

(19 October 2005; Revised May 2, 2007)
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

**GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRS IN RECOMMENDING
PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (WITH TENURE)**

The primary purpose of these guidelines is to help the candidate prepare the strongest possible case for promotion. They describe the elements, which evaluators typically look for. These guidelines should fit the majority, but perhaps not all situations. If the candidate feels his/her accomplishments need a different approach, changes can be made in consultation with the department chair. 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 there is a review by the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenured Appointments (FACTA). The general university criteria for promotion 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.

The college and Cornell University expect candidates to present an exceptional record in the research, advising, teaching and extension aspects of position responsibilities, to rank very high compared to colleagues in the same field at similar stages in their careers at peer institutions, and to demonstrate the potential to become a leader 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.

In judging a candidate for promotion, the tenured faculty of the Department considers:

- i. Evidence of excellence in performance since initial appointment.
- ii. The potential of the candidate for 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?

A. TIMETABLE

Once the promotion packages are delivered to the Senior Associate Dean's office (265 Roberts) they are reviewed by the Sr. Assoc. Dean for completeness, and an ad hoc review committee is selected. Once the ad hoc review committee report is received it is then forwarded to the appropriate associate dean(s) for review. Six to eight weeks is a normal time for review by the ad hoc committee. After review at the college level, the Sr. Assoc. Dean will add to the documentation the report of the ad hoc committee, any additional material requested by the ad hoc committee or by the Sr. Assoc. Dean, and a letter of recommendation from the Sr. Assoc. Dean to the Provost. The documentation will then be reviewed by the Provost and his/her advisors before being approved for presentation at a Cornell University Board of Trustees meeting. [The Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure Appointments reviews files and advises the Provost on tenure decisions.] This process necessitates a long time frame.

Promotion recommendations from the department should be delivered to Susan Lewis in the Sr. Assoc. Deans' in 265 Roberts Hall by:

December 15 for an effective tenure date of the next July 1

May 1 for an effective tenure date of the next November 1

August 15 for an effective tenure date of the next February 1

September 14 for an effective tenure date of the next April 1

Approval of the promotion will be conveyed by a letter from the President to the candidate.

If a negative decision is reached at the Department, please refer to the Faculty Handbook (Appendix 3) page 159 – Appeal at the Departmental Level or <http://www.cornell.edu/UniversityFaculty/docs/main.html> for further policy. It is essential that the Chair discuss the situation with the Sr. Assoc. Dean before notification is sent either to the Dean or to the candidate. A formal appeals process must be followed in all cases of negative decisions.

B. DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED

Documentation should be submitted in **four** three-ring notebooks (3”) in the order specified below using standardized tab dividers provided from the Sr. Assoc. Deans Office (5-7720). Materials should be addressed to the Dean but delivered to the Sr. Assoc. Dean (265 Roberts). Submit one original set and 3 copies of the documentation.

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

1. CHAIR'S LETTER

Letter from Department Chair to the Dean including:

- a. Recommendation by Chair in reference to considerations i through iii on pg. 1.
- b. 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 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.")
- c. 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.
- d. Any expected changes in responsibilities.
- e. Discussion of any problematic or confusing statements that appear in the dossier.

Additional Letters

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. For paired

departments at Ithaca and Geneva there should be an evaluation by the corresponding Ithaca/Geneva Department Chair. These additional letters also should be substantive evaluations addressing considerations i-iii on page 1 in relation to contributions to the joint program.

2. DEPARTMENT PROGRAM

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

3. POSITION DESCRIPTION

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.

4. ANNUAL REVIEWS

Include copies of letters sent to the candidate following each annual review. If the department utilizes a faculty mentoring committee, a copy of its report should be included.

5. FACULTY LETTERS

Please include letters from each tenured faculty member providing an evaluation of the candidate in reference to the three considerations on page 1 and the individual's vote.

6. PEER LETTERS

a. Letters of evaluation from at least four, but not more than six, recognized leaders in the field outside Cornell who have not been closely associated with, nor selected by, the candidate. Include a copy of the letter sent to the evaluators. The letters should request evaluation, not support. The request letter should state the three criteria on page 1 which the faculty will use in judging a candidate for promotion and should ask for comparisons with scholars in the field at comparable stages in their careers.

b. The department should also solicit letters (4-6) from co-authors on publications, co-principal investigators and co-instructors of the candidate or other evaluators suggested by the candidate. These evaluations should 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, program evaluation. This applies to research, extension and teaching activities.

We recommend contacting external reviewers to determine their availability prior to sending them material. Individuals who are unavailable need not 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 does provide a list of recommended evaluators, the conditions of the first sentence still must be met. If the candidate is aware of individuals who are likely to provide an unfair evaluation, the Chair should be informed. In addition to the outside letters, obtaining written assessments from faculty in other departments at Cornell is appropriate, but authors of such letters are excluded from the candidate's ad hoc committee.

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.

The letters must be preceded by a list of persons asked to give an evaluation, clearly indicating which evaluators were not selected by the candidate. Please include brief information on the professional stature of the evaluators and their relationship to the candidate.

7. RESUME

Include an updated resume. The resume should be the same format as submitted for faculty annual reports. [A complete set of publications in research and extension will appear in section 12.]

8. ADVISING

a. Goals. The candidate is to provide a description of goals and approaches used to enhance his/her effectiveness in advising.

b. List of Advisees. The candidate must provide a list of undergraduate and graduate student advisees with the degrees and degree dates.

c. Evaluations from Advisees. Letters (3-5) from representative undergraduate students and graduate students selected by and solicited by the department.

9. TEACHING

a. Accomplishments. The candidate should provide a statement of teaching accomplishments which supports 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.

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.

b. Goals. A statement describing course and educational objectives for the next three to five years. (If you feel that your teaching, research, or extension programs are sufficiently integrated that they require a comprehensive statement, feel free to do so here or in another appropriate section.)

c. Courses Taught. Please provide a) courses taught each year and enrollments in each, and b) course outlines. For team-taught courses, include a statement of specific involvement by the candidate.

d. Student Evaluation. Student evaluations should be summarized in a table of course evaluation data over time. Please include a brief interpretation by the candidate of student evaluations, including any changes made or planned as a result. Letters may be solicited if it is department practice to do so at this stage. These should be treated as confidential and shared only generally with the candidate.

e. Student Letters. Letters (5-10) from students who have completed the course(s) should be solicited by the department chair.

f. Faculty Course Evaluation. A statement of faculty evaluation of course content and instructional effectiveness is essential. The candidate or Chair should ask appropriate faculty to provide an evaluation of the content and improvement over time, where possible, of courses taught by the candidate. Possible sources of data for review are listed in the document "Best Practices for the Evaluation of Teaching" to be found on the Office of Instructional Support website at <http://www.clt.cornell.edu/campus/teach/faculty/faculty.html>.

These letters should be sent directly to the Chair. Class handouts and other teaching materials do not need to be included with the materials submitted to the Dean, but should be available to the

faculty evaluators. The Teaching Evaluation Handbook should be consulted for additional guidance and can be found at the website of the Office of Instructional Support: <http://www.clt.cornell.edu/resources/teh/teh.html>.

10. EXTENSION

a. Accomplishments. The candidate should provide 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 in the resume. Highlight unique and creative aspects of the extension program.

b. Goals. The candidate is to provide a description of the goals and objectives of extension programming.

c. Audience Evaluation. 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 stakeholders. Include summaries of participant evaluations of significant extension efforts when appropriate (including extension off-campus staff, faculty, extension associates, and related stakeholders). Describe changes made or planned as a result of the evaluations. Include administrative and leadership responsibilities and roles that the candidate has assumed.

d. Faculty Evaluation. A statement of faculty evaluation of the individual's extension program content is essential. The Chair 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.

11. RESEARCH

a. Goals. A statement by the candidate describing goals and objectives for his/her research program.

b. Accomplishments. A statement by the candidate 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 resume and should not be repeated here.

c. Faculty Evaluation. A statement from a department faculty member evaluating the direction and accomplishment of the research program, [including assessment of the relationship of the research program to the department mission.]

12. PUBLICATIONS

a. A list of all publications related to research, teaching, and extension activities in the following order:

1. Refereed journal articles (for articles published within the last five years, please identify the candidate's role vis-à-vis that of other authors)

2. Abstracts of papers presented at professional meetings
3. Technical articles, books, etc.
4. Extension publications (bulletins, fact sheets, newsletters edited, training materials/manuals for staff and clientele, etc.)
5. Trade publications
6. Materials other than those listed in 1-5 (computer programs, patents, licenses, videotapes, films, slide sets, TV/radio presentations, etc.)

(Within each group, the most recent publications should be listed first.)

- a. A list of publications included with these materials. There should be a brief description (not the abstract) of the importance of each publication included. Examples of significant work relating to research, teaching, and/or extension should be included.
- b. Please provide three loan sets of **no more than five recent publications** in each functional area (research, instruction, extension) if applicable.

13. EXTERNAL FUNDING

Summary of external funding obtained to support research, extension, and teaching functions. This should include all grants applied for and received and annual dollar support received. On grants with multiple principal investigators, the role of the candidate in proposed preparation and conduct of project should be described.