APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR (TENURE LINE)

Note: Appointments at Stanford University are governed by the guidelines and procedures set forth in the Stanford University Faculty Handbook and the Stanford University Faculty Appointment Forms, both of which are published by the Provost's Office. The policies and procedures described below are specific to H&S and have been approved by the Provost's Office as consistent with overall University policy. Those carrying out faculty searches are urged to review both University and School policies and procedures.

1.1 Timeline and Checkpoints for Search Activities (see chart)

1.2 Search Authorizations

Appointments to the tenure-line faculty ranks in the School can be initiated only by departmental or joint departmental action. Recommendations for an appointment at the junior level are to be preceded by a rigorous and comprehensive search.

A department chair must present the case for a new appointment to the Dean's Office and obtain formal authorization before a search can be launched. Officially, every billet that becomes vacant for any reason returns to the Dean's Office. In some circumstances, it is returned to the department for a replacement or for a search in another field. In other cases, the Dean may reallocate that billet to another department or hold it in reserve in the Dean's Office.

The cognizant dean meets with the department chair to discuss faculty appointment needs, normally in the spring. After consulting with the cognizant dean, the department chair should submit the search authorization request form (Appendix 1F). Such requests are then reviewed by the deans, and approvals are communicated to chairs in June.

Departmental faculties and the deans must regard every search authorization as a potential long-term commitment. The Dean's authorization is based upon an assessment of the department's present and predicted future needs in scholarship and teaching and involves priority judgments both within the department and between departments. Teaching needs of interdisciplinary programs also may play a role in assigning authorizations to departments.

A decision regarding the area of search is among the most important in the process, since this determines the applicant pool for initial appointment and may help to define the group with whom a candidate will be compared at the time of tenure review. Whenever possible, departments should search broadly for the "best of field" rather than in narrowly defined subfields. A search that yields a small number of applicants may signal that the search has not been defined broadly enough, or that the net may not have been cast widely enough.

As part of the School's continuing commitment to faculty renewal, it is expected that
most searches will be authorized at the junior level. However, the department chair and the cognizant dean should confer regarding the appropriate rank, which should be determined in accordance with the department’s distribution of ranks, long-range hiring plan and programmatic needs.

1.3 Appointment Terms

Assistant professors normally spend seven years in rank and are evaluated for promotion to associate professor with tenure in their seventh year. There are some circumstances in which an assistant professor can delay the tenure review until a later year (see Core Policies, Tenure Clock Examples).

All newly hired assistant professors in the School of Humanities and Sciences follow the 4+3 schedule, which consists of an initial term of four years and, if approved, reappointment to a second term of three years. This pattern is designed to provide time necessary to begin an academic career and to establish a record on which to be evaluated for reappointment.

1.4 Appointment as Assistant Professor (Subject to Ph.D.)

A person hired as an assistant professor who does not complete requirements for the Ph.D. degree before the start of his/her appointment at Stanford is appointed as an assistant professor (subject to Ph.D.) on a lower salary scale. Under normal circumstances, a maximum of a one-year delay on the tenure clock is allowed in H&S. When the degree is received, the parenthetical portion of the title is dropped, he/she is appointed for the remainder of the first term as assistant professor, and the tenure clock begins running. The faculty member should provide the department with documentation showing date of completion of requirements for the Ph.D. degree. The department will need to forward the documentation along with the “blue form” (Recommendation for Amendment of Professorial Appointment) to the Dean’s Office.

1.5 Appointment as Non-Tenured Associate Professor

The rank of non-tenured associate professor is occasionally used as a means of attracting especially promising people who may not yet have the strong credentials required for initial appointment to a tenured rank. In H&S, such an appointment may be from three to five years in length. To be appointed as a non-tenured associate professor, the person must have distinguished herself or himself in scholarship considerably more than persons appointed as assistant professors and, as with all faculty appointments, must clearly have the potential to be tenurable at Stanford. However, such an appointment implies no commitment or prejudgment with respect to tenure. For appointments at this rank, the department chair is to meet with the cognizant dean to discuss issues concerning the tenure clock; expectations of the tenure clock should be made clear to the candidate. The chair should also discuss with the cognizant dean the solicitation of external referees and students. Sample external letter Appendix1F should be followed closely and the letters should be comparative.
1.6 Forming the Search Committee

The search committee has the responsibility of gathering data on scholarship, teaching, and other relevant matters. While the structure of search committees varies among departments, normally the minimum is three members with a senior faculty member serving as chair. A member of the committee should be assigned the job of overseeing the diversity aspects of the search.

Once the department chair has selected the committee, he or she is to consult with the cognizant dean, who retains authority to approve its membership. By School policy, a department may permit emeriti and a graduate student to serve on and vote in a search committee. However, emeriti and graduate students are not allowed to vote at the departmental (as opposed to the committee) level. The department chair retains final approval regarding the selection of students for committee membership.

1.7 Advertising

Searches should include advertising in professional journals or other widely-disseminated professional publications. All advertisements are to be forwarded to the cognizant dean for approval. A sample advertisement is included as Appendix 1A and should be followed closely.

Search committee members and other department faculty are encouraged to call and write colleagues at other universities in order to identify applicants and to encourage them to apply. Solicitation letters should be carefully phrased to make certain that recipients understand Stanford's eagerness to receive applications from all highly qualified candidates. A sample letter is included as Appendix 1B and should be followed closely.

The School encourages contact with institutions that have significant minority enrollments, as well as professional groups of women and minorities, including advertising in special journals so that such groups are alerted to a search.

1.8 Candidates with Stanford Affiliations

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 credentials of such persons may be more easily assessed than those of others, but the search committee is still obliged to consider by all appropriate means the credentials of candidates having no prior association with the University. This obligation should be made clear to candidates who hold or have held Stanford appointments.

Faculty members from outside of the department but internal to Stanford may serve as a reference for such candidates. However, the number of such letters should not be more than two. Please see Appendix 1D for a sample letter to internal referees. A faculty member within the department also has the prerogative to write a letter on behalf of the
candidate. However, if this option is exercised, he or she may not participate in departmental deliberations regarding the search and must recuse himself or herself from voting. Exceptions to this requirement may only be granted by the cognizant dean.

1.9 Criteria

Both scholarship and teaching are important prerequisites for tenured appointments at Stanford because the University is dedicated to outstanding achievement in both. The purpose of the appointment evaluation is to form, on the basis of the record to date, appraisals of the candidate’s standing and potential in his or her scholarly discipline broadly defined and the candidate’s quality as a teacher.

The first criterion for an appointment at Stanford is that the individual is the best available at his or her level of professional development for the proposed rank. All appointments have in common the requirement of excellence, however measured. The second criterion for an 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. The teaching record should include undergraduate, graduate, and, if appropriate, postdoctoral instruction, of all types.

In judging candidates for appointments whose work involves creative writing, dramatic or musical composition or performance, works of art, and the equivalent, special criteria must be defined and applied. In general, the judgment of teaching quality for these fine arts faculty can follow normal procedures applicable to all faculty.

Uniqueness of function is also not a criterion for an appointment. The fact that a candidate is the only faculty member teaching in a specific area or doing scholarship on a certain subject is not relevant to the process of judging the quality of scholarship and teaching. A department's faculty and/or the Dean 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 may decide that the best 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, appointments, and reappointments 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.

1.10 Developing the Short List

When the search process has resulted in a short list of candidates, the department chair normally consults with the cognizant dean to discuss the search (including the diversity aspects of the search), the quality of the applicant pool, and the ranking of the candidates.
If at this stage the candidate pool is judged insufficiently strong, no appointment should be made; the deans may authorize another search in the same or another field during a subsequent year.

*Diversity Action Plan.* All candidates known to be women or minority group members are to be discussed by the search committee. If the short list does not include women or minority candidates, the department chair is to provide the cognizant dean with a careful explanation. If a woman or minority candidate is identified in the search process whose qualifications do not fit the opening but are consistent with the standards and future direction of the department, the cognizant dean should be informed. For further information regarding the School's diversity action plan, please see the Core Policies, Diversity Action Plan.

1.11 Bringing Candidates to Campus

The search process will include visits to the campus by the leading candidates, who should have an opportunity to speak with faculty and students. The norm is three candidates, although the Dean's Office will support more, if necessary. Because of financial considerations, the department chair must gain the approval of the cognizant dean when the number of candidates exceeds three. The cognizant dean should also be given an opportunity to meet with the finalists. Background materials on candidates (including a curriculum vitae, transcripts, dossier letters and teaching evaluations) should be assembled and made available to faculty and deans who are scheduled to meet with the candidate.

The Dean's Office can serve as a liaison in providing information to candidates on housing, benefits, and employment opportunities for partners.

1.12 Guidelines for Student Participation

Student perspectives are important to the appointments and promotions process, especially when there is little evidence available on the candidate's teaching. During the search, students should be asked to participate in seminars, colloquia, and other public occasions where the candidates present their research. This gives students an opportunity to interact with the candidates both as part of a group and individually. Departments are encouraged to provide a systematic process for students to give feedback and input, and to include this input for consideration in the faculty’s deliberations.

1.13 Department Discussion and Confidentiality Issues

It is expected that each Academic Council faculty member within the department will carefully and objectively evaluate the credentials of all candidates before the case is discussed or voted upon. Should a faculty member write a personal letter for the file evaluating the candidate before the case is discussed or voted upon, he or she may not participate in departmental discussions regarding the search and must recuse himself or herself from voting. Exceptions to this requirement may only be granted by the cognizant
The information to be included in the appointment papers should be read carefully and objectively prior to the formal vote by every faculty member voting on the candidate. The search committee will then present its recommendations for discussion and consideration by the department's faculty. To underscore Stanford's policy of vigorously protecting the sources of information contained in third-party evaluation, department chairs are required to read the following statement to their faculty before every discussion of an individual's appointment or promotion:

"The entire proceedings during which specific individuals are discussed are to be held in strict confidence by all participants. The chair of the department or his/her designee shall convey whatever information needs to be transmitted to the candidate; the opinions expressed by the department's faculty or by internal or external referees shall not be discussed with the candidate nor with other parties except as set forth in Sections VI (I) and VII of the Stanford University Faculty Handbook or when necessary for University review of the process. A breach of confidence by a participant in an appointment and promotion matter may be considered to be a serious violation of professional ethics." (See memo to department chairs from Dean Sharon R. Long, issued on October 15, 2002 and revised on April 13, found in Core Policies, Confidentiality.)

1.14 Voting

With the exception of emeriti (whether or not recalled to active duty), all Academic Council members may vote on the appointment of assistant professors.

Departments must have a clear and consistent voting policy. Any modification of the policy needs to be discussed in advance with the Dean’s Office. Eligible department members are expected to vote. Faculty in residence should make every effort to attend the department meeting. Faculty who are away from campus for a brief period are expected to vote. Faculty on leave may discuss with the chair and cognizant dean conditions for participation. The department chair and cognizant dean may request that a person on leave participate in the voting process. Faculty away from campus should ensure that their votes are received by the chair in advance of departmental balloting. Some faculty are to recuse themselves from voting, including spouses, domestic partners, those who have written a letter on behalf of the candidate prior to departmental discussion and voting, and others negotiated with the cognizant dean and agreed upon with him or her prior to the departmental vote. Emeriti and graduate students serving on search committees may (in the discretion of the department) vote on appointments at the committee level, and/or participate in the department's deliberations, but they may not vote at the departmental level.

School policy allows for either secret or open ballots on appointments. Secret ballots
have the advantage of reducing the effects of peer pressure on the vote, but may allow for unexplained and perhaps uninterpretable votes. Open ballots have the advantage of forcing each faculty member to take an open position before his or her peers on the issue. Departments should adopt one system or the other and apply it consistently in all cases. The practice of conducting a "straw vote" which, if positive, is followed by a final "unanimous vote" is prohibited. The actual yea, nay, abstentions, and non-votes must be recorded and reported in all votes on faculty appointments. In cases involving split or negative votes, every faculty member who votes is encouraged to include a written explanation of his or her vote in the papers submitted by the department.

**Split Votes.** In cases where the vote is split or negative, the department chair retains the authority to decide whether or not to forward a file to the Dean's Office.

**Abstentions:** If there are any abstentions, the chair should summarize the reasons for them, if practicable.

**Dissenting Votes.** If there are dissenting votes, the chair should summarize the reasons for them, if practicable. Dissenting voters are strongly encouraged to write a letter for the file.

**Communications to the Dean regarding the case.** Faculty members who vote may communicate directly with the Dean's Office about their vote, and their written statements will be added to the papers that are considered by reviewing bodies. In such instances, the faculty member must provide a copy of his or her letter to the department chair, who will have the option of forwarding a written response that will also be added to the file. Both the faculty member's letter and the department chair's response must be held in strictest confidence and not be shared with other members of the department's faculty.

In extraordinary situations, however, faculty members may communicate in writing to the Dean's Office with the assurance that their communication will be held confidential from other members of the department, including the chair. Letters of this type may be added to the papers that are considered by reviewing bodies if, in the opinion of the cognizant dean, (1) the letter discusses information or views that are relevant to the review of the appointment or promotion; (2) the letter clearly states the reason why the writer desires to communicate confidentially; and (3) the reason for confidentiality is a compelling one.

If such a letter is included in the file, the file should note that the letter is confidential and has not been reviewed by the department chair. Where appropriate, the cognizant dean should try to verify the accuracy of any problematic statements in the letter and record his or her findings in the file.

1.15 Assembling the Appointment Papers

**Scholarship.** Evidence of scholarly excellence and potential is essential. When candidates for first-term assistant professorships have letters of reference sent, either through
placement offices or by asking references directly, the department does not need to follow up on these letters. Normally, the department should ask candidates to provide three letters of reference. If the department receives more than three, all of these letters are included in the file. In cases where candidates are asked to provide the names of referees from whom the department will solicit evaluations, the sample letter shown as Appendix 1C should be followed closely.

**Teaching.** At the beginning assistant professor level, the file should include whatever evidence can be obtained about the candidate’s teaching. Many candidates will have taught as graduate students or as postdoctoral fellows, and data on that teaching performance should be gathered. Faculty members for whom the candidate has served as a teaching assistant should be asked to provide commentary about teaching. The sample letter included as Appendix 1E should be followed closely.

1.16 Submission of the Appointment Papers

The chair of the search committee is responsible for assembling the documentation necessary to complete the file. The appointment papers should be assembled in accordance with the guidelines (including sequential page numbering and font size) set forth in Stanford University Faculty Appointment Forms, 1A. Academic Council Faculty: New Untenured Appointment. The department administrator (or person responsible for faculty affairs within the department) will have extra forms and will assist the faculty in assembling the file.

The department chair is responsible for writing the cover letter to the cognizant dean for the file. While acting as a letter of transmittal, the letter should include the pertinent reasons for the candidate's selection and the effective date of the appointment, which is normally September 1 of the following academic year.

1.17 The Review Process

When the file has been completed, the department administrator should send the file to the Faculty Affairs Officer in the Dean's Office for review. After reviewing the materials, the Faculty Affairs Officer will return the file to the department for any revisions before copying. The department administrator can then send the original file plus six copies to the Dean's Office. The Dean’s Office, in its discretion, may solicit additional information regarding the file. The following chart shows (starting at the bottom) the path that papers follow after leaving the department:

- President (for final approval and reporting to the Board of Trustees)
- Advisory Board of the Academic Council (for review and voting)
- Provost (for submission to Advisory Board)
- Dean (final approval at School level)
1.18 Negative Decisions at the School Level

If the decision is negative at the School level, the Dean must inform the department chair of that decision and the reasons for it. Under normal circumstances, the candidate should be informed within one week from the time of the decision. Reconsideration of a negative decision by the Dean will be allowed only when the department presents convincing evidence that new data bearing on the case exist, such as information that could not have been available in the original evaluation. Reconsiderations are rare and may be avoided by consultation between the chair and the cognizant dean at appropriate intervals in the search process.

1.19 The Written Offer

A draft of the written offer letter may be prepared after the departmental vote and must be forwarded to the cognizant dean for final approval. The letter must contain an explicit statement reminding the individual that such an offer is contingent upon approval of the Dean's Office, the Provost, the Advisory Board, and the President. Candidates may be referred to the Stanford University Faculty Handbook for rules and policies relating to the faculty. A sample offer letter is included as Appendix 1H.
APPENDIX 1A: SAMPLE ADVERTISEMENT FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

FACULTY POSITION AVAILABLE

The Department of NAME at Stanford University is seeking applicants for a tenure track Assistant Professor in the area of AREA. Areas of interest include but are not limited to SUBDISCIPLINES. Applicants will be expected to teach courses at both the graduate and undergraduate levels in AREA.

Applicants should send curriculum vitae, a list of publications, a brief statement of research interest, and names and addresses of three references (OPTIONAL: arrange for three letters of references to be mailed) to Professor NAME, ADDRESS. For full consideration, materials must be received by DATE. The term of appointment would begin DATE. Stanford University is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer.
APPENDIX 1B: SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR SEARCH

DATE

Professor NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

As you may know, the Department of XX is conducting a search for an assistant professor in AREA. The appointment will begin in September, 20XX. We seek individuals committed to excellence in carrying out a vigorous research program as well as having a strong commitment to both graduate and undergraduate education.

The first criterion for an appointment at Stanford is that the individual is the best available at his or her level of professional development for the proposed rank. All appointments have in common the requirement of excellence, however measured.

The second criterion for an 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. The teaching record should include undergraduate, graduate, and, if appropriate, postdoctoral instruction, of all types.

We hope that you will pass this information along so that this position may be brought to the attention of qualified graduate and postgraduate students. Stanford is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer.

Interested candidates should send 1) a current curriculum vitae; 2) a list of publications; 3) a brief statement of research interests; and 4) names and addresses of three references (OPTIONAL: arrange for three letters of references to be mailed) to Chair, Department of XX, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305. These materials should be sent as soon as possible, but no later than DATE.

Thank you for your assistance in helping us to identify candidates for this position.

Sincerely,

Professor of X
Chair, Search Committee
APPENDIX 1C: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR SEARCH

DATE

Professor NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the appointment of NAME to the rank of Assistant Professor. As you know, outside letters from experts in the field who are familiar with the individual's work are one of the important sources of information for such decisions. We would very much like to have you write such a letter for us about NAME. (Optional: Your name was given to us by the candidate as a person who is familiar with his/her scholarship and/or teaching.)

The first criterion for an appointment at Stanford is that the individual is the best available at his or her level of professional development for the proposed rank. All appointments have in common the requirement of excellence, however measured. We are especially interested in your judgment of NAME's research in terms of both published scholarship and likely future contributions. Frank and discriminating evaluation of the extent (and therefore the limits of) NAME's achievements will be more helpful to us than sheer commendation. The more detailed and documented your evaluation and analysis, the more helpful it will be for us.

The second criterion for an 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. The teaching record should include undergraduate, graduate, and, if appropriate, postdoctoral instruction, of all types. Your comments on NAME's qualities as an undergraduate and graduate teacher (if known to you) would be most helpful as well.

We know that this process imposes a time-consuming task upon you, but there really is no adequate substitute for informed judgments from professionals in the field.

It would be most useful if you would send your letter by DATE. [OPTIONAL TEXT: If it would help you to meet our deadline to respond by e-mail (to NNN@stanford.edu) or fax (at 650-72X-XXX), you may certainly do so, though we do ask that you follow up with a signed, hard copy of your letter.] We appreciate your help. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential.

Sincerely,
Professor of X
Chair, Search Committee
APPENDIX 1D: SAMPLE LETTER TO INTERNAL REFEREES FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR SEARCH

DATE

NAME
MAILCODE

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the appointment of NAME as an Assistant Professor (or non-tenured Associate Professor). We understand that you have served on the X committee (or co-taught or whatever) with NAME. We would be most appreciative if you could take the time to write a letter about how you see NAME's contributions and potential contributions to the University, in scholarship, teaching, and leadership.

The first criterion for an appointment at Stanford is that the individual is the best available at his or her level of professional development for the proposed rank. All appointments have in common the requirement of excellence, however measured.

The second criterion for an 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. The teaching record should include undergraduate, graduate, and, if appropriate, postdoctoral instruction, of all types.

I am enclosing a curriculum vitae and would be pleased to see that you receive copies of NAME's materials, if you would like them. You may contact our administrator, NAME2, to indicate what you want. She/he can be reached at PHONE or E-MAIL or FAX.

Since the department must consider this matter in MONTH, we would very much like to have your response by DATE. We appreciate your help. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential.

Sincerely,

Professor of X
Chair, Search Committee
APPENDIX 1E: SAMPLE LETTER TO STUDENTS FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR SEARCH

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Ms./Mr. NAME:

Our department is considering the appointment of NAME to the rank of Assistant Professor (or non-tenured Associate Professor). We place a great deal of weight on the individual's performance as a teacher, not only as a classroom instructor, but also as a research or academic advisor, or as a dissertation committee member. As a consequence the department is soliciting letters from students who have had classes with NAME or who have otherwise studied or worked with him/her.

It would be a great help to us if you could write such a letter. In your letter, we would like to indicate the nature and extent of your contacts with NAME, then indicate what you feel are his/her strengths and/or weaknesses as an instructor from your perspective.

We would appreciate hearing from you by DATE. Letters of response should be addressed to Professor CCC, VVV Department, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-MMMM, or sent by e-mail to NNN@stanford.edu. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential. We are soliciting a number of such letters and these will be an important part of the documentation.

Thank you for your assistance. We appreciate your time and effort in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Professor of X
Chair, Search Committee
APPENDIX 1F: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES AT THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (WITHOUT TENURE)

DATE

Professor NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the appointment of NAME to the rank of non-tenured Associate Professor. As you know, outside letters from experts in the field who are familiar with the individual's work are one of the important sources of information for such decisions. Therefore, I would be very grateful if you would write to give me your assessment of Professor NAME's scholarship and teaching. I enclose Professor NAME's current curriculum vitae, a statement he has written summarizing his research and teaching, and copies of some of his papers.

The first criterion for an appointment at Stanford is that the individual is the best available at his or her level of professional development for the proposed rank. All appointments have in common the requirement of excellence, however measured. We are especially interested in your judgment of Professor NAME’s research in terms of both published scholarship and likely future contributions. Candid and discriminating evaluation of the extent of (and, therefore, the limits of) Professor NAME’s achievements will be more helpful to us than sheer commendation. The more detailed and documented your evaluation and analysis, the more useful it will be for us.

In evaluating the potential and accomplishments of Professor NAME for an untenured Associate Professorship, it would be particularly helpful if you could compare HIS/HER work with that of the following scholars or others you might choose: COMP SET NAMES. Again, the more detailed and documented your evaluation and analysis, the more useful it will be for us.

The second criterion for an 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. The teaching record should include undergraduate, graduate, and, if appropriate, postdoctoral instruction, of all types. Your comments on NAME's qualities as an undergraduate and graduate teacher (if known to you) would be most helpful as well.

We know that this process imposes a time-consuming task upon you, but there really is no adequate substitute for informed judgments from professionals in the field.

It would be most useful if you would send your letter by DATE. [OPTIONAL TEXT: If it would help you to meet our deadline to respond by e-mail (to NNN@stanford.edu) or
fax (at 650-72X-XXX), you may certainly do so, though we do ask that you follow up
with a signed, hard copy of your letter.] We appreciate your help. It is Stanford’s policy
and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential.

Sincerely,

Professor of X
Chair, Search Committee
APPENDIX 1G: H&S SEARCH AUTHORIZATION REQUEST FORM

Coming Soon
APPENDIX 1H: SAMPLE OFFER LETTER FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Dear NAME:

It gives me great pleasure to offer you a tenure-line appointment at Stanford as Assistant Professor of X for a term of four years beginning DATE. This letter outlines our offer to you.

Stanford will provide you with a starting nine-month salary of $XX,XXX. (IF YOU WISH TO OFFER THE CANDIDATE A SUPPLEMENTAL SALARY, THIS IS AN APPROPRIATE PLACE.) (In the event that you have not completed the Ph.D. by your appointment start date, the starting nine-month salary will $XX,XXX and your title will be Assistant Professor (Subject to Ph.D. of DEPT.)

In addition to your base salary, Stanford will provide assistance to you in connection with housing. Stanford has several housing programs designed to assist faculty with the purchase of a home within a defined geographical area. At present, this area includes the city of San Francisco; a map illustrating the qualifying limits can be located on the faculty/staff housing website at http://fsh.stanford.edu.

You are eligible to participate in all University housing programs, subject to existing eligibility requirements and program guidelines. In addition to the standard loan programs, you are eligible for the Housing Allowance Program ("HAP") income supplement. HAP is a taxable fringe benefit available to certain individuals who do not already own a house within the Stanford area. The maximum term of the allowance is nine years, and the allowance declines on a linear basis by one-ninth of the first year amount each year throughout the duration of the term. The amount of the benefit depends on your 9-month starting salary and the year of purchase. We suggest that you contact Faculty/Staff Housing directly at (650) 725-6893 for specific information regarding housing programs.

The Dean's Office will provide you with $XXXX toward the purchase of computer equipment. When you arrive, a staff member from the H&S Technical Support Team can help you determine an appropriate choice of computer from currently available models. Equipment purchased with these funds remain the property of Stanford University, but can be located in your office or at home, as you prefer. In addition, a representative from the University's central computing organization will provide an orientation to Stanford's information technology resources.
Stanford will pay the costs, against actual receipts, of your expenses in moving here from YYYY, up to a total of $XXXX. The University has a contract with several moving companies. For more information on documenting expenses and getting in touch with an appropriate moving company, please contact NAME, our department administrator at (650) 72X-XXXX. As you may know, the IRS considers reimbursements for moves taxable income in some instances. Therefore, you should consult the relevant IRS publications before embarking on your move.

Stanford provides a range of health and other benefits for faculty in our "Educated Choices" program. This is a cafeteria-style benefits program allowing for choice among various types of health, insurance and retirement benefits. A complete packet of information will follow under separate cover. Meanwhile, you may review faculty benefits information available at http://benefitsu.stanford.edu/.

The regular teaching load is currently XX courses each year. The course mix and schedule for each professor is worked out in consultation with the department chair, taking into account the needs of the curriculum as well as each professor's particular preferences. In addition, faculty are expected to direct various independent reading or research projects, undergraduate honors theses, M.A. projects, and Ph.D. theses. (USE THIS LAST SENTENCE TO DEFINE YOUR EXPECTATIONS OF THE CANDIDATE'S ROLE)

One of the major resources to support your teaching at Stanford is the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). CTL provides an infrastructure of support for all faculty in their pursuit of teaching excellence, including midterm small group evaluations, classroom observations, videotaping, a teaching newsletter and handbook, and one-on-one consultations. You can explore CTL's offerings and helpful information on teaching at its website http://ctl.stanford.edu.

In the normal course of events, early in your fourth academic year, the Department will consider the renewal of your appointment as Assistant Professor for a further term of three years. Many of the University's general policies and regulations for faculty, including procedures and criteria for reappointment and promotion, are set forth in the Stanford University Faculty Handbook and in the Humanities and Sciences Faculty Handbook, both of which are available on-line.

As a tenure-line, untenured faculty member in H&S you will receive an unrestricted research grant of $5,000 from the Presidential Research Grants for Junior Faculty Program. These funds may be used only in direct support of your research program; they are not to provide you with salary support in any way. If you are reappointed to a second term at Stanford, you will receive another $5,000 and if you are granted tenure here you will receive an additional $10,000.

The School of H&S will make an additional $XX,XXX in research funds available to you to support your present and future research projects. These funds are paid as
reimbursement, against receipts, of reasonable research-related expenses (travel, gathering materials, subsidizing reproduction costs of illustrations if that is required by a publisher, research assistance, etc.).

Faculty at Stanford currently accrue sabbatical credits toward sabbatical leave every quarter, at a rate that entitles them to one academic year at half-salary for every six years of on-duty service. Some faculty prefer to wait until they have accumulated a year of leave at half-pay; others prefer to take a quarter off every few years.

A particularly important additional benefit is the H&S Junior Faculty Leave Program. You will be eligible to participate if you are reappointed to a second term as an assistant professor. This program allows you to take three quarters of sabbatical leave at full pay normally during your fifth or sixth year by contributing all the sabbatical credits you would earn as an assistant professor. The School, in turn, provides the remaining 50% of your salary through paid leave funding. Some restrictions apply and are described online and through the Dean's Office.

As is the case for all appointments at Stanford, this offer is contingent upon final approval by the Provost, the University Advisory Board of the Academic Council, and the President, which we anticipate receiving in QUARTER. Your appointment then would be reported to the Board of Trustees. In the interim, the papers will be moving through several intermediate stages. First they must be reviewed for approval by the H&S Deans. This should be completed in MONTH. The papers will then be forwarded to the Provost's Office.

Finally (and despite the necessary logistical content), I hope we have conveyed our genuine enthusiasm about the possibility of your joining our department. We do hope that you find the terms of our offer reasonable and attractive.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (650) 72X-XXXX if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Professor of X
Chair, Department of XX

Cc: NAME, Cognizant Dean
Jim Henry, Director of Finance
NAME, Faculty Affairs Officer

Below are some web addresses that you might find useful:
Humanities and Sciences Faculty:
http://hsfaculty.stanford.edu

Humanities and Sciences Faculty Handbook:

Stanford University Faculty Handbook:
http://facultyhandbook.stanford.edu/

Research Policy Handbook for Stanford University:
http://www.stanford.edu/dept/DoR/RPH.html

Resources for New and Junior Faculty:
http://jrfaculty.stanford.edu/

Stanford University Faculty and Staff Housing:
http://fsh.stanford.edu/

IRS Moving Expenses:
REAPPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR (TENURE LINE)

Note: Reappointments at Stanford University are governed by the guidelines and procedures set forth in the Stanford University Faculty Handbook and the Stanford University Faculty Appointment Forms, both of which are published by the Provost's Office. The policies and procedures described below are specific to H&S; and have been approved by the Provost's Office as consistent with overall University policy. Those carrying out assistant professor reappointments are urged to review both University and School policies and procedures.

2.1 Timeline and Checkpoints for Reappointment Activities (see chart)

2.2 Criteria

While non-tenured appointments are generally made for a first term with the clear possibility of reappointment, such action is by no means automatic. A recommendation for non-tenured reappointment or promotion must be preceded by a careful evaluation of all available information on the candidate’s performance and progress since initial appointment to the Stanford faculty to ensure that the candidate continues to meet expectations of excellence.

At the time of reappointment, it is expected that a junior faculty member will be on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in both scholarship and teaching. Service (including what might be called institutional citizenship), although relevant, is not a primary criterion for reappointment.

2.3 Forming the Evaluation Committee

The evaluation committee has the responsibility of gathering data on scholarship, teaching, and other relevant matters, such as institutional service. While the structure of evaluation committees varies among departments, normally the minimum is three members with a senior faculty member serving as chair. With the exception of assistant professors and non-tenured associate professors, any member of the Academic Council may serve on a reappointment evaluation committee. In selecting the committee, the department chair is to consult with the cognizant dean, who retains authority to approve its membership. In general, a faculty member who has served as the mentor or Ph.D. advisor to the candidate should not serve on the committee.

2.4 Department Discussion and Confidentiality Issues

Should a faculty member within the department write a personal letter evaluating the candidate before the case is discussed or voted upon, he or she may not participate in departmental discussions regarding reappointment and must recuse himself or herself from voting.
The information to be included in the reappointment papers should be read carefully and objectively prior to the vote by every faculty member voting on the candidate. The evaluation committee will then present its recommendations for discussion and consideration by the department's faculty. To underscore Stanford's policy of vigorously protecting the sources of information contained in third-party evaluation, department chairs are required to read the following statement to their faculty before every discussion of an individual's appointment, reappointment or promotion:

"The entire proceedings during which specific individuals are discussed are to be held in strict confidence by all participants. The chair of the department or his/her designee shall convey whatever information needs to be transmitted to the candidate; the opinions expressed by the department's faculty or by internal or external referees shall not be discussed with the candidate nor with other parties except as set forth in Sections VI (I) and VII of the Stanford University Faculty Handbook or when necessary for University review of the process. A breach of confidence by a participant in an appointment and promotion matter may be considered to be a serious violation of professional ethics." (See memo to department chairs from Dean Sharon R. Long, issued on October 15, 2002, found in Core Policies, Confidentiality.)

2.5 Assembling the Reappointment Papers

Scholarship

External referees. Evidence concerning teaching and scholarly performance is essential, and the reappointment papers must include careful documentation of both. One of the purposes of the reappointment review is to provide constructive suggestions for the junior faculty member's career development. Thus, department chairs or evaluation committees are usually required to obtain a minimum of three to a maximum of five letters from distinguished scholars outside of Stanford. At most, one letter may be from candidate's dissertation advisor or mentor. Ideally, the referees should have no mentoring or direct relationship with the candidate. There should not be more than one referee suggested by the candidate. The candidate should suggest no more than two referees. Comparisons of the candidate's work with that of other scholars are not necessary at the time of reappointment.

Confidential letters from professional peers and students are an important part of the reappointment process. Candid assessment of scholarship and teaching, without concern for breach of confidentiality, can best be obtained if explicit assurance is given that Stanford's policy is to vigorously protect the sources of information contained in third-party evaluation.

In selecting the referees, the committee should consult with the junior faculty member as to who is knowledgeable about the field as well as possible scholarly conflicts. Once the referees have been selected by the department, those involved in the process should avoid
communication with them that relates to the review process both before and after letters are sent out.

Normally, an individual with a strong negative personal bias toward the candidate or a clear conflict of interest should not be asked to serve as a referee. If for some reason letters from such individuals are judged likely to be useful and are solicited and received, the existence and nature of the bias or conflict of interest should be clearly indicated in the evaluation committee report.

External referees evaluating the individual's scholarship are to be chosen with great care. A preliminary list of external referees should be prepared by the evaluation committee, after considering the suggestions (both positive and negative) of the candidate, as well as their own knowledge of the field. Not all of the persons suggested by the candidate will necessarily be asked to write, nor will the negative suggestions of the candidate necessarily be followed; the initial preparation of the list is in the discretion of the committee. After the preliminary list of external referees is prepared, the department chair should present this information to the cognizant dean together with brief biographical sketches and should identify any individuals with special ties to the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor, collaborator, etc.). The cognizant dean may suggest and/or require that changes be made to the list in order to obtain a more appropriate evaluation of the candidate. The cognizant dean has the responsibility for determination and approval of the final list.

The wording of the letter soliciting evaluation of the candidate's scholarship is of critical importance. Because it is extremely difficult to correct uncertainties generated by incorrectly phrased solicitation letters, protection of the candidate and the University necessitates that all such letters be expressly approved by the cognizant dean before they are mailed. Referees are to be given sufficient time to respond, which will normally be at least four weeks. The sample letter in Appendix 2A should be followed closely.

Phone calls should not be made to external referees prior to letters being sent to them. Departments are to maintain a written record of all follow-up done with referees. If, after receiving no response from the referee, a phone call is made to solicit a letter, then a written log of conversation is to be kept and included in the file.

If a referee chooses not to write, the communication explaining this decision (e.g., letter, e-mail message or phone conversation summary) is to be included in the file. If it becomes necessary to supplement the original referee list, the cognizant dean is to approve the addition of any new names.

Once a letter of evaluation is received, it is inappropriate for the department to ask a referee for an interpretation or clarification of his or her comments. Any exception must be approved in advance by the cognizant dean.

*Internal Referees.* In addition to external referees, faculty members from outside of the department but internal to Stanford may be asked to provide an evaluation of the
candidate's scholarship and/or teaching. However, the number of such letters should normally not be more than two. The file should contain brief biographical sketches of the internal referees, along with a short explanation about why the person is being asked to write. The cognizant dean has the responsibility for determination and approval of the final list. Please see Appendix 2B for a sample letter to internal referees.

**Departmental Evaluation.** The chair and/or members of the reappointment committee must provide a report describing the candidate's current work, along with an evaluation of its quality. In cases where there has not been considerable published work beyond the dissertation, a particular effort should be made to evaluate the candidate's unpublished work in progress. The author(s) of this report must be identified.

**Candidate's Statement.** The candidate should include a statement describing the present and future course of his or her research and teaching. The candidate should consult with his or her chair regarding the content and length of the statement, which ordinarily should not exceed five pages. The evaluation committee should comment on these planned activities and the potential for professional growth. The curriculum vitae and candidate's statement should also be included in the materials sent to all external referees.

**Teaching**

Candidates for reappointment are expected to continue to meet expectations of excellence in teaching. It is the responsibility of the department and the candidate to plan the course teaching assignments of an assistant professor so that he or she will have the opportunity to gain experience and develop skills in the various types of coursework that are relevant to the educational mission of the department and appropriate for the candidate (e.g., large and small classes; undergraduate and graduate courses; lectures, seminars, laboratory classes, etc.).

Evidence gathered for the reappointment papers should include:

- Course evaluation summaries;
- a summary of the teaching commitments since the beginning of the candidate's Stanford appointment (or since the last multi-year reappointment) with course titles, numbers, units, and enrollments;
- any pedagogical innovations or course development activities in which the candidate has participated;
- confidential letters from students enrolled in the assistant professor's courses as well as letters from teaching assistants and graduate students for whom the candidate is an advisor or mentor;
- evaluation by senior faculty who have visited the candidate's classroom or who have evaluated the candidate's course materials.

Letters from students are a critical component of the reappointment process. The number of letters and how the students are selected are directly related to the teaching and
advising load of the faculty candidate. Using the sample letter in Appendix 2C, the following are guidelines for obtaining a random sample of students.

- All graduate students for whom the candidate is/was an advisor or mentor are to be asked to write a letter;
- For small courses and for individually supervised student projects, the entire cohort of students should be solicited for letters. For large courses, every fourth or fifth student from a grade list should be solicited. (Duplicate names from either of the first two samples should be removed prior to solicitation.)
- The file should contain between six to twelve undergraduate student letters. No more than 30 undergraduate student letters should be solicited.
- A minimum of two follow-up requests should be made to non-respondents.
- E-mail may be used to facilitate the procedure.
- The department should document the process in the final file. Tallies of the number of letters requested and received are to be included, along with copy of sample solicitation letter and follow-up request letters.
- Unsolicited letters may not be included in the file.

The evaluation committee should provide an analysis of the qualitative data as well as commentary on the content of the student letters. Negative comments should be addressed.

2.6 Reappointment Options

If the department decides to recommend an assistant professor for reappointment, there are several options depending on the findings of the review:

a. An assistant professor whose performance is judged to meet the standard at Stanford is normally reappointed to a second term as assistant professor for three years.

b. If uncertainty exists about the individual's performance and promise, then it is possible to reappoint the assistant professor for a two-year term with provision for another review during year six. Subsequent reappointment for one additional year is possible but, in the absence of extenuating circumstances such as leaves without salary and new parent tenure clock extensions, the maximum number of years in rank remains seven. (For further information regarding circumstances in which an assistant professor can delay the tenure review until a later year, see Core Policies, Tenure Clock Examples). The department chair should consult with the cognizant dean in this situation.

c. Occasionally, it may be advantageous to promote an assistant professor to the rank of non-tenured associate professor. This exceptional type of reappointment may be used as a means of retaining faculty who are especially promising though they may not yet have acquired the record appropriate for a consideration for tenure. The candidate’s performance should be sufficiently strong, including scholarly work and teaching, to justify non-tenured promotion. Promotion to the rank of non-tenured associate professor implies no commitment or prejudgment with respect to the outcome of any future tenure
review. However, options for such appointments are limited by the tenure clock, in that, absent extenuating circumstances such as leaves without salary, no person may be appointed in a non-tenure professorial rank at Stanford University for greater than a total of seven years. For appointments beginning after August 31, 1996, the total length of untenured full-time service without tenure at Stanford University at the tenure line ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor (or at more than one of such ranks) may not exceed ten years, regardless of the number of leaves without salary, extensions for new parenthood, or time spent in either an administrative appointment or on a specific project. The department chair must consult with the cognizant dean regarding this option.

d. The department or the deans may decide not to recommend an assistant professor for reappointment. If an assistant professor receives a negative review and decision on reappointment, then under Chapter 2 of the Stanford University Faculty Handbook the individual may be entitled to an additional one-year, non-tenure accruing appointment.

2.7 Voting

With the exception of assistant professors, all departmental members of the Academic Council may vote on the reappointment of assistant professors. Students may neither participate in departmental deliberations nor vote.

Departments must have a clear and consistent voting policy. Any modification of the policy needs to be discussed with the Dean’s Office. Eligible department members are expected to vote. Faculty in residence should make every effort to attend the department meeting. Faculty who are away from campus for a brief period are expected to vote. Faculty on leave may discuss with the chair and cognizant dean conditions for participation. The department chair and cognizant dean may request that a person on leave participate in the voting process. Faculty away from campus should ensure that their votes are received by the chair in advance of departmental balloting. Some faculty are to recuse themselves from participating and voting, including spouses, domestic partners, those who have written a letter on behalf of the candidate prior to departmental discussion and voting, and others negotiated with the cognizant dean and agreed upon with him or her prior to the departmental vote.

School policy allows for either secret or open ballots on reappointments. Secret ballots have the advantage of reducing the effects of peer pressure on the vote, but may allow for unexplained and perhaps uninterpretable votes. Open ballots have the advantage of forcing each faculty member to take an open position before his or her peers on the issue. Departments should adopt one system or the other and apply it consistently in all cases. The practice of conducting a "straw vote" which, if positive, is followed by a final "unanimous vote" is prohibited. The actual yeas, nays, abstentions, and non-votes must be recorded and reported in all votes on faculty appointments. Any faculty member may write a letter explaining his or her vote in the file. A faculty member who votes negatively or abstains is encouraged to include a written explanation.
Split Votes. In cases where the vote is split, the department chair retains the authority to decide whether or not to forward a file to the Dean's Office. Any member of the departmental professoriate has the right to appeal the decision of the department or of the chair. The appeal process should begin at the level of cognizant dean.

Abstentions. If there are any abstentions, the chair should summarize the reasons for them, if practicable.

Dissenting Votes. If there are dissenting votes, the chair should summarize the reasons for them, if practicable. Dissenting voters are strongly encouraged to write a letter for the file.

Communications to the Dean regarding the case. Faculty members who vote may communicate directly with the Dean's Office about their vote, and their written statements will be added to the papers that are considered by reviewing bodies. In such instances, however, the faculty member must provide a copy of his or her letter to the department chair, who will have the option of forwarding a written response that will also be added to the file. Both the faculty member's letter and the department chair's response must be held in strictest confidence and not be shared with other members of the department's faculty.

In extraordinary situations, however, faculty members may communicate in writing to the Dean's Office with the assurance that their communication will be held confidential from other members of the department, including the chair. Letters of this type may be added to the papers that are considered by reviewing bodies if, in the opinion of the cognizant dean, (1) the letter discusses information or views that are relevant to the review of the appointment or promotion; (2) the letter clearly states the reason why the writer desires to communicate confidentially; and (3) the reason for confidentiality is a valid one.

If such a letter is included in the file, the file should note that the letter is confidential and has not been reviewed by the department chair. Where appropriate, the cognizant dean should try to verify the accuracy of any problematic statements in the letter and record his or her findings in the file.

2.8 Negative Decisions at the Department Level

If a candidate for reappointment is turned down at the department level, the chair should first discuss the outcome with the cognizant dean. Shortly after the meeting, the chair should provide the cognizant dean with a copy of the file, a memo outlining the reasons for the reappointment denial, along with the letter to the candidate that notifies the candidate of the decision. Under normal circumstances, the candidate should be informed within one week from the time of the decision.

2.9 Submission of the Reappointment Papers
The chair of the evaluation committee is responsible for writing the documentation necessary to complete the file. The reappointment papers should be assembled in accordance with the guidelines set forth in Stanford University Faculty Appointment Forms, IB. Academic Council Faculty: Reappointment or Promotion to an Untenured Rank for a Term of Years, which is shown as Appendix 2D. The department administrator (or person responsible for faculty affairs within the department) will have extra forms and will assist the faculty in assembling the file.

The department chair is responsible for writing the cover letter for the file. While acting as a letter of transmittal, the letter should include the pertinent information found during the course of the candidate's reappointment and should state the effective date of the reappointment, which is normally September 1 of the following academic year.

2.10 The Review Process

When the file has been completed, the department administrator should send the file to the Faculty Affairs Officer in the Dean's Office for review. After reviewing the materials, the Faculty Affairs Officer will return the file to the department for any revisions before copying. The department administrator can then send the original file plus six copies to the Dean's Office. The Dean’s Office, in its discretion, may solicit additional information regarding the file.

The following chart shows (starting at the bottom) the path that papers follow after leaving the department:

- President (for final approval and reporting to the Board of Trustees)
- Advisory Board of the Academic Council (for review and voting)
- Provost (for submission to Advisory Board)
- Dean (final approval at School level)
- Dean and Cognizant Deans (for review and voting)
- Assistant Dean and Faculty Affairs Officer (for review only)

2.11 Annual Counseling Sessions

Every junior professor should have an annual counseling session with the department chair or his or her designee from the senior faculty. This is a joint responsibility. In other words, it is the responsibility of the department chair annually to offer to confer with the assistant professor, and it is the responsibility of the assistant professor annually to follow up with the department chair to arrange for such an annual conference.
For further information regarding annual counseling sessions in the years preceding and following the time of reappointment, please see the H&S Faculty Handbook, Part II, Core Policies, Annual Counseling Meetings.

2.12 Feedback from the Reappointment Process

When the department has completed the reappointment review, the chair should draft a counseling letter that focuses on the faculty member's development as a scholar, teacher, and colleague. The counseling letter should not be shared with the candidate until the completion of the reappointment process (approval by the President of the University). It should be kept in mind that, in general, the purpose of the reappointment process is more to provide useful feedback than to make judgments. Therefore, counseling letters should not explicitly address the candidate's prospects for tenure. Appropriate areas to discuss may include:

- scholarship quality to date
- general expectations of discipline(s) with respect to quantity, forum, or scientific venue of publications usually found in tenure cases
- suggestions for the research program that might be helpful to the assistant professor
  - teaching quality, quantity, type to date
  - special efforts in teaching (new courses, courses for interdepartmental programs, curricular innovations, etc.)
- appropriate amount of service during assistant professor years
- acknowledgment of special service efforts
- any institutional citizenship issues

The draft of the counseling letter should be submitted as part of the reappointment file. After the file has been reviewed by the deans, Provost and Advisory Board, the cognizant dean will discuss the counseling letter with the department chair and incorporate feedback, if any, gained from these other levels of review. A fuller perspective can thereby be provided to the assistant professor about his or her performance. In particular, reappointment cases that appear weak to the deans, the Provost, or the Advisory Board can be discussed at length so that the faculty member can make appropriate attempts to strengthen his or her profile as a scholar and teacher, or to begin planning for employment elsewhere.

When the final draft of the counseling letter has been approved by the cognizant dean and after the completion of the reappointment process, the department chair will have a counseling session with the candidate and give him or her the letter. Department chairs are encouraged to include the chair and/or members of the evaluation committee in this counseling session.
APPENDIX 2A: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR REAPPOINTMENT

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the reappointment of NAME to the rank of Assistant Professor. As you know, outside letters from experts in the field who are familiar with the individual's work are one of the important sources of information for such decisions. We would very much like to have you write such a letter for us about Professor NAME. Enclosed are copies of Professor NAME's current curriculum vitae, statement on research and teaching, and the following publications: LIST PUBLICATIONS ENCLOSED.

At Stanford, the criteria for reappointment in the School of Humanities and Sciences are that the candidate continues to meet expectations of excellence and is on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in both scholarship and teaching. Later, the principal criteria for a promotion to tenure will be that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship. For promotion to the rank of associate professor, the scholarship will need to reveal clearly that the person is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field.

We are interested in your evaluation of whether NAME meets these criteria. We are especially interested in your judgment of NAME's research in terms of both published scholarship and likely future contributions to the field. Frank and discriminating evaluation of the extent (and, therefore, the limits of) NAME's achievements will be more helpful to us than sheer commendation. The more detailed and documented your evaluation and analysis, the more helpful it will be for us.

Teaching is an important aspect for professorial appointments at Stanford, and the University is dedicated to outstanding achievement in this area. Your comments on NAME's qualities as an undergraduate and graduate teacher (if known to you) would be most helpful as well. We know that this process imposes a time-consuming task upon you, but there really is no adequate substitute for informed judgments from professionals in the field.

We would appreciate hearing from you by DATE. Letters of response should be addressed to Professor CCC, VVV Department, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-MMMM. [OPTIONAL TEXT: If it would help you to meet our deadline to respond by e-mail (to NNN@stanford.edu) or fax (at 650-72X-XXX), you may certainly do so, though we do ask that you follow up with a signed, hard copy of your letter.] It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential.
Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Department of XX
APPENDIX 2B: SAMPLE LETTER TO INTERNAL REFEREES FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR REAPPOINTMENTS

DATE

NAME
MAILCODE

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the reappointment of NAME to the rank of Assistant Professor. We would be most appreciative if you could take the time to write a letter about how you see NAME's contributions and potential contributions to the University, in scholarship, teaching, and leadership.

At Stanford, the criteria for reappointment in the School of Humanities and Sciences are that the candidate continues to meet expectations of excellence and is on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in both scholarship and teaching. We are interested in your evaluation of whether NAME meets these criteria.

I am enclosing a curriculum vitae and would be pleased to see that you receive copies of NAME's materials, if you would like them. You may contact our administrator, NAME, to indicate what you want. HE/SHE can be reached at PHONE or E-MAIL or FAX.

Since the department must consider this matter in MONTH, we would very much like to have your response by DATE. We appreciate your help. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Department of XX
APPENDIX 2C: SAMPLE LETTER TO STUDENTS FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR REAPPOINTMENTS

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Ms./Mr. NAME:

Our department is considering the reappointment of NAME to the rank of Assistant Professor. We place a great deal of weight on the individual's performance as a teacher, not only as a classroom instructor, but also as a research or academic advisor, or as a dissertation committee member. As a consequence the department is soliciting letters from students who have had classes with Professor NAME or who have otherwise studied or worked with him/her.

It would be a great help to us if you could write such a letter. In your letter, we would like to indicate the nature and extent of your contacts with Professor NAME, then indicate what you feel are his/her strengths and/or weaknesses as an instructor, advisor, or committee member from your perspective.

We would appreciate hearing from you by DATE. Letters of response should be addressed to Professor CCC, VVV Department, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-MMMM, or sent by e-mail to NNN@stanford.edu. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential. We are soliciting a number of such letters and these will be an important part of the documentation.

Thanks you for your assistance. We appreciate your time and effort in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Department of VVV
APPENDIX 2D: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR PROMOTION TO UNTENURED ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the promotion of NAME to the rank of Associate Professor without tenure. As you know, outside letters from experts in the field who are familiar with the individual’s work are one of the important sources of information for such decisions. We would very much like to have you write such a letter for us about Professor NAME. Enclosed are copies of Professor NAME’s current curriculum vitae, statement on research and teaching, and the following publications: LIST PUBLICATIONS ENCLOSED.

At Stanford, the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor without tenure in the School of Humanities and Sciences are that the candidate continues to meet expectations of excellence and is on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in both scholarship and teaching. The candidate’s performance should be sufficiently strong to justify non-tenured promotion.

We are interested in your evaluation of whether NAME meets these criteria. We are especially interested in your judgment of NAME’s research in terms of both published scholarship and likely future contributions to the field. Frank and discriminating evaluation of the extent (and, therefore, the limits of) NAME’s achievements will be more helpful to us than sheer commendation.

In evaluating the potential and accomplishments of Professor NAME for an untenured Associate Professorship, it would be particularly helpful if you could compare HIS/HER work with that of the following scholars or others you might choose: [COMPARISON SET LIST]. The more detailed and documented your evaluation and analysis, the more useful it will be for us.

Teaching is an important aspect for professorial appointments at Stanford, and the University is dedicated to outstanding achievement in this area. Your comments on NAME’s qualities as an undergraduate and graduate teacher (if known to you) would be most helpful as well. We know that this process imposes a time-consuming task upon you, but there really is no adequate substitute for informed judgments from professionals in the field.

We would appreciate hearing from you by DATE. Letters of response should be addressed to Professor CCC, VVV Department, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-MMMM. [OPTIONAL TEXT: If it would help you to meet our deadline to
respond by e-mail (to NNN@stanford.edu) or fax (at 650-72X-XXX), you may certainly do so, though we do ask that you follow up with a signed, hard copy of your letter.] It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Department of VVV
PROMOTION TO TENURE (TENURE LINE)

Note: Promotions to tenure at Stanford University are governed by the guidelines and procedures set forth in the Stanford University Faculty Handbook and the Stanford University Faculty Appointment Forms, both of which are published by the Provost's Office. The policies and procedures described below are specific to H&S and have been approved by the Provost's Office as consistent with overall University policy. Those carrying out promotion reviews are urged to examine both University and School policies and procedures.

3.1 Timeline and Checkpoints for Promotion Activities (see chart)

3.2 Tenure Clock and Timing for Review

University policies regarding the tenure clock are set forth in the Stanford University Faculty Handbook, Chapter 2. For a sample of various tenure clock scenarios, see the H&S Faculty Handbook, Part II, Core Policies, Tenure Clock Examples.

Assistant Professor (Subject to Ph.D.). It is School policy that those who held the rank of “Assistant Professor (Subject to Ph.D.)” during their initial appointment may have their tenure review delayed by a maximum of one year.

Early Promotions. Assistant professors with truly exceptional records may be proposed for promotion prior to their seventh year of appointment. An early promotion process can be initiated only with the consent of the candidate. Normally, the promotion will be to a tenured associate professorship. Consultation between the chair and the cognizant dean is essential prior to initiating a review process leading toward early promotion. Since the University is being asked to make the tenure commitment to a person who may have a shorter track record in scholarship and teaching, as a rule of thumb, the candidate must not only meet the standard for teaching, but the evidence must be completely unequivocal that the candidate has achieved true distinction in scholarship.

Unsuccessful candidates for early promotion may be proposed again at the regular time if that remains desirable to the candidate and the department. In order to avoid the potential awkwardness following a negative tenure decision, it is prudent to initiate early promotion cases only in rare instances.

3.3 Criteria

Both scholarship and teaching are important factors in evaluation for tenure at Stanford because the School and University are dedicated to outstanding achievement in both. Scholarly distinction is especially important for tenure because it sustains both the University's research mission and its distinctive type of teaching, which draws its strength from the teacher's continuing involvement in scholarly research at the frontiers of a field. The purpose of the tenure evaluation is to form, on the basis of the record to date,
appraisals of the candidate's standing and potential in his or her scholarly field broadly defined and the candidate's quality as a teacher.

The first criterion for tenure is that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship. The scholarship must clearly reveal that the person being proposed for tenure is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field. Letters from referees should support that assessment in an unequivocal fashion.

The second criterion for tenure 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. The teaching record should include undergraduate, graduate, and, if appropriate, postdoctoral instruction, of all types. To the extent that teaching achievement is based on work that extends beyond the classroom, such as writing a textbook, there should be evidence about the national impact of this work and recognition.

In judging candidates for tenure whose work involves creative writing, dramatic or musical composition or performance, works of art, and the equivalent, special criteria must be defined and applied. The comparison group, for example, should be artists, musicians, and writers who work in universities, conservatories, or institutes, and have obligations of faculty membership in addition to their artistic activities. As a rule of thumb, the candidate's creative products must have gained a critical recognition equivalent to what we demand of scholarship by tenurable faculty in other humanities disciplines. In general, the judgment of teaching quality for these fine arts faculty can follow normal procedures applicable to all faculty.

Within H&S service (including what might be called institutional citizenship), although relevant, is not a primary criterion for tenure. We recognize that the junior faculty can make valued contributions to the life of the department, to Residential Education, to the extra-curricular life of the students, and to various departmental and university committees. The basic policy is that service, however exemplary, cannot substitute for shortcomings in scholarship or teaching.

Uniqueness of function is also not a criterion for tenure. The fact that a candidate is the only faculty member teaching in a specific area or doing scholarship on a certain subject is not relevant to the process of judging the quality of scholarship and teaching. Moreover, the School's requirement that a candidate for tenure be compared with other scholars in the given discipline provides departmental faculty, the Appointments and Promotions Committee, and the Dean with a perspective on the area in which a candidate works. Hence, a department's tenured faculty and/or the Dean, either independently or upon advice from the Appointments and Promotions Committee, may on occasion decide at the time of a tenure review that a candidate does not warrant promotion to tenure even though that person may be the best available within a field. That is, the reviewing group
may decide that the best candidate in a weak or overly narrow professional field should not become tenured at Stanford.

Deans and department chairs must try to avoid such situations by ensuring that initial searches, appointments, and reappointments 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.

3.4 Forming the Evaluation Committee

The tenure evaluation committee in the department has the responsibility of gathering data on scholarship, teaching, and other relevant matters, such as institutional service. Any tenured member of the Academic Council may serve on a tenure evaluation committee. While the structure of committees varies among departments, normally the minimum is three members, including the committee chair. Once the department chair has selected the committee, he or she is to consult with the cognizant dean, who retains authority to approve its membership.

3.5 Reviewing the Scholarship

*External referees.* Confidential letters from professional peers and students are the cornerstone of the evaluation process at every research university. Candid assessment of scholarship and teaching, without concern for breach of confidentiality, can best be obtained if explicit assurance is given that Stanford's policy is to vigorously protect the sources of information contained in third-party evaluation.

Once the referees have been selected by the department, those involved in the process should avoid communication with them that relates to the review process, both before and after letters are sent out.

External referees evaluating the individual's scholarship are to be chosen with great care. A preliminary list of external referees should be prepared by the evaluation committee after considering the suggestions (positive and negative) of the candidate, as well as their own knowledge of the field. Not all of the persons suggested by the candidate will necessarily be asked to write, though normally the evaluation committee should write at least three of them.

All of the referees who wrote at the time of the candidate's reappointment should be asked to provide a letter for the promotion review. The department chair should present the list to the cognizant dean together with brief biographical sketches, including current title, institution, and stature in the field, and should identify any individuals with special ties to the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor, collaborator, etc.). The cognizant dean may suggest and/or require that changes be made to the list in order to obtain a more appropriate evaluation of the candidate. The cognizant dean has the responsibility for determination and approval of the final list.
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In constructing the referee list, a wide variety of considerations are appropriate, including but not limited to:

1. The list should include individuals with expertise very closely related to that of the candidate and those who work in the same or a closely related specialty in order to obtain critical evaluations of the scholarship.

2. The list should include individuals in related fields and those with a broader range of interests in order to obtain insights into the breadth of impact of the candidate's work.

3. The list may contain individuals (generally, no more than three), including former mentors and current or former collaborators, who would be useful in educating readers of the file about the structure of the field.

4. Normally, an individual with a strong negative personal bias toward the candidate or a clear conflict of interest should not be asked to serve as a referee. If for some reason letters from such individuals are judged likely to be useful and are solicited and received, the existence and nature of the bias or conflict of interest should be clearly indicated in the evaluation committee report.

5. The list should contain individuals from strong academic institutions where tenure standards are generally high, in order to get letters from people who are comfortable with reading and writing the type of frank and critical evaluations that Stanford's tenure process requires.

The number of letters from external referees in the file should be in the range of 8 to 12. To obtain this number of letters, a department may expect to solicit approximately 13 to 15 letters. All letters received by the department must typically be placed in the file, together with a list and biographical sketches of all the referees who were solicited. Letters may not be solicited by the candidate, and the candidate should not be told the identities of the external referees chosen for the evaluation process.

The wording of the letter soliciting evaluation of the candidate's scholarship and ranking is of critical importance. Referees should be asked to be quite specific in their comments about the junior faculty member's scholarship, as well as in their comparisons and rankings of the candidate relative to other named persons in the field. In soliciting opinions from external referees, the department (or the Dean's Office or the A&P Committee at later stages of review) may request special commentary on one or more items in the candidate's bibliography. Because it is extremely difficult to correct uncertainties generated by incorrectly phrased solicitation letters, all such letters should be expressly approved by the cognizant dean before they are mailed.

Some departments send a preliminary letter to determine a referee's willingness to provide an evaluation and, if the reply is positive, then follow up with more detailed information, including the candidate's curriculum vitae and selected publications; others
send the request for evaluation without prior communication. Sample letters for both approaches are included as Appendix 3A-C, and should be followed closely. In all cases, referees are to be given sufficient time to respond, which will normally be at least four weeks.

Phone calls should not be made to external referees prior to letters being sent to them. Departments are to maintain a written record of all follow-up done with referees. For example, if, after receiving no response from the referee, a phone call is made to solicit a letter, then a written log of conversation is to be kept and included in the file.

If a referee chooses not to write, the communication explaining this decision (e.g., letter, e-mail message or phone conversation summary) is to be included in the file. If it becomes necessary to supplement the original referee list, the cognizant dean is to approve the addition of any new names.

Once a letter of evaluation is received, it is inappropriate for the department to ask a referee for an interpretation or clarification of his or her comments. Any exception must be approved in advance by the cognizant dean.

Comparison Set. As previously mentioned, the first criterion for tenure is that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship and is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field. To obtain information from the referees that is useful in determining whether the candidate meets these criteria, the referees should be asked to compare the candidate with a group of people (the "comparison set") consisting both of highly regarded people in the field who have recently obtained tenure, as well as more senior people who are setting the standard of excellence for the discipline. All or most of the individuals included in the comparison set should be scholars who would likely receive tenure at Stanford. A useful rule of thumb is that the comparison set should include at least three of the most distinguished names from the list of referees. (In the specific letter written to a referee, the referee's name should, of course, not appear on the comparison set.)

In constructing the comparison set, the "field" of the candidate for tenure must not be defined in overly narrow terms. Thus, a specific research topic should not define the comparison set; instead, an appropriately broad segment of the discipline should be used.

After a preliminary comparison set has been prepared by the search committee, the department chair should present the list to the cognizant dean together with brief biographical sketches. At the same time, the department chair should present the referee list. It is helpful if the biographical descriptions include the year and school from which the individual received his or her highest degree, his or her current title and institution, and a description of his or her area of expertise. The cognizant dean may suggest and/or require that changes be made to the list in order to obtain a more appropriate evaluation of the candidate. The cognizant dean has the responsibility for determination and
approval of the final list. The comparison set should normally range from four to six names depending on the candidate's field(s) of interest.

**Internal referees.** Stanford senior faculty from outside the department with special professional competence to evaluate a candidate normally should also be asked to contribute to the file. Such internal referees may also be asked to comment upon the candidate's teaching performance. The file should contain brief biographical sketches of the internal referees, along with a short explanation about why the person is being asked to write. The cognizant dean has the responsibility for determination and approval of the final list. A sample letter to internal referees can be found in Appendix 3D.

**Published scholarship.** The candidate for tenure has the responsibility for designing and pursuing a schedule of research and writing that results in publication well in advance of the tenure review. In good part, the candidate's reputation as a scholar derives from published articles and books that have been subjected to broad, formal professional scrutiny. The candidate’s CV should list separately peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed publications.

It is the joint responsibility of the candidate and of the evaluation committee to ensure that all works by the candidate that have appeared in print be included in the tenure review process. The evaluation committee bears ultimate responsibility for determining which of these works is sent to external referees. The same set of published materials must be provided to each referee.

All published reviews of books and articles that the candidate has authored should also be included in the completed file. When the promotion file is assembled, the evaluation committee can, if necessary, comment on any bias that they perceive in the reviews.

**Unpublished scholarship.** The decision regarding which, if any, unpublished works should be sent to external referees rests with the candidate. The candidate is encouraged to seek advice from the department chair or senior colleagues in this matter. Such works may range from materials that have been submitted for publication in final form to incomplete manuscripts. The same set of unpublished materials must be provided to each referee.

**Performances or exhibitions.** Faculty whose creative work involves either performance or exhibition, and not conventional publication, may require a special type of evaluation. For instance, chairs may solicit from qualified referees, near the time of a performance or exhibition, evaluations for future use during reappointment or tenure evaluations. In addition, sketches, tapes, samples of paintings, recordings of performance, or other artifacts of such events may be brought to the attention of the referees so that those persons may better judge the candidate's creative accomplishments. The solicitation letters should reflect special aspects of the particular creative activity. The file should contain published reviews of the work.
Candidate's Statement. The candidate should include a statement describing the present and future course of his or her research and teaching. The candidate should consult with his or her chair regarding the content and length of the statement, which ordinarily should not exceed five pages. The evaluation committee should comment on these planned activities and potential for professional growth. The curriculum vitae and candidate's statement should also be included in the materials sent to all external referees.

3.5 Reviewing the Teaching

As mentioned previously, the second criterion for tenure 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.

It is the responsibility of the department and the candidate to plan the course teaching assignments of an assistant professor so that he or she will have the opportunity to gain experience and develop skills in the various types of coursework that are relevant to the educational mission of the department and appropriate for the candidate (e.g., large and small classes; undergraduate and graduate courses; lectures, seminars, laboratory classes, etc.). Evidence of the skill of the candidate in all areas should be collected and considered in the tenure evaluation process.

Teaching evidence gathered for the promotion file should include:

- course evaluation summaries;
- a summary of the teaching commitments since the beginning of the candidate's Stanford appointment (or since the last multi-year reappointment) with course titles, numbers, units, and enrollments;
- any pedagogical innovations or course development activities in which the candidate has participated;
- confidential letters from students enrolled in the candidate's courses, as well as letters from teaching assistants and graduate students for whom the candidate is an advisor or mentor;
- commentary from senior faculty who have visited the candidate's classroom and/or who have evaluated the candidate's course materials.

Letters from students are a critical component of the promotion process. The number of letters and how the students are selected are directly related to the teaching and advising load of the faculty candidate. Using the sample letter in Appendix 3E, the following are guidelines for obtaining a random sample of students:

- All graduate students for whom the candidate is/was an advisor or mentor are to be asked to write a letter;
- For small courses and for individually supervised student projects, the entire cohort of students should be solicited for letters. For large courses, every fourth or fifth student from a grade list should be solicited. (Duplicate names from either of the first two samples should be removed prior to solicitation.)
• The file should contain between six to twelve undergraduate student letters. No more than 30 undergraduate student letters should be solicited.
• A minimum of two follow-up requests should be made to non-respondents.
• E-mail may be used to facilitate the request and follow-up procedures.
• The department should document the process in the final file. Tallies of the number of letters requested and received are to be included, along with a copy of sample solicitation letter and follow-up request letters.
• Unsolicited letters may not be included in the file.

The evaluation committee should provide an analysis of the qualitative data as well as commentary on the content of the student letters. Negative comments should be addressed.

3.6 Department Discussion and Confidentiality Issues

Should a faculty member within the department write a personal letter for the file evaluating the candidate before the case is discussed or voted upon, he or she may not participate in departmental discussions regarding the promotion and must recuse himself or herself from voting.

The candidate’s work and information to be included in the promotion papers should be read carefully and objectively prior to the formal vote by every faculty member voting on the candidate. The evaluation committee will then present its recommendations for discussion and consideration by the department's faculty. To underscore Stanford's policy of vigorously protecting the sources of information contained in third-party evaluation, department chairs are required to read the following statement to their faculty before every discussion of an individual's appointment or promotion:

"The entire proceedings during which specific individuals are discussed are to be held in strict confidence by all participants. The chair of the department or his/her designee shall convey whatever information needs to be transmitted to the candidate; the opinions expressed by the department's faculty or by internal or external referees shall not be discussed with the candidate nor with other parties except as set forth in Sections VI (I) and VII of the Stanford University Faculty Handbook or when necessary for University review of the process. A breach of confidence by a participant in an appointment and promotion matter may be considered to be a serious violation of professional ethics." (See memo to department chairs from Dean Sharon R. Long, issued on October 15, 2002 in Core Policies, Confidentiality.)

3.7 Voting

Tenured associate professors and full professors vote on the promotion of assistant professors. At the department's discretion, faculty holding parenthetical appointments at the rank of associate professor or professor may vote. A clear departmental policy should
be established in this regard and applied consistently. Students may neither participate in departmental deliberations nor vote. By H&S policy, emeriti do not vote on A&P cases.

Eligible department members are expected to vote. Faculty in residence should make every effort to attend the department meeting. Faculty who are away from campus for a brief period are expected to vote. Faculty on leave may discuss with the chair and cognizant dean conditions for participation. The department chair and cognizant dean may request that a person on leave participate in the voting process. Faculty away from campus should ensure that their votes are received by the chair in advance of departmental balloting. Some faculty are to recuse themselves from participating and voting, including spouses, domestic partners, those who have written a letter on behalf of the candidate prior to departmental discussion and voting, and others negotiated with the cognizant dean and agreed upon with him or her prior to the departmental vote.

School policy allows for either secret or open ballots on promotions. Secret ballots have the advantage of reducing the effects of peer pressure on the vote, but may allow for unexplained and perhaps uninterpretable votes. Open ballots have the advantage of forcing each faculty member to take an open position before his or her peers on the issue. Departments should adopt one system or the other and apply it consistently in all cases. The practice of conducting a straw vote which, if positive, is followed by a final "unanimous vote" is prohibited. The actual yeas, nays, abstentions, and non-votes must be recorded and reported in all votes on faculty appointments and promotions. Every faculty member who votes on a case is encouraged to include a written explanation of his or her vote in the papers submitted by the department.

**Split Votes.** In cases where the vote is split, the department chair retains the authority to decide whether or not to forward a file to the Dean's Office.

**Abstentions:** If there are any abstentions, the chair should summarize the reasons for them, if practicable.

**Dissenting Votes.** If there are dissenting votes, the chair should summarize the reasons for them, if practicable. Dissenting voters are strongly encouraged to summarize their views for the file.

**Communications to the Dean regarding the case.** Faculty members who vote may communicate directly with the Dean's Office about their vote, and their written statements will be added to the papers that are considered by reviewing bodies. In such instances, however, the faculty member must provide a copy of his or her letter to the department chair, who will have the option of forwarding a written response that will also be added to the file. Both the faculty member's letter and the department chair's response must be held in strictest confidence and not be shared with other members of the department's faculty.

In extraordinary situations, however, faculty members may communicate in writing to the Dean's Office with the assurance that their communication will be held confidential from
other members of the department, including the chair. Letters of this type may be added to the papers that are considered by reviewing bodies if, in the opinion of the cognizant dean, (1) the letter discusses information or views that are relevant to the review of the appointment or promotion; (2) the letter clearly states the reason why the writer desires to communicate confidentially; and (3) the reason for confidentiality is a compelling one.

If such a letter is included in the file, the file should note that the letter is confidential and has not been reviewed by the department chair. Where appropriate, the cognizant dean should try to verify the accuracy of any problematic statements in the letter and record his or her findings in the file.

3.8 The Rank of Non-Tenured Associate Professor

Depending on the outcome of department deliberations, the rank of non-tenured associate professor may occasionally (though rarely) be used as a means of retaining especially promising people who may not yet have the strong credentials required for promotion to a tenured rank. Such an appointment may be up to three to five years in length and may involve promotion from an assistant professorship at Stanford (although the seven-year-tenure-by-length-of-service rule may limit options for the length of such appointments). Like all faculty appointments, the person must clearly have the potential to be tenurable at Stanford. However, such a promotion implies no commitment or prejudgment with respect to the outcome of any future tenure review. In an appropriate case, the department chair should discuss the option of this rank with the cognizant dean.

3.9 Negative Decisions at the Department Level

If a candidate for tenure is turned down at the department level, the chair should first discuss the outcome with the cognizant dean. Shortly after the meeting, the chair should provide the cognizant dean with a copy of the file, a memo outlining the reasons for the tenure denial, along with the letter to the candidate that notifies the candidate of the decision. Under normal circumstances, the candidate should be informed within one week from the time of the decision.

3.10 Submission of the Tenure File

If the department votes positively on the tenure decision, the chair of the evaluation committee is responsible for writing the documentation necessary to complete the file. The promotion papers should be assembled in accordance with the guidelines set forth in Stanford University Faculty Appointment Forms, 1C. Academic Council Faculty: Reappointment or Promotion Conferring Tenure or Continuing Term of Appointment, which is shown as Appendix 3F. The department administrator (or person responsible for faculty affairs within the department) will have extra forms and will assist the faculty in assembling the file.

The department chair is responsible for writing the cover letter for the file. While acting as a letter of transmittal, the letter should include the pertinent information found during
the course of the candidate's review and should state the effective date of the promotion, which is normally September 1 of the following academic year.

3.11 The Review Process

When the file has been completed, the department administrator should send the file to the Faculty Affairs Officer in the Dean's Office for review. After reviewing the materials, the Faculty Affairs Officer will return the file to the department for any revisions before copying. The department administrator can then send the original file plus 12 copies to the Dean's Office. The Dean’s Office, in its discretion, may solicit additional information regarding the file.

The following chart shows (starting at the bottom) the path that papers follow after leaving the department:

President (for final approval and reporting to the Board of Trustees)

Advisory Board of the Academic Council (for review and voting)

Provost (for submission to Advisory Board)

Dean (final approval at School level)

Dean and Cognizant Deans (for review and voting)

Appointments and Promotions Committee (for review and voting)

Assistant Dean and Faculty Affairs Officer (for review only)

All proposals for promotion to tenure in H&S are reviewed by the School’s Appointments and Promotions Committee (the A&P Committee). The Committee consists of six senior faculty members: two each from the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. The membership is appointed by the Dean and announced each year in the fall. It is wholly improper for any Academic Council member to communicate with a member of the A&P Committee concerning a pending case.

The A&P Committee is provided with the full dossier as submitted by the department and has the responsibility to review the case as carefully as possible and to make recommendations to the Dean. At its discretion, the Committee may ask the Dean’s Office to obtain additional information from inside or outside Stanford about the candidate (this is usually done in consultation with the department and dean). Committee members may themselves gather information about the referees, the comparison list, or the candidate’s subdiscipline. The A&P Committee and the deans may review all or parts of the candidate’s primary scholarly documents. The Committee may also ask the department chair to visit an A&P meeting in order to answer questions about the department, the candidate’s scholarly subdiscipline, or other aspects of the case. The
A&P Committee members vote by open ballot and make final recommendation to the Dean.

The Dean and cognizant deans then convene in executive session to consider the case and vote by open ballot. The final decision is made by the Dean, who can take action other than that recommended by the A&P Committee or cognizant deans. Both the A&P Committee’s recommendation and the Dean’s decision are ultimately matters of judgment and are based on the information available at the time of the vote.

If the decision by the Dean is positive, a cover letter is written, and the recommendation is forwarded to the Provost. If approved by the Provost, the file is forwarded to the Advisory Board. The Provost and/or the Advisory Board may request further information from the Dean and, of course, both the Provost and the Advisory Board have the prerogative of denying a positive recommendation of the Dean. When that occurs, reasons for the denial will be provided by the Provost directly to the candidate. All approved cases are submitted to the President for final review and, if approved, for reporting to the Board of Trustees.

3.12 Negative Decisions at the School Level

If the decision is negative at the School level, the Dean must inform the department chair of that decision and the reasons for it, as well as communicate in brief to the candidate. Under normal circumstances, the candidate should be informed within one week from the time of the decision. University policy allows the candidate to request a fuller explanation of a negative decision from the Provost's Office. The dean and cognizant dean should also prepare a memo for the Provost stating the reasons for the tenure denial.

Reconsideration of a negative decision by the Dean will be allowed only when the department presents convincing evidence that new data bearing on the case exist, such as information that could not have been available in the original evaluation. Reconsiderations are rare and may be avoided by consultation between the chair and the cognizant dean at appropriate intervals in the process.

If a faculty member is denied tenure during any stage of the review, he or she can get more information about a terminal year from the department chair or cognizant dean and from the Stanford University Faculty Handbook, Chapter 4, for information on the appeal process.
APPENDIX 3A: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR PROMOTION TO TENURE (ask before sending materials)

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the promotion of Assistant Professor NAME to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. We would very much appreciate it if you could take the time to write a letter evaluating her/his contributions in scholarship and teaching. I am enclosing her/his current curriculum vitae. We know this process imposes a time-consuming task upon you, but there really is no adequate substitute for informed judgments from professionals in the field. If you will be able to evaluate Professor NAME's work, we will send a more detailed letter, along with copies of her/his written work.

It would be helpful if you would let me know by DATE. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me at (650) 72X-XXXX or by e-mail at E-MAIL ADDRESS. You may also reply to this letter by FAX; our departmental FAX number is (650) 72X-XXXX.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 3B: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR PROMOTION TO TENURE (to be sent after the referee agrees to write)

DATE
NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Thank you very much for agreeing to assist our department in our consideration of the promotion of Assistant Professor NAME to Associate Professor with tenure by reviewing her/his work. Enclosed are copies of Professor NAME's current curriculum vitae, research and teaching statement, as well as the following publications: LIST PUBLICATIONS ENCLOSED.

The first criterion for a promotion to tenure at Stanford is that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship. For promotion to the rank of associate professor, the scholarship must clearly reveal that the person is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field. In evaluating the potential and accomplishments of Professor NAME, it would be particularly helpful if you could compare her/his work with that of scholars you regard as the current and future intellectual leaders of the discipline. The following people come to mind as examples: Name 1, Name 2, Name 3, Name 4, Name 5. Taking into account obvious differences in career stages, how does Professor NAME's work compare with that of these scholars or others you might choose? The more specific your evaluation and analysis, the more helpful it will be for us.

The second criterion for tenure 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. Your comments on Professor NAME's teaching capabilities (if known to you) would be invaluable in helping us assess her/his talents and accomplishments in this area.

Again, thank you for your willingness to undertake this time-consuming task. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential. It would be most useful if you would send your letter by DATE. [OPTIONAL TEXT: If it would help you to meet our deadline to respond by e-mail (to NNN@stanford.edu) or fax (at 650-72X-XXX), you may certainly do so, though we do ask that you follow up with a signed, hard copy of your letter.] If you have questions, please feel free to contact me at (650) 72X-XXXX or by e-mail at E-MAIL ADDRESS.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 3C: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR PROMOTION TO TENURE (no prior contact)

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the promotion of NAME to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. As you are aware, one of the key sources of information for making such decisions is outside letters from experts in the field. We would be grateful if you would be willing to take the time to write such a letter for us about Professor NAME. Enclosed are copies of Professor NAME’s current curriculum vitae, research and teaching statement, as well as the following publications:

LIST PUBLICATIONS ENCLOSED

The first criterion for a promotion to tenure at Stanford is that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship. For promotion to the rank of associate professor, the scholarship must clearly reveal that the person is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field. In evaluating the potential and accomplishments of Professor NAME, it would be particularly helpful if you could compare her/his work with that of scholars you regard as the current and future intellectual leaders of the discipline. The following people come to mind as examples: Name 1, Name 2, Name 3, Name 4, Name 5. Taking into account obvious differences in career stages, how does Professor NAME’s work compare with that of these scholars or others you might choose? The more specific your evaluation and analysis, the more helpful it will be for us.

The second criterion for tenure 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. Your comments on Professor NAME’s teaching capabilities (if known to you) would be invaluable in helping us assess her/his talents and accomplishments in this area.

Again, thank you for your willingness to undertake this time-consuming task. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential. It would be most useful if you would send your letter by DATE. [OPTIONAL TEXT: If it would help you to meet our deadline to respond by e-mail (to NNN@stanford.edu) or fax (at 650-72X-XXX), you may certainly do so, though we do ask that you follow up with a signed, hard copy of your letter.] If you have questions, please feel free to contact me at (650) 72X-XXXX or by e-mail at E-MAIL ADDRESS.
Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 3D: SAMPLE LETTER TO INTERNAL REFEREES FOR PROMOTION TO TENURE

DATE

NAME
MAILCODE

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the promotion of NAME to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. We understand that you have served on the X committee (or co-taught or whatever) with NAME. We would be most appreciative if you could take the time to write a letter about how you see NAME's contributions to the University, in scholarship, teaching, and leadership.

The first criterion for a promotion to tenure at Stanford is that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship. For promotion to the rank of associate professor, the scholarship must clearly reveal that the person is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field.

The second criterion for tenure 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation.

I am enclosing a current curriculum vitae and would be pleased to see that you receive copies of NAME's materials, if you would like them. You may contact our administrator to indicate what you want. She is HERNAME at PHONE or E-MAIL or FAX.

Since the department must consider this matter in MONTH, we would very much like to have your response by DATE. We appreciate your help. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 3E: SAMPLE LETTER TO STUDENTS FOR PROMOTION TO TENURE

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Ms./Mr. NAME:

Our department is considering the promotion of NAME to the tenured rank of Associate Professor. We place a great deal of weight on the individual's performance as a teacher, not only as a classroom instructor, but also as a research or academic advisor, or as a dissertation committee member. As a consequence the department is soliciting letters from students who have had classes with Professor NAME or who have otherwise studied or worked with him/her.

It would be a great help to us if you could write such a letter. In your letter, we would like to indicate the nature and extent of your contacts with Professor NAME, then indicate what you feel are his/her strengths and/or weaknesses as an instructor, advisor, or committee member from your perspective.

We would appreciate hearing from you by DATE. Letters of response should be addressed to Professor CCC, VVV Department, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-MMMM, or sent by e-mail to NNN@stanford.edu. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential. We are soliciting a number of such letters and these will be an important part of the documentation.

Thank you for your assistance. We appreciate your time and effort in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
CHAPTER 4: PROMOTION TO FULL (TENURE LINE)

Note: Promotions to full professor at Stanford University are governed by the guidelines and procedures set forth in the Stanford University Faculty Handbook and the Stanford University Faculty Appointment Forms, both of which are published by the Provost's Office. The policies and procedures described below are specific to H&S and have been approved by the Provost's Office as consistent with overall University policy. Those carrying out promotion reviews are urged to review both University and School policies and procedures.

4.1 Timeline and Checkpoints for Promotion Activities (see chart)

4.2 Criteria and Timing

In order to be promoted to full professor, a faculty member should have achieved recognized distinction in his or her field, broadly defined, and compiled a significant record of 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 a field. The candidate should also have achieved and maintained a record of high quality teaching of Stanford students. While the primary criteria for promotion are excellence in scholarship and teaching, service (including what might be called institutional citizenship) may also be given some consideration.

Chairs are urged to meet with their cognizant dean during spring quarter to discuss any associate professor who is a prospective candidate for promotion in the following academic year. This should be an occasion to look at the performance and progress of all associate professors in the department. The timing of the review is variable and depends on such factors as the progress of the person's scholarship and norms for the discipline. Special circumstances, such as some outside offers or unusually rapid professional advancement, can also be considered.

4.3 Forming the Evaluation Committee

The promotion evaluation committee in the department has the responsibility of gathering data on scholarship, teaching, and service. While the structure of evaluation committees varies among departments, normally the minimum is three full professors, including the committee chair. In selecting the committee, the department chair is to consult with the cognizant dean, who retains authority to approve its membership.

4.4 Reviewing the Scholarship

*External referees.* Confidential letters from professional peers and students are the cornerstone of the evaluation process at every research university. Candid assessment of scholarship and teaching, without concern for breach of confidentiality, can best be obtained if explicit assurance is given that Stanford's policy is to vigorously protect the
sources of information contained in third-party evaluation.

Once the referees have been selected by the department, those involved in the process should avoid communication with them that relates to the review process, both before and after letters are sent out.

External referees evaluating the individual's scholarship are to be chosen with great care. A preliminary list of external referees should be prepared by the evaluation committee, taking into account the suggestions (positive and negative) of the candidate, as well as their own knowledge of the field. Not all of the persons suggested by the candidate will necessarily be asked to write, though normally the evaluation committee should write at least three of them. The department chair should present the list to the cognizant dean together with brief biographical sketches and should identify any individuals with special ties to the candidate (e.g., mentor, collaborator, etc.). The cognizant dean may suggest and/or require that changes be made to the list in order to obtain a more appropriate evaluation of the candidate. The cognizant dean has the responsibility for determination and approval of the final list.

In constructing the referee list, a wide variety of considerations are appropriate, including but not limited to:

1. The list should include individuals with expertise very closely related to that of the candidate and those who work in the same or a closely related specialty in order to obtain critical evaluations of the scholarship.

2. The list should include individuals in related fields and those with a broader range of interests in order to obtain insights into the breadth of impact of the candidate's work.

3. The list may contain individuals (generally, no more than three), such as former mentors and current or former collaborators, who would be useful in educating readers of the file about the structure of the field.

4. Normally, an individual with a strong negative personal bias toward the candidate or a clear conflict of interest should not be asked to serve as a referee. If for some reason letters from such individuals are judged likely to be useful and are solicited and received, the existence and nature of the bias or conflict of interest should be clearly indicated in the evaluation committee report.

5. The list should contain individuals from strong academic institutions where promotion standards are generally high, in order to get letters from people who are comfortable with reading and writing the type of frank and critical evaluations that Stanford's promotion process requires.

The number of letters from external referees in the file should be in the range of 5 to 8. To obtain this number of letters, a department may expect to solicit approximately 8 to 10 letters. All letters received by the department must typically be placed in the file, together
with a list and biographical sketches of all the referees who were solicited. Letters may not be solicited by the candidate, and the candidate should not be told the identities of the external referees chosen for the evaluation process.

The wording of the letter soliciting evaluation of the candidate's scholarship and ranking is of critical importance. Referees should be asked to be quite specific in their comments about the candidate's scholarship, as well as in their comparisons and rankings of the candidate relative to other named persons in the field. In soliciting opinions from external referees, the department (or the Dean's Office at a later stage of review) may request special commentary on one or more items in the candidate's bibliography. Because it is extremely difficult to correct uncertainties generated by incorrectly phrased solicitation letters, protection of the candidate and the University necessitates that all such letters be expressly approved by the cognizant dean before they are mailed.

Some departments send a preliminary letter to determine a referee's willingness to provide an evaluation and, if the reply is positive, then follow up with more detailed information, including the candidate's curriculum vitae and selected publications; others send the request for evaluation without prior communication. Sample letters for both approaches are included as Appendix 4A-C, and should be followed closely. In all cases, referees are to be given sufficient time to respond, which will normally be at least four weeks.

Phone calls should not be made to external referees prior to letters being sent to them. Departments are to maintain a written record of all follow-up done with referees. For example, if, after receiving no response from the referee, a phone call is made to solicit a letter, then a written log of conversation is to be kept and included in the file.

If a referee chooses not to write, the communication explaining this decision (e.g., letter, e-mail message or phone conversation summary) is to be included in the file. If it becomes necessary to supplement the original referee list, the cognizant dean is to approve the addition of any new names.

Once a letter of evaluation is received, it is inappropriate for the department to ask a referee for an interpretation or clarification of his or her comments.

**Comparison Set.** As noted above, 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 a field. To obtain information from the referees that is useful in determining whether the candidate meets this criterion, the referees should be asked to compare the candidate with a group of people (the "comparison set") consisting of four to six highly regarded people in the field who are setting the standard of excellence. All or most of the individuals included in the comparison set should be scholars who would likely receive tenure at Stanford. A useful rule of thumb is that the comparison set should include at least three of the most distinguished names from the list of referees. All the names on the comparison set should be at the rank of full professor or the equivalent. (In the specific letter written to a referee,
the referee's name should, of course, not appear on the comparison set.)

In constructing the comparison set, the "field" of the candidate for promotion must not be defined in overly narrow terms. Thus a specific research topic should not define the comparison set; instead, as broad a segment as possible of the discipline should be used.

After a preliminary comparison set has been prepared by the evaluation committee, the department chair should present the list to the cognizant dean together with brief biographical sketches. At the same time, the department chair should present the referee list. It is helpful if the description includes the year and school from which the individual received his or her highest degree, his or her current title and institution, and a description of his or her area of expertise. The cognizant dean may suggest and/or require that changes be made to the list in order to obtain a more appropriate evaluation of the candidate. The cognizant dean has the responsibility for determination and approval of the final list. The comparison set should normally range from five to seven names depending on the candidate's field(s) of interest.

Internal Referees. Stanford senior faculty from outside the department with special professional competence to evaluate a candidate normally should be asked to contribute to the file. Such internal referees may also be asked to comment upon the candidate's teaching performance. The file should contain brief biographical sketches of the internal referees, along with a short explanation about why the person is being asked to write. The cognizant dean has the responsibility for determination and approval of the final list. A sample letter to internal referees can be found in Appendix 4D.

Published scholarship. The candidate for promotion has the responsibility of designing and pursuing a schedule of research and writing that results in a significant record of accomplishment since the time of the tenure decision. In good part, the candidate's reputation as a scholar derives from published articles and books that have been subjected to broad, formal professional scrutiny.

It is the joint responsibility of the candidate and of the evaluation committee to ensure that all works by the candidate which have appeared in print since the time of the tenure decision be included in the promotion review process. The evaluation committee bears ultimate responsibility for determining which of these works is sent to external referees. The same set of published materials must be provided to each referee.

All published reviews of books and articles that the candidate has authored since receiving tenure should also be included in the completed file. When the promotion file is assembled, the evaluation committee can, if necessary, comment on any bias that they perceive in the reviews.

Unpublished scholarship. The decision regarding which, if any, unpublished works should be sent to external referees rests with the candidate. The candidate is encouraged to seek advice from the department chair or other colleagues in this matter. Such works may range from materials that have been submitted for publication in final form to
incomplete manuscripts. The same set of unpublished materials must be provided to each referee.

**Performances or exhibitions.** Faculty whose creative work involves either performance or exhibition, and not conventional publication, may require a special type of evaluation. For instance, chairs may solicit from qualified referees, near the time of a performance or exhibition, evaluations for future use during promotion evaluations. In addition, sketches, tapes, samples of paintings, recordings of performance, or other artifacts of such events may be brought to the attention of the referees so that those persons may better judge the candidate's creative accomplishments. The solicitation letters should reflect special aspects of the particular creative activity. The file should contain copies of published reviews.

**Candidate's Statement.** The candidate should include a statement describing the present and future course of his or her research and teaching. The candidate should consult with his or her chair regarding the appropriate content and length of the statement, which ordinarily should be no more than five pages. The evaluation committee should comment on these planned activities and potential for professional growth. The curriculum vitae and candidate's statement should also be included in the materials sent to all external referees.

4.5 Reviewing the Teaching

Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to have achieved and maintained a record of high quality teaching of Stanford students. Teaching evidence gathered for the file should include:

- course evaluation summaries;
- a summary of the teaching commitments since the tenure decision with course titles, numbers, units, and enrollments;
- any pedagogical innovations or course development activities in which the candidate has participated;
- confidential letters from students enrolled in the candidate's courses, as well as letters from teaching assistants and graduate students for whom the candidate is an advisor or mentor;
- commentary from senior faculty who have visited the candidate's classroom; and/or who have evaluated the candidate's course materials.

Letters from students are a critical component of the promotion process. The number of letters and how the students are selected are directly related to the teaching and advising load of the faculty candidate. Using the sample letter in Appendix 4E, the following are guidelines for obtaining a random sample of students:

- All graduate students for whom the candidate is/was an advisor or mentor are to be asked to write a letter.
- For small courses and for individually supervised student projects, the entire cohort of students should be solicited for letters. For large courses, every fourth or fifth student from a grade list should be solicited. (Duplicate names from either of the first two samples should be removed prior to obtaining the sample.)
- No more than 30 undergraduate student letters should be solicited. The file should contain a minimum of six undergraduate letters.
- A minimum of two follow-up requests should be made to non-respondents.
- E-mail may be used to facilitate the request and follow-up procedures.
- The department should document the process in the final file. Tallies of the number of letters requested and received are to be included, along with a copy of sample solicitation letter and follow-up request letters.
- Unsolicited letters may not be included in the file.

The evaluation committee should provide an analysis of the qualitative data as well as commentary on the content of the student letters. Negative comments should be addressed.

4.6 Department Discussion and Confidentiality Issues

Should a faculty member within the department write a personal letter for the file evaluating the candidate before the case is discussed or voted upon, he or she may not participate in departmental discussions regarding the promotion and must recuse himself or herself from voting.

The candidate’s work and information to be included in the promotion papers should be read carefully and objectively prior to the formal vote by every faculty member voting on the candidate. The evaluation committee will then present its recommendations for discussion and consideration by the department's faculty. To underscore Stanford's policy of vigorously protecting the sources of information contained in third-party evaluation, department chairs are required to read the following statement to their faculty before every discussion of an individual's appointment or promotion:

The information to be included in the promotion papers should be read carefully prior to the formal vote by every faculty member voting on the candidate. The evaluation committee will then present its recommendations for discussion and consideration by the department's faculty. To underscore Stanford's policy of vigorously protecting the sources of information contained in third-party evaluation, department chairs are expected to read the following statement to their faculty before every discussion of an individual's appointment or promotion:

"The entire proceedings during which specific individuals are discussed are to be held in strict confidence by all participants. The chair of the department or his/her designee shall convey whatever information needs to be transmitted to the candidate; the opinions expressed by the department's faculty or by internal or external referees shall not be discussed with the candidate nor with other parties except as set forth in Sections VI (I) and VII of the Stanford University Faculty
Handbook or when necessary for University review of the process. A breach of confidence by a participant in an appointment and promotion matter may be considered to be a serious violation of professional ethics." (See memo to department chairs from Dean Sharon R. Long, issued on October 15, 2002, found in Core Policies, Confidentiality.)

4.7 Voting

Only full professors are eligible to vote on the promotions of associate professors. At the department's discretion, faculty holding parenthetical appointments at the rank of professor may vote. A clear departmental policy should be established for whether parenthetical faculty vote or not and applied consistently. Students may neither participate in departmental deliberations nor vote. By H&S policy, emeriti faculty do not vote on A&P cases.

Eligible department members are expected to vote. Faculty in residence should make every effort to attend the department meeting. Faculty who are away from campus for a brief period are expected to vote. Faculty on leave may discuss with the chair and cognizant dean conditions for participation. The department chair and cognizant dean may request that a person on leave participate in the voting process. Faculty away from campus should ensure that their votes are received by the chair in advance of departmental balloting. Some faculty are to recuse themselves from participating and voting, including spouses, domestic partners, those who have written a letter on behalf of the candidate prior to departmental discussion and voting, and others negotiated with the cognizant dean and agreed upon with him or her prior to the departmental vote.

School policy allows for either secret or open ballots on promotions. Secret ballots have the advantage of reducing the effects of peer pressure on the vote, but may allow for unexplained and perhaps uninterpretable votes. Open ballots have the advantage of forcing each faculty member to take an open position before his or her peers on the issue. Departments should adopt one system or the other and apply it consistently in all cases. The practice of conducting a straw vote which, if positive, is followed by a final "unanimous vote" is prohibited. The actual yea's, nay's, abstentions, and non-votes must be recorded and reported in all votes on faculty appointments and promotions. Every faculty member who votes on a case is encouraged to include a written explanation of his or her vote in the papers submitted by the department.

*Split Votes.* In cases where the vote is split, the department chair retains the authority to decide whether or not to forward a file to the Dean's Office.

*Abstentions:* If there are any abstentions, the chair should summarize the reasons for them, if practicable.

*Dissenting Votes.* If there are dissenting votes, the chair should summarize the reasons for them, if practicable. Dissenting voters are strongly encouraged to summarize their views for the file.
Communications to the Dean regarding the case. Faculty members who vote may communicate directly with the Dean's Office about their vote, and their written statements will be added to the papers that are considered by reviewing bodies. In such instances, however, the faculty member must provide a copy of his or her letter to the department chair, who will have the option of forwarding a written response that will also be added to the file. Both the faculty member's letter and the department chair's response must be held in strictest confidence and not be shared with other members of the department's faculty.

In extraordinary situations, however, faculty members may communicate in writing to the Dean's Office with the assurance that their communication will be held confidential from other members of the department, including the chair. Letters of this type may be added to the papers that are considered by reviewing bodies if, in the opinion of the cognizant dean, (1) the letter discusses information or views that are relevant to the review of the appointment or promotion; (2) the letter clearly states the reason why the writer desires to communicate confidentially; and (3) the reason for confidentiality is a valid one.

If such a letter is included in the file, the file should note that the letter is confidential and has not been reviewed by the department chair. Where appropriate, the cognizant dean should try to verify the accuracy of any problematic statements in the letter and record his or her findings in the file.

4.8 Negative Decisions at the Department Level

If a candidate for promotion is turned down at the department level, the chair should first discuss the outcome with the cognizant dean. Shortly after the meeting, the chair should provide the cognizant dean with a copy of the file, a memo outlining the reasons for the promotion denial, along with the letter to the candidate that notifies the candidate of the decision. Under normal circumstances, the candidate should be informed within one week from the time of the decision.

4.9 Submission of the Promotion File

The chair of the evaluation committee is responsible for writing the documentation necessary to complete the file. The promotion papers should be assembled in accordance with the guidelines set forth in Stanford University Faculty Appointment Forms, 1D. Academic Council Faculty: Promotion from the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure to the Rank of Professor with Tenure, which is shown as Appendix 4F. The department administrator (or person responsible for faculty affairs within the department) will have extra forms and will assist the faculty in assembling the file.

The department chair is responsible for writing the cover letter for the file. While acting as a letter of transmittal, the letter should include the pertinent information found during the course of the candidate's review and the effective date of the promotion, which is normally September 1 of the following academic year.
4.10 The Review Process

When the file has been completed, the department administrator should send the file to the Faculty Affairs Officer in the Dean's Office for review. After reviewing the materials, the Faculty Affairs Officer will return the file to the department for any revisions before copying. The department administrator can then send the original file plus six copies to the Dean's Office. The Dean's Office, in its discretion, may solicit additional information regarding the file.

The following chart shows (starting at the bottom) the path that papers follow after leaving the department:

1. President (for final approval and reporting to the Board of Trustees)
2. Advisory Board of the Academic Council (for review and voting)
3. Provost (for submission to Advisory Board)
4. Dean (final approval at School level)
5. Dean and Cognizant Deans (for review and voting)
6. Assistant Dean and Faculty Affairs Officer (for review only)

If the decision by the Dean is positive, a cover letter is written, and the recommendation is forwarded to the Provost. If approved by the Provost, the file is forwarded to the Advisory Board. The Provost (and her or his staff) and/or the Advisory Board may request further information from the Dean and, of course, both the Provost and the Advisory Board have the prerogative of denying a positive recommendation of the Dean. When that occurs, reasons for the denial will be provided by the Provost directly to the candidate. All approved cases are submitted to the President for final approval and reporting to the Board of Trustees.

4.11 Negative Decisions at the School Level

If the decision is negative at the School level, the Dean must inform the department chair of that decision and the reasons for it, as well as communicate in brief to the candidate. Under normal circumstances, the candidate should be informed within one week from the time of the decision. University policy allows the candidate to request a fuller explanation of a negative decision from the Provost's Office.

Reconsideration of a negative decision by the Dean will be allowed only when the department presents convincing evidence that new data bearing on the case exist, such as information that could not have been available in the original evaluation. Reconsiderations are rare and may be avoided by consultation between the chair and the
cognizant dean at appropriate intervals in the process.

If a faculty member is denied promotion during any stage of the review, he or she may refer to the Stanford University Faculty Handbook, Chapter 4, for information on the appeal process.

4.12 Decanal and Provostial Feedback

After the file has been reviewed and approved by the deans, Provost and Advisory Board, the cognizant dean will discuss the evaluation with the department chair and communicate feedback, if any, gained from these other levels of review that can be incorporated into the letter. A fuller perspective can thereby be provided to the faculty member about his or her performance.

When the department has completed the promotion review, the chair should then draft a letter to the candidate that summarizes the results of the review. The letter should not be shared with the candidate until the completion of the promotion process (approval by the President of the University). Appropriate areas to discuss include the quality and quantity of both scholarship and teaching, guidance or suggestions for future actions or areas of focus, as well as an acknowledgment of any special service efforts and institutional citizenship issues. The draft of this letter should be included as part of the promotion file.

When the final draft of the letter has been approved by the cognizant dean, the department chair should then meet with the candidate to discuss the results of the review and give him or her the letter. Department chairs are encouraged to include the chair and/or members of the evaluation committee in this meeting.
APPENDIX 4A: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR (ask before sending materials)

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the promotion of Associate Professor NAME to the rank of Professor. We would very much appreciate it if you could take the time to write a letter evaluating her/his contributions in scholarship and teaching. I am enclosing her/his current curriculum vitae. We know this process imposes a time-consuming task upon you, but there really is no adequate substitute for informed judgments from professionals in the field. If you will be able to evaluate Professor NAME's work, we will send a more detailed letter, along with copies of her/his written work.

It would be helpful if you would let me know by DATE. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me at (650) 72X-XXXX or by e-mail at E-MAIL ADDRESS. You may also reply to this letter by FAX; our departmental FAX number is (650) 72X-XXXX.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 4B: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR (to be sent after the referee agrees to write)

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Thank you very much for agreeing to assist our department in our consideration of the promotion of NAME from the rank of tenured Associate Professor to Professor. Enclosed are copies of Professor NAME’s current curriculum vitae as well as the following publications: LIST PUBLICATIONS ENCLOSED.

At Stanford persons promoted to the rank of Professor should have achieved recognized distinction in their fields, broadly defined, and compiled a significant record of 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 a field. In evaluating the work of Professor NAME, it would be particularly helpful if you could compare his/her scholarship with that of scholars you regard as the intellectual leaders of the discipline. The following people come to mind as examples: NAME 1, NAME 2, NAME 3, AND NAME 4. How does NAME’S work compare with that of these scholars or others you might choose? The more specific these comparisons are, and the more detailed and documented your evaluation and analysis, the more helpful it will be for us.

The candidate should also have achieved and maintained a record of high quality teaching of Stanford students. Your comments on NAME’S teaching record (if known to you), which may include undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral instruction of all types, as well as curriculum development would be invaluable.

We know that this process imposes a time-consuming task upon you, but there really is no adequate substitute for informed judgments from professionals in the field. We deeply appreciate your help and can only promise to reciprocate when your university has similar needs. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential. We would appreciate receiving your comments no later than DATE. [OPTIONAL TEXT: If it would help you to meet our deadline to respond by e-mail (to NNN@stanford.edu) or fax (at 650-72X-XXX), you may certainly do so, though we do ask that you follow up with a signed, hard copy of your letter.] If you have questions, please feel free to contact me at (650) 72X-XXXX or E-MAIL ADDRESS.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 4C: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR (no prior contact)

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the promotion of NAME from the rank of tenured Associate Professor to Professor. As you know, one of the important sources of information for making such decisions is outside letters from experts in the field who are familiar with the individual's work. We would very much like to have you write such a letter for us about Professor NAME. Enclosed are copies of Professor NAME's current curriculum vitae as well as the following publications: LIST PUBLICATIONS ENCLOSED.

At Stanford persons promoted to the rank of Professor should have achieved recognized distinction in their fields, broadly defined, and compiled a significant record of 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 a field. In evaluating the work of Professor NAME, it would be particularly helpful if you could compare his/her scholarship with that of scholars you regard as the intellectual leaders of the discipline. The following people come to mind as examples: NAME 1, NAME 2, NAME 3, AND NAME 4. How does NAME'S work compare with that of these scholars or others you might choose? The more specific these comparisons are, and the more detailed and documented your evaluation and analysis, the more helpful it will be for us.

The candidate should also have achieved and maintained a record of high quality teaching of Stanford students. Your comments on NAME'S teaching record (if known to you), which may include undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral instruction of all types, as well as curriculum development would be invaluable.

We know that this process imposes a time-consuming task upon you, but there really is no adequate substitute for informed judgments from professionals in the field. We deeply appreciate your help and can only promise to reciprocate when your university has similar needs. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential. We would appreciate receiving your comments no later than DATE. [OPTIONAL TEXT: If it would help you to meet our deadline to respond by e-mail (to NNN@stanford.edu) or fax (at 650-72X-XXX), you may certainly do so, though we do ask that you follow up with a signed, hard copy of your letter.] If you have questions, please feel free to contact me at (650) 72X-XXXX or E-MAIL ADDRESS.
Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 4D: SAMPLE LETTER TO INTERNAL REFEREES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

DATE

NAME
MAILCODE

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the promotion of NAME to the rank of Professor. We understand that you have served on the X committee (or co-taught or whatever) with NAME. We would be most appreciative if you could take the time to write a letter about how you see NAME's contributions to the University, in scholarship, teaching, and leadership.

At Stanford persons promoted to the rank of Professor should have achieved recognized distinction in their fields, broadly defined, and compiled a significant record of 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 a field.

The candidate should also have achieved and maintained a record of high quality teaching of Stanford students. While the primary criteria for promotion are excellence in scholarship and teaching, service (including what might be called institutional citizenship) may also be given some consideration.

I am enclosing a current curriculum vitae and would be pleased to see that you receive copies of NAME's materials if you would like them. You may contact our administrator to indicate what you want. She is HERNAME at PHONE or E-MAIL or FAX.

Since the department must consider this matter in MONTH, we would very much like to have your response by DATE. We appreciate your help. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 4E: SAMPLE LETTER TO STUDENTS FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Ms./Mr. NAME:

Our department is considering the promotion of NAME to the rank of Professor. We place a great deal of weight on the individual's performance as a teacher, not only as a classroom instructor, but also as a research or academic advisor, or as a dissertation committee member. As a consequence the department is soliciting letters from students who have had classes with Professor NAME or who have otherwise studied or worked with him/her.

It would be a great help to us if you could write such a letter. In your letter, we would like to indicate the nature and extent of your contacts with Professor NAME, then indicate what you feel are his/her strengths and/or weaknesses as an instructor, advisor, or committee member from your perspective.

We would appreciate hearing from you by DATE. Letters of response should be addressed to Professor CCC, VVV Department, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-MMMM, or sent by e-mail to NNN@stanford.edu. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential. We are soliciting a number of such letters and these will be an important part of the documentation.

Thank you for your assistance. We appreciate your time and effort in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
CHAPTER 5: TENURED APPOINTMENT (TENURE LINE)

Note: Appointments at Stanford University are governed by the guidelines and procedures set forth in the Stanford University Faculty Handbook and the Stanford University Faculty Appointment Forms, both of which are published by the Provost's Office. The policies and procedures described below are specific to H&S and have been approved by the Provost's Office as consistent with overall University policy. Those carrying out faculty searches are urged to review both University and School policies and procedures.

5.1 Timeline and Checkpoints for Tenured Appointment Activities (see chart)

5.2 Search Authorizations

Appointments to the tenure-line faculty in the School can be initiated only by departmental or joint departmental action. In most cases, recommendations for an appointment are to be preceded by a rigorous and comprehensive search. On occasion, however, the Provost may approve a search waiver for a position when an exceptionally talented person is unexpectedly available. For further information regarding the School's search waiver process, please see the Core Policies, Search Waiver.

A department chair must present the case for a new appointment to the Dean's Office and obtain formal authorization before a search can be launched. Officially, every billet that becomes vacant for any reason returns to the Dean's Office. In some circumstances, it is returned to the department for a replacement or for a search in another field. In other cases, the Dean may reallocate that billet to another department or hold it in reserve in the Dean's Office.

The cognizant dean meets with the department chair to discuss faculty appointment needs, normally in the spring. After consulting with the cognizant dean, the department chair should submit the search authorization request form (Appendix 5I). Such requests are then reviewed by the deans, and approvals are communicated to chairs in June.

Departmental faculties and the deans must regard every search authorization as a potential long-term commitment. The dean's authorization is based upon an assessment of the department's present and predicted future needs in scholarship and teaching and involves priority judgments both within the department and between departments. Teaching needs of interdisciplinary programs also may play a role in assigning authorizations to departments.

A decision regarding the area of search is among the most important in the process. Whenever possible, departments should search broadly for the "best of field" rather than in narrowly defined subfields. A search that yields a small number of applicants may signal that the search has not been defined broadly enough, or that the net may not have been cast widely enough.
As part of the School's continuing commitment to faculty renewal, it is expected that most searches will be authorized at the junior level. However, the department chair and the cognizant dean should confer regarding the appropriate rank, which should be determined in accordance with the department's mix of ranks, long-range hiring plan and programmatic needs.

5.3 Forming the Search Committee

The search committee in the department has the responsibility of gathering data on scholarship, teaching, and other relevant matters, such as institutional service. While the structure of search committees varies among departments, normally the minimum is three members with a senior faculty member serving as chair. A member of the committee should be assigned the job of overseeing the diversity aspects of the search.

Once the department chair has selected the committee, he or she is to consult with the cognizant dean, who retains authority to approve its membership. By School policy, a department may permit emeriti and a graduate student to serve on and vote in a search committee. However, emeriti and graduate students are not allowed to vote at the departmental (as opposed to the committee) level. The department chair retains final approval regarding the selection of students for committee membership.

5.4 Advertising

Searches should include advertising in professional journals or other widely-disseminated professional publications. All advertisements are to be forwarded to the cognizant dean for approval. A sample advertisement is included as Appendix 5A and should be followed closely.

Search committee members and other department faculty are encouraged to call and write colleagues at other universities in order to identify applicants and to encourage them to apply. Solicitation letters should be carefully phrased to make certain that recipients understand Stanford's eagerness to receive applications from all highly qualified candidates. A sample letter is included as Appendix 5B and should be followed closely.

The School encourages contact with institutions that have significant minority enrollments, as well as professional groups of women and minorities, including advertising in special journals so that such groups are alerted to a search.

5.5 Candidates with Stanford Affiliations

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 credentials of such persons may be more easily assessed than those of others, but the search committee is still obliged to consider by all appropriate means the credentials of candidates having no prior association with the University. This obligation should be made clear to candidates who hold or have held Stanford appointments.
Faculty members from outside of the department but internal to Stanford may serve as a reference for such candidates. Please see Appendix 5G for a sample letter to internal referees. A faculty member within the department also has the prerogative to write a letter on behalf of the candidate. However, if this option is exercised, he or she may not participate in departmental deliberations regarding the search and must recuse himself or herself from voting. Exceptions to this requirement may only be granted by the cognizant dean.

5.6 Criteria

Both scholarship and teaching are important prerequisites for tenured appointments at Stanford because the University is dedicated to outstanding achievement in both. Scholarly distinction is especially important for tenured appointments because it sustains both the University's research mission and its distinctive type of teaching, which draws its strength from the teacher's continuing involvement in scholarly research at the frontiers of a field. The purpose of the appointment evaluation is to form, on the basis of the record to date, appraisals of the candidate's standing and potential in his or her scholarly discipline broadly defined and the candidate's quality as a teacher.

The first criterion for a tenured appointment is that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship. At the rank of associate professor, the scholarship must clearly reveal that the person being proposed for appointment is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field. At the rank of full professor, the expectation is that the candidate has achieved the status of one of the very best in a broadly defined field. In both cases, letters from distinguished referees should support that assessment in unequivocal fashion.

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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. The teaching record should include undergraduate, graduate, and, if appropriate, postdoctoral instruction, of all types.

In judging candidates for tenured appointments whose work involves creative writing, dramatic or musical composition or performance, works of art, and the equivalent, special criteria must be defined and applied. The comparison group, for example, should be artists, musicians, and writers who work in universities, conservatories, or institutes, and have obligations of faculty membership in addition to their artistic activities. As a rule of thumb, the candidate's creative products must have gained a critical recognition equivalent to what we demand of scholarship by tenurable faculty in other humanities disciplines. In general, the judgment of teaching quality for these fine arts faculty can follow normal procedures applicable to all faculty.

Within H&S service (including what might be called institutional citizenship), although
relevant, is not a primary criterion for a tenured appointment. The basic policy is that service, however exemplary, cannot substitute for deficiencies in scholarship or teaching. Uniqueness of function is also not a criterion for a tenured appointment. The fact that a candidate is the only faculty member teaching in a specific area or doing scholarship on a certain subject is not relevant to the process of judging the quality of scholarship and teaching. Moreover, the School's requirement that a candidate for a tenured appointment be compared with other scholars in the given discipline provides departmental faculty, the Appointments and Promotions Committee, and the Dean with a perspective on the area in which a candidate works. Hence, a department's faculty and/or the Dean, either independently or upon advice from the Appointments and Promotions Committee, may on occasion decide that a candidate does not warrant a tenured appointment even though that person may be the best available within a field. That is, the reviewing group may decide that the best candidate in a weak or overly narrow professional field should not be appointed to a tenured position at Stanford.

Deans and department chairs must try to avoid such situations by ensuring that initial searches, appointments, and reappointments 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.

5.7 Developing the Short List

When the search process has resulted in a short list of candidates, the department chair normally consults with the cognizant dean to discuss the search (including the diversity aspects of the search), the quality of the applicant pool, and the ranking of the candidates. If at this stage the candidate pool is judged insufficiently strong, no appointment should be made; the deans may authorize another search in the same or another field during a subsequent year.

*Diversity Action Plan.* All candidates known to be women or minority group members are to be discussed by the search committee. If the short list does not include women or minority candidates, the department chair is to provide the cognizant dean with a careful explanation. If a woman or minority candidate is identified in the search process whose qualifications do not fit the opening but are consistent with the standards and future direction of the department, the cognizant dean should be informed. For further information regarding the School's diversity action plan, please see the Core Policies, Diversity Action Plan.

5.8 Bringing Candidates to Campus

The search process will include visits to the campus by the leading candidates, who should have an opportunity to speak with faculty and students. The norm is three candidates, although the Dean's Office will support bringing in more, if necessary. Because of financial considerations, the department chair must gain the approval of the cognizant dean when the number of candidates exceeds three. The cognizant dean should
also be given an opportunity to meet with the finalists. Background materials on candidates (including a curriculum vitae and other relevant information) should be assembled and made available to those scheduled to meet with the candidate.

The Dean's Office can serve as a liaison in providing information to candidates on housing, benefits, and employment opportunities for partners.

5.9 Guidelines for Student Participation

Student perspectives are important to the appointment process, especially when there is little evidence available on the candidate's teaching. During the search, students should be asked to participate in seminars, colloquia, and other public occasions where candidates present their research. This gives students an opportunity to interact with the candidates both as part of a group and individually. Departments are encouraged to provide a systematic process for students to give feedback and input, and to include this input for consideration in the faculty's deliberations.

5.10 Department Discussion and Confidentiality Issues

It is expected that each Academic Council faculty member within the department will carefully and objectively evaluate the credentials of all candidates before the case is discussed or voted upon. Should a faculty member within the department write a personal letter for the file evaluating the candidate before the case is discussed or voted upon, he or she may not participate in departmental discussions regarding the search and must recuse himself or herself from voting. Exceptions to this requirement may only be granted by the cognizant dean.

The information to be included in the appointment papers should be read carefully and objectively prior to the formal vote by every faculty member voting on the candidate. The search committee will then present its recommendations for discussion and consideration by the department's faculty. To underscore Stanford's policy of vigorously protecting the sources of information contained in third-party evaluation, department chairs are required to read the following statement to their faculty before every discussion of an individual's appointment or promotion:

"The entire proceedings during which specific individuals are discussed are to be held in strict confidence by all participants. The chair of the department or his/her designee shall convey whatever information needs to be transmitted to the candidate; the opinions expressed by the department's faculty or by internal or external referees shall not be discussed with the candidate nor with other parties except as set forth in Sections VI (I) and VII of the Stanford University Faculty Handbook or when necessary for University review of the process. A breach of confidence by a participant in an appointment and promotion matter may be considered to be a serious violation of professional ethics." (See memo to department chairs from Dean Sharon R. Long,
5.11 Reviewing the Scholarship

*External referees.* Confidential letters from professional peers and students are the cornerstone of the evaluation process at every research university. Candid assessment of scholarship and teaching, without concern for breach of confidentiality, can best be obtained if explicit assurance is given that Stanford's policy is to vigorously protect the sources of information contained in third-party evaluation.

Once the referees have been selected by the department, those involved in the process should avoid communication with the referees that relates to the review process both before and after letters are sent out.

External referees evaluating the individual's scholarship are to be chosen with great care. A preliminary list of external referees should be prepared by the evaluation committee, taking into account the suggestions (positive and negative) of the candidate, as well as their own knowledge of the field. Not all of the persons suggested by the candidate will necessarily be asked to write, nor will the negative suggestions of the candidate necessarily be followed; the initial preparation of the list is in the discretion of the evaluation committee. Normally the candidate should suggest a maximum of three names for the referee list and the evaluation committee should write to all three of them. The set of names on the referee list are to be at the rank of the proposed appointment or higher. The department chair should present the list to the cognizant dean together with brief biographical sketches, including current title, institution, and stature in the field, and should identify any individuals with special ties to the candidate (e.g., mentor, collaborator, etc.). The cognizant dean may suggest and/or require that changes be made to the list in order to obtain a more appropriate evaluation of the candidate. The cognizant dean has the responsibility for determination and approval of the final list.

In constructing the referee list, a wide variety of considerations are appropriate, including but not limited to:

1. The list should include individuals with expertise very closely related to that of the candidate and those who work in the same or a closely related specialty in order to obtain critical evaluations of the scholarship.

2. The list should include individuals in related fields and those with a broader range of interests in order to obtain insights into the breadth of impact of the candidate's work.

3. The list may contain individuals (generally, no more than three), such as former mentors and current or former collaborators, who would be useful in educating readers of the file about the structure of the field.

4. Normally, an individual with a strong negative personal bias toward the candidate or a
clear conflict of interest should not be asked to serve as a referee. If for some reason letters from such individuals are judged likely to be useful and are solicited and received, the existence and nature of the bias or conflict of interest should be clearly indicated in the evaluation committee report.

5. The list should contain individuals from strong academic institutions where tenure standards are generally high, in order to get letters from people who are comfortable with reading and writing the type of frank and critical evaluations that Stanford's tenure process requires.

The number of letters from external referees in the file should be in the range of 8 to 12. To obtain this number of letters, a department may expect to solicit approximately 13 to 15 letters. All letters received by the department must typically be placed in the file, together with a list and biographical sketches of all the referees who were solicited. Letters may not be solicited by the candidate, and the candidate should not be told the identities of the external referees chosen for the evaluation process.

The wording of the letter soliciting evaluation of the candidate's scholarship and ranking is of critical importance. Referees should be asked to be quite specific in their comments about the candidate's scholarship, as well as in their comparisons and rankings of the candidate relative to four to six other named persons in the field. In soliciting opinions from external referees, the department (or the Dean's Office or the A&P Committee at later stages of review) may request special commentary on one or more items in the candidate's bibliography. Because it is extremely difficult to correct uncertainties generated by incorrectly phrased solicitation letters, protection of the candidate and the University necessitates that all such letters be expressly approved by the cognizant dean before they are mailed.

Some departments send a preliminary letter to determine a referee's willingness to provide an evaluation and, if the reply is positive, then follow up with more detailed information, including the candidate's curriculum vitae and selected publications; others send the request for evaluation without prior communication. Sample letters for both approaches are included as Appendix 5C-E and should be followed closely in all such proceedings. In all cases, referees are to be given sufficient time to respond, which will normally be at least four weeks.

Phone calls should not be made to external referees prior to letters being sent to them. Departments are to maintain a written record of all follow-up done with referees. For example, if, after receiving no response from the referee, a phone call is made to solicit a letter, then a written log of conversation is to be kept and included in the file.

If a referee chooses not to write, the communication explaining this decision (e.g., letter, e-mail message or phone conversation summary) is to be included in the file. If it becomes necessary to supplement the original referee list, the cognizant dean is to approve the addition of any new names.
Once a letter of evaluation is received, it is inappropriate for the department to ask a referee for an interpretation or clarification of his or her comments.

*Comparison Set*. As previously mentioned, the first criterion for a tenured appointment is that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship. Departments must obtain information from the referees that is useful in determining whether candidates meet this standard.

For tenured associate professors, the evaluations of the scholarship must clearly reveal that the person being proposed for appointment is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field. The referees should be asked to compare the candidate with a group of four to six people (the "comparison set") consisting both of highly regarded people in the field who are in the candidate's experience cohort, as well as more senior people who are setting the standard of excellence for the field. "How does the candidate compare with the intellectual leaders of the field and at comparable stages of those persons' careers?" is an appropriate question.

At the rank of full professor, the expectation is that the candidate has achieved the status of one of the very best in a broadly defined field. The referees should be asked to compare the candidate with a group of people who are setting the standard of excellence for the discipline.

In both cases, a useful rule of thumb is that the comparison set should include at least three of the most distinguished names from the list of referees. (In the specific letter written to a referee, the referee's name should, of course, not appear on the comparison set.) All or most of the individuals included in the comparison set should be scholars who would likely receive tenure at Stanford at the specific rank.

In constructing the comparison set, the "field" of the candidate for a tenured appointment must not be defined in overly narrow terms. Thus, a specific research topic should not define the comparison set; instead, as broad a segment as possible of the discipline should be used.

After a preliminary comparison set has been prepared by the search committee, the department chair should present the list to the cognizant dean together with brief biographical sketches. At the same time, the department chair should present the referee list. It is helpful if the description includes the year and school from which the individual received his or her highest degree, his or her current title and institution, and a description of his or her area of expertise. The cognizant dean may suggest and/or require that changes be made to the list in order to obtain a more appropriate evaluation of the candidate. The cognizant dean has the responsibility for determination and approval of the final list. The comparison set should normally range from five to seven names depending on the candidate's field(s) of interest.

*Published or unpublished scholarship*. Departments may on occasion provide external
referees with copies of the candidate's published or unpublished scholarship. If this is done, the same set of materials must be provided to each referee.

**Internal referees.** Stanford senior faculty from outside the department with special professional competence to evaluate a candidate normally should be asked to contribute to the file. Such internal referees may also be asked to comment upon the candidate's teaching performance. The file should contain brief biographical sketches of the internal referees, along with a short explanation about why the person is being asked to write. The cognizant dean has the responsibility for determination and approval of the final list. A sample letter to internal referees can be found at Appendix 5G.

**Candidate's Statement.** The candidate may include a statement (no more than five pages) describing the present and future course of his or her research and teaching. If the candidate does submit a statement, the department should send it to the external referees, along with the other materials. The evaluation committee should comment on these planned activities and potential for professional growth.

### 5.12 Reviewing the Teaching

As mentioned previously, 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.

At the tenured associate professor or tenured professor rank, the file should include substantial evidence about the candidate's teaching. While statistical data from course evaluations by students are not available at some academic institutions, the search committee should obtain direct comment on teaching from the candidate's professional peers, past (and, if possible, current) graduate students, teaching assistants, undergraduate students, and any other person knowledgeable about the candidate's teaching. Evidence of the skill of the candidate in all areas of teaching (e.g., large and small classes; undergraduate and graduate courses; lectures, seminars, laboratory classes, etc.) should be collected and considered in the appointment process. In special cases where the person has not taught before, specific comments on his or her potential lecturing ability and capacity to interact with students should be included.

Teaching evidence gathered for the appointment file should include:

- course evaluation summaries;
- a summary of the teaching commitments for at least the last three years with course titles, numbers, units, and enrollments;
- any pedagogical innovations or course development activities in which the candidate has participated;
- confidential letters from students enrolled in the candidate's courses, as well as letters from teaching assistants and graduate students for whom the candidate is an advisor or mentor;
Letters from students are a critical component of the appointment process. Using the sample letter in Appendix 5H, the following are guidelines for obtaining student letters:

- All graduate students for whom the candidate is/was an advisor or mentor are to be asked to write a letter (the candidate should provide the department with this list).
- The file should contain between six to twelve undergraduate student letters. No more than 30 undergraduate student letters should be solicited (the candidate should provide the department with this list).
- A minimum of two follow-up requests should be made to non-respondents.
- E-mail may be used to facilitate the request and follow-up procedures.
- The department should document the process in the final file. Tallies of the number of letters requested and received are to be included, along with a copy of sample solicitation letter and follow-up request letters.
- Unsolicited letters may not be included in the file.

The evaluation committee should provide an analysis of the qualitative data as well as commentary on the content of the student letters. Negative comments should be addressed.

5.13 Voting

The School permits departments, at their option, to allow all Academic Council members, with the exception of emeriti (whether or not recalled to active duty), to vote on appointments of outside scholars at any rank, tenured or non-tenured.

Departments must have a clear and consistent voting policy. Any modification of the policy needs to be discussed in advance with the Dean’s Office. Eligible department members are expected to vote. Faculty in residence should make every effort to attend the department meeting. Faculty who are away from campus for a brief period are expected to vote. Faculty on leave may discuss with chair and cognizant dean conditions for participation. Under certain circumstances, the department chair and cognizant dean may request that a person on leave participate in the voting process. Faculty away from campus should ensure that their votes are received by the chair in advance of departmental balloting. Some faculty are to recuse themselves from voting, including spouses, domestic partners, those who have written a letter on behalf of the candidate prior to departmental discussion and voting, and others negotiated with the cognizant dean and agreed upon prior to the departmental vote. Emeriti and graduate students serving on search committees may (in the discretion of the department) vote on the appointments at the committee level, and/or participate in the department’s deliberations, but they many not vote at the departmental level.

School policy allows for either secret or open ballots on appointments. Secret ballots have the advantage of reducing the effects of peer pressure on the vote, but may allow for unexplained and perhaps uninterpretable votes. Open ballots have the advantage of
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forcing each faculty member to take an open position before his or her peers on the issue. Departments should adopt one system or the other and apply it consistently in all cases. The practice of conducting a "straw vote" which, if positive, is followed by a final "unanimous vote" is prohibited. The actual yeas, nays, abstentions, and non-votes must be recorded and reported in all votes on faculty appointments. In cases involving split or negative votes, every faculty member who votes is encouraged to include a written explanation of his or her vote in the papers submitted by the department.

**Split Votes.** In cases where the vote is split, the department chair retains the authority to decide whether or not to forward a file to the Dean's Office.

**Abstentions:** If there are any abstentions, the chair should summarize the reasons for them, if practicable.

**Dissenting Votes.** If there are dissenting votes, the chair should summarize the reasons for them, if practicable. Dissenting voters are strongly encouraged to summarize their views for the file.

**Communications to the Dean regarding the case.** Faculty members who vote may communicate directly with the Dean's Office about their vote, and their written statements will be added to the papers that are considered by reviewing bodies. In such instances, however, the faculty member must provide a copy of his or her letter to the department chair, who will have the option of forwarding a written response that will also be added to the file. Both the faculty member's letter and the department chair's response must be held in strictest confidence and not be shared with other members of the department's faculty.

In extraordinary situations faculty members may communicate in writing to the Dean's Office with the assurance that their communication will be held confidential from other members of the department, including the chair. Letters of this type may be added to the papers that are considered by reviewing bodies if, in the opinion of the cognizant dean, (1) the letter discusses information or views that are relevant to the review of the appointment or promotion; (2) the letter clearly states the reason why the writer desires to communicate confidentially; and (3) the reason for confidentiality is a compelling one.

If such a letter is included in the file, the file should note that the letter is confidential and has not been reviewed by the department chair. Where appropriate, the cognizant dean should try to verify the accuracy of any problematic statements in the letter and record his or her findings in the file.

### 5.14 Submission of the Appointment Papers

The chair of the search committee is responsible for assembling the documentation necessary to complete the file. The appointment papers should be assembled in accordance with the guidelines (including sequential page numbering and font size) set forth in Stanford University Faculty Appointment Forms, 1E. Academic Council
Professoriate New Appointment Conferring Tenure or Continuing Term of Appointment. The department administrator (or person responsible for faculty affairs within the department) will have extra forms and will assist the faculty in assembling the file.

The department chair is responsible for writing the cover letter to the cognizant dean for the file. While acting as a letter of transmittal, the letter should include the pertinent reasons for the candidate’s selection and the effective date of the appointment, which is normally September 1 of the following academic year.

5.15 The Review Process

When the file has been completed, the department administrator should send the file to the Faculty Affairs Officer in the Dean's Office for review. After reviewing the materials, the Faculty Affairs Officer will return the file to the department for any revisions before copying. The department administrator can then send the original file plus 12 copies to the Dean's Office. The Dean’s Office, in its discretion, may solicit additional information regarding the file. The following chart shows (starting at the bottom) the path that papers follow after leaving the department:

The following chart shows (starting at the bottom) the path that papers follow after leaving the department:

- President (for final approval and reporting to the Board of Trustees)
- Advisory Board of the Academic Council (for review and voting)
- Provost (for submission to Advisory Board)
- Dean (final approval at School level)
- Dean and Cognizant Deans (for review and voting)
- Appointments and Promotions Committee (for review and voting)
- Assistant Dean and Faculty Affairs Officer (for review only)

All proposals for promotion to tenure in H&S are reviewed by the School’s Appointments and Promotions Committee (the A&P Committee). The Committee consists of six senior faculty members: two each from the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. The membership is appointed by the Dean and announced each year in the fall. It is wholly improper for any Academic Council member to communicated with a member of the A&P Committee concerning a pending case.

The A&P Committee is provided with the full dossier as submitted by the department and has the responsibility to review the case as carefully as possible and to make recommendations to the Dean. At its discretion, the Committee may ask the Dean’s
Office to obtain additional information from inside or outside Stanford about the candidate (this is usually done in consultation with the department and dean). Committee members may themselves gather information about the referees, the comparison list, or the candidate’s subdiscipline. The A&P Committee and the deans may review all or parts of the candidate’s primary scholarly documents. The Committee may also ask the department chair to visit an A&P meeting in order to answer questions about the department, the candidate’s scholarly subdiscipline, or other aspects of the case. The A&P Committee members vote by open ballot and make final recommendation to the Dean.

The Dean and cognizant deans then convene in executive session to consider the case and vote by open ballot. The final decision is made by the Dean, who can take action other than that recommended by the A&P Committee or cognizant deans. Both the A&P Committee’s recommendation and the Dean’s decision are ultimately matters of judgment and are based on the information available at the time of the vote.

If the decision by the Dean is positive, a cover letter is written, and the recommendation is forwarded to the Provost. If approved by the Provost, the file is forwarded to the Advisory Board. The Provost and/or the Advisory Board may request further information from the Dean and, of course, both the Provost and the Advisory Board have the prerogative of denying a positive recommendation of the Dean. When that occurs, reasons for the denial will be provided by the Provost directly to the candidate. All approved cases are submitted to the President for final review and, if approved, for reporting to the Board of Trustees.

5.16 Negative Decisions at the School Level

If the decision is negative at the School level, the Dean must inform the department chair of that decision and the reasons for it. Under normal circumstances, the candidate should be informed within one week from the time of the decision.

Reconsideration of a negative decision by the Dean will be allowed only when the department presents convincing evidence that new data bearing on the case exist, such as information that could not have been available in the original evaluation. Reconsiderations are rare and may be avoided by consultation between the chair and the cognizant dean at appropriate intervals in the search process.

5.17 The Written Offer

A draft of the written offer letter may be prepared after the departmental vote and must be forwarded to the cognizant dean for final approval. The letter must contain an explicit statement reminding the individual that such an offer is contingent upon approval of the Dean’s Office, the Provost, the Advisory Board, and the President. Candidates may be referred to the Stanford University Faculty Handbook for rules and policies relating to the faculty. A sample offer letter is included as Appendix 5J.
APPENDIX 5A: SAMPLE ADVERTISEMENT FOR TENURED ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR

FACULTY POSITION AVAILABLE

The Department of X at Stanford University is seeking applicants for a tenured faculty position in the area of AREA. Areas of interest include but are not limited to SUBDISCIPLINES. Applicants will be expected to teach courses at both the graduate and undergraduate levels in AREA.

Applicants should send curriculum vitae, bibliography, a brief statement of research interest, and names and addresses of three references to Professor NAME, ADDRESS. For full consideration, materials must be received by DATE. The term of appointment would begin DATE. Stanford University is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer.
APPENDIX 5B: SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER FOR TENURED ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

As you may know, the Department of DEPT is conducting a search for a senior faculty member in AREA. It would be very helpful to have your nominations and suggestions for such an appointment.

The first criterion for a tenured appointment at Stanford is that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship. At the rank of full professor, the expectation is that the candidate has achieved the status of one of the very best in a broadly defined field. (and/or At the rank of associate professor, the scholarship must clearly reveal that the person is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field.) Please give us your assessment of the past accomplishments and likely future contributions of those individuals whom you regard as the top four or five candidates for such a position.

The teaching record must clearly reveal 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. Your comments on the teaching strengths and weaknesses of these candidates (if known to you) would also be very helpful to us.

We know that this process imposes a time-consuming task upon you, but there really is no adequate substitute for informed judgments from professionals in the field. We greatly appreciate your help and can only promise to reciprocate when your institution requires similar assistance. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential.

We would appreciate having your letter by DATE. If you need additional time or if you have any questions, please contact me at PHONE or our staff assistant at PHONE.

Sincerely,

Faculty member
Chair, Search Committee
APPENDIX 5C: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR TENURED ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR (ask before sending materials)

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the appointment of NAME to the rank of Professor (or Associate Professor) with tenure. We would very much appreciate it if you could take the time to write a letter evaluating HER/HIS contributions in scholarship and teaching. I am enclosing HER/HIS current curriculum vitae. We know this process imposes a time-consuming task upon you, but there really is no adequate substitute for informed judgments from professionals in the field. If you will be able to evaluate Professor NAME's work, we will send a more detailed letter, along with copies of HER/HIS written work.

It would be helpful if you would let me know by DATE. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me at (650) 72X-XXXX or by e-mail at E-MAIL ADDRESS. You may also reply to this letter by FAX; our departmental FAX number is (650) 72X-XXXX.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 5D: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR TENURED ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR (to be sent after the referee agrees to write)

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Thank you very much for agreeing to assist our department in our consideration of the appointment of NAME to the rank of Professor (or Associate Professor) with tenure. Enclosed are copies of Professor NAME's current curriculum vitae, as well as the following publications:

LIST PUBLICATIONS ENCLOSED

The first criterion for a tenured appointment at Stanford is that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship. At the rank of full professor, the expectation is that the candidate has achieved the status of one of the very best in a broadly defined field. (or At the rank of associate professor, the scholarship must clearly reveal that the person is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field.) In evaluating the potential and accomplishments of Professor NAME, it would be particularly helpful if you could compare HER/HIS work with that of scholars you regard as the current and future intellectual leaders of the discipline. The following people come to mind as examples: COMPARISON SET IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER. Taking into account obvious differences in career stages, how does Professor NAME'S work compare with that of these scholars or others you might choose? The more specific your evaluation and analysis, the more helpful it will be for us.

The teaching record must clearly reveal 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. Your comments on Professor NAME'S teaching capabilities (if known to you) would be invaluable in helping us assess HER/HIS talents and accomplishments in this area.

Again, thank you for your willingness to undertake this time-consuming task. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential. It would be most useful if you would send your letter by DATE. [OPTIONAL TEXT: If it would help you to meet our deadline to respond by e-mail (to NNN@stanford.edu) or fax (at 650-72X-XXX), you may certainly do so, though we do ask that you follow up with a signed, hard copy of your letter.] If you have questions, please feel free to contact me at (650) 72X-XXXX or by e-mail at E-MAIL ADDRESS.
Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 5E: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR TENURED ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR (no prior contact)

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the appointment of NAME to the rank of Professor (or Associate Professor) with tenure. As you are aware, one of the key sources of information for making such decisions is outside letters from experts in the field. We would be grateful if you would be willing to take the time to write such a letter for us about Professor NAME. Enclosed are copies of Professor NAME's current curriculum vitae, as well as the following publications:

LIST PUBLICATIONS ENCLOSED

The first criterion for a tenured appointment at Stanford is that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship. At the rank of full professor, the expectation is that the candidate has achieved the status of one of the very best in a broadly defined field. (or At the rank of associate professor, the scholarship must clearly reveal that the person is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field.) In evaluating the potential and accomplishments of Professor NAME, it would be particularly helpful if you could compare HER/HIS work with that of scholars you regard as the current and future intellectual leaders of the discipline. The following people come to mind as examples: COMPARISON SET IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER. Taking into account obvious differences in career stages, how does Professor NAME'S work compare with that of these scholars or others you might choose? The more specific your evaluation and analysis, the more helpful it will be for us.

The teaching record must clearly reveal 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. Your comments on Professor NAME'S teaching capabilities (if known to you) would be invaluable in helping us assess HER/HIS talents and accomplishments in this area.

Again, thank you for your willingness to undertake this time-consuming task. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential. It would be most useful if you would send your letter by DATE. [OPTIONAL TEXT: If it would help you to meet our deadline to respond by e-mail (to NNN@stanford.edu) or fax (at 650-72X-XXX), you may certainly do so, though we do ask that you follow up with a
signed, hard copy of your letter.] If you have questions, please feel free to contact me at (650) 72X-XXXX or by e-mail at E-MAIL ADDRESS.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 5F: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR TENURED ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR (IN STUDIO)

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the appointment of NAME to the rank of Professor (or Associate Professor) with tenure. As you are aware, one of the key sources of information for making such decisions is outside letters from experts in the field. We would be grateful if you would be willing to take the time to write such a letter for us about Professor NAME. Enclosed are copies of Professor NAME's current curriculum vitae, as well as the following publications:

LIST PUBLICATIONS ENCLOSED

The first criterion for a tenured appointment at Stanford is that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship or artistic work. At the rank of full professor, the expectation is that the candidate has achieved the status of one of the very best in a broadly defined field. (At the rank of associate professor, the scholarship must clearly reveal that the person is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field.) In evaluating the potential and accomplishments of Professor NAME, it would be particularly helpful if you could compare HER/HIS work with that of scholars or artists you regard as the current and future leaders of the discipline. The following people come to mind as examples: COMPARISON SET IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER. Taking into account obvious differences in career stages, how does Professor NAME'S work compare with that of these scholars or others you might choose? The more specific your evaluation and analysis, the more helpful it will be for us.

The teaching record must clearly reveal 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. Your comments on Professor NAME'S teaching capabilities (if known to you) would be invaluable in helping us assess HER/HIS talents and accomplishments in this area.

Again, thank you for your willingness to undertake this time-consuming task. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential. It would be most useful if you would send your letter by DATE. [OPTIONAL TEXT: If it would help you to meet our deadline to respond by e-mail (to NNN@stanford.edu) or fax (at 650-72X-XXX), you may certainly do so, though we do ask that you follow up with a signed, hard copy of your letter.] If you have questions, please feel free to contact me at

Revised 11/1/03
(650) 72X-XXXX or by e-mail at E-MAIL ADDRESS.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 5G: SAMPLE LETTER TO INTERNAL REFEREES FOR TENURED ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR

DATE

NAME
MAILCODE

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the appointment of NAME as a Professor of (or Associate Professor of) DEPARTMENT. We understand that you have direct knowledge of NAME's scholarship (or teaching or whatever). We would be most appreciative if you could take the time to write a letter about how NAME would contribute to the University, in scholarship, teaching, and leadership.

The first criterion for a tenured appointment at Stanford is that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship. At the rank of full professor, the expectation is that the candidate has achieved the status of one of the very best in a broadly defined field. (or At the rank of associate professor, the scholarship must clearly reveal that the person is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field.)

The teaching record must clearly reveal 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. Your comments on Professor NAME'S teaching capabilities (if known to you) would be invaluable in helping us assess HER/HIS talents and accomplishments in this area.

Since the department must consider this matter in MONTH, we would very much like to have your response by DATE. We appreciate your help. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee

Revised 11/1/03
APPENDIX 5G: SAMPLE LETTER TO INTERNAL REFEREES FOR TENURED ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR

DATE

NAME
MAILCODE

Dear Professor NAME:

Our department is considering the appointment of NAME as a Professor of (or Associate Professor of) DEPARTMENT. We understand that you have direct knowledge of NAME’s scholarship (or teaching or whatever). We would be most appreciative if you could take the time to write a letter about how NAME would contribute to the University, in scholarship, teaching, and leadership.

The first criterion for a tenured appointment at Stanford is that the individual has achieved true distinction in scholarship. At the rank of full professor, the expectation is that the candidate has achieved the status of one of the very best in a broadly defined field. (or At the rank of associate professor, the scholarship must clearly reveal that the person is not only among the best in his/her experience cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field.)

The teaching record must clearly reveal 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 or laboratory, advising, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. Your comments on Professor NAME’S teaching capabilities (if known to you) would be invaluable in helping us assess HER/HIS talents and accomplishments in this area.

Since the department must consider this matter in MONTH, we would very much like to have your response by DATE. We appreciate your help. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 5H: SAMPLE LETTER TO STUDENTS FOR TENURED APPOINTMENT

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Ms./Mr. NAME:

Our department is considering the appointment of NAME to the tenured rank of Associate Professor or Professor. We place a great deal of weight on the individual's performance as a teacher, not only as a classroom instructor, but also as a research or academic advisor, or as a dissertation committee member. As a consequence the department is soliciting letters from students who have had classes with Professor NAME or who have otherwise studied or worked with him/her.

It would be a great help to us if you could write such a letter. In your letter, we would like to indicate the nature and extent of your contacts with Professor NAME, then indicate what you feel are his/her strengths and/or weaknesses as an instructor, advisor, or committee member from your perspective.

We would appreciate hearing from you by DATE. Letters of response should be addressed to Professor CCC, VVV Department, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-MMMM, or sent by e-mail to NNN@stanford.edu. It is Stanford’s policy and practice to keep such communications strictly confidential. We are soliciting a number of such letters and these will be an important part of the documentation. Thank you for your assistance. We appreciate your time and effort in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Evaluation Committee
APPENDIX 5I: H&S SEARCH AUTHORIZATION REQUEST FORM

Coming Soon
APPENDIX 5J: SAMPLE OFFER LETTER TO TENURED ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSORS

DATE

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear Professor NAME:

It gives me great pleasure to offer you an appointment at Stanford as Professor (or Associate Professor) of DEPT beginning September 1, 200X. This letter outlines our offer to you.

Stanford will provide you with a starting nine-month salary of $XX,000. (If you wish to offer the candidate a supplemental salary, this is an appropriate place.)

[OPTIONAL: The Dean's Office will provide you with research support in the amount of $XX,000 to be spent over seven years. These funds may be used for any legitimate research expense, such as travel, books, equipment, and so forth. Please note that all items, including books, purchased with Stanford funds from a faculty member's research support account remain the property of Stanford University. If items purchased exceed the capital asset threshold (currently $1,500), they must be properly accounted for in accordance with University administrative guidelines.]

In addition to your base salary, Stanford will provide assistance to you in connection with housing. These programs are available to you upon the final approval of your appointment as a regular full-time faculty member. Stanford has several housing programs designed to assist faculty with the purchase of a home within a defined geographical area. At present, this area includes the city of San Francisco. You are eligible to participate in all University housing programs, subject to existing eligibility requirements and program guidelines. In addition to the standard loan programs, you are eligible for the Housing Allowance Program ("HAP") income supplement. HAP is a taxable fringe benefit available to certain individuals who do not already own a house within the Stanford area. The maximum term of the allowance is nine years, and the allowance declines on a linear basis by one-ninth of the first year amount each year throughout the duration of the term. The amount of the benefit depends on your 9-month starting salary and the year of purchase. We suggest that you contact Faculty Staff Housing directly at (650) 725-6893 for specific information regarding housing programs.

The Dean's Office will provide you with $XXXX toward the purchase of computer equipment. When you arrive, a staff member from the H&S Technical Support Team can help you determine an appropriate choice of computer from currently available models. Equipment purchased with these funds remain the property of Stanford University, but can be located in your office or at home, as you prefer. In addition, a representative from the University's central computing organization will provide an orientation to Stanford's
information technology resources.

Stanford will pay the costs, against actual receipts, of your expenses in moving here from XXX, up to a total of $XXXX. The University has a contract with several moving companies. For more information on documenting expenses and getting in touch with an appropriate moving company, please contact XX, our department administrator at (650) 72X-XXXX. As you may know, the IRS considers reimbursements for moves taxable income in some instances. Therefore, you should consult the relevant IRS publications before embarking on your move.

Stanford provides a range of health and other benefits for faculty in our "Educated Choices" program. This is a cafeteria-style benefits program allowing for choice among various types of health, insurance and retirement benefits. We are sending program brochures under separate cover.

Faculty at Stanford currently accrue sabbatical credits toward sabbatical leave every quarter, at a rate that entitles them to one academic year at half-salary for every six years of on-duty service. Some faculty prefer to wait until they have accumulated a year of leave at half-pay; others prefer to take a quarter off every few years.

The regular teaching load is currently XX courses each year. The course mix and schedule for each professor is worked out with our faculty, taking into account the needs of the curriculum as well as each professor's particular preferences. In addition, faculty are expected to direct various independent reading or research projects, undergraduate honors theses, M.A. projects, and Ph.D. theses. (USE THIS LAST SENTENCE TO DEFINE YOUR EXPECTATIONS OF THE CANDIDATE'S ROLE)

One of the major resources to support your teaching at Stanford is the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). CTL provides an infrastructure of support for all faculty in their pursuit of teaching excellence, including midterm small group evaluations, classroom observations, videotaping, a teaching newsletter and handbook, and one-on-one consultations. You can explore CTL's offerings and helpful information on teaching at its website http://ctl.stanford.edu.

Many of the University's general policies and regulations for faculty are set forth in the Stanford University Faculty Handbook and in the Humanities and Sciences Faculty Handbook, both of which are available online and copies of which will also be available to you when you arrive.

As is the case for all appointments at Stanford, this offer is contingent upon final approval by the Provost, the University Advisory Board of the Academic Council, and the President, which we anticipate receiving in QUARTER NAME. Your appointment then would be reported to the Board of Trustees. In the interim, the papers will be moving through several intermediate stages. First they must be reviewed for approval by the H&S Deans. This should be completed in MONTH. The papers will then be forwarded to the Provost's Office.
Finally (and despite the necessary logistical content), I hope we have conveyed our sincere enthusiasm about the possibility of your joining our department. We do hope that you find the terms of our offer reasonable and attractive.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (650) 72X-XXXX if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Faculty Member
Chair, Department of XX

cc: NAME, Cognizant Dean
Jim Henry, Director of Finance
Mary Kate Wood, Faculty Affairs Officer

Below are some web addresses that you might find useful:

Humanities and Sciences Faculty Handbook:

Stanford University Faculty Handbook:
http://facultyhandbook.stanford.edu/

Research Policy Handbook for Stanford University:
http://www.stanford.edu/dept/DoR/RPH.html

Stanford University Faculty and Staff Housing:
http://fsh.stanford.edu/

Resources for New and Junior Faculty:
http://jrfaculty.stanford.edu/

IRS Moving Expenses: