

## **B2 Stanford Professoriate: Reappointment or Promotion for a Term of Years**

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

This form must be submitted for recommendations for the reappointment for a term of years of:

- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor, without tenure
- Professor, without tenure
- Assistant Professor (Research)
- Associate Professor (Research)
- Professor (Research)
- Associate Professor (Teaching)
- Senior Fellow in a specified policy center or institute
- Assistant Professor (MCL)
- Associate Professor (MCL)

And for promotion to the rank of:

- Associate Professor, without tenure
- Associate Professor (Research)
- Professor (Research)
- Associate Professor (MCL)

**Various schools may have school specific policies and practices that must be followed. Users of this form should also review Chapter 2 of the Faculty Handbook for University policies and practices relevant to faculty appointments.**

The blue text in the form provides instructions and information relevant to preparing the papers and should be omitted from the final papers. The black text should be retained in the final papers. This form contains the following sections:

- Form Face Page
- Section 1: Evaluation Process
- Section 2: Biographical and Bibliographic Information
- Section 3: Description of the Candidate's Role
- Section 4: Referee Letters
- Section 5: Student Letters
- Section 6: Teaching & Clinical Evaluations
- Section 7: Evaluation of the Candidate
- Section 8: Counseling
- Section 9: Department or School Approval

**B2 Stanford Professoriate: Reappointment or Promotion for a Term of Years**

**TO THE ADVISORY BOARD AND THE PRESIDENT:**

\_\_\_\_\_ (last name) \_\_\_\_\_ (first name) \_\_\_\_\_ (middle name)

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

For a term of years, beginning on \_\_\_\_\_ and ending 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) \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ % time

Courtesy department/school \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ % time

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

\_\_\_ 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 school) (date)

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

\_\_\_\_\_ (Dean of secondary school/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

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. List any Stanford faculty appointments in 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 the following (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 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 3 pages).

## Instructions for Submitting Evidence (Sections 4, 5 and 6)

Set forth below are the guidelines relating to evidentiary sections of the form (Section 4 – Referee Letters; Section 5 – Student Letters; and Section 6 – Teaching and Clinical Evaluations). The guidelines are organized by rank and line as follows:

Reappointment to the rank of:

- Assistant Professor all lines)
- Associate Professor, without tenure
- Professor, without tenure
- Assistant Professor (Research)
- Associate Professor (Research)
- Professor (Research)
- Associate Professor (Teaching)
- Senior Fellow in a specified policy center or institute
- Assistant Professor (MCL)

Promotion to the rank of:

- Associate Professor, without tenure
- Associate Professor (Research)
- Professor (Research)
- Associate Professor (MCL)

<b>Reappointment of Assistant Professor (all lines)</b>	
<b>SCHOLARSHIP</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3-5</b> Letters</li> <li>• Evaluations from external or internal referees (or a combination thereof) are expected to assess the candidate’s scholarship and career trajectory.</li> </ul>
<b>COMPARATIVE EVALUATIONS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparative evaluations to peers are not required.</li> </ul>
<b>TEACHING</b>	<p>Evidence in the form of letters from students, results of peer reviews of teaching, transcribed comments from individual course evaluation forms, etc., may be submitted according to school practice and in accordance with requirements below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No separate referee letters required.</li> <li>• Undergraduate student letters: If appropriate to the candidate’s role, solicit <b>4-6</b>.</li> <li>• Graduate student letters: If the candidate is expected to direct graduate study, include names and graduation dates of all 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.</li> <li>• Student 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.</li> <li>• 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.)</li> <li>• The department or school should document the process used to generate student letters, following the guidelines just described, and should include</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>tallies of the number of letters requested and received.</li> <li>Copies of all available standardized course evaluation summaries are expected.</li> </ul>
OTHER ACTIVITIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No separate referee or student/trainee letters required.</li> <li>Following usual school practice, available assessments of clinical and/or other activities relevant to the candidate's intended role may be solicited simultaneously with scholarship assessments.</li> </ul>

<b>Reappointment or Promotion of Tenure Line Associate Professor or Professor (without tenure)</b>	
SCHOLARSHIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4-7 Letters</li> </ul>
COMPARATIVE EVALUATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need not be comparative; however, include comparative evaluations (comparison set of 4-6 scholars) according to school practice or when deemed appropriate to judge candidate's work.</li> <li>All or most of the individuals in the comparison set should be scholars who would likely be appointable at Stanford.</li> </ul>
TEACHING	<p>Evidence in the form of letters from students, results of peer reviews of teaching, transcribed comments from individual course evaluation forms, etc., may be submitted following usual school practice and in accordance with the requirements below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No separate referee letters required.</li> <li>Undergraduate student letters: If appropriate to the candidate's role, solicit 4-6.</li> <li>Graduate student letters: If the candidate is expected to direct graduate study, include names and graduation dates of all 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.</li> <li>Student 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.</li> <li>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.)</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Copies of all available standardized course evaluation summaries are expected.</li> </ul>
OTHER ACTIVITIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No separate referee or student/trainee letters required.</li> <li>Following usual school practice, available assessments of clinical and/or other activities relevant to the candidate's intended role may be solicited simultaneously with scholarship assessments.</li> </ul>

<b>Reappointment or Promotion of Non-Tenure Line Associate Professor (Research) or Professor (Research)</b>	
SCHOLARSHIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>4-7</b> Letters</li> </ul>
COMPARATIVE EVALUATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need not be comparative; however, include comparative evaluations (comparison set of <b>4-6</b> scholars) according to school practice or when deemed appropriate to judge candidate's work.</li> <li>• All or most of the individuals in the comparison set should be scholars who would likely be appointable at Stanford.</li> </ul>
TEACHING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No separate referee or student/trainee letters required.</li> <li>• Teaching evidence is not expected; however, if teaching evidence is available and appropriate to the candidate's intended role, it may be included.</li> </ul>
OTHER ACTIVITIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Applicable</li> </ul>

<b>Reappointment or Promotion of Non-Tenure Line Associate Professor (Teaching)</b>	
SCHOLARSHIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In cases where the candidate is an active scholarly contributor, <b>2-3</b> of the required letters (see Teaching below) should assess the candidate's scholarly contributions.</li> </ul>
COMPARATIVE EVALUATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluations need not be comparative.</li> </ul>
TEACHING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>4-7</b> letters</li> <li>• Evaluations from external or internal referees (or a combination thereof) are expected to assess the candidate's pedagogical contributions.</li> <li>• Undergraduate letters: If appropriate to the candidate's role, solicit <b>4-6</b>.</li> <li>• Graduate student letters: If the candidate is expected to direct graduate study, include names and graduation dates of all 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.</li> <li>• Student 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.</li> <li>• 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.)</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Copies of all available standardized course evaluation summaries are expected.</li> </ul>

<b>Reappointment of Senior Fellow</b>	
SCHOLARSHIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>4-7</b> Letters</li> </ul>
COMPARATIVE EVALUATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need not be comparative; however, include comparative evaluations (comparison set of <b>4-6</b> scholars) according to school practice or when deemed appropriate to judge candidate's work.</li> <li>• All or most of the individuals in the comparison set should be scholars who would likely be appointable at Stanford.</li> </ul>
TEACHING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No separate referee or student/trainee letters required.</li> <li>• Teaching evidence is not expected; however, if teaching evidence is available and appropriate to the candidate's intended role, it may be included.</li> </ul>
OTHER ACTIVITIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Applicable</li> </ul>

<b>Reappointment of MCL Associate Professor or Promotion of MCL Assistant Professor to MCL Associate Professor</b>	
SCHOLARSHIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5-8</b> External Letters, <b>3-5</b> Internal</li> <li>• Evaluations must assess the candidate's scholarly contributions.</li> </ul>
COMPARATIVE EVALUATIONS	Evaluations need not be comparative.
TEACHING	<p><b>Evidence in the form of letters from trainees, results of peer reviews of teaching, transcribed comments from individual course evaluation forms, etc., may be submitted according to school practice.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.)</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
OTHER ACTIVITIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No separate referee or student/trainee letters required.</li> <li>• Following usual school practice, available assessments of clinical and other activities relevant to the candidate's intended role may be solicited simultaneously with scholarship assessments.</li> </ul>

#### 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. Clearly note responses received, declines, and non-responses. *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. The solicitation letter should provide referees with a description of the candidate's role and the evaluative criteria so that referees may provide an informed and meaningful assessment (See the preceding chart for guidelines concerning referee letters that apply to particular actions). When no response is received to a solicitation, there should be a minimum of two follow-up requests. *NOTE: Refrain from having a mentor or co-investigator solicit referee evaluations.*
- C. A list of the 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):**

- 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. When no response is received to a solicitation, there should be a minimum of two follow-up requests.
- 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. Do not include large volumes of individual evaluations; if comments are included in such evaluations, provide a representative sample.
- 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 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. Provide 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.*

### Criteria for candidates in the Tenure Line:

While non-tenured term appointments are (in general) made with the clear possibility of reappointment or promotion, there is no entitlement to reappointment or promotion at the end of the term, and such action is by no means automatic. Instead, decisions on reappointment and promotion are, like decisions on initial appointment, subject to the exercise of professional and scholarly judgment and discretion by the University's departmental faculty and academic leadership.

A recommendation for reappointment or promotion must be preceded by a careful evaluation of the available information on the candidate's demonstrated performance and achievement in research, teaching (as applicable), and/or other pertinent aspects of his or her performance since initial appointment to the Stanford faculty, so as to ensure that the candidate continues to meet expectations of excellence. Candidates may be reappointed on the basis of progress, high-level performance, and their continuing to fulfill programmatic need.

1. **Scholarship:** Factors considered in assessing research performance or promise 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:** Teaching is broadly defined to include: the classroom, studio, 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 or promise may 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 reappointment or promotion whose work involves creative writing, dramatic or musical composition or performance, works of art, and the equivalent, special 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:** Service (including what may be called institutional citizenship), although relevant, is not a primary criterion for reappointment. Since a major commitment to administrative activities may detract from the time available for the primary areas of research and teaching, **Assistant Professors** are discouraged from significant administrative commitment.
6. **Career trajectory:** At the time of reappointment, it is expected that an **Assistant Professor** will be on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in scholarship, teaching and (if applicable) other activities. The reappointment process should include an evaluation of whether there is a realistic chance for promotion in the future on the basis of continuation of the candidate's work.

Evidence for reappointment as or promotion to **Associate Professor without tenure** and **Professors without tenure** must show that the faculty member is on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in scholarship, teaching and (if applicable) other activities. There must exist a realistic chance for reappointment or promotion with tenure in the future on the basis of continuation of the candidate's work. Evidence for non-tenured promotions must show that the candidate's performance, including scholarly work and teaching, has been sufficiently strong to justify advancement in rank.

#### **Additional information for particular ranks and lines:**

7. Candidates for reappointment and promotion as **Assistant Professor (Research)**, **Associate Professor (Research)** or **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."
8. Candidates for reappointment as **Associate 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 (where applicable), it would be expected that the candidate is regarded as a strong scholarly contributor, though not necessarily a leader in the field.
9. Candidates for reappointment as **Senior Fellow** have a different institutional role than the tenure line professoriate. Nevertheless, they are reviewed in the same fashion as tenure line Professor 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 standard with respect to teaching. Appointments to this rank are

contingent on continued programmatic need and program funding. (For Senior Fellow appointments of faculty with pre-existing primary appointments in academic departments, follow the procedure described in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 2.

10. For criteria for reappointment as **Assistant Professor**, or for reappointment as or promotion to **Associate Professor, and Professor in the MCL**, see the School of Medicine Faculty Handbook, Chapter 2, Sections 2.25 through 2.29 (<http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/handbook/chap2.html>).

## 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 this review.

One of the most important aspects of the reappointment process is the opportunity it provides to give candid feedback to a junior faculty member on his or her academic performance and progress to date based on the results of this reappointment or promotion review. The counseling letter provides a vehicle for this feedback, which should be constructive, realistic, and specifically tailored to the candidate and to the standards and criteria he or she will face in a future review or promotion.

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, if 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 junior faculty (and acknowledgment of special service efforts); and any institutional citizenship issues.

As to junior faculty in the tenure line, the letter might note that, at the time of the future tenure decision, referees will be asked whether the candidate is not only among the best scholars in his or her experience cohort in a broadly defined field, but is also likely to become one of the very best in the field; in short, the judgment will be both comparative and predictive. Because in general this judgment cannot be made until the referee letters are gathered and the tenure file is compiled, the counseling letter should not opine that the junior faculty member is currently “on track” to promotion.

Finally, although the purpose of the counseling letter is to offer practical guidance to the junior faculty member in regard to his or her future efforts (such as by pointing out areas for potential attention or improvement), the candidate should understand that the strategic advice offered is not a prescription for achieving promotion, but rather the letter writer’s best judgment based on the results of this review, to be accepted or rejected as the junior faculty member chooses. It bears repeating that the ultimate responsibility for career trajectory and success lies with each faculty member himself or herself.

## 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.