GUIDELINES AND CHECKLIST FOR CHAIRS AND DIRECTORS IN RECOMMENDING:
PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE;
TENURE FOR NEWLY HIRED ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND PROFESSOR

The purpose of these guidelines is to help the candidate prepare the strongest possible dossier for promotion to associate professor with tenure or for the award of tenure to newly-hired associate professors or full professors. These guidelines should fit the majority of, but perhaps not all, situations. If you feel your accomplishments and activities need a slightly different approach, you are welcome to make changes in consultation with the chair/director of your tenure home and approval by your senior associate dean. Promotion to the rank of associate professor is typically for an indefinite term (tenured) by ballot of the University Board of Trustees. Prior to consideration by the Board of Trustees, the dossier is reviewed by the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure Appointments (FACTA). The general university criteria for promotion and/or to tenure are “excellence in performance of the responsibilities of the position and unusual promise for continued achievement.” Promotion to associate professor with tenure normally will not precede the completion of six years as an Assistant Professor. Consideration for the granting of tenure to newly-hired associate professors or professors must occur before completion of five years as an associate professor or professor, and may occur earlier for strong candidates.

Candidates for tenure at CALS and other colleges at Cornell University are expected to present an exceptional record in research, advising, teaching and extension aspects of position responsibilities, to rank very highly compared to colleagues in the same field at similar stages in their careers at peer institutions, and to demonstrate leadership or potential leadership in their field. The candidate’s research should be regularly published in recognized journals or in books issued by reputable publishers. In most disciplines, success in obtaining external financial support is expected. Accomplishment as an educator is expected either in a range of undergraduate and graduate courses or as an extension educator. Performance as an advisor will be evaluated, as will general leadership abilities.

TIMETABLE

Notification must be sent to dual/joint or funding department(s)/college(s)/unit(s) to allow for participation and/or financial planning. In the case of a joint appointment, it is essential that the secondary department’s tenured faculty be given access to the dossier. The secondary department must have the opportunity to deliberate using the same information as the tenure-home department. Although the secondary department does not vote on promotion to associate professor with tenure, or the award of tenure to newly-hired associate professors or professors, their views must be taken into account by the tenure-home department via a letter from the chair or director of the secondary unit. Secondary departments must prepare/provide their inputs prior to voting by the tenure-home department to ensure their feedback is taken into account.
Considerations in the decision to award tenure and include:

For those who will be at the **associate professor level after the dossier review:**

i. Evidence of excellence in performance in carrying out the responsibilities of the position.

ii. The potential of the candidate for continued achievement and leadership over the next 10-20 years.

iii. Is this person among the ablest and most promising individuals that Cornell could expect to attract to this position?

For those who will be at the **professor level after the dossier review:**

i. Evidence of excellence in performance in teaching, research, and/or extension over the course of the individual's career, including at prior institutions.

ii. The potential of the candidate for leadership over the next 10-20 years.

iii. Evidence justifying the initial appointment at the level of professor.

Recommendations for promotion to associate professor with tenure or tenure for newly-hired associate professors and professors should be delivered by the department to your senior associate deans office by:

- **April 1 for an effective tenure date of November 1**
- **August 1 for an effective tenure date of February 1**
- **October 1 for an effective tenure date of April 1**
- **December 1 for an effective tenure date of July 1**

Once the electronic PDF dossier is delivered via Cornell Drop Box to your SrAD's assistant in the senior associate deans office, it is reviewed to be sure all relevant sections have been submitted. An ad hoc committee is selected to undertake a review of the dossier and make a recommendation to the dean. Four - six weeks is a normal time for review by the ad hoc committee. After review at the college level, the following documents are included in the dossier: the ad hoc committee report, any additional materials requested by the ad hoc committee or by the senior associate dean and a letter of recommendation to the provost from the dean and senior associate dean. The documentation will then be reviewed by the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure Appointments (FACTA), which will advise the provost. The provost will consult with his/her advisors before conveying the dossier to the Cornell University Board of Trustees. This process necessitates a long time frame.

Approval of the award of tenure, or promotion and tenure, will be made by the Board of Trustees and conveyed by a letter from the president to the candidate.

If a negative decision on promotion is reached at the tenure-home level, it is essential that the chair/director discuss the situation with the senior associate dean before any official notification is sent either to the dean or to the candidate. A formal appeals process at the department level is available to the candidate. Please see [https://blogs.cornell.edu/deanoffaculty/files/2015/12/APPENDIX-3-2hjr0uf.pdf](https://blogs.cornell.edu/deanoffaculty/files/2015/12/APPENDIX-3-2hjr0uf.pdf) for further policy. The candidate must be informed of this formal process by the chair/director.

In case of a negative decision, the candidate should be informed in writing of the starting date of the terminal two semesters of employment.
DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED (Note – ALL solicitations for letters must be done by the department and not the candidate. Do not include any letter received in more than one area (peer letter, student teaching letter, student advising letter).

Documentation should be submitted in electronic form via Cornell Drop Box to Allison Pelletier (akp28) or Anne Marie Sheridan (ams53) in the senior associate deans office. The dossier should be submitted using the outline below, with .pdf BOOKMARKS and SUB-BOOKMARKS as noted by distinct text. Letters from the chair/director should be addressed to the dean. All materials assembled supporting the evaluation and recommendation are regarded as confidential, to be shared only with those involved in the decision process.

Department/Unit Name: __________________________________________     
Faculty Member: ___________________________________________   ___  
Promotion to Assoc. Prof. w/Tenure ☑ Tenure Only for Assoc. Prof. ☐ Tenure Only for Full Prof.  
☐ Check if Dual/Joint Appointment  
Name of secondary unit/college: _____________________________________  
☐ Check if funded from sources outside your department  
Name of funding unit(s)/college(s): ____________________      ___  
☐ Notification to secondary funding unit/college to confirm that process has been initiated  
Names and dates of those notified: ____________________      ___  

1. **UNIT HEAD RECOMMENDATION**
This section contains a letter from the unit chair/director to the dean with the recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure. Recommendation by chair/director in reference to the relevant considerations i through iii on page 2. The letter should include the date of meeting and vote of tenured faculty, giving reasons for any objections, reservations, or abstentions. The vote should be taken after the tenured faculty have reviewed the full documentation, including feedback from the secondary unit, and there has been opportunity for discussion. (Letters from the tenure-home faculty with their evaluation and the reasons for their vote are to be included in the documentation, see "Individual Faculty Assessments.")

The letter should include the chair’s/director’s evaluation of the performance of the candidate in each function for which s/he carries responsibility. This should be a thoughtful analysis of the relationship of the candidate to the present and developing mission of the unit and college. The chair/director should comment on the quality of journals, presses, and other venues where the candidate’s work has appeared. S/he should also explain the conventions of the discipline related to the listing of author order on publications, in relation to the candidate’s contributions to co-authored publications. The letter should also address how the candidate’s teaching evaluations compare to those of other faculty teaching similar courses. The letter should address any changes in responsibilities and discussion of any problematic or confusing statements that appear in the dossier. The letter should address any disagreements and matters of serious concern in the file. If the department uses a departmental review committee, its report should be included in the Individual Faculty Assessments section, not here.

**Note on secondary appointments:** Where there is a joint appointment or obligation to another program, an evaluation and recommendation letter should be included from the chair or director of that program. This additional letter also should contain substantive evaluations addressing
considerations i–iii, page 2, in relation to contributions to the joint program. Opportunity for review and discussion must occur before the letter is written. This letter need not be lengthy, but should summarize salient accomplishments of the candidate and any issues concerning the secondary unit.

If the secondary unit declines to participate, then a letter of explanation from that chair or director must be included. Although the secondary unit does not vote on promotion and/or tenure, their views must be taken into account by the tenure-home department. Thus, the letter from the secondary unit must be available to the tenured faculty with the other dossier materials, in advance of any discussion/vote. The promotion and/or tenure should be considered at a meeting of the tenured faculty of the tenure home unit prior to a faculty vote.

UNIT HEAD RECOMMENDATION Letter
Secondary Unit’s Letter (if appropriate)

2. **INDIVIDUAL FACULTY ASSESSMENTS**
   Please include letters from each tenured faculty member providing an evaluation of the candidate in reference to the three considerations on page 2 and the individual’s vote. If the unit uses a promotion/tenure review committee, its report should be included here.

   **Note:** Per March 12, 2010 memo from the United States Department of Agriculture, faculty who hold USDA appointments are prohibited from making tenure recommendations.

   Faculty Letters from each tenured faculty member in the department
   Unit Promotion/Tenure Review Committee Letter

3. **EXTERNAL/PEER REVIEWS**
   *(ALL solicitations for letters must be done by the department and not the candidate.)*
   The role of external evaluators is to assess the candidate’s accomplishments, stature in the field, and future promise. All evaluators should be given a charge that is as specific as possible and should be provided with as much material relating to the candidate’s performance as is conveniently possible, excluding other confidential evaluations. Provide a list of all reviewers who were solicited, segregated into two categories:

   A. Recognized Leaders outside Cornell University, and
   B. Collaborators, Associated or Cornell Experts.

   For each reviewer who provides a letter, FACTA needs a short bio with a brief overview of experts’ qualifications and relationship (if any) to the candidate. Do not include CVs. If any reviewer was unwilling or unable to provide a review, please indicate that on the list. Reviewers in either category who were suggested by the candidate should be flagged as such.

   We recommend contacting external reviewers to determine their availability prior to sending them material. Individuals who are unavailable/unwilling to provide a review need to be listed among those asked for an evaluation. It is the candidate’s choice whether to provide a list of possible evaluators. If the candidate is aware of individuals who are likely to provide an unfair evaluation, the chair/director should be informed. Written assessments from faculty in other units at Cornell are appropriate (in category B only). Chairs and directors should take note that authors of such letters would be excluded from the candidate’s ad hoc committee.

   **In your request to external reviewers, clearly state that the reviewer needs to explain the contact s/he has had with the candidate during the candidate’s career.** Letters solicited from reviewers can be subpoenaed as part of a legal process, but are treated by the university as confidential.
documents. Letters solicited from students, any Cornell colleagues and others are similarly confidential and should not be shared with outside peer reviewers.

A. Recognized Leaders External to Cornell (at least 7 reviewers, at least 5 of whom were not suggested by the candidate)

Letters of evaluation from at least 7 recognized leaders in the field, external to Cornell who have not been closely associated with the candidate. At least 5 of these letters should be written by referees from the unit’s list of potential referees to minimize the potential for a perceived or real conflict of interest. The letter from the chair/director should:

- request evaluation, not support;
- state the three criteria on page 2, which the faculty will use in judging a candidate for promotion to associate professor and/or the award of tenure;
- ask for comparisons with scholars in the field at comparable stages in their careers
- address scholarly, creative, and extension work;
- provide an evaluation of the quality of the candidate’s creative work and its impact on the scholarship of the field;
- include the full details of the contact the reviewer has had with the candidate through his/her career.

B. Additional Letters (Collaborators, Associates or Cornell Experts) (3-5 letters)

The unit should also solicit 3-5 letters from co-authors on publications, co-principal investigators and co-instructors of the candidate or other evaluators suggested by the candidate. Note, as indicated above, it is the candidate’s choice whether to suggest people who should (or should not) be solicited for review. Letters included in this category should:

- request evaluation, not support;
- state the three criteria on page 2, which the faculty will use in judging a candidate for promotion to associate professor and/or the award of tenure;
- Evaluate the materials from the dossier and/or address the contribution of the candidate to the publication and the work regarding conceptualization (including integration of ideas), theory development, technique development, methodology, implementation, development of policy and practice implications, and program evaluation. This applies to research, extension and teaching activities;
- include the full details of the contact he/she has had with the candidate through his/her career.

List of all evaluators solicited (whether or not they wrote letters), including a brief overview of experts’ qualifications and relationship (if any) to the candidate and noting if the reviewer was suggested by the candidate. The list should be segregated into 2 categories:

A. Recognized Leaders External to Cornell University
B. Collaborators, Associates, or Cornell Experts

Short bios or brief information regarding each evaluator who submitted a letter (no CVs)
Copy of solicitation letter in each section (A & B)
In category A, at least 7 letters from external peers (at least 5 not suggested by the candidate)
In category B, 3-5 letters from evaluators (suggested by the candidate or unit)

4. **CANDIDATE CV**

The candidate should provide a complete and comprehensive CV. The CV should include the standard categories of education, experience, honors and awards, professional service, department/college/ and university service, outreach/extension activities, research funding, publications and/or artistic work, and presentations.

CV
5. **CANDIDATE STATEMENTS**

The candidate should provide statements for his/her functional areas as appropriate, according to the guidelines below.

A. **Advising Statement**

Goals and Accomplishments. The candidate should provide a description of goals and approaches used to enhance his/her effectiveness in advising, and should include a list of all student advisees, segregated into 2 categories (undergraduate and graduate) with their degrees and actual or expected degree dates.

B. **Research Statement**

Goals and Accomplishments. The candidate should provide a statement describing goals and objectives for his/her research program and a statement of substantive research accomplishments, activities or discoveries. What have been the principal achievements to date? The overall intent is to make a compelling case for the ability of the candidate to provide leadership for his/her discipline in discovering new knowledge through creative analysis and synthesis. Publications and grants are listed in the CV and should not be repeated here, except to illustrate how certain products relate to the candidate's research themes.

C. **Teaching Statement**

Goals and Accomplishments. The candidate should provide a statement describing course and educational objectives for the next three to five years, and a statement of teaching accomplishments which support excellence in performance. It is appropriate to provide a thoughtful self-analysis regarding the candidate's personal view of his/her performance, successes, concerns, and expectations of his/her teaching effort, including a statement of the candidate's efforts to improve instruction. This may include current teaching and improvements over time from such areas as instructional delivery, course content, instructional design and evaluating student learning and providing effective feedback.

D. **Extension Statement**

Goals and Accomplishments. The candidate should provide a description of the goals and accomplishments of extension programming, and a description of the approach used to meet the goals of the extension program. Note the intended outcome and impact of specific types of activities, including in-service education. Provide details of activities in summary or tabular form, and include a list of extension publications and examples of scholarship (e.g., in the resume). Highlight unique and creative aspects of the extension program. Include administrative and leadership responsibilities and roles that the candidate has assumed.

6. **TEACHING MATERIALS**

A. **Courses Taught**

The candidate should provide a listing of courses taught each year and enrollments in each. A course outline should also be submitted for all courses taught. The last 5-10 years may be used for this list if the candidate has a long history of teaching that may be onerous to document completely. Indicate whether the courses were taught at Cornell or elsewhere (as in the case of newly-hired faculty). For team-taught courses, include a statement of specific involvement by the candidate.

B. **Course Evaluation Summaries**

The candidate should summarize in a table student evaluations. Include an interpretation by the candidate of student evaluations, including any changes made or planned as a result.
C. **Student Teaching Letters (5-10)**
Include 5-10 letters from students who have completed the candidate's course(s), solicited by department, based on names of students at Cornell (or from the candidate's former institution for tenure only cases). Candidates may suggest to their chair/director some names for the chair/director to solicit. No more than 50% of letters in this section dossier may come from students suggested by the candidate. This section must contain a copy of the request letter, a list of students contacted, the method of student selection, and the rate of response.

D. **Student Advising Letters (3-5)**
Include 3-5 letters from representative undergraduate students and graduate students selected by and solicited by the department. A copy of the request letter should be included as well as a list of advisees contacted.

**Important Notes Regarding Student/Advisee Letters in C & D, above:**
- Students are sometimes reluctant to write a letter due to fear of reprisals. The unit may choose to redact student names from letters in this case, but must keep letters or emails with signatures on file for verification upon request from the SAD Office in the case of an appeal. Redactions of signatures should be addressed in a brief statement by the chair/director to confirm that unredacted versions will be available to the SrAD office upon request.
- For newly-hired associate and full professors, please be advised that federal FERPA legislation (http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html) will impact the way you can solicit input from students at other institutions. To comply with the privacy laws, no school will give out class lists or contact information for students. Accordingly, the chair/director or director should ask the faculty candidate to provide the appropriate lists/contact information for students. If undergraduates and graduates make up the cohorts of advisees and/or students, solicitations to both groups should be made to ensure a representative sample.

E. **Faculty Course Evaluation**
A statement of faculty evaluation of course content is essential. The chair/director should ask appropriate faculty to provide an evaluation of the content of courses taught by the candidate. **PDF**

**Sub-Bookmark Name: Faculty Course Evaluation**
The letter should be sent directly to the chair/director. Class handouts and other teaching materials not called out above do not need to be included with the materials submitted to the dean, but should be available to the faculty evaluators. The Center for Teaching Excellence website should be consulted for additional guidance (https://www.cte.cornell.edu/resources/documenting-teaching/index.html).

- List of courses taught each year and their enrollment (note location for new hires)
- Course outline for each course taught
- Team-taught involvement statement (if applicable)
- Student Evaluation
  - Summary in a table, not actual evaluations, including a statement of changes made or planned a result of feedback
  - List of students contacted with brief statement as to how they were selected and the rate of response
  - Copy of solicitation and 5-10 evaluations from students
- Advisee Evaluation
  - List of advisees contacted
  - Copy of solicitation and 3-5 evaluations from students
- Faculty course evaluation
7. **Appendix** *(nb underlined headings should be sub/sub-bookmarked if possible)*

A. **Program Description**

Please provide a one-page overview description of the department/division/school.

- Program Description

B. **Position Description/Letters of Appointment**

Please include a copy of the original letter of appointment, a copy of the original position description, and any subsequent letters, which altered expectations of the position. All references to salary, start-up must be redacted.

- Position Description
- Copy of original letter of appointment
- Copy of original position description
- Any subsequent letters altering expectations of position

C. **Annual Reviews**

Include copies of the letter sent to the candidate following each annual review. Include candidate comments submitted in response to reviews, if any. If any annual reviews are missing, the chair/director must address the reasons for omission in her/his recommendation or include an explanation here.

- Annual Reviews

D. **Extension Evaluations**

Stakeholder Evaluation. The candidate should provide evidence that the extension program addresses audience needs in a timely manner, is relevant and of high quality, is based on a foundation of research, and has made an impact on participants (stakeholders). Include:

i. **Stakeholder Evaluation**
   - When appropriate, summaries of stakeholder evaluations of significant extension efforts, (including extension off-campus staff, faculty, extension associates and related stakeholders). Describe changes made or planned as a result of the evaluations.
   - A copy of solicitation letter and 5-7 stakeholder letters in the extension program independent of other external letters, serving an equivalent role as letters from students to evaluate teaching or letters from advisees. Chairs/directors may wish to include such letters if a formal extension component is not present, but in that case should note that the faculty member does not have an extension component and acknowledge that their faculty will be evaluated on their official appointments.

ii. **Faculty Evaluation**
   - A statement of faculty evaluation of the individual's extension program content is essential. The chair/director should ask appropriate faculty to provide an evaluation of the content (and delivery if the candidate has been working at Cornell for a sufficient amount of time) of the candidate's extension program. These letters should be sent to the chair/director.

- Stakeholder evaluation
  - Copy of stakeholder solicitation letter
  - 5-7 stakeholder letters
- Faculty evaluation
E. **Research Evaluation and Publications**

i. **Faculty Evaluation**
The chair/director should solicit a statement from a department faculty member evaluating the direction and accomplishment of the research program, including assessment of the research program's relationship to the department's mission.

ii. **Brief Description of 5 Included Publications**
The candidate should provide a list of the 5 publications included in the dossier below. There should be a brief description (not the abstract) of the importance and an indication of the candidate’s role for each publication included. Examples of significant work relating to research, teaching, and/or extension should be included.

iii. **5 Publications**
The candidate must submit a total of five recent publications in electronic form showcasing his/her highest quality work in the functional areas (research, instruction, extension) as applicable. (Please flag each publication with a separate sub-bookmark.)

- Faculty evaluation
- Brief description of included publications
- 5 recent publications

F. **External Funding**
The candidate should provide a summary of external funding sought and obtained to support research, extension, and teaching functions. This should include two separate lists:

i. **Successful proposals and total dollar support received**
On successful grants with multiple principal investigators, the role of the candidate in proposal preparation and conduct of project should be described, as well as the percentage of the grant allotted to candidate's program.

ii. **Grants applied for but not received**

- Grants received, with total $ in and role/funding % identified for collaborative projects
- Grants applied for but not received

G. **Signed CALS Checklist and Attestation (this document).**
Please send this with the dossier to the senior associate dean's office as a separate file (i.e., not as part of the dossier itself).

We have reviewed the dossier and to the best of our understanding, met all the requirements. We understand that missing or incorrect items could result in possible delay of the promotional process. HR personnel matters (personal details regarding any health/sickness/death) have been redacted.

______________________________
Signature of Unit Chair/Director  Date

______________________________
Signature of Preparer  Date