**Unit/Department Head** **Promotion and Tenure to Associate Report**

**Guidance and Template**

This report should consist of two parts:

1. A short administrative summary of the department’s handling of and position on the case;
2. the department head’s independent evaluation of the case.

It is neither necessary nor desirable to duplicate material presented by the department committee. Members of internal review committees will appreciate additional insights provided by the department head that help them to interpret the file, particularly in cases of conflicting opinions among the external reviewers and/or department faculty. It is the responsibility of the department head to independently analyze any diverging opinions and indicate the reasoning behind their conclusions about the merits of the case.

# *\*Use your departmental letterhead*

# To: <DEAN>

# From: <UNIT/DEPARTMENT HEAD NAME, UNIT NAME>

# Re: Department Head’s Report for <CANDIDATE’S NAME>, Tenure and Promotion to Associate

# Administrative Summary

If the department committee report does not do so, the department head should provide:

* A brief explanation of the unit’s review process and any special considerations involved with the review
* Clarification of any special conditions of the appointment (timeline, years of credit, and/or tenure clock extensions) or special duties and obligations for which the candidate’s performance is to be evaluated
* An explanation of who in the unit was eligible to vote on the candidate
* A summary of any formal faculty discussion preceding the official vote
* An explanation for any abstentions, recusals, and for the absence of votes from any faculty (e.g. spouse, sabbatical leave, etc.). Explain any unusual features of the departmental vote.
* Votes at the department level on tenure cases must be by signed and secret ballot, with only the tally revealed to the voting faculty and recorded on the Voting Summary.

# Department Head’s Independent Evaluation and Recommendation

The department head should objectively and honestly discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate.

## Assess Candidate’s Research and Scholarship and/or Creative and Artistic Achievement

In addition to conveying the department’s assessment of the case, the head’s report should do the following to facilitate the next review steps, which are by colleagues increasingly distant from the candidate’s academic specialty:

* Explain multiple-authorship conventions: In those disciplines in which co-authorship of research is common, it is essential that the candidate’s statement, as well as department heads and promotion committee reports, explain how the list of names translates to contributions. This includes, as appropriate:
* the kinds of contributions that individual authors have made (e.g., overall intellectual leadership of a big project vs design and execution of a particular part of it by a colleague or student)
* the significance of the order in which authors are listed
* the co-authors’ rank or relationship to the candidate (e.g. former advisors/mentors, senior faculty colleagues, junior faculty colleagues, post-doctoral fellows, Ph.D. students, or undergraduate students)
* the frequency of single vs multiple authorship in the candidate’s sub-field and the department’s standards with respect to co-authored work
	+ Put the candidate’s research/creative activity contributions in context:
		- explain where the research fits into the field and in what way it is influential
		- rankings or prestige of journals or venues
		- outline expectations regarding external funding for research (both within the field or subfield, and within the candidate’s department)
		- provide standard measures of quality or appropriateness for venues of published work (publishing houses or series for books, journal rankings for articles)
	+ Be explicit about the status of unpublished work:
		- For the UO in general, and for CAS more specifically, an article or book manuscript is properly considered for promotion if, and only if, there is (1) a commitment to publish by a journal or press, reflected in a contract or editor’s letter, a copy of which is included in the file; and (2) the manuscript has been completed and requires no additional revision beyond copy editing; this must be confirmed through the inclusion in the file of a letter from the editor verifying the article’s or book’s status as “in production” or “in press.” For these reasons, we request that the file does not label a work “forthcoming” but rather relies on the more precise terms “in progress,” “in press” or “in production.”
		- If a tenure case depends on a book, but the manuscript does not meet both of these criteria, the case will likely encounter serious difficulty. Cases of promotion to full Professor that depend on a book should be delayed if the manuscript does not clearly meet these criteria at the time the file is submitted.
	+ Internal and external grants/fellowships/awards record

## Assess Candidate’s Teaching

* + - Describe the standard course load and teaching expectations in the department (including norms for class sizes), the candidate’s contribution to the department’s teaching mission, and any extenuating circumstances that affected the candidate’s teaching record (e.g., teaching assignment policies, special releases as a result of research awards, etc.)

## Assess Candidate’s Service

* + - Describe the candidate’s contributions to service at all relevant levels.

## Assess Candidate’s Contributions to DEI

* + - Describe the candidate’s contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

## Other Comments

The report should also address any matters not adequately addressed by the department committee report. Such matters could include the following:

* Stature and unique perspectives of the external reviewers
* Additional observations about the teaching and service records

##  Conclusion and Recommendation

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Unit/Department Head Signature Date