



CHECKLIST FOR DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR NOMINATIONS

Please note as of June 2017, **REVISED** guidelines for the selection and review of Distinguished Professors are available on the CUNY website <http://www2.cuny.edu/about/alumni-students-faculty/faculty/distinguished-professors/nomination-guidelines/> and provide detailed information on selection criteria and other matters. The purpose of the checklist below is to summarize and clarify the materials that are to be included in the nomination/application packet, for the convenience of everyone involved with preparing the packet for submission. The materials generally fall within three categories: (1) supporting documents that originate with the candidate and the college, (2) letters from external referees; and (3) representative work samples.

Nominee's Name _____

Nominee's College _____

Date of Submission to OAA _____

Checklist of Materials from the College and Candidate

For everything listed below, include ONE set of unbound originals and **FOUR** sets of bound copies with cover page detailing the college and name of nominee. Please submit materials neatly, i.e., two-sided copies if possible, bound copies in either three ring binders or spiral binders for easy distribution to committees. No staples, binder or paper clips, post-it notes, or flags will be accepted.

- Complete CV of the candidate, with full listings of degrees, positions held, and all relevant publications
- A representative sample of the candidate's work (see section below for details)
- Letter of nomination from College President
- Letter in support of nomination from Chief Academic Officer
- Letter from candidate's Department Chair soliciting letters of recommendation from external reviewers. This should be neutral in tone and should not suggest that referees extol the candidate and his/her work
- Documentation of votes by all committees including dates, committee names, and vote totals and the processes used up to the point of submission of the case from the College, including an account of the process by which external evaluators' letters were solicited;
- A minimum of at least ten (10) external letters of recommendation from external reviewers (sometimes called "referees"; see section below for details on criteria). The review letters should include a comparison of the nominee to a specific list of other distinguished scholars in the field and provide a clearly articulated rationale for the assessment. Reviewers should acknowledge any prior contact with the nominee; they **should not** ordinarily be coauthors with the candidate, and they cannot be from any CUNY college.

Note: The evaluations submitted by the College are critical. The evaluators must be among the most highly respected persons in the field, and they must be objective, without reason for bias; for example, as mentioned above, evaluators should not ordinarily be coauthors with the candidate. Again, reviewers also cannot be from any CUNY college.

- CVs for each external reviewer
- Master list of external reviewers, with their titles (see form below)
- Paragraph description of the entire process used in obtaining the letters from external reviewers

Representative Work Samples

- A significant sample of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative work, as appropriate, and any additional evidence of exceptional performance by national and international standards of excellence should be submitted, ideally **four copies of each**, however please limit the materials to one standard letter-sized box if possible. If relevant materials must exceed one box, please contact OAA for further instructions.

Letters from External Reviewers

The guidelines state: "Campuses should seek at least ten (10) external letters of evaluation from full professors or people of comparable standing outside the academy who are widely recognized authorities in the nominee's field and can provide objective analyses of the nominee's qualifications. As part of the nomination materials sent to the University, the campuses should provide the evaluating committee with each reviewer's vita. The review letters should include a comparison of the nominee to a specific list of other distinguished scholars in the field and provide a clearly articulated rationale for the assessment. Reviewers should acknowledge any prior contact with the nominee; they should not ordinarily be coauthors with the candidate, and they cannot be from any CUNY college."

- There must be **at least ten external letters of evaluation from reviewers** that satisfy the following qualifications:
 - The majority of letters should be from full professors or the equivalent with very distinguished careers (e.g., holders of named chairs). See TIPS below regarding referees outside the academy.
 - The letters should come from a geographically wide selection of institutions, given that DPs are expected to have national and, where appropriate, international reputations.
- External letters should **NOT** be from any of the following:
 - CUNY faculty members,
 - People who have collaborated with the candidate on research or publications,
 - People who served on the candidate's dissertation committee,
 - People who have a close relationship with the candidate (e.g., relatives or business partners).

Tips for collecting External Reviewer Letters:

- It is wise to request letters from more than ten reviewers, because some might decline or fail to produce letters on time or it may be found that a letter reveals disqualifying connections with the candidate (such as having coauthored articles).
- Note that for some candidates, reviewers from outside the academy may be appropriate, depending on the nature of the candidate's research and its impact in other professional arenas.
- Colleges should ask reviewers who respond by email to send a PDF of their letter on their institution's letterhead.

Master List of External Reviewers (please complete)

Note: The evaluations submitted by the College are critical. The evaluators must be among the most highly respected persons in the field, and they must be objective, without reason for bias; for example, as mentioned above, evaluators should not ordinarily be coauthors with the candidate. Again, reviewers also cannot be from any CUNY college.

#	Name	Current Rank	Current Institution	No Co-authored Papers w/Nominee	Not on Nominee's Dissertation Committee	No Other Close Relationship	CV
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							