

Supplemental Instructions for HHS Unit Heads About Faculty Promotion Documents

(Approved by: Dean Aaron Bowman, 8/18/2026)

To assist both junior faculty who are writing their promotion documents and the senior faculty who are helping them, a set of PowerPoint slides with the title, “Information on HHS Promotion Documents” has been created (at https://www.purdue.edu/hhs/faculty/promotion_tenure.html). The slides include repeated references to the head’s role in helping junior faculty prepare the documents that are submitted to campus promotion committees. Therefore, those slides are an essential resource for unit heads who are assisting with promotion documents.

However, because the slides are intended primarily to help promotion candidates, they say little about three parts of the promotion process that are the primary responsibility of the unit heads who chair primary committees. The first is the brief section of President’s Office Form 36 (also known as “Faculty Promotion Form 36”) that provides the head’s comments on a promotion candidate. The second is the portion of the “Faculty P and T Evaluation in COVID-19 Guidance” (at <https://www.purdue.edu/provost/faculty/promotion/covid-evaluation.html>) that is specifically for promotion committee members and their chairs. The last part is the solicitation of letters of evaluation of a promotion candidate from experts at other institutions. Those three parts of the promotion process are the focus of this document. Text that is new or revised for this version of the document is **in red type**.

Part 1 – Comments by Head of Department (or School)

Item 8 of President’s Office Form 36 is for “Comments by Head of Department (or School).” Specific instructions for Item 8 come from the “[Instructions for Use with Faculty Promotion Form 36](#).” The Form 36 instructions say that the head’s comments for Item 8, “Normally . . . will be evaluative in nature because factual data are to be presented in attached pages.” They add, “The department head should offer their assessment of the candidate’s scholarship and excellence in Discovery, Learning, and Engagement as appropriate.” they may comment on their answers to the questions in 8b, and “Append their signature.” Almost always, heads should include comments on the vote of the primary committee and on the evaluations of the external experts. **If needed, those comments can continue and/or be placed onto an additional page.**

Former Vice Provost Peter Hollenbeck provided “informal guidance” for the head’s comments in an August 21, 2020, email message. The guidance was specifically for heads who endorsed a nomination for promotion “despite various apparent weaknesses in the case.” His comments are clear and comprehensive, so they are quoted in full:

“Dear Colleagues,

As the 2020-21 promotion and tenure cycle looms ahead of us, I would like to address an issue with you as the chairs of the primary and area committees: the summary sections on the front page of form 36. These comments from heads and deans are important for members of the committee at the next stage to understand how the previous committees arrived at their votes, and how the chairs arrived at their recommendations in each case. In 2019-20, as in past years, the majority of the head’s and dean’s summaries on the form 36 were very clear, and expedited the handling of the case at the next level. Indeed, a lot of them were slam-dunks: Of the cases that arrived at the campus promotions committee, fully half had had unanimous votes at their primary committee; nearly 60% did at their area committee.

However, a minority of cases were recommended to the next level for approval despite various apparent weaknesses in the case: mixed votes at one or both levels; questions about the strength of an aspect of the impact; less-than unanimous support from external referees. In order for these worthy cases to be evaluated accurately when they move forward, it is essential that committee chairs summarize the reasons for their positive endorsement. This could mean relaying and critiquing the reasons for a minority of negative votes, explaining why the majority view was fair and accurate, or rationalizing one or more negative external reviewers. I offer here a couple of fictional, generic examples of helpful reasoning that might appear in a form 36 summary for cases such as these:

“The primary committee was split, 6 voting against promotion and 16 in favor. These negative votes reflected questions about the impact of Dr. Smith’s research, which is broadly interdisciplinary. Although she could be viewed as a zoologist like her colleagues, her work in fact spans evolutionary biology, development, physiology and behavior, as well as traditional zoology, and is published in top journals across these varied fields. Although this interdisciplinary impact is highly valued by the Department of Zoology, some committee members who have a more traditional disciplinary focus tend to overlook impact outside of their specialty. This caused them to discount some of her most highly-cited work, and produced a number of negative votes. It is also important to note that her letters came from eminent zoologists at AAU aspirational peer institutions and were uniformly positive and recommended promotion. I strongly concur with the letters and the majority of the committee who felt that the breadth, quantity, and impact of her published research warrants her promotion to Associate Professor.”

“Professor Jones works in the area of Oenology and has made major contributions to two problems in the field: (i) the tightness issue in bottle corking and its implications for breakage/product loss and ullage; (ii) the early detection and control of the bunch rot fungus Botrytis cinerea. His letter writers all point to the high quality and impact of his work, although a few (3 out of 9), while generally positive, point out that his quantity of publications could be higher given time since the last promotion. However, I note that referees from the top institutions on the list are actually the most enthusiastic about his record, and clearly appreciate the contributions of the work. The discussion in the primary and area committee reflected the letters, in that it noted the high quality of his published research, but was somewhat critical of the quantity, which some viewed as low. I would add that his teaching is outstanding, his mentorship exemplary, and his service to the department and college has been frequent and effective. I settle at the position of 80% of the primary and area voters, and 6 distinguished referees from outstanding institutions, and strongly support his case for promotion to full Professor of Viticulture.”

Part 2 - COVID-Related Guidance for Promotion Committees

*****The COVID statement will no longer be permitted after AY 2026-27.**

The University statement, “Faculty P and T Evaluation in COVID-19 Guidance” (at <https://www.purdue.edu/provost/faculty/promotion/covid-evaluation.html>) includes one section with “Guidelines for faculty” and a later section with “Guidance for chairs and members of primary and area committees.” That latter section is stated succinctly, so the relevant portions of it are simply quoted below.

“The COVID-19 pandemic has affected every aspect of the University’s operation and, in turn, every faculty member. We are deeply committed to the well-being and success of our faculty and acknowledge the differential and, in many cases, negative impacts of the pandemic on their work and career development. Therefore, in considering decisions about promotion and tenure, the University must evaluate each candidate’s research, teaching, engagement, and service activities within the context of the pandemic.

Toward that end, beginning in Fall 2021, promotion candidates will have an opportunity to describe how the pandemic has affected their professional accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching, engagement, and service in a Professional COVID-19 Impact Statement. In addition, the Provost’s Office will recommend language to use when soliciting external letters, to remind evaluators of the pandemic’s impact. See elsewhere in this document for the particulars. These considerations will remain in place through AY 2025-26.”

Rationale:

For academic promotion at Purdue, we assess both the record of achievements of faculty candidates and their potential for the future (“a sustainable and impactful record”). For example, for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, our policy states that the candidate must demonstrate, “a significant record of accomplishment...and promise of continued professional growth and recognition.” In weighing the promotion to Full Professor, the University also evaluates whether the candidate has fulfilled that potential.

We recognize that during the pandemic period, circumstances beyond our control have, in many cases, changed both the distribution of faculty effort and what can be achieved in discovery, teaching, and engagement. This in turn affects the amount of information available to make our collective judgment about a faculty member’s future trajectory. We must accept that our inferences about a promotion candidate’s potential could be based on less information than in the past. We cannot simply rely on our traditional milestones and markers, but must take care to evaluate the candidate’s record in light of the challenges created by the pandemic.

While the information available to make these important decisions about promotion and tenure has changed, our standards have not changed. The University still expects

excellence, as demonstrated by visible, meaningful, and impactful contributions to the research, teaching, and engagement missions of our institution.

And so, we expect promotion and tenure evaluation committees to consider the specific impacts COVID-19 has presented for individual faculty members and to evaluate their records holistically and in context. While in a real sense this is what we expect every year in the evaluation of candidates for promotion and tenure, it has never been more important than at this time, given the widely differing ways that COVID-19 has affected individual faculty.

Implementation:

1. Attend to the Professional COVID-19 Impact Statement of each faculty member who submits one. This will be an addition to the promotion document and will not displace other content.
2. Note the range and depth of specific obstacles to faculty productivity, and note the Provost's statement. Recognize that COVID-19 had widely varying impacts across our faculty. Attend to how each candidate overcame these obstacles.
3. Be cognizant of the additional effort required for faculty to pivot their teaching modality, and to other potential burdens associated with carrying out their teaching, research, engagement, and service responsibilities under the conditions of the past year. Recognize all that they did to keep their department, college, and Purdue operating during the pandemic.
4. Be cautious in the assessment of teaching evaluations for terms affected by the pandemic. Faculty will have faced changing their teaching modality as well as managing highly stressed students, and different faculty will have had to adapt or accommodate to different degrees. Note that for the disrupted spring 2020 semester, the University suspended summative evaluations completely (see the 3/25/2020 memo).
5. "Bracket" the COVID-19-effect era, consider where it falls along each candidate's career trajectory and, in subsequent years, how far out its effects persist.
6. For fair and equitable assessment of each promotion candidate's impact and potential, evaluation decisions for promotion should be:
 - a. Individual (as always)
 - b. Holistic (as always)
 - c. Forward-looking (candidate's future potential)
 - d. Discipline-specific, discipline-informed (they know best what has been possible)
 - e. Guided by our clear principles and language, both central and local."

More information about the Professional COVID-19 Impact Statement is provided in the “Information on HHS Promotion Documents” that was mentioned earlier.

Part 3 – Section D: SEA 202 Assessment

To meet the requirements of Indiana Law, the following additional information should be included.

- a) The department/school head’s assessment of answers to the following two questions. Heads should answer these questions based on past annual reviews, and any additional information that they have received pertinent to this assessment.
 - 1. Has the individual exposed students to scholarly works from a variety of political or ideological frameworks that may be within and applicable to the given academic discipline? (Yes/No)
 - 2. Has the individual refrained from subjecting students to views and opinions concerning matters not related to the discipline or assigned course of instruction? (Yes/No)
- b) A summary of any additional information pertinent to this assessment. Examples include a summary of any complaints received, and their resolution.
- c) The candidate’s optional response to the above items.

Please note that if the Form 36 Part II Packet is provided to External Referees, this section should NOT be included.

Part 4 - Letters from External Referees

A few sentences about the letters of evaluation of promotion candidates by experts from other institutions are in the External Review Letters section of the “Instructions for Use with Faculty Promotion Form 36.” More detailed instructions are in the current versions of the provost’s memos on promotion and tenure, which are available at <https://www.purdue.edu/provost/faculty/promotion/index.html>.

The provost’s memos address six issues concerning the letters by external referees: (1) the qualifications necessary for an external referee; (2) the procedures for identifying possible referees; (3) the dean’s approval, when a promotion candidate is a tenure-track or tenured faculty member, of a set of possible external referees; (4) the special letters that may be included in some candidate’s documents; and (5) the requirements for the letter soliciting an evaluation from a possible referee; and (6) the placement of the referees’ letters and some related materials in a promotion document.

In the following paragraphs, statements taken directly from the provost’s memos are printed in regular type; any instructions specific to HHS are printed in **boldface**.

Qualifications of an External Referee

1. External letters should be collected for all tenure and/or promotion cases. External letters should typically be sought from peer or aspirational peer universities. Examples of peers and aspirational peers include members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) and leading international institutions. Letters may also be sought from faculty members at top academic programs from other institutions, and preeminent experts at other institutions, although justification in the form of expertise credentials is expected in all cases. Deans should certify that the lists of letter-writers meet these expectations for each case going forward in their college. A minimum of 8 letters is expected for tenure and/or promotion cases, and documentation should be included stating whether a letter writer was suggested by the candidate or by the department/school (or both). It is essential to obtain unbiased external evaluations, so the letters should come from distinguished scholars who are not: the candidate's thesis advisor (M.S. or Ph.D.), or postdoctoral advisor; a business or professional partner; any family relation such as spouse, sibling, parent or relative; a collaborator on a substantive project, book, article, paper or report within the last 24 months.
2. **Examples of acceptable options for external referees not at AAU institutions include: (a) faculty in a highly-ranked medical school at an institution whose overall reputation is equal to or higher than that of Purdue; and (b) faculty in a top-5 ranked department (by a widely-accepted ranking system) in the candidate's field, even if the department is at a non-AAU institution.**
3. **Although the provost's memo does not refer to the rank of the experts at peer institutions, they should normally be full professors.**

Some statements about the criteria for promotion refer to a faculty member's international reputation, so experts from universities or other institutions outside the United States may be identified as potential referees. Because the promotion process at universities outside the U.S. is often very different from that at U.S. universities, heads are advised to include no more than one referee who is outside the U.S.

4. **Letter writers should not be collaborators with the candidate on funded grants or contracts.**
5. **If the package that is sent to letter writers includes publications, no letter writer should be a co-author of any of those publications, even if they were published more than 24 months earlier. In HHS, this 24-month period will be interpreted as covering calendar years. Thus, for a 2026 promotion candidate, no promotion candidate should have an external referee who is a co-author on a publication that is under review, in press, or published in 2026, 2025, or 2024 and no candidate should have an external referee who is or was a collaborator on a grant in 2026, 2025, or 2024. If a proposed referee has publications or grants that violate the calendar year timeframe but not the 24-month period (e.g. the candidate and the referee co-authored a publication that appeared in January 2024 and the document is being considered in August 2026), this timing must be explained and a strong justification for choosing that referee should be stated in the promotion document.**

Procedures for Identifying Possible Referees

1. Promotion candidates should have an opportunity to suggest letter writers and to identify potential letter writers who should not be asked. **The other suggestions for external referees should come from the unit head or from other senior faculty in the unit. For HHS tenure-track or tenured promotion candidates, unit heads should choose at least five external referees whom they or other senior faculty suggested. For promotion candidates who are clinical/professional/teaching or research faculty, the final document should include at least five external letters. HHS unit heads should choose at least three letter writers whom they or other senior faculty suggested.**
2. **Before a candidate, head, or other senior faculty member suggests an external expert as a letter writer, they should try to confirm that the expert does not have any type of personal or professional relationship with the candidate that could bias the expert's evaluation. For example, heads and senior faculty should review the candidate's curriculum vitae for information about the candidate's previous advisors and recent collaborators. Heads should also inform candidates about the restrictions on their relationships with external referees before asking the candidates to suggest possible referees.**
3. **These preliminary checks may not be sufficient to identify every person who should not serve as an external referee of a promotion candidate. In some cases, potential referees will themselves indicate that their relationship with a candidate prevents them from serving as a referee. But if an expert writes a letter of evaluation and the head subsequently discovers that the expert should not have been chosen as a referee of a candidate, the head should notify the dean about this situation.**
4. **Heads have the final responsibility for choosing the external referees for all promotion candidates. Heads should choose most referees from their own list of names or those suggested by other senior faculty before they review any names suggested by a candidate.**
5. **Unit heads may request more than the required number of letters to ensure that they have at least the minimum number required by the deadline for consideration of the case by the primary committee. In particular, heads are advised to seek at least nine or ten letters for promotion candidates who are tenure-track faculty or tenured associate professors. All letters that are received before the deadline for primary-committee consideration must be included in the promotion document, and no letters received after the deadline may be added to the promotion document.**

6. Tracking the number of solicited external referees who decline or fail to provide letters and/or recording their stated reasons for not writing does not provide relevant, useful information about the quality of the candidate's case. Therefore, such information should not be part of the document.

Dean's Approval of Possible External Referees for Tenure-Track and Tenured Promotion Candidates

1. No additional review of the external referees chosen by the unit head is necessary when the promotion candidate is a clinical/professional/teaching or research faculty member.
2. When the candidate is a tenure-track or tenured faculty member, the dean (or his/her designee, the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs) must review and approve the list of possible external referees before any of them is sent an official solicitation to provide a letter of evaluation of the candidate. **If the external reviewer is from an AAU institution, an initial email may be sent by the Head to inquire about their willingness to provide a review prior to the ADFA's approval.**
3. **To expedite the review process, unit heads should complete an Excel spreadsheet for each tenure-track and tenured promotion candidate, using the template shared as a Box file by the ADFA. The first draft of the completed template should be saved in Box, preferably no later than June 15. Once the spreadsheet is saved with the requested letter writers, the head should notify the ADFA and the ADFA's assistant by email or by tagging them in Box.**
4. **The Excel template includes a column for indicating whether each proposed letter writer is affiliated with a university in the AAU. If that's true, the head does not need to provide information in the column for a "Brief justification for being a top scholar." Otherwise, the head should provide a short (2-3 sentence) narrative which establishes that the person is at a top academic program and/or is a preeminent expert in the candidate's field. (See also Point 2 on Page 6 about the qualifications of reviewers from non-AAU institutions.)**
5. **If approval is requested for more than one letter writer from the same institution, it will be assumed that only one letter writer **from a given department of an institution** will be asked at a time, so that no more than one letter from **a writer of a single department of the same** institution will be in the final promotion document, unless a request for including more than one referee from **writers with primary appointments in the same department of an institution** is provided and that request is approved.**
6. **The Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs will review the proposed list, generally within three business days, and notify the head when the proposed referees have been approved. Approvals, or other comments, will be entered into the Box file, and heads will be notified by email about these updates. Subsequent requests should also be entered into the appropriate file in box and the ADFA should be notified by email that there are additional names to be reviewed.**

Special Letters that may be Included for Some Promotion Candidates

Individuals whose relationships with a promotion candidate prevent them from serving as external referees may provide a “letter of information” for inclusion in the promotion document. For example, a letter from a collaborator who is clearly identified can help to define and evaluate the candidate’s role in major collaborative work. **These letters are not commonly obtained, but if such a letter is included in the promotion document, a brief explanation for including it should be provided in the page of information that precedes the copies of the external referees’ letters, and the letter of information should be placed after the referees’ letters. Alternatively, rather than including the letter in the promotion document, it may be included among the supporting materials made available to primary committee members.**

When a promotion candidate has a joint appointment in another academic unit, the head of the unit that is the tenure home should inform the head of the other unit of the candidate’s nomination for promotion and ask them to provide a letter of evaluation of the performance of the candidate from the perspective of the other unit. This letter should not include a recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. This letter is included in the promotion document in a new Section F titled “Section F: Assessment from Minority Appointment(s).”

Requirements for Solicitation Letters

1. The letter sent by the unit head (or another senior faculty member) soliciting an evaluation of a promotion candidate who is a tenure-track or tenured faculty member must explicitly ask the external referees “to comment on the suitability of the candidate for a tenured appointment at the level of [Associate Professor/Professor, as applicable] at an institution whose goal is to be recognized as a top 5 public institution.” This specific request is not required in a solicitation letter for a candidate who is a clinical/professional/teaching faculty member or a research faculty member.

2. The solicitation letter for all promotion candidates should include the following text from the provost’s memos:

“Candidates may request a summary of all evaluations in their file. However, sources remain confidential. We cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or government agency will not require the disclosure of the source of confidential evaluations. Purdue University will endeavor to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluation to the fullest extent allowable under law.”

3. Some tenure-track faculty who are candidates for promotion and tenure will have received an extension of the tenure clock by virtue of university policy. Under these circumstances, the criteria for promotion and tenure are the same as those expected for a faculty member who has not received a tenure clock extension. The same is true for those being considered earlier than is typical. To ensure that our external referees are aware that we hold all promotion

cases to the same criteria, the following statement must be included in every request for an external review letter for a candidate for tenure (**i.e., for candidates who are tenure-track assistant professors or untenured associate professors**):

“Please note that length of service in rank by itself is not a factor in promotion and/or tenure decisions at Purdue. Our criteria clearly state: “...issues of timing should not be paramount, and discussions should focus instead on the question of whether the faculty member has provided evidence of a sustainable and impactful record that warrants promotion and/or tenure...” We do not designate any promotion nomination to be “early” (records are ready for promotion or they are not), nor are any extensions of the tenure clock granted to a faculty member to be considered in the decision.”

4. The “Faculty P and T Evaluation in COVID-19 Guidance” (at <https://www.purdue.edu/provost/faculty/promotion/covid-evaluation.html>) states that the following paragraph must be included in solicitation letters when promotion candidates have added a COVID impact statement to their promotion documents:

“Purdue University acknowledges the differential and negative impacts that the COVID-19 pandemic may have had on faculty career development. In carrying out decisions about promotion and tenure, we will evaluate each candidate’s research, teaching, service, and engagement activities within the context of the pandemic. To this end, candidates have had an opportunity to include in their document a Professional COVID-19 Impact Statement, which documents how the pandemic has affected their professional accomplishments in discovery, teaching, and engagement, as well as their service obligations. To assist in your evaluation, we include this statement in the promotion document with which you have been provided. It presents information about what obstacles were faced by this candidate during the COVID year and how they overcame them, and helps to put their impact during that year into the context of what was possible.”
5. **It is useful to include in a solicitation letter a request for information about the referee’s relationship with the candidate, and for the referee’s CV or a biographical summary.**
6. **Along with the solicitation letter, external referees should receive materials that provide a reasonable sampling of a candidate’s work. Usually, referees for candidates nominated for promotion on the basis of Discovery receive a selection of the candidate’s journal articles. Referees for promotion candidates nominated on the basis of Learning or Engagement may receive other types of supporting materials. All materials sent to external referees should be made available to primary committee and area committee members before their meetings to vote on the candidates. In HHS, those materials will be made available to Area Committee members through the HHS Teams site.**
7. **The ADFA has prepared HHS templates for letters for promotion candidates who are tenure-track assistant professors, tenured associate professors, and clinical/professional/teaching assistant or associate professors. There are separate templates for assistant to associate and associate to full professors because the language**

required by the Provost for these letters differs. Those templates are included in an appendix to this document, and unit heads may use these templates for their promotion candidates.

8. The letter should be saved with a new file name in the unit's Box subfolder for tenure-track/tenured or clinical/professional/teaching faculty, as appropriate. Then the ADFA's assistant should be notified that the letter is ready for review and approval. A letter should not be sent to an external referee until it has been approved. In addition, the template for the solicitation letter sent to external referees must be reviewed and approved by the ADFA before any letters are sent to referees. (See the section below on "Requirements for Solicitation Letters.")

Placement of the External Referees' Letters, the Special Letters, Minority Appointment Letters, and Related Materials in a Promotion Document

1. According to the Form 36 instructions, the letters of external referees and special letters should be placed at the end of the promotion document under the heading, "Section E: External Evaluation Letters." Letters from heads of departments where the candidate holds a minority appointment should be placed under the heading, "Section F: Assessment from Minority Appointment(s)."
2. Section E begins with one or two pages of information about the external referees. It also includes a brief explanation of the special letters mentioned in the previous section, if any special letters are included in the promotion document.
3. An introductory paragraph should name all the referees and indicate that they do not have a relationship with the candidate that would bar them from serving as external referees. This statement can be as simple and concise as, "No personal or professional relationship exists between any letter writer and the candidate."
4. Then the introductory paragraph can indicate which external referees were suggested by the head or other senior faculty, and which were suggested by the candidate.
5. The introductory paragraph should be followed by a paragraph of description of each external referee. Here is an example of an introductory paragraph.

Eight letters evaluating Dr. X's scholarship were sought from leading experts outside of Purdue University. All reviewers are at AAU universities, with the exception of Dr. Y. All were chosen by senior faculty members in the unit. No letter writer has a relationship with Dr. X or has served in an advisory role during Dr. X's education. Below are biographical sketches for each letter writer (in alphabetical order). Copies of each letter appear later in this section along with a copy of the solicitation letter sent to the outside experts. After ensuring, via electronic mail, that each expert was willing to provide a letter, each outside expert was sent the solicitation letter, the department's promotion criteria, a current version of Dr. X's promotion document, and five publications chosen by Dr. X.

6. **Referees should be listed in alphabetical order by the referee's last name.**
7. **The description begins with the name, title, and affiliation of the referee. The city/state or country where the institution is located should be listed. Also, if it is not noted in the introductory paragraph that all institutions are AAU institutions, then each entry should indicate whether it is an AAU institution.**
8. **Next, a summary of the referee's academic credentials is provided. The summary should be relatively brief; promotion committee members just want to know that the letter writer is a leading scholar in the field.**
9. **The pages describing the external referees are followed by a sample of the solicitation letter sent to the referees. The solicitation letter "sample" should be on the department's letterhead.**
10. **The final pages of Section E are copies of the letters from the external referees, followed by any special letters that were obtained. The referees' letters should be in alphabetical order by the referee's last name and should be printed on the letterhead of the university or other institution with which the referee is affiliated. Referees can submit their letters electronically, but each letter must have the referee's signature. (In other words, referees do not need to send "hard" or printed copies of their letters to the unit head by regular mail, but an electronic or hand-written signature is needed.)** Finally, the pages of these letters need a footer that indicates their page number in the promotion document.
11. **The letters from minority appointments come next under the heading, "Section F: Assessment From Minority Appointment(s)."**

The following examples of solicitation letters may be useful to heads.

Template 1 – Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure

Some language must be used verbatim as provided; these parts of the text are highlighted in yellow in the templates. Black text indicates suggested template language. Red text indicates fields that need text inserted or a choice to be selected. Sections that are irrelevant to a particular candidate can be deleted.

[Department Letterhead]

[Insert Date]

[First Name] [Last Name], PhD
[Department of]
[University of]
[Address]
[City], [State] [Zip Code]

Dear Dr. [Last Name]:

I greatly appreciate your willingness to write a letter of evaluation regarding the scholarly accomplishments of Assistant Professor [Last Name], who is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of [School/Department Name]. To assist you in your evaluation, I have enclosed a draft of Dr. [Last Name]'s promotion document, [#] publications chosen by Dr. [Last Name] that are representative of [her or his] work, and the Department of [School/Department Name]'s criteria for promotion. If you would like copies of any other publications listed in the enclosed document, please let me know and I will send them to you immediately.

At Purdue University, a successful candidate for promotion to Associate Professor will have a significant record of accomplishment as a faculty member and will show promise of continued professional growth and recognition. Therefore, we request your opinion about the importance of Dr. [Last Name]'s work, its range and depth, and the quality of its presentation. Has the candidate demonstrated the ability to conduct independent research? Has the candidate initiated a research program that has or will have a significant impact on the field? Does Dr. [Last Name]'s scholarship represent the work of a person who has the potential to achieve a position of leadership in the field? Finally, please comment on the suitability of the candidate for a tenured appointment at the level of Associate Professor at an institution whose goal is to be recognized as a top 5 public institution. Your frank evaluation is an essential part of our review process.

Please note that length of service in rank by itself is not a factor in promotion and/or tenure decisions at Purdue. Our criteria clearly state: "...issues of timing should not be paramount, and

discussions should focus instead on the question of whether the faculty member has provided evidence of a sustainable and impactful record that warrants promotion and/or tenure...” We do not designate any promotion nomination to be “early” (records are ready for promotion or they are not), nor are any extensions of the tenure clock granted to a faculty member to be considered in the decision.

(INCLUDE FOLLOWING STATEMENT IF THE PROMOTION DOCUMENT SENT TO THE EXTERNAL REFEREE INCLUDES A CANDIDATE’S PROFESSIONAL COVID-19 IMPACT STATEMENT)

Purdue University acknowledges the differential and negative impacts that the COVID-19 pandemic may have had on faculty career development. In carrying out decisions about promotion and tenure, we will evaluate each candidate’s research, teaching, service, and engagement activities within the context of the pandemic. To this end, candidates have had an opportunity to include in their document a Professional COVID-19 Impact Statement, which documents how the pandemic has affected their professional accomplishments in discovery, teaching, and engagement, as well as their service obligations. To assist in your evaluation, we include this statement in the promotion document with which you have been provided. It presents information about what obstacles were faced by this candidate during the COVID year and how they overcame them, and helps to put their impact during that year into the context of what was possible.

Your evaluation will become a part of Dr. [Last Name]’s promotion documentation, which will be shared with those faculty and administrators directly participating in the promotion process. Candidates may request a summary of all evaluations in their file. However, sources remain confidential. We cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or government agency will not require the disclosure of the source of confidential evaluations. Purdue University will endeavor to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluations to the fullest extent allowable under law.

We would also appreciate knowing the extent of your relationship, if any, with Dr. [Last Name]. Additionally, please send with your letter a short bio or CV so that we may accurately portray your academic credentials.

We would very much appreciate receiving your letter by [Date]. Please do not hesitate to contact me (phone [Phone Number]; e-mail [Purdue Email]) if you have any questions or need additional information.

Thank you very much for your time and effort in helping us review Dr. [Last Name]’s credentials for promotion.

Sincerely,

[First Name] [Last Name], Ph.D.

[Title]

Template 2 – Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

Some language must be used verbatim as provided; these parts of the text are highlighted in yellow in the templates. Black text indicates suggested template language. Red text indicates fields that need text inserted or a choice to be selected. Sections that are irrelevant to a particular candidate can be deleted.

[Department Letterhead]

[Insert Date]

[First Name] [Last Name], PhD

[Department of]

[University of]

[Address]

[City], [State] [Zip Code]

Dear Dr. [Last Name]:

I greatly appreciate your willingness to write a letter of evaluation regarding the scholarly accomplishments of Associate Professor [Last Name], who is being considered for promotion to Professor in the Department of [School/Department Name]. To assist you in your evaluation, I have enclosed a draft of Dr. [Last Name]'s promotion document, [#] publications chosen by Dr. [Last Name] that are representative of [her or his or their] work, and the Department of [School/Department Name]'s criteria for promotion. If you would like copies of any other publications listed in the enclosed document, please let me know and I will send them to you immediately.

At Purdue University, successful candidates for promotion to Full Professor are recognized as authorities in their fields of specialization by external colleagues nationally and/or internationally. Therefore, we would be especially interested in your evaluations of the quality of Dr. [Last Name]'s research, its impact on the field, and [her or his or their] potential for continued scholarly contributions. Finally, please comment on the suitability of the candidate for a tenured appointment at the level of Professor at an institution whose goal is to be recognized as a top 5 public institution. Your frank evaluation is an essential part of our review process.

(INCLUDE FOLLOWING STATEMENT IF THE PROMOTION DOCUMENT SENT TO THE EXTERNAL REFEREE INCLUDES A CANDIDATE'S PROFESSIONAL COVID-19 IMPACT STATEMENT)

Purdue University acknowledges the differential and negative impacts that the COVID-19 pandemic may have had on faculty career development. In carrying out decisions about promotion and tenure, we will evaluate each candidate's research, teaching, service, and

engagement activities within the context of the pandemic. To this end, candidates have had an opportunity to include in their document a Professional COVID-19 Impact Statement, which documents how the pandemic has affected their professional accomplishments in discovery, teaching, and engagement, as well as their service obligations. To assist in your evaluation, we include this statement in the promotion document with which you have been provided. It presents information about what obstacles were faced by this candidate during the COVID year and how they overcame them, and helps to put their impact during that year into the context of what was possible.

Your evaluation will become a part of Dr. [Last Name]'s promotion documentation, which will be shared with those faculty and administrators directly participating in the promotion process. Candidates may request a summary of all evaluations in their file. However, sources remain confidential. We cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or government agency will not require the disclosure of the source of confidential evaluations. Purdue University will endeavor to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluations to the fullest extent allowable under law.

We would also appreciate knowing the extent of your relationship, if any, with Dr. [Last Name]. Additionally, please send with your letter a short bio or CV so that we may accurately portray your qualifications.

We would very much appreciate receiving your letter by [Date]. Please do not hesitate to contact me (phone [Phone Number]; e-mail [Purdue Email]) if you have any questions or need additional information.

Thank you very much for your time and effort in helping us review Dr. [Last Name]'s credentials for promotion.

Sincerely,

[First Name] [Last Name], Ph.D.
[Title]

Template 3 – Promotion of Clinical Faculty

Some language must be used verbatim as provided; these parts of the text are highlighted in yellow in the templates. Black text indicates suggested template language. Red text indicates fields that need text inserted or a choice to be selected. Sections that are irrelevant to a particular candidate can be deleted.

[Department Letterhead]

[Insert Date]

[First Name] [Last Name]
[Department of]
[University of]
[Address]
[City], [State] [Zip Code]

Dear Professor. [Last Name]:

We greatly appreciate your willingness to write a letter of evaluation regarding the accomplishments of Clinical [Assistant or Associate] Professor [First Name] [Last Name], who is being considered for promotion to the rank of Clinical [Associate Professor or Professor] in the [School/Department Name] at Purdue University. To assist you in your evaluation, I have enclosed a draft of Professor [Last Name]'s promotion document, [# publications or additional materials] chosen by Professor [Last Name] that are representative of [her or his or their] work, and the Department of [School/Department Name]'s criteria for promotion. If you would like copies of any other materials listed in the enclosed document, please let me know and I will send them to you immediately.

At Purdue University, successful candidates for promotion to [Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor] should have demonstrated excellence in teaching/learning or engagement and related activities, and scholarly productivity in one of those areas. Engagement reflects various forms of scholarly work in partnership with others to address local, national, or global issues. Research is not required for promotion in the clinical track.

The primary basis for Professor [Last Name]'s nomination for promotion are [her or his or their] accomplishments in the area of [Learning or Engagement]. We would appreciate your evaluation of her/his contributions as a clinical faculty member and your assessment of Professor [Last Name]'s contributions as a clinical faculty member in comparison with others who are in a similar non-tenure track position at major universities such as Purdue.

(INCLUDE FOLLOWING STATEMENT IF THE PROMOTION DOCUMENT SENT TO THE EXTERNAL REFEREE INCLUDES A CANDIDATE'S PROFESSIONAL COVID-19 IMPACT STATEMENT)

Purdue University acknowledges the differential and negative impacts that the COVID-19 pandemic may have had on faculty career development. In carrying out decisions about promotion and tenure, we will evaluate each candidate's research, teaching, service, and engagement activities within the context of the pandemic. To this end, candidates have had an opportunity to include in their document a Professional COVID-19 Impact Statement, which documents how the pandemic has affected their professional accomplishments in discovery, teaching, and engagement, as well as their service obligations. To assist in your evaluation, we include this statement in the promotion document with which you have been provided. It presents information about what obstacles were faced by this candidate during the COVID year and how they overcame them, and helps to put their impact during that year into the context of what was possible.

Your evaluation will become a part of Professor [Last Name]'s promotion documentation, which will be shared with those faculty and administrators directly participating in the promotion process. Candidates may request a summary of all evaluations in their file. However, sources remain confidential. We cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or government agency will not require the disclosure of the source of confidential evaluations. Purdue University will endeavor to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluations to the fullest extent allowable under law.

We would also appreciate knowing the extent of your relationship, if any, with Professor [Last Name]. Additionally, please send with your letter a short bio or CV so that we may accurately portray your qualifications.

We would very much appreciate receiving your letter by [Date]. Please do not hesitate to contact me (phone [Phone Number]; e-mail [Purdue Email]) if you have any questions or need additional information.

Thank you very much for your time and effort in helping us review Professor [Last Name]'s credentials for promotion.

Sincerely,

[First Name] [Last Name] [Designation]
[Title]