

**B4 STANFORD PROFESSORIATE:
PROMOTION
FOR INDIVIDUALS PREVIOUSLY CONFERRED WITH TENURE OR CURRENTLY IN AN
APPOINTMENT FOR A CONTINUING TERM**

BLACK TEXT – SHOULD APPEAR IN FINAL PAPERS BLUE TEXT – INFORMATION FOR PREPARING PAPERS; DO NOT INCLUDE IN FINAL

Use this form for promotion from:

- Tenured Associate Professor to tenured Professor
- Associate Professor (Research) with a continuing term of appointment to Professor (Research) with a continuing term of appointment
- Associate Professor (Teaching) with a continuing term of appointment to Professor (Teaching) with a continuing term of appointment

NOTE: Various schools may have school specific policies and practices that must be followed. Those carrying out faculty searches are urged to consult their dean's office for the pertinent information. Users of this form should also review Chapter 2 of the Faculty Handbook for University policies and practices relevant to faculty appointments.

Continuing Term of Appointment

A continuing term of appointment does not confer tenure. It provides security of appointment without requiring further formal academic reappointment; it may be terminated for just cause or (upon proper notice) when satisfactory performance or programmatic need ceases. Continuing terms of appointment for Associate Professor (Research) and Professor (Research) are normally "coterminous with continued salary and other research funding from sponsored projects."

Part-time, Joint and Coterminous Appointments

If an individual is being recommended for a part-time appointment, indicate on the form the percentage of full-time. If an individual is being recommended for a joint appointment, indicate the percentage of time of each appointment; the department chairs and deans for both departments must sign this form.

When an individual is being recommended for an appointment coterminous with support or with an administrative assignment at Stanford or an affiliated institution, department chairs and deans are to note the coterminous nature of the appointment, generally stated as "Coterminous with continued salary and other research funding from sponsored projects." The statement may vary to meet specific situations; for example, appointments at SLAC carry the qualification "Coterminous with continuation of contract support at SLAC." Questions about specific wording should be directed to the Provost's Faculty Affairs group.

TO THE PROVOST AND THE PRESIDENT:

(last name) (first name) (middle name)

is hereby recommended for reappointment/promotion to the rank of:

Beginning on _____

Fill out as applicable:

Primary department/school/policy institute _____ at _____ % time

Secondary department/school/policy institute _____ at _____ % time

Courtesy department/school _____ at _____ % time

Appointment is (if applicable, check one):

___ Coterminal with continued salary and other research funding
from sponsored projects

___ Coterminal with continued salary and other support
from _____

___ Coterminal with _____

Recommended by (as applicable):

(Chair of primary department) (date)

(Dean of primary school) (date)

(Chair of secondary department/Director) (date)

(Dean of secondary school/Institute) (date)

Approved for recommendation to the President:

(Provost) (date)

1. Evaluation Process

The department chair or dean should appoint an evaluation committee to carry out the evaluation. The evaluation committee should be chaired by someone who has no mentoring or regular collaborative relationship with the candidate. The department chair or dean should inform the candidate in writing that the review process has commenced and request that the candidate provide certain information.

Provide the following (in one or more attached sheets):

- A. A list of the members of the evaluation committee. Disclose any collaborative and/or mentoring relationship an evaluation committee member may have with the candidate.
- B. A copy of the notification sent to the candidate that the review process has commenced.
- C. A description of the process that led to this recommendation.

2. Biographical and Bibliographic Information

Provide the following information in a dated curriculum vitae:

- A. Academic history:
 - Colleges and universities attended, degrees received, dates.
 - Scholarships and honors
 - Post-doctoral and residency training
 - Other study and research opportunities
 - Medical Board eligibility (if applicable)
- B. Employment history. List all academic and non-academic positions.
- C. Public and professional service.
- D. Post-degree honors and awards, if any. Include major invited papers and addresses, memberships in professional associations and learned societies, etc.
- E. A complete list of scholarly publications or other creative works. Group original works (e.g. books, articles, performances, exhibitions) separately from other materials (e.g. commentaries, reviews, editorials). Include page numbers. If pertinent, list other writings such as abstracts, technical reports, etc.

3. Description of the Candidate's Role

Provide the following (in one or more attached sheets):

A. Scholarly work:

Describe (in no more than 2 pages) the candidate's scholarly work since his or her last review at Stanford, with particular reference to its significance and importance for the field, in terms that are understandable to a Stanford faculty member outside the candidate's field. If appropriate, comment on contemporary schools of thought in the field, its recent history, or other such contextual factors that might illuminate the candidate's contribution. For example, describe the authorship practices of the candidate's particular discipline, the contribution of the candidate to multi-authored publications listed in his or her CV, and the candidate's contribution to the work as compared to the other authors. Include in the description an account of at least one specific work by the candidate and its impact or importance. Indicate the author of this statement, normally a member or members of the evaluation or search committee. *(Please save your evaluation of the candidate for the "Evaluation of the Candidate" section below.)*

B. Other academic activities:

Describe, if applicable, the candidate's planned academic activities other than scholarship and teaching, and how they align with the programmatic needs of the department, school and University. For example:

1. Creative works (including dramatic productions, musical performance, studio art, etc.):

Describe (in terms that are understandable to a Stanford faculty member outside the candidate's field) any significant creative works produced by the candidate, with particular reference to their importance in the field. If appropriate, comment on contemporary schools of thought or practice in the field, the field's recent history, or other such contextual factors that might illuminate the candidate's contribution, and include in the description an account of at least one specific work by the candidate and its impact or importance. Indicate the author of this statement, normally a member or members of the evaluation committee. *(Please save your evaluation of the candidate for the "Evaluation of the Candidate" section below.)*

2. Clinical activities:

Describe, if applicable, the candidate's planned clinical activities and how they align with the mission of the applicable school (e.g., the School of Law, the School of Medicine and the applicable medical center). *(Please save your evaluation of the candidate for the "Evaluation of the Candidate" section below.)*

C. Teaching and advising:

Describe, for all ranks as applicable, the candidate's teaching and advising role (all members of the Academic Council are expected to teach in some capacity). Include a summary of teaching commitments since the beginning of the candidate's Stanford appointment (or since the last multi-year reappointment), with course titles and numbers, units and enrollments. Describe any pedagogical innovations or course development activities in which the candidate has participated. *(Please save your*

evaluation of the candidate's teaching for the "Evaluation of the Candidate" section below)

D. Candidate's statement:

Include a statement by the candidate about his or her current scholarly, teaching and other academic activities and plans (clearly legible and not to exceed 3 pages).

Evidence Gathered General Requirements

NOTE: Printouts of electronic mail communications are acceptable for inclusion in the file, although departments are encouraged to exercise care in safeguarding the confidentiality of such communications. In general, departments and schools should consider the balance between the potentially low level of security of electronic mail and the convenience of a rapid response.

Action	to the rank of:	Scholarship: usual number of letters	Comparative evaluations	Guidelines regarding scholarship	Teaching: usual number of letters	Guidelines regarding teaching	Other activities: usual number of letters	Guidelines regarding other activities
Promotion	Tenure line Professor	5-8 a	b		c	d	e	f
Promotion	Non-tenure line Professor(Research)	4-7	b	g	e	h	Not applicable	Not applicable

^a Additional outside evaluations may be sought according to school practice. Evaluations from internal referees may be submitted according to school practice.

^b Comparative evaluations may be obtained according to school practice or when deemed appropriate to judge the candidate's work.

^c No separate referee letters required. If appropriate to the candidate's role, the number of undergraduate student letters should normally be between 4 and 6. If the candidate is expected to direct graduate study, include names and dates of doctoral graduates for whom the candidate was the principal advisor and evaluations from those individuals wherever practicable. In addition, if applicable, evaluations should normally be sought from current doctoral students and postdoctoral fellows who are directly supervised by the candidate. These evaluations may take the form of letters, or they may be in the form of a summary of confidential conversations with a member of the evaluation committee.

^d Letters from students, results of peer reviews of teaching, transcribed comments from individual course evaluation forms, etc., may be submitted according to school practice. If student letters are used to evaluate teaching effectiveness, the department or school should take steps to assure an unbiased response by using a random sampling process to solicit evaluations. (For small courses and for individually supervised student projects, the entire set of students should be solicited for letters.) There should be a minimum of two follow-up requests to non-respondents. The department or school should document the process used to generate student letters, following the guidelines just described, and should include tallies of the number of letters requested and received.

^e No separate referee or student/trainee letters required.

^f Following usual school procedure, available assessments of other activities relevant to the candidate's intended role may be solicited simultaneously with scholarship assessments.

^g Additional outside evaluations may be sought according to school practice. Evaluations from internal referees may be submitted according to school practice.

^h Teaching evidence is not expected; however, if teaching evidence is available and appropriate to the candidate's intended role, it may be included.

Action	to the rank of:	Scholarship: usual number of letters	Comparative evaluations	Guidelines regarding scholarship	Teaching: usual number of letters	Guidelines regarding teaching	Other activities: usual number of letters	Guidelines regarding other activities
Promotion	Non-tenure line Professor(Teaching)	i	j	k	4-6 l	m	e	f

ⁱ In cases where the candidate is an active scholarly contributor, 3 of the required letters should be the candidate's scholarly contributions.

^j Referee letters need not be comparative.

^k Letters may be from external and/or internal referees.

^l Evaluations from external or internal referees (or a combination thereof) are expected to assess the candidate's pedagogical contributions. In cases where the candidate is an active scholarly contributor, refer to *footnote i*. The number of undergraduate student letters should normally be between 4 and 6. If the candidate is expected to direct graduate study, include names and dates of doctoral graduates for whom the candidate was the principal advisor and evaluations from those individuals wherever practicable. In addition, if applicable, evaluations should normally be sought from current doctoral students and postdoctoral fellows who are directly supervised by the candidate. These evaluations may take the form of letters, or they may be in the form of a summary of confidential conversations with a member of the evaluation committee.

^m Solicitation letter should provide referees with description of the candidate's role and the evaluative criteria so that referees may provide an informed and meaningful assessment. Letters from students, results of peer reviews of teaching, transcribed comments from individual course evaluation forms, etc., may be submitted according to school practice. If student letters are used to evaluate teaching effectiveness, the department or school should take steps to assure an unbiased response by using a random sampling process to solicit evaluations. (For small courses and for individually supervised student projects, the entire set of students should be solicited for letters.) There should be a minimum of two follow-up requests to non-respondents. The department or school should document the process used to generate student letters, following the guidelines just described, and should include tallies of the number of letters requested and received.

4. Referee Letters

Provide the following (in one or more attached sheets):

- A. A list of referees (determined through consultation between the department chair, if applicable, and dean) who were asked for evaluations, and a brief comment on the stature and competence of each to judge the candidate's work. Disclose any professional relationship of the referees with the candidate. *NOTE: Evaluations from internal referees may be submitted according to school practice.*
- B. A sample of the solicitation letter sent to referees and any follow-up correspondence. (See the following chart for guidelines concerning referee letters.) *NOTE: Refrain from having a mentor or co-investigator solicit referee evaluations.*
- C. A list of scholars in the comparison set (if applicable). Include each named peer's highest degree, the year conferred and the academic institution from which he or she received it, his or her current title and institution, and a very brief description of his or her area of expertise.
- D. All external referee letters, declinations and any other correspondence with referees.
- E. All internal referee letters, declinations and any other correspondence with referees.

(Please save your discussion of the referee letters for the "Evaluation of the Candidate" section below.)

5. Student Letters

Provide (in one or more attached sheets):

All student/trainee letters, declinations and any other correspondence with students/trainees.

(Please save your discussion of these letters for the "Evaluation of the Candidate" section below.)

6. Teaching and Clinical Evaluations

Provide the following (in one or more attached sheets):

- A. Copies of all available standardized course evaluation summaries.
- B. If applicable, copies of all available forms or other instruments used to document clinical skills, with summaries of responses.

(Please save your discussion of these evaluations for the "Evaluation of the Candidate" section below.)

7. Evaluation of the Candidate

Provide the following (in one or more attached sheets):

- A. An evaluation of the quality of the candidate's performance to date in the areas of scholarship, teaching, clinical work (if applicable), and/or other pertinent aspects of his or her performance. If there are identified weaknesses, describe what provisions are being made to help the candidate improve his or her performance. Justify the recommendation to promote the candidate in light of the qualifications described above.
- B. The evaluation committee report.

Deans and department chairs are reminded that consideration of reappointment and promotion cases should include an account of the future of the department/division and/or school, which may include consideration of programmatic need.

Criteria for candidates in the Tenure Line:

Promotion to Professor of a faculty member already holding tenure at Stanford is not an entitlement and is by no means automatic. Rather, it is a matter subject to the exercise of professional and scholarly judgment and discretion by the University's departmental faculty and academic leadership. Promotions should be preceded by a careful evaluation of the candidate's overall performance, including scholarly work and teaching, and the results of this evaluation must clearly justify promotion at the time of the recommendation.

1. **Scholarship:** In order to be promoted to Professor, a faculty member should have achieved recognized distinction in his or her field (broadly defined) and have compiled a significant record of excellent scholarly accomplishment since the time of the tenure review. In general, the evidence must show that the person being proposed for promotion is among the very best individuals in the field and not merely the best of a particular experience cohort in the field. The evaluation should address whether the candidate's performance is the kind of innovative, cutting-edge research on important questions in the field that breaks new ground, or changes the way the field is viewed, or broadens our understanding of the field, or opens up new methods or new areas of investigation, and thereby has (or is likely to have) the fundamental impact on the field that is expected from the very best scholars in the field.

Factors considered in assessing research performance include (but are not limited to) the following: scholarly activity and productivity; impact, innovation and creativity; recognition in the field; ability to work effectively as part of a research team (if relevant); effective communication with colleagues, staff and students; and professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics.

2. **Teaching:** The candidate for promotion to Professor should also have achieved and maintained a record of high quality teaching and mentoring of Stanford students. Teaching is broadly defined to include: the classroom, laboratory, or clinical setting; advising; mentoring; program building; and curricular innovation. The teaching record should include, as appropriate, undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral instruction, of all types.

Factors considered in assessing teaching performance include (but are not limited to) the following: knowledge of the material; clarity of exposition; positive style of interaction with

students; availability; professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics; effective communication skills; helpfulness in learning; and ability to stimulate further education.

3. **Clinical work:** Excellence in clinical practice or clinical care is a requirement for those candidates (such as in the School of Law or in the School of Medicine) whose duties include such practice. Factors considered in assessing clinical performance include (but are not limited to) the following: clinical knowledge; clinical judgment; procedural skills (if relevant); clinical productivity; clinical outcomes or results; professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics; humanism; ability to work effectively as part of the clinical team; and effective communication with colleagues, staff, students, and patients or clients.
4. **Other activities:** In judging candidates for promotion whose work involves creative writing, dramatic or musical composition or performance, works of art, and the equivalent, appropriate criteria are to be defined and applied. In general, the judgment of teaching quality for these faculty should follow procedures applicable to all faculty.
5. **Service:** While the primary criteria for promotion are excellence in scholarship, teaching, and (if applicable) clinical work, service (including what might be called institutional citizenship) may also be given consideration.

Additional information for particular ranks and lines:

6. Candidates for promotion to **Professor (Research)** have a different institutional role than the tenure line professoriate. Nevertheless, they are reviewed in the same fashion as for comparable tenure line appointments and evaluated (in general) by the same standards with respect to research. Even though the candidate may be expected to provide pedagogical contributions, he or she is not evaluated by the same standards with respect to teaching. Deans and department chairs should be aware that individuals appointed to these ranks would normally hold terms “coterminous with continued salary and other research funding from sponsored projects.”
7. Candidates for promotion to **Professor (Teaching)** have a different institutional role than the tenure line professoriate. Nevertheless, they are reviewed in the same fashion as comparable tenure line appointments, but are evaluated (in general) by higher standards with respect to teaching. In cases where evaluation by external referees may not be appropriate, a thorough evaluation of the candidate’s teaching and pedagogical contributions is particularly crucial. Even though the candidate may be a scholarly contributor, he or she is not evaluated by the same standards with respect to scholarship. As to scholarship (and where applicable), it would be expected that the candidate is regarded as a strong scholarly contributor, though not necessarily a leader in the field.

8. Counseling

Provide (in one or more attached sheets):

The proposed (draft) counseling letter or memorandum that the candidate will receive regarding his or her academic progress and performance based on the results of the review.

Guidelines:

One of the most important aspects of the process for promotion to full professor is the opportunity it provides to give candid and constructive feedback to a faculty member on his or her academic performance and progress to date based on the results of the promotion review. The counseling letter provides a vehicle for this feedback.

Appropriate areas to discuss may include: scholarship quality to date; general expectations of the discipline with respect to quantity; form or scholarly venue of publications; expectations, as applicable, about other indicators of recognition such as grant funding; suggestions for the research program that may be helpful; teaching quality, quantity, and type to date (including acknowledgment of special efforts in teaching); quality of performance in other academic activities (such as creative works or clinical practice), if applicable; general expectations as to levels of service appropriate for senior faculty (and acknowledgment of special service efforts); and any institutional citizenship issues.

The purpose of the counseling letter is to offer practical guidance and collegial feedback and advice to the faculty member in regard to his or her future efforts (such as by pointing out areas for potential attention and improvement) based on the results of the promotion review process.

9. Department or School Approval

Provide the following (in one or more attached sheets):

- A. Discuss any reservations that may have been expressed concerning the candidate and how they have been resolved.
- B. Describe the departmental voting practice.
- C. Was this voting practice employed for this recommendation?
- D. Did all members of the group(s) have an opportunity to vote on this recommendation?
- E. Summarize the vote. If the vote was not unanimous, please explain.