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 professor is earned and awarded in recognition of distinguished research and educational accomplishment. Responsibilities and expectations of faculty evolve over time and the criteria used to award promotion to professor differ somewhat from those used to award tenure. To be awarded tenure candidates must have demonstrated potential for ongoing outstanding educational and research accomplishments, as defined by their position description, over the next 20 to 30 years of their career. To be promoted to professor candidates must present a strong record of accomplishments in research, teaching or extension, and advising that provide evidence of fulfillment of the expectations that accompany the awarding of tenure. These accomplishments should reflect position responsibilities that may have changed since tenure was granted and may reveal a greater emphasis on research or education, though accomplishments in both are expected.

While the norms for promotion to professor vary across departments and disciplines, the College has established broad guidelines: A candidate's research should be regularly published in recognized journals or in books issued by reputable publishers and, 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. Candidates should also have a strong record of advising students. Overall, candidates should rank high compared to colleagues in the same field at similar stages in their careers at peer institutions. Tenure is a commitment by the University to career-long employment based on projected future accomplishments. Promotion to professor is awarded in recognition of fulfillment of the expectations that come with being awarded tenure.

In judging a candidate for promotion, only the tenured full professors in the department (and appropriate professors in related disciplines, if the department is very small) will consider:

i. Evidence of excellence in performance in teaching, research, and/or extension since granting of tenure, and a judgment of whether the candidate has fulfilled the promise on which tenure was originally granted.

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

University guidelines state that associate professors with tenure are normally considered for review for promotion to professor in the sixth year of such an appointment, and require that the process is begun by the chairperson convening a meeting of the full professors to “decide whether a formal review for promotion should be initiated.” Please see, https://cpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/blogs.cornell.edu/dist/3/6798/files/2016/07/Chapter-2-1gssgml.pdf, pages 49-51 for further guidelines.
Promotion can be decided in the 6th year after the award of tenure (with an effective date 6 years after the tenure effective date). Thus, review may begin during the start of the 6th year, but should begin no earlier than the end of the 5th year. If an earlier promotion is warranted, approval by your SrAD is required. The unit chair/director sends the request to their SrAD indicating the timeframe desired, the agreement of the full professors in the unit, and including an updated CV from the candidate. The SrAD must receive approval from the Provost before an early review can be initiated by the department.

**TIMELINE**

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 full professors 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 full professor 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.

Recommendations for promotion to full professor should be delivered by the department to your senior associate dean's office by:

- **July 1** for an effective date of January 1
- **February 1** for an effective date of July 1

When the electronic PDF dossier is delivered via Cornell dropbox (https://dropbox.cornell.edu/) it is reviewed to be sure all relevant sections have been submitted. It is forwarded to the college standing committee for review. Six to eight weeks is a normal time for review by the standing committee. After review at the college level the standing committee report, any additional materials requested by the standing committee or by the Sr. Assoc. Dean, and a letter of recommendation to the Provost from the Dean and Sr. Assoc. Dean will be added to the dossier.

Approval of the promotion will be made by the Provost 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 is available to the candidate. Please see https://cpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/blogs.cornell.edu/dist/3/6798/files/2015/12/APPENDIX-6-xmezxg.pdf for further policy. The candidate must be informed of this formal process by the chair/director.
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 letter, advisee letter).

Documentation should be submitted in electronic form via Cornell dropbox to your SrAD assistant. 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 can be subpoenaed as part of a legal process, but are treated by the university as confidential documents to be shared only with those involved in the decision process.

Department/Unit Name: ________________________________________________________________

Faculty Member: _________________________________________________________________

☐ 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 and justification regarding promotion. This letter is one of the most important elements of the dossier. The letter should include the date of the meeting and vote of tenured full professors in the tenure-home department, giving reasons for any objections, reservations, or abstentions. The vote should be taken after the tenured full professors 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", Section 2.)

The letter should include the chair’s/director’s evaluation of the performance of the candidate in each function for which they carry 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. The chair/director 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 award nominations: The unit chair/director will have an extensive and up-to-date list of faculty accomplishments available in the dossier. We strongly encourage you to take advantage of this information by nominating the faculty member for various awards (e.g. fellows of their respective society, CALS/Cornell awards, etc.) at this time.
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. 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. These additional letters also should be substantive evaluations addressing the criteria for promotion, in relation to contributions to the joint program. If the secondary department declines to participate, then a letter of explanation from that chair or director must be included. The letter from the secondary unit must be available to the full professors in the tenure-home unit with the other dossier materials, in advance of any discussion/vote.

Checklist for Section 1:
- UNIT HEAD RECOMMENDATION Letter
- Secondary Unit’s Letter (if appropriate)

2. **INDIVIDUAL FACULTY ASSESSMENTS**
Please include letters (or emails) from each full professor providing the individual's vote and their evaluation of the candidate/justification of their vote. These letters are critical components of the promotion dossier. If the unit uses a promotion/tenure review committee, its report should be included here. All appropriate redactions must be made prior to releasing the dossier to the unit faculty for review.

Checklist for Section 2:
- Faculty Letters from each full professor in the unit
- 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/peer reviewers is to assess the candidate's accomplishments, stature in the field, and future promise. All reviewers 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. We recommend contacting external reviewers to determine their availability prior to sending them material. The reviewers should be at the rank of full professor or equivalent.

**List of Reviewers:**
Provide a list of all reviewers who were solicited, segregated into two categories:
- A. Recognized Leaders outside Cornell University, and
- B. Collaborators, Associates and/or Cornell Experts.

For each reviewer who provides a letter, provide the reviewer's current title, institution, a few sentences on their research area, and note their association (if any) to the candidate (do not include CVs). For those who were asked but did not provide a letter, please provide only their title and institution.

Reviewers in either category who were suggested by the candidate should be flagged as such. It is the candidate's choice whether or not to provide a list of possible reviewers for either category, though a maximum of two letters from candidate suggestions is allowed in category A. If the candidate is aware of individuals who are likely to provide an unfair evaluation or are in direct competition, the chair/director should be informed. Written assessments from faculty in other units at Cornell are appropriate in category B only; there should be at least one letter in category B.
that is external to Cornell. Chairs and directors should take note that authors of letters in category B would be excluded from the candidate's ad hoc committee.

All 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, Cornell colleagues, and others are similarly confidential and should not be shared with outside peer reviewers.

**Category A Letters: Recognized Leaders External to Cornell (at least 7 letters)**
The unit should solicit at least 7 letters of evaluation from recognized leaders in the field, external to Cornell, with at least 5 of the 7 letters from reviewers who have not been closely associated with the candidate. To minimize the potential for a perceived or real conflict of interest, no more than 2 letters in this section may be from reviewers suggested by the candidate. The request letter from the chair/director should:
- request evaluation, not support;
- state the two criteria on page 1, which the reviewer will use in judging a candidate for promotion to full professor; and ask the reviewer to indicate whether, on the basis of the materials provided to them, they think the candidate should be promoted to full professor;
- ask for comparisons with scholars in the field at comparable stages in their careers;
- ask for an evaluation of the quality of the candidate's scholarly, creative, and extension work and its impact on the scholarship of the field;
- clearly state that the reviewer needs to explain their association (if any) to the candidate.

**Category B Letters: Collaborators, Associates and/or Cornell Experts (3-5 letters)**
The unit should also solicit 3-5 letters from co-authors on publications, co-principal investigators, co-instructors of the candidate or other evaluators. The request letter from the chair/director should:
- request evaluation, not support;
- state the two criteria on page 1, which the faculty will use in judging a candidate for promotion to full professor;
- ask for an evaluation of the materials from the dossier and/or ask to address the contribution of the candidate to their collaborative 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 as appropriate;
- an explanation of their association (if any) to the candidate.

**Checklist for Section 3:**
- List of all reviewers solicited (whether or not they wrote letters), including the reviewer's current title, institution, a few sentences on their research area, and note their association (if any) to the candidate (do not include CVs). For those who were asked but did not provide a letter, please provide only their title and institution. Please note 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, and/or Cornell Experts
- Copy of solicitation letter for each category (A & B)
- Category A letters (at least 7)
- Category B letters (3-5)

**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.
Checklist for Section 4:

☐ CV

5. **CANDIDATE STATEMENTS**
The candidate should provide statements for their 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 their 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 their 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 their 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 their performance, successes, concerns, and expectations of 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.

Checklist for Section 5:

☐ Advising Statement
☐ Research Statement
☐ Teaching Statement
☐ Extension Statement

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. 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 evaluation data over time. Include an interpretation by the candidate of the student evaluations, including any changes made or planned as a result. This section should emphasize student evaluations since tenure.

C. Student Teaching Letters (5-10)
If possible, letters (5-10) from students who have completed the candidate’s course(s) should be solicited by the department chair, based on names of students at Cornell, preferably from courses taught post-tenure. Candidates may suggest to the department chair some names for the department chair to solicit. No more than 50% of letters in the dossier may come from students suggested by the candidate. Other letters must come from students selected (and solicited) by the department chair. 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. A copy of the request letter should be included as well as a list of students contacted.

D. Student Advising Letters (3-5)
Include 3-5 letters from representative undergraduate students and graduate students selected by and solicited by the department. The letters should include a sampling of undergraduate academic advisees, undergraduate research advisees, and graduate students. 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).

Checklist for Section 6:
☐ Courses taught each year and their enrollment
☐ Course outline for each course taught
Team-taught involvement statement (if applicable)
Student Teaching Evaluation Summary (in a table, not actual evaluations) including a statement of changes made or planned as a result of feedback
List of students contacted by the unit with brief statement as to how they were selected and the rate of response.
Copy of solicitation letter and 5-10 evaluations from students
Advisee Evaluation
   List of advisees contacted
   Copy of solicitation and 3-5 evaluations from students
Faculty course evaluation letter

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.

Checklist for Section 7A:
- 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 and start-up amounts must be redacted.

Checklist for Section 7B:
- Copy of original letter of appointment
- Copy of original position description
- Any subsequent letters altering expectations of position
- Copy of letter awarding tenure

C. **Annual Reviews**
Include copies of the letter sent to the candidate following each review since promotion to associate professor. Include candidate comments submitted in response to reviews, if any. If any reviews are missing, the chair/director must address the reasons for omission in their recommendation or include an explanation here.

Checklist for Section 7C:
- Annual (or biennial) Reviews

D. **Extension**
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**
      a. 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.
      b. 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. 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 of the candidate’s extension program. These letters should be sent to the chair/director.

Checklist for Section 7D:
- Stakeholder evaluation
  - Copy of stakeholder solicitation letter
  - 5-7 stakeholder letters
- Faculty evaluation

E. Research
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 their highest quality work in the functional areas (research, instruction, and extension) as applicable. (Please flag each publication with a separate sub-bookmark.)

Checklist for Section 7E:
- 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

Checklist for Section 7F:
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 (salary and startup amounts; personal details regarding any health/sickness/death) have been redacted.

__________________________________________________                                            _________________
Signature of Unit Chair/Director  Date

__________________________________________________            _________________
Signature of Preparer  Date