

Review Process for Tenure

Permission to initiate a review for tenure must be obtained from the dean, because it commits the college or school to long-term support of the position. When a review for promotion to tenure is conducted, it is required to be thorough and well-documented, since the decision that is made is of far-reaching importance both to the individual and to the university. The first step in the process is a review of the candidate by the faculty of the department. For this purpose, and with the assistance of the candidate, a complete vita and list of publications are assembled, together with copies of the most relevant of the publications. Typically the candidate is asked to submit statements of goals and achievements in research, teaching, advising and extension/service. Documentation of success in teaching is collected, in the form of course-evaluation questionnaires and letters from both selected and randomly chosen graduate and undergraduate students. Evidence of service to the community, the department, the college, and the university is compiled. Letters are solicited from colleagues in the university and from outside experts to provide an evaluation of the quality of the candidate's creative work and its impact on the scholarship of the field.

The aim of the review is to assess the achievements of the individual during his or her probationary period, as well as the promise shown for growth and further achievement. The detailed procedures by which the department conducts its assessment vary, but they must include the basic elements mentioned above as well as: (1) making the documentation gathered during the review available to the tenured faculty members of the department, (2) holding a meeting of the tenured faculty members for the announced purpose of discussing and voting on the promotion in question, and (3) taking the vote. There is no general prescription for interpreting the vote; some departments do not consider such a vote positive unless the margin of positive over negative votes is quite large. In any case, the department chairperson is not bound by the vote, though he or she must report it to the dean. The chairperson represents the department in making and explaining to the dean the department's recommendation for or against the promotion.

If, after a tenure review is carried out, the department's tentative tenure decision is negative, it is communicated to the candidate before being given to the dean, and the candidate has an opportunity to request a reconsideration by the department. The procedures for this are attached as appendix five or can be accessed at <https://blogs.cornell.edu/deanoffaculty/files/2016/01/NEGTENUREDECISION-205n6kl.pdf> on the University Faculty website.

After the department's initial review and any reconsideration are completed, the decision is reviewed at the college level by the dean. If the department's recommendation is positive, the dean must appoint an *ad hoc* committee of faculty members outside the department to study the evidence and advise him or her in

reaching a decision. Even if the department's recommendation is negative, the candidate may still request that the dean appoint the *ad hoc* committee.