thorough and detailed explanation is expected.

### **5.4 Local (Area/College) Committee Evaluation with Recommendation (Required)**

The chair of the local committee writes a letter on behalf of the committee which notes committee membership and presents the vote of the committee and its evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service. Be sure to include a discussion of both positive and negative aspects of the case. For units without departments, the local committee letter may note any leaves of absence or other extensions to the time-bound year granted to a candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure, excluding research/scholarly leaves. Where the vote was not unanimous, minority view(s) must be explained. Any committee member with a dissenting view may write a separate letter explaining her or his minority view.

### **5.5 Dean Evaluation with Recommendation (Required)**

The Dean's letter must indicate whether or not the Dean supports the candidate along with specific reasons for the recommendation based on the extent to which the candidate meets criteria around scholarship, teaching, and service. In addition, the Dean must address any weaknesses raised in the dossier. For units without departments, the Dean's letter should note any leaves of absence or other

extensions to the time-bound year granted to a candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure, excluding research/scholarly leaves, if they are not noted in the local area committee letter.

## **6.0 Addendum Materials**

Include the optional candidate addendum, in cases where the Dean and/or the local committee does not recommend the candidate for promotion and/or tenure, and the optional update to existing materials, if the status of existing materials included elsewhere in the dossier has changed.

### **6.1 Candidate Addendum (As Applicable)**

While atypical, a candidate may include an addendum in the dossier if the Dean and/or the local committee does not recommend the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. The addendum must be included in the dossier before reaching the University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure. A detailed explanation of why the material was added is to be provided by the candidate at the beginning of this section. Candidates are encouraged to discuss the desire to create a “Candidate Addendum” with the individual charged with preparing the dossier before doing so.

Most typically, an addendum is included only when either the local committee or the Dean or both do not recommend the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. A candidate who wishes to include information in an addendum must do so at least three days prior to the date dossiers are made available to the University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure (see Promotion and Tenure Calendar Deadlines). Candidates should have no less than one week from their meeting with the dean to write an addendum. Exceptions to the addendum deadline, as referenced in this paragraph, will be granted only when the meeting with the dean does not provide sufficient time (e.g., one week) for the candidate to write the addendum.

Candidates wishing to include an addendum in response to the recommendation of the local committee or the dean, should do so by delivering a hard copy to the Office of the Provost by November 2, 2026. The addendum will be added by the Office of the Provost to both the hard copy dossier and the electronic copy dossier.

### **6.2 Updates to Existing Materials (As Applicable)**

Candidates may work with the dossier preparer to add updated details about existing materials in the dossier, such as the awarding of a previously noted grant application or the acceptance of a publication previously listed as “under review.” These updates should only contain the details of evidence that was unavailable at the time of the department, local area, or Dean levels of review and must refer to materials noted elsewhere in the dossier. Any description of new evidence must include the date the description was added to this section to clarify which level(s) of review had access to this information.

The final date to add updates to materials is three days prior to the date dossiers are made available to the University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure (see Promotion and Tenure Calendar Deadlines). Dossier preparers will submit this material to the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs for inclusion in the dossier.

Candidates are not required to add updates. Candidates are encouraged to discuss the desire to add details to this section with the individual charged with preparing the dossier before doing so.



**APPENDIX A**  
**Promotion / Tenure Proposal Form**

1. Name (Last, First, Middle) \_\_\_\_\_ 2. College/School \_\_\_\_\_
3. Department (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Highest Degree Earned \_\_\_\_\_
5. Total years of relevant professional experience prior to MU (appropriate to the discipline) \_\_\_\_\_
6. Total years teaching as a tenure track faculty member prior to coming to Marquette University \_\_\_\_\_
- 7a. Present Rank: Assistant Professor ☐ Associate Professor ☐ 7b. Start Date of Present Rank \_\_\_\_\_
- 8a. Proposed Rank: Associate Professor ☐ Professor ☐ 8b. Is candidate seeking tenure? Yes ☐ No ☐
- 9a. Is candidate time-bound? Yes ☐ No ☐ 9b. If No, indicate time-bound year \_\_\_\_\_
- 

Recommendation of:	Recommendation	Votes if Applicable # Yes / # No	Date	Signature
Department	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
Local Committee	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
Dean	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>			
Provost	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>			

*Print form for signatures, then scan and upload to dossier.  
Place the original, signed document in the paper copy binder for the Provost.*

## APPENDIX B

### Checklist / Table of Contents

Candidate Name \_\_\_\_\_

Please name all electronic files exactly as listed below, including numbers.

**When the dossier is complete, all boxes should be checked and sections uploaded.**

Key: R = Required      A = As Applicable		R/A	Uploaded to Electronic Dossier (✓)
<b>Item</b>			
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introductory Information</b>		
1.1	Promotion / Tenure Proposal Form (Appendix A)	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Checklist / Table of Contents (Appendix B)	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Curriculum Vitae	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4	Department and/or College / School Criteria	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Teaching Data</b>		
2.1	Candidate's Teaching Philosophy Statement	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2	Course List Table	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3	Graduate Student Committee History Table	A	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.4	Mentoring Table	A	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.5	Student Letters	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.6	Department Policy on Peer Review of Teaching	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.7	Peer Review Evaluations	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.8	Teaching Grants, Awards, and Honors	A	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.9	Teaching Summary Statement	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Scholarship Data</b>		
3.1	Candidate's Scholarship Philosophy Statement	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2	List of Publications and Creative Work	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3	Publication Outlet Evaluation and Citation Count	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.4	List of Presentations	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.5	Scholarly Awards and Honors	A	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.6	Scholarly Grants (applied for and received)	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.7	External Reviewer Letters	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.8	Scholarly Publications (Electronic Dossier Only)	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.9	Scholarship Summary Statement	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Service Data</b>		
4.1	Candidate's Service Philosophy Statement	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2	List of Service Activities	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.3	Service Summary Statement	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Additional Letters, Reviews, and Recommendations</b>		
5.1	Third-year and Annual Reviews	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Items 1.0 - 5.1 must be uploaded by September 2, 2026</i>			
5.2	Faculty Letters	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.3	Department Evaluation with Recommendation	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Items 5.2 &amp; 5.3 must be uploaded by September 14, 2026</i>			
5.4	Local Committee Evaluation with Recommendation	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Item 5.4 must be uploaded by October 7, 2026</i>			
5.5	Dean Evaluation with Recommendation	R	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Item 5.5 must be uploaded by October 21, 2026</i>			
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Addendum Materials</b>		
6.1	Candidate Addendum	A	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.2	Updates to Existing Materials	A	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Addendum items must be provided to the Office of the Provost by November 2, 2026*

-----  
Dossier preparer comments, if any (to explain any anomalies in the dossier):

Dossier Preparer Name (print) \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

The above signature verifies that the guidelines have been followed with the understanding that non-compliance may result in the rejection of the dossier.