Report of Ad Hoc Committee Concerning the 
(Promotion/Appointment) of ____ Professor NAME in the Department/School  
Of __________ 

Date

The ad hoc committee recommends (unanimously/by a split vote of 2-1) that the department support the candidacy of _______ for (promotion/appointment) to the rank of ______. The Committee consists of Professors W (chair), X, Y, and Z.

Bulleted list of candidate’s strengths and weaknesses

Relationship and significance of field and subfield to the discipline

Candidate’s professional development, current interests, likely future directions

Significance of candidate’s research agenda to developments in the field (elaborate on the role of the candidate in collaborative ventures)

Candidate’s scholarly trajectory including specific contributions, their impact and breadth

Individual members of peer group in the discipline and candidate’s ranking therein (explain reasons for selecting each member of the candidate’s peer group)

Disputes in the discipline that are relevant to this review

Nature of scholarly productivity, describing both the rate and the type of contributions (explain any online educational efforts, examples of public scholarship, or other modes of expression to be evaluated as components of the candidate’s overall professional productivity)

Candidate’s effectiveness as teacher, contributor to graduate program, department, and discipline (include both quantitative information and evaluative statements from student surveys as well as input from other faculty members, if available)

Recommendation to voting faculty

Signatures:

Professor W (chair)       Date

Professor X       Professor Y       Professor Z
Date              Date              Date

Attachments:
• Statement from academic unit where candidate has a secondary/joint appointment or participates in interdisciplinary activities
• Description of the broad field and its role in the discipline
• Size of field and subfield
• Statement of journal and press quality
• Tabular summary of teaching evaluations
• Description of all evaluators (documenting the standing of the evaluator as a leader in the field and including a rationale for why each evaluator was selected; discuss any possible mitigating factors if there are an unusually high number of declines)
• Reappointment letter and committee report (for internal tenure cases)
• Search committee report (for new external appointments involving tenure)
• Names of the Last 5 Tenured in the department (CVs to be included in a separate folder in dossier)