

B5 Stanford Professoriate: New Appointment Conferring Tenure or a Continuing Term of Appointment

This form must be submitted for recommendations for appointment to:

- Associate Professor, with tenure
- Professor, with tenure
- Senior fellow in a policy center or institute, for a continuing term of appointment (when candidate is NOT currently a member of the Stanford faculty)

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.

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

**B5 Stanford Professoriate: New Appointment 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 appointment to the rank of:

Beginning on _____

Fill out as applicable: (for part time or joint appointment, indicate percent time employment)

Fill out as applicable:

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

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

Courtesy department/school _____ at _____ % time

For an appointment 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 school) (date)

_____ (Chair of secondary department/Director) (date)

_____ (Dean of secondary school/Institute) (date)

Approved for recommendation to the Advisory Board:

_____ (Provost) (date)

Approved for recommendation to the President by the Advisory Board:

_____ (Advisory Board Chair) (date)

1. Billet Information

Provide:

A. Primary Department: _____

Billet/Position Numbers: _____ FTE: _____

Secondary Department: _____

Billet/Position Numbers: _____ FTE: _____

B. Correspondence regarding billet and search authorization for the position for which the candidate is recommended.

C. If the School intends to seek support through the Faculty Incentive Fund, please include a separate letter to the Provost.

2. Search and Evaluation Process

Provide (in one or more attached sheets):

- A. A list of the members of the search committee. If there was a separate evaluation committee, list the members of that as well. Disclose any collaborative and/or mentoring relationship a committee member may have with the candidate.
- B. A description of the process that led to this recommendation.
- C. A description of the affirmative action aspects of the search. Include a list of all outside sources contacted, along with samples of letters sent to such sources requesting information and/or nominations of possible candidates. Include the responses received.
- D. The completed Applicant Pool Information Form indicating the total number of applicants for the position, including their gender and ethnic background, if known. If these numbers cannot be precisely determined, explain. Please compare the composition of the candidate pool with the availability pool data for the discipline (this information is available from your dean's office).
- E. A list, in order of priority, of the finalists for this position and an explanation as to why each of those, other than the appointee, was not selected for appointment. Include a discussion of the results of the affirmative action efforts described above. *(Please evaluate the proposed appointee in the "Evaluation of the Candidate" section below).*

Searches and Search Waivers

Stanford's appointment procedures are designed so that each prospective member of the faculty will be suitable for appointment to Stanford and shall be the best available person at his or her level of professional development for the proposed appointment in a broadly defined field.

1) Search

When a department or school receives authorization to appoint a new faculty member, the department chair or dean should appoint an evaluation or search committee to carry out the evaluation or search in a broadly defined field.

A rigorous and comprehensive search is required for new appointments to the Stanford professoriate. The search committee should advertise publicly all vacancies in addition to using other appropriate methods of candidate solicitation. Letters describing the position should be sent to higher education and other institutions that are likely to provide a suitable candidate.

All searches should actively engage in affirmative action in the search process; professional colleagues should be contacted to solicit names of female and minority candidates (as well as others who would bring diversity to the professoriate) and such candidates should be encouraged to apply. Contacts should be made with resources such as female and minority professional organizations and journals so that such groups are alerted to the search.

Advertisements and letters announcing vacancies must include a statement such as:

“Stanford University is an equal opportunity employer and is committed to increasing the diversity of its faculty. It welcomes nominations of and applications from women and members of minority groups, as well as others who would bring additional dimensions to the University’s research, teaching and clinical missions.”

The Office of the Provost makes available to each dean’s office availability pool data in various disciplines. Search committees are encouraged to obtain this information and seek the assistance of the Faculty Recruitment Office (<http://facultydevelopment.stanford.edu/FRO.html>).

NOTE: Departments must retain complete records of each search, including vitae of applicants, for at least three years.

2) Transitions between faculty lines

Recommendations resulting in transitions between faculty lines are considered new appointments and occur infrequently. If a full search was not conducted, a search waiver is required. The appointment file should contain information that distinguishes the faculty member’s current and future roles and responsibilities; in particular, it should explain the necessity for the proposed appointment. Assertions that the candidate deserves the recommended appointment for meritorious service or time in rank are not sufficient justifications.

Persons who hold or have held acting or visiting titles at Stanford or who have been at the University in other capacities occasionally become candidates for regular professorial appointments. The search committee is obliged to assemble evidence concerning candidates having prior association with the University in the same manner as for external candidates; this obligation should be made clear to candidates who hold or have held Stanford appointments.

3) Search waivers

On occasion, the Provost may approve a search waiver for a professorial position when an exceptionally talented person (usually an eminent scholar who is clearly a leader in his or her field) is unexpectedly available. The existence of such a target of opportunity may become known in the course of a regular search, through communication via professional channels, or even by the individual making it known that he or she is available.

Other potentially appropriate uses of a search waiver for a professorial position may include: for a scholar who would bring diversity to the school or department; for a transition between faculty lines where there is evidence that the individual’s activities and stature have evolved; or for a spousal appointment. There may be rare programmatic reasons that warrant a search waiver; inquiries should be addressed to the Provost’s Office.

A request to waive the search requirement for a professorial appointment must present to the Provost convincing evidence that the candidate would have emerged as the leading candidate, if there had been a search. To the extent possible, the request should be substantiated by comparative evaluations (from external and/or internal referees) and evidence of the candidate’s significant accomplishments.

In addition, a rigorous review of the candidate’s qualifications is expected in the subsequent preparation of the appointment recommendation.

3. Biographical and Bibliographic Information

Provide for the Provost's Office the following confidential information (on a separate sheet):

- Date of birth; place of birth
- Social Security Number
- Ethnicity (if known)
- Citizenship status (If foreign, give visa or immigration status)
- Proof of California Medical Licensure (if applicable)

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.

4. 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, 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 teaching and advising role of the candidate (all members of the Academic Council are expected to teach in some capacity). Describe the candidate's prior teaching experience and performance, including 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:

Optional: 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).

Instructions for Submitting Evidence (Sections 5, 6 and 7)

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

Appointment to the rank of:

- Tenure Line Associate Professor or Professor with Tenure
- Senior Fellow for a Continuing Term

Appointment to Tenure Line Associate Professor or Professor with Tenure	
SCHOLARSHIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8-12 Letters • All or most of the individuals in the comparison set should be scholars who would likely receive tenure at Stanford.
COMPARATIVE EVALUATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be comparative (comparison set of 4-6 scholars).
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 according to usual school practice and in accordance with the requirements below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No separate referee letters required. • Undergraduate student letters: solicit 6-12. • 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. • 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. • 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. • Copies of all available standardized course evaluation summaries are required.
OTHER ACTIVITIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No separate referee or student/trainee letters required. • Following usual school practice, available assessments of other activities relevant to the candidate’s intended role may be solicited simultaneously with scholarship assessments.

Appointment to Senior Fellow for a Continuing Term	
SCHOLARSHIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8-12 Letters
COMPARATIVE EVALUATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be comparative (comparison set of 4-6 scholars). • All or most of the individuals in the comparison set should be scholars who would likely receive tenure at Stanford.
TEACHING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No separate referee letters required. • Teaching evidence is not expected; however, if teaching evidence is available and appropriate to the candidate's intended role, it may be included.
OTHER ACTIVITIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following usual school practice, available assessments of other activities relevant to the candidate's intended role may be solicited simultaneously with scholarship assessments.

5. 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 scholars in the comparison set. 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.)

6. 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.)

7. 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.)

8. Evaluation of the Candidate

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

- A. Describe how the recommended candidate was chosen from the pool of candidates assembled in the search. Include the search/evaluation committee's assessment of the candidate, if there is one.
- B. Discuss and evaluate 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. Justify the appointment in light of the qualifications of the recommended candidate in relation to the entire pool of available candidates.

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

Criteria (in general) in the Tenure Line:

The University recognizes that there are significant variations in how candidates qualify for and secure appointment, according to field and discipline. Scholars come from different backgrounds and receive different educational training. Nevertheless, all appointments have in common the requirement of excellence, however measured.

Excellence in both scholarship and teaching is an important prerequisite for a tenured appointment at Stanford because the University is dedicated to outstanding achievement in both. The purpose of the appointment evaluation is to appraise, on the basis of the record to date, the candidate's standing in his or her scholarly discipline (broadly defined) and the candidate's quality as a teacher. Decisions on initial appointment are subject to the exercise of scholarly and professional judgment and discretion by the University's departmental faculty and academic leadership.

1. **Scholarship:** The first criterion for a tenured appointment at Stanford is that the individual is the best scholar available at his or her level of professional development in the relevant field.

The candidate must have achieved true distinction in scholarship. The scholarship must clearly reveal that: (for the Associate Professor rank) the candidate is not only among the best 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; or (for the Professor rank) that the candidate is one of the very best in the broadly defined field. In short, the judgment is comparative and (for the Associate Professor rank) predictive. It focuses on issues such as whether the candidate is performing the kind of innovative, cutting-edge research on important questions in the field that breaks new ground, changes the way the field is viewed, 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 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:** The second criterion for a tenured appointment is a record of high quality teaching that clearly reveals that the candidate is capable of sustaining a first-rate teaching program during his or her career at Stanford. 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 undergraduate, graduate, and, if appropriate, postdoctoral instruction, of all types.

Factors considered in assessing teaching performance or promise 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, 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:** Candidates for appointment in the tenure line are primarily assessed on the basis of their achievements in the areas of scholarship and teaching, as noted above. Service (including what might be called institutional citizenship), although relevant, is not a primary criterion.
6. **Uniqueness of function:** Uniqueness of function is not, in and of itself, a criterion for an appointment. The fact that a candidate is the only available individual teaching in a specific area or doing scholarship on a certain subject is not relevant to the process of judging the quality of teaching and scholarship and is not determinative in the decision to appoint the candidate. Furthermore, a department's faculty and/or the dean (and, similarly, the Provost, Advisory Board and/or President) may on occasion decide that a candidate does not warrant an appointment even though that person may be the best available within a field. That is, the reviewing group or individual may decide that the best available candidate in a weak or overly narrow professional field should not be appointed to a position at Stanford.

Deans and department chairs must try to avoid such situations by ensuring that initial searches and appointments are made in areas in which the quality of scholarship is relatively strong, and in which the subject area is sufficiently broad. If teaching needs exist in potentially weak areas, then non-faculty appointments should be considered until that field improves or a strong candidate in it emerges.

7. **Career trajectory:** For an initial appointment as a tenured **Associate Professor** or tenured **Professor**, the department or school is expected to follow especially rigorous screening and evaluation processes. For an appointment at the level of tenured **Professor**, it is expected that the candidate's qualifications will be more advanced than those for a tenured **Associate Professor**.

Additional information for particular ranks and lines:

8. Candidates for appointment 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 standards 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.

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.