Guidelines for department chairs in preparing dossiers recommending Tenure for External Hires to Associate or Full Professors[1], July 2023

The purpose of these guidelines is to help the candidate and department prepare the strongest possible dossier for the awarding of tenure to newly-hired associate or full professors. These guidelines should fit the majority of, but perhaps not all, situations. If you feel your candidate's accomplishments and activities need a slightly different approach, you are welcome to make changes in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean. Departments are also welcome to include additional material beyond what is listed here when useful.

Candidates for tenure at Cornell University are expected to present an exceptional record, 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. University considerations in the decision to award tenure include **"**excellence in carrying out the responsibilities of the position, and unusual promise for continued achievement".[2]

Unit Name: _____

Candidate's Name: _____

- ☐ Associate Professor with Tenure
- ☐ Full Professor with Tenure
- ☐ Streamlined Process
- ☐ Start Date _____

Special Consideration: *Streamlined Review Process.* The Provost's office (as of April 2023) allows a streamlined review process in cases of lateral hires of Associate Professors and Full Professors.

1. Consult with the Senior Associate Dean as to the appropriateness of a streamlined review. The Dean's office will then inform the provost's office.

2. Provide the department's tenured faculty with the candidate's CV and external letters that evaluate the candidate for a tenured position at the offered rank at Cornell. *To streamline the process, the department has the option of using the letters provided during the hiring process (minimum 3).* It is recommended that letter writers are asked to comment on suitability for tenure at the appropriate title. Integrating this request into the department's review of the candidate for hiring will make this simpler. Additional letters, beyond the required 3, can be solicited if the department so chooses but are not required.

3. A departmental faculty meeting of tenured faculty (associate and full professors) is held to discuss and vote on tenure, following departmental protocol.
   a. Both Associate and full professors vote on tenure;

---

[1] The College of Agriculture and Life Sciences has similar guidelines, which served as a key resource in the development of the current document. The CALS guidelines can be found here: CALS Guidelines

[2] Faculty Handbook section 4.1.2 University Criteria

      b. Only Full professors vote on appointment to full professor.

      c. Faculty votes are accompanied by letters from each faculty member explaining votes.

4. Department Chair submits dossier including the candidate's CV, faculty vote and letters, along with the chair's letter to the college outlining the department's recommendation on the appointment of a tenured associate or full professor appointment in the department, including the conditions around which the candidate was offered a position in the department.

5. The timeline for streamlined review is an expedited one. Please communicate with the Sr. Associate Dean to clarify the timeline for your particular case.

The Non-Streamlined Review Process

A. TIMELINE

Electronic PDF dossiers containing information for promotion to associate professor with tenure should be delivered by the department via Secure File Transfer (SFT) (https://sft.cornell.edu/login/) to the Dean's assistant (Cindy Thompson) by:

- June 1 for an effective tenure date of November 1
- August 1 for an effective tenure date of February 1
- September 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 to the Dean's office via SFT it is reviewed to be sure all relevant sections have been submitted. An ad hoc committee then reviews the dossier and makes a recommendation to the Dean. Six to eight weeks is a typical time for review by the ad hoc committee. After review at the College level, the following documents are added to the dossier:

- the ad hoc committee report
- any additional materials requested by the ad hoc committee or by the Senior Associate Dean
- a letter of recommendation to the Provost from the Dean and Senior Associate Dean.

The Provost will then determine whether to seek the advice of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure Appointments (FACTA). The Provost will then convey the dossier to the Cornell University Board of Trustees. This process necessitates a long timeframe. Approval of the award of tenure will be made by the Board of Trustees and conveyed by a letter from the President to the candidate.

Procedures following a negative tenure decision at the departmental level can be found here: Appealing a negative decision

B. Documentation Required

The dossier should be submitted to the Dean's office in PDF format using the bookmarks outlined below. Materials should be addressed to the Dean but delivered to the Senior Associate Dean. Note that the documentation listed below indicates materials in the dossier that are required by the Provost. The dossier examined within the department may include additional information, as specified by the Department's procedures. The list below in no way precludes the inclusion of additional materials for departmental deliberations.

All materials assembled supporting the evaluation and recommendation are regarded as confidential to be shared only with those involved in the decision process.

1. Department Head Recommendation

Letter from the Department Chair to the Dean with the recommendation regarding tenure. This letter should reflect the results of two votes (if relevant): 1) a vote on tenure by the tenured faculty, and 2) a vote on the rank of Full Professor, by the Full Professors (if relevant). The letter should include the date of the meeting and votes, giving reasons for any objections, reservations, or abstentions. The votes should be taken after the tenured faculty have reviewed the full documentation, and there has been opportunity for discussion. (Letters from the faculty with their evaluation and the reasons for their vote are to be included in the documentation, see "Faculty Letters" below.)

The letter should include the Chair's evaluation of the performance of the candidate in each function for which he or she carries responsibility. This should be a thoughtful analysis of the relationship of the candidate to the present and developing mission of the department and College. The Chair should comment on the quality of journals, presses, and other venues where the candidate's work has appeared. The letter should also address the candidate's teaching or extension/outreach work. The letter should address any disagreements and matters of serious concern in the file, as well as any abstentions.

If the department uses a departmental review committee, its report should be included in "Faculty Letters" section below, not here.

Checklist for Section 1. Department recommendation:
☐ Chair's letter of recommendation

2. Individual Faculty Assessments

Please include **letters** from each tenured faculty member providing an evaluation of the candidate in reference to the considerations above and the individual's vote. If the faculty member participated in both votes (regarding both tenure and Full Professor status), one letter can be used to explain both votes. If the department uses a departmental review committee, its report should be included in this section. Faculty Letters listed by faculty name.

Checklist for Section 2. Faculty assessments:
☐ Tenured faculty letters of evaluation

3. External Reviews

ALL solicitations for letters must be done by the department and **<u>not</u>** by the candidate. A copy of the solicitation letter must be included in the dossier. The role of external evaluators is to assess the candidate's accomplishments, stature in the field, and future promise. External 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. In your request to external reviewers, please include a request to the reviewer to please provide the full details of the contact he/she has had with

the candidate through his/her career. Note: Letters solicited from peer 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.

How much of the dossier is made available to the reviewers: The candidate has the right to determine the exact subset of their scholarly work that is accessible to the external reviewer. Recommendations to the candidate:

- Chosen content must include the CV. Other content should be discussed with the chair.
- Content should be easy to navigate with important items highlighted. A pdf dossier with bookmarks is recommended.
- The research, teaching, and extension statements should be included, as applicable.
- If the visibility of a publication requires payment of a fee or the purchase of a book, then steps must be taken to provide access.
- "Do not share" stipulations should accompany those documents that are not (yet) intended for free public viewing.
- External reviewers are not in a position to interpret course evaluations so that data should never be included. On the other hand, course syllabi, assignments, and examples of student work should be included.
- Please review https://theuniversityfaculty.cornell.edu/news/the-tenure-track-project/d-external-reviewer-selection/

a. Table of Evaluators. The dossier should include two tables with information regarding reviewers. One table includes external reviewers selected by the department; the other includes external reviewers suggested by the candidate. Each of these tables must include the following information: names and institutions of all reviewers invited to serve as reviewers and whether the reviewer declined, agreed to the review, or failed to respond to the invitation.

 i. Evaluators Selected by the Department. Letters of evaluation from at least five, but not more than seven, recognized leaders in the field outside Cornell who have neither been closely associated with, nor selected by, the candidate. The letters should request evaluation, not support. The request letter should state the criteria listed above which the faculty will use in judging a candidate for the awarding of tenure. The letters should provide an evaluation of the quality of the candidate's work and its impact on the scholarship of the field. In selecting external evaluators and when possible, departments should select at least one well-established leader in the larger discipline who is not working in the same sub-discipline as the candidate. The purpose of these evaluations is to understand the breadth of impact and promise of the candidate's work.[3]

 ii. Evaluators Suggested by the Candidate. The department should also solicit letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate and submit at least 4 and not more than 6 letters in the dossier. Two of the evaluators can be within arm's length and should not include Cornell faculty. These should request evaluation, not support. The request letter should state the criteria listed above which the faculty will use in judging a candidate for the awarding of tenure. The letters should provide an evaluation of the quality of the candidate's work and its impact on the

---

[3] HR Guidelines

scholarship of the field. If the evaluator is a co-author or collaborator of the candidate, the letter should address the contribution of the candidate to the work.

b. CVs of Evaluators Selected by the department.

c. CVs of Evaluators suggested by the candidate.

Checklist for Section 3. External Reviews:
- ☐ Table of evaluators, separated into two categories.
  - ☐ Evaluators selected by the department. (minimum of 5 and not more than 7)
  - ☐ Evaluators suggested by the candidate. (minimum of 4 and not more than 6)
- ☐ CVs of evaluators selected by the department.
- ☐ CVs of evaluators suggested by the candidate.

4. Candidate CV
The candidate should provide a complete and comprehensive CV.

Checklist for section 4. CV
- ☐ Candidate's CV

5. Candidate Statements
a. **Teaching Statement.** The candidate should provide a statement describing teaching goals and accomplishments.
b. **Research Statement**. 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. 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. When relevant, this includes information on external funding (a separate section on external funding can also be included if preferred). Include Google Scholar. Candidates for promotion should create a Google Scholar Profile and include the link so outside reviewers as well as relevant college faculty can easily access the candidate's publications and indicators of impact.
c. **Extension Statement.** An extension statement is required only of faculty who have a formal extension appointment.   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. This should include 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). Stakeholder Evaluation. Include 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. CV's for Stakeholder Evaluators must be included.

Checklist for Section 5. Statements
- ☐ Teaching statement.
- ☐ Research statement.

□ When relevant, include external funding.

□ Include Google Scholar

□ Extension statement.

□ Stakeholders' evaluations (minimum of 5 and not more than 7)

□ Stakeholders' CV's

6. Teaching Materials

a. **Courses Taught.** The dossier should include a listing of courses taught each year since tenure was awarded and enrollments in each.   A course outline or syllabus should also be submitted for these courses. For team-taught courses, include a statement of specific involvement by the candidate. Note: Indicate where the courses were taught.

b. **Assignments and examples** of student work should be included.

c. **Student Course Evaluations.** These should be summarized in a table and not prepared by the candidate.

Checklist **for Section 6. Teaching:**

□ Courses taught.

□ Syllabus for each course

□ Student course evaluations in table format.

Appendix: Although departments may require additional information from candidates, the elements above are sufficient for university-level review. If other material **is referenced in the reports or letters, please include it as an appendix.**

□ **Publications.** The candidate must submit representative publications (in electronic form) showcasing his or her highest quality work.

□ **Position Description.** Please include a copy of the original letter of appointment with salary information redacted, no addendums needed (i.e., start-up information) and a copy of the original position description.

□ **Material referenced** in the reports or letters, when applicable. For example, assignments and examples of student work.