



CHECKLIST FOR DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR CANDIDATES

The guidelines for the selection and review of Distinguished Professors are available on the [CUNY website](#) and provide detailed information on selection criteria and other matters. The purpose of the checklist below is to summarize and clarify the items that are to be included in the submission materials. The materials generally fall within three categories: (1) supporting documents that originate with the nominee and the college, (2) letters from external referees; and (3) representative work samples.

Timeline: All Distinguished Professor candidates whose complete dossiers are received by the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) by November 1st will be reviewed in the current academic year, and if recommended, they will be forwarded to the CUNY Board of Trustees' Education Policy Committee and Board of Trustees in May/June of that academic year. Distinguished Professor nominees whose dossiers are received by OAA after November 1st will be reviewed in the following academic year. OAA will continue to accept nominations on a rolling basis.

Candidate's Name _____

Candidate's College _____

Date of Submission to OAA _____

Checklist of Materials to be submitted by the College

All materials listed below must be submitted in electronic format. For instructions on this format and how to submit the materials via Dropbox, please contact [Scott Ayers](#). Please also see the tips on page 2 of this document.

- ☐ The candidate's current and complete curriculum vitae (CV), checked for accuracy. The CV must include all degrees earned, all positions held and complete citations for all scholarly/creative activities (e.g., publications, exhibits, performances) and a list of all awards and honors.
- ☐ A representative sample of the candidate's scholarly/creative work and any additional evidence of exceptional performance by national and international standards of excellence.
- ☐ Letter of recommendation from the college President.
- ☐ Letter of recommendation from the college Provost/Chief Academic Officer.
- ☐ Letter used by the candidate's department Chair to solicit letters of recommendation from external reviewers. This letter should be neutral in tone and should not suggest that referees praise the nominee and his/her work.
- ☐ Documentation of votes by all college-required committees including dates, committee names, and vote totals, along with a description of the processes used up to the point of submission of the case from the college.
- ☐ Paragraph that describes the process by which evaluators' letters were solicited, including, where applicable, an indication of the evaluators who were suggested by the candidate.
- ☐ A minimum of ten (10) external letters of recommendation from external reviewers. (see section below for details on criteria)
- ☐ Full CV for each external reviewer.

- ☐ Master list of external reviewers with their titles. (see form below)
- ☐ A draft resolution for the Board of Trustees (see the [CUNY DP Resolutions Guide](#) for rules and guidelines for drafting resolutions)

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 nominee, and they cannot be from any CUNY college.”

- There must be at least ten (10) 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). For some nominees, reviewers from outside the academy may be appropriate, depending on the nature of the nominee’s research and its impact in other professional arenas.
- 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 or administrators,
 - 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 nominee (such as having coauthored articles).
- Colleges should ask reviewers to send a PDF of their letter on their institution’s letterhead.

TIPS for submitting electronic materials via Dropbox

- Items from the **Submission Checklist** should be organized and labeled as **separate PDF files**, e.g., the CV is one file, and the President’s Letter is one file. External review letters can be all in one file, so can external review CVs. These separate files should be placed in ONE folder labeled “**Core Materials**”. Please do not submit one large PDF file.
- For all supporting materials such as books, articles, journals, and other supporting documentation, please create another folder labeled “**Supplemental Materials**” to include work sample PDF files. Please keep supplemental materials to a minimum. However, include works that strongly represent the professor’s scholarly achievements.

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 nominee. Again, reviewers also cannot be from any CUNY college.

#	Name	Current Rank	Current Institution	No Co-authorship with Nominee	Not a Member of Nominee's Dissertation Committee	No Close Professional or Personal Relationship	CV
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							