

**B3 STANFORD PROFESSORIATE:  
REAPPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION  
INITIALLY CONFERRING TENURE OR A CONTINUING TERM OF APPOINTMENT**

**TO THE ADVISORY BOARD 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: (for part time or joint appointment, indicate percent time employment)*

Primary department/school/policy institute \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ % time

Secondary department/school/policy institute \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ % time

Medical Center affiliation (for MCL) \_\_\_\_\_

Courtesy department/school \_\_\_\_\_

*For a reappointment or promotion coterminous with support or with an administrative assignment at Stanford or an affiliated institution, note the coterminous nature of the appointment:*

**Appointment is (check one):**

- With tenure
- For a continuing term of appointment

**Appointment is (if applicable, check one):**

- Coterminous with continued salary and other research funding from sponsored projects
- Coterminous with continued salary and other support from \_\_\_\_\_
- Coterminous with \_\_\_\_\_

**Recommended by (as applicable):**

\_\_\_\_\_ (Chair of primary department) (date)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Dean of primary department) (date)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Chair of secondary department/Director) (date)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Dean of secondary department/Institute) (date)

**Approved for recommendation to the Advisory Board (Academic Council) or to the President (MCL):**

\_\_\_\_\_ (Provost) (date)

**Approved for recommendation to the President by the Advisory Board (Academic Council):**

\_\_\_\_\_ (Advisory Board Chair) (date)

## 1. Evaluation Process

**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. List any Stanford faculty appointments using a dd/mm/yyyy format.
- 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. Distinguish between peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed publications. 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 (in one or more attached sheets):**

A. Scholarly work:

Describe (in no more than 2 pages) the candidate's scholarly work since initial appointment 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, particularly former mentors. 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. Optional: Include a list of current and former masters, Ph.D. and postdoctoral trainees and their current positions. *(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 5 pages).



#### 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.)*



*School of Medicine Adaptive Long Form Evidence Table  
For use with **University Long Form B3** (Reappointment or Promotion Initially Conferring Tenure or a Continuing Term of Appointment)*

Reappointment or Promotion to the Rank of:	Scholarship: Usual Number of Letters	Comparative Evaluatons	Guidelines regarding scholarship	Teaching: usual number of letters	Guidelines regarding teaching	Other activities (includes clinical care): usual number of letters	Guidelines regarding other activities (includes clinical care):
Reappt/Promo to Associate Professor or Professor <b>conferring tenure</b> - University Tenure Line	8 - 12 external letters required <b>Note A</b> 3 - 5 internal letters required	5 named comparison peers REQUIRED	<b>Note B</b>	5 - 10 trainee letters required <b>Note C</b>	<b>Note D</b>	<b>Note E</b>	<b>Note F</b>
Reappt/Promo to Associate Professor or Full Professor <b>conferring a continuing term</b> - Non-Tenure Line -Research	8 - 12 external letters required <b>Note A</b> 3 - 5 internal letters required	5 named comparison peers REQUIRED	<b>Note G</b>	1 - 5 Trainee letters required	<b>Note H</b>	<b>Note E</b>	<b>Note F</b>
Reappt/Promo to Associate Professor or Full Professor <b>conferring a continuing term</b> - Non-Tenure Line -Teaching	Scholarship – specific referee letters <u>may</u> be required <b>Note I</b>	Named comparison peers NOT required	<b>Note I</b>	8 - 12 letters from internal and/or external referees required <b>Note I</b> 5 - 10 trainee letters required <b>Note C</b>	<b>Note J</b>	<b>Note E</b>	<b>Note F</b>
Reappt/Promo to Full Professor <b>conferring a continuing term</b> - Medical Center Line <b>Note O</b>	5 - 8 external letters required <b>Note A</b> 3 - 5 internal letters required	Named comparison peers NOT required	<b>Note K</b>	3 - 5 total trainee letters required	<b>Notes D, L</b>	<b>Note M</b>	<b>Note N</b>

## **Notes – Form B3:**

- A. The clear majority of external letters **obtained** should come from non-mentor, non-collaborator referees - as a general guideline, no more than 1 or 2 should come from mentors or collaborators.
- B. Peers in UTL: The referee and peer sets should be selected to allow calibration of the candidate's distinction and recognition across a broadly defined field (hundreds of researchers working in the area). All or most of the peers should be scholars who would likely receive tenure at Stanford. In general, the School recommends selection of peers who are tenured at their home institutions. Consult OAA if any uncertainty.
- C. If the candidate is expected to direct graduate study, include the names and dates of doctoral graduates for whom the candidate was the principal advisor, and include letters 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. 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. Copies of all available standardized course evaluation summaries are expected. Results of peer reviews of teaching, summaries of individual course evaluation forms, representative transcribed comments from such forms, etc. should be submitted as available and applicable.
- D. If a large number of trainees are available from whom to solicit evaluation letters, use a random sampling process to determine the trainees who should be solicited. (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 2 follow-up requests to non-respondents. The department should document the process used to generate trainee letters, following the guidelines just described, should include tallies of the number of letters requested and received. For example, the department might state, "The candidate provided us a list of 12 former and current trainees. The departmental evaluation committee solicited letters from all three of the candidate's current doctoral trainees and seven randomly selected remaining trainees. 9 out of the 10 letters were received. A letter was not received from Dr. \_\_\_\_ despite two follow-up attempts."
- E. No separate letters required, but some assessment is required by the School if the candidate has a clinical care role – see note F.
- F. If the candidate has a clinical care role at Stanford or one of Stanford's affiliates, Clinical Excellence Core Competency Evaluation (CECCE) forms should be obtained as described in the CECCE form instructions.
- G. Peers in NTLR: Peer set should be selected to allow calibration of candidate's distinction in the relevant field. Due to differences in the institutional roles of NTLR faculty, the breadth of scope of comparison fields in the NTLR may be narrower than for comparable actions in the UTL. Consult OAA for guidance. All or most of the peers should be scholars who would likely be appointed at Stanford.
- H. Teaching evidence in addition to the trainee letter(s) is not expected; however, if teaching evidence is available and appropriate to the candidate's intended role, it may be included.
- I. If the candidate is an active scholarly contributor, 3 of the 8 - 12 external and/or internal letters required by the teaching section should also address the candidate's scholarly contributions. In other words, 8 - 12 total referee letters are required and may come from internal and/or external referees; if the candidate is an active scholarly contributor, 3 of these letters should address the scholarly work. These cases are unusual; please consult OAA in advance for guidance regarding this requirement and the mix of external and internal letters. Scholarship-specific letters, if required, may come from external and/or internal referees, as appropriate.
- J. 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. If a large number of trainees are available from whom to solicit evaluation letters, use a random sampling process to determine the trainees who should be solicited. (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 2 follow-up requests to non-respondents. The department should document the process used to generate trainee letters, following the guidelines just described, and should include tallies of the number of letters requested and received. For example, the department might state, "The candidate provided us a list of 12 former and current trainees. The departmental evaluation committee solicited letters from all six of the candidate's current doctoral trainees and four randomly selected remaining trainees. 9 of the 10 letters were received. A letter was not received from Dr. \_\_\_\_ despite two follow-up attempts."

*Effective November 1, 2010*

- K. Evaluation letters must include assessment of the candidate's scholarly contributions.
- L. Summaries of individual course evaluation forms, representative transcribed comments from such forms, etc. should be submitted as available and applicable.
- M. MCL: No separate letters required, but some assessment is required by the School – see note N.
- N. MCL: If the candidate has a clinical care role at Stanford or one of Stanford's affiliates, as is the norm in the MCL, Clinical Excellence Core Competency Evaluation (CECCE) forms should be obtained as described in the CECCE form instructions.
- O. As a matter of practice, the School of Medicine confers a continuing term in the MCL only by reappointment or promotion to the rank of Full Professor. Initial appointments to Professor in the MCL are normally for a fixed term – **see Form B1**

End

## 5. Student Letters

**Provide (in one or more attached sheets):**

- A. A list of trainees solicited for letters, with a description of the process used to determine which trainees to contact. Indicate which are current and which are former trainees.
- B. A sample of the solicitation letter sent to trainees.
- C. 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. Do not include large volumes of individual evaluations; if comments are included in evaluations, provide a representative sample.

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

## 7. Evaluation of the Candidate

**Provide (in one or more attached sheets):**

- A. An evaluation of the quality and promise 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 reappoint or promote the candidate in light of the qualifications described above.
  
- B. The evaluation committee report, if applicable

*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.*

## **8. Counseling (optional)**

## 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.