Some Guidelines for the HHS Promotion Process and HHS Promotion Documents  
(Revised, June 27, 2017)

This document provides information for promotion candidates in the College of Health and Human Sciences (HHS). The information should also be useful to HHS unit heads and other HHS faculty who help promotion candidates to prepare the documents that are reviewed by promotion committees. This document should be used in conjunction with the other documents about promotion policies, procedures, and criteria that are available at http://www.purdue.edu/hhs/faculty/promotion_tenure.html. In this document, words or sentences that are new for 2017-18 are underlined.

Form 36

The first page of the promotion document is President’s Office Form 36. The instructions for that form (at http://www.purdue.edu/provost/faculty/promotionandtenure.html) are divided into two parts. Part I deals with the form itself, and it is normally completed by the unit head. Part II describes the subsequent pages of the promotion document, which are prepared by promotion candidates with guidance from their mentors and the unit head. In HHS promotion documents, the sections of Part II, beginning with “General Information,” follow the Executive Summary of the entire document.

Executive Summary

Promotion documents should include a single-spaced Executive Summary, approximately one page long, which is placed immediately after the Form 36. The Executive Summary, which should be written in the third person, should provide the broad outlines of the case for promotion by describing a candidate’s most significant accomplishments in discovery, learning, and engagement. When the primary basis for the promotion is research, the summary should show the coherence of the candidate’s research program. It should also clarify how candidates’ records fit the missions of their academic units, and whether candidates have made the contributions expected of them when they were recruited. Candidates are encouraged to write initial drafts of the summary, with advice and guidance from their mentors and the head, but heads are responsible for editing those drafts to ensure that the final versions accurately present the candidates’ accomplishments and the significance of their work.

“Comments by Head of Department (or School)” on the Form 36

If a tenure-track assistant professor has received a tenure-clock extension, it is useful for the head to mention the extension, but not to detail the reason for it, in the section on the Form 36 for “Comments by Head of Department (or School).” Doing so forestalls questions about why the entry on the Form 36 for “penultimate year” is the same as that for other candidates whose initial appointment at Purdue began a year later.

Section A: Discovery

1. The “Instructions for President’s Form 36” require promotion candidates to “Note undergraduate and graduate students and postdocs you have mentored who are co-authors on
your published work” (See Section A.1.a.) For consistency, co-authors who were undergraduates at the time that the research was done should be indicated by a superscript “1,” co-authors who were graduate students should be indicated by a superscript “2,” and co-authors who were post-docs should be indicated by a superscript “3” next to their last names in the publication reference. Note that the primary author is, as in previous years, designated with an asterisk. A “legend” explaining these notations should be provided at the beginning of the “Published work” section of the promotion document, as in the following example:

1. Published Work

[*indicates primary author(s); superscript numbers indicate co-author(s) mentored by the candidate: 1 undergraduate student, 2 graduate student, 3 postdoctoral scientist]


2. The Form 36 instructions say in Section A.1.d. that “It would be helpful to include where the publications [of a candidate] are ranked in one’s field (first tier, second tier, third tier).” In some fields, this kind of information is usually provided by listing the impact factor for the journal in which a publication appeared. When impact factors are listed, it is useful to include some comment in the document about what values of impact factors should be considered as high, medium, or low for a candidate’s field.

3. The Form 36 instructions require that undergraduates, graduate students, and postdocs mentored by the candidate be noted on multiple-author conference presentations (Section A.2, “Exhibition of creative work”). The same kind of “legend” and the same conventions for superscripts should be used as for publications.

4. The Instructions for Section A.7. refer to “Research grants and awards received.” The template at the end of this document should be used to present information about these grants. Note that if the promotion candidate has been a Co-PI, the amount of money for which the candidate is “directly responsible” should be listed, rather than the percentage of the credit for the grant allocated to the Co-PI.

5. The grant/award template should only be used for grants received, not for grant applications that are pending or for applications that were submitted but not funded. Including some information about the latter types of grant applications may sometimes be useful, but that information should not be presented using the template and should not be under the same heading as “Research grants and awards received.” Instead, pending and unfunded grant applications may be mentioned, if appropriate, in a narrative section under “Current research interests, including experimentation and other projects in process” (Section A.8.) or under “Other evidence of creative excellence” (Section A.3).

6. Promotion candidates may also have received grants for their teaching or engagement. Those grants should be listed in Section B or Section C, respectively, using the same template as for grants listed in Section A.
Section B: Learning

1. The Instructions say in Section B.1. that the document should show “Courses taught during past three years (course numbers and titles) and any associated evaluations.” In this listing, the courses taught each semester should be shown. In addition, the record of teaching for more than the past three years may be shown if a fuller record would more adequately demonstrate promotion candidates’ contributions to the educational programs of their units.

2. As noted in the previous point, students’ evaluations of courses taught by a candidate should also be part of Section B.1. Candidates should use the table that follows these guidelines as a template for presenting the ratings of students’ evaluations of their teaching. Candidates have the option of reporting on only the two core items for evaluations of the course and of the instructor, or they may (as shown in the table) include other items as well.

Section C: Engagement

To the extent possible, reports of engagement activities should include documentation of their impact.

Additional Information

The Form 36 instructions end with a short section titled, “Additional Information,” that refers to the letters solicited from outside (i.e., external to Purdue) referees. The following guidelines refer to the selection of those referees and to the solicitation of letters from them. They are derived mostly from information in the University’s document on promotion procedures and the provost’s memos about the promotion of West Lafayette faculty. Guidelines that are stated in University documents or in the provost’s memos are printed in regular type; those specific to HHS are printed in boldface.

1. External letters of evaluation should be obtained for all tenure and/or promotion candidates. These letters should be sought from experts at universities that are considered as peers or aspirational peers of Purdue University. Examples of the peer and aspirational peer institutions include members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) [see https://www.aau.edu/about/default.aspx?id=16710] and leading international institutions. Letters may also be sought from faculty members at top academic programs from other institutions, and from preeminent experts at other institutions, although justification in the form of expertise credentials is expected in the latter case.

2. Promotion candidates should have an opportunity to suggest letter writers and to identify those potential letter writers who should not be asked. Someone other than the candidate should select some of the external referees. Usually, other suggestions for referees come from the head or from senior faculty in the unit. The promotion document should indicate which external referees were suggested by the candidate and which by the head or other faculty.
3. Information in the promotion document should describe the relationship, if any, of the candidate to each external referee. It is essential to obtain unbiased evaluations, so the letters should come from distinguished scholars who are not: the candidate’s thesis advisor (MS or PhD), or postdoctoral advisor; a collaborator on a project, book, article, report or paper within the last 24 months; co-editor of a journal, compendium, or conference proceeding within the last 24 months; a business or professional partner; any family relation such as spouse, sibling, parent or relative. (See Point 4.d and Point 6 below.)

4. The promotion document should include a copy of the letter sent to external referees requesting an evaluation of the candidate. (See following examples.)
   a. The solicitation letter should state the domain of expertise on which the letter writer should focus, that is, the domain (Discovery, Learning, or Engagement) that is the primary basis of the nomination for the candidate’s promotion.

   b. The solicitation letter should include the text from the University’s Procedures document about the confidentiality of referees’ letters. (See following examples).

   c. If a candidate received a tenure-clock extension, the solicitation letter should include the statement in the provost’s memo that indicates the criteria for promotion and tenure are the same for that candidate as for others who did not receive an extension. (See following examples.)

   d. It is useful to include in a solicitation letter a request for the referee’s CV or a biographical summary, and for information about the referee’s relationship with the candidate. Then the “Additional Information” section of the promotion document (see the Form 36 Instructions) should begin with a listing of the names, titles, and affiliations of the external referees, whether the referees were suggested by the promotion candidate or by others, and a few sentences that describe the referees’ credentials and relationships to the candidate (if any).

   e. It may be helpful to include in the solicitation letter a request that the referee comment on the quality and the appropriateness of the journals in which the promotion candidate’s articles have appeared.

5. Along with the solicitation letter, external referees should be sent materials that provide a reasonable sampling of a candidate’s work. Usually, referees for HHS promotion candidates receive a selection of the candidates’ journal articles. The 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 SharePoint site.
6. Individuals whose relationships with a promotion candidate prevent them from serving as external referees (see Point 3 of this section, above) may provide a “letter of information” for inclusion in the promotion document, but such letters are atypical. If any letter of this sort 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 all the letters.

7. A special letter may be obtained when a promotion candidate has a joint appointment in another academic unit. The “HHS Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures” states in Section IV.C. that “The head of the other academic unit will be invited to provide the head of the unit that is the tenure home with a letter of evaluation of the performance and achievements of the candidate from the perspective of that unit. This letter should not include a recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. If provided, this letter will be included in the candidate’s promotion document.”

8. In some units, a peer evaluation of teaching is conducted in advance of, or at the same time as, the preparation of a promotion document, and the findings of the evaluation are summarized in a letter prepared by a faculty member in the unit. Letters of this type may not be included in a candidate’s promotion document but they may be added to the set of supplemental materials made available to members of the unit’s primary committee.

9. Promotion documents should include a minimum of five letters from external referees. Heads may request more than five letters to ensure that they have at least five letters by the deadline for consideration of the case by the primary committee. (No letters received after the primary committee meeting may be added to the promotion document after that meeting.) If a head requests and receives more than five letters, all these letters must be included in the promotion document. Letters of information do not count toward the minimum number of letters needed from external referees.
### Student Evaluations of Teaching Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>HHS 12500</th>
<th>HHS 52300</th>
<th>HHS 64700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester and Year</td>
<td>F/06</td>
<td>S/07</td>
<td>F/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional delivery</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course content</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content expertise</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course management</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor core</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course core</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Template for Grants/Awards Received

Basic Format

1. Agency/Title of Grant:
2. Duration of Funding (Dates):
3. Total amount of award:
4. Your role:
5. If Co-PI, for how much of the total funding are you directly responsible:

EXAMPLE 1

1. Agency/Title of Grant: National Science Foundation (NSF)/Widgets of the World
2. Duration of Funding: Three (3) years (07/01/93-06/30/96)
3. Total amount of award: $180,000
4. Your role: PI
5. If Co-PI, for how much of the total funding are you directly responsible: NA

EXAMPLE 2

1. Agency/Title of Grant: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA)/Corn Alcohol for the Masses
2. Duration of Funding: Five (5) years (01/01/93-12/31/97)
3. Total amount of award: $5 million
4. Your role: Co-PI
5. If Co-PI, for how much of the total funding are you directly responsible: $1 million
Examples of the Most Important Parts of the External Referee Solicitation Letter

1. Introduction, rank to which candidate would be promoted, and enclosed materials

Example 1
I greatly appreciate your willingness to write a letter of evaluation of the scholarly accomplishments of Associate Professor [name], who is being considered for promotion to Full Professor in the Department of [dept. name]. To assist you in your evaluation, I have enclosed [name’s] curriculum vitae and six publications chosen by [name] as representative of his or her work. If you would like copies of any other publications listed on the enclosed vita, please let me know and I will send them to you quickly.

Example 2
Dr. [name] has submitted his or her documents for consideration for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The University Promotion Policy states that successful candidates for promotion should have a significant record of accomplishment as a faculty member and show promise of continued professional growth and recognition. Dr. [name’s] research expertise is in [topic].

I would be most grateful if you could assist us in the evaluation of Dr. [name’s] document and representative supporting materials. Your candid appraisal of any aspect of the document would be extremely helpful.

2. Statement of the “domain of expertise” of the candidate (i.e., the basis of the nomination for promotion, which is required), the relevant promotion criteria of the unit (recommended; occasionally, the unit’s guidelines for promotion are included with the other supplemental materials), statement about journal quality (recommended), and request for overall assessment (optional)

Example 1
At Purdue University, a successful candidate for promotion to Full Professor should have a significant record of accomplishment and be recognized nationally and/or internationally as an authority in his or her field of specialization. The primary basis for [name’s] nomination for promotion is his/her accomplishments in research (also labeled at Purdue as Discovery). Therefore, we would be especially interested in your evaluations of the quality of [name’s] research, its impact on the field, and his or her potential for continued scholarly contributions. It is also helpful when referees comment on the quality and appropriateness of the journals in which a promotion candidate’s articles have appeared.

Purdue University also values faculty members’ contributions to student learning and to Engagement. The latter reflects both various forms of University and professional service and scholarly work in partnership with others to address local, national, or global issues. If you can evaluate [name’s] contributions in these areas, I would encourage you to comment on them as well. Finally, I would appreciate knowing whether you would recommend Dr. [name] for promotion to Full Professor at a major research university like Purdue.

Or
If appropriate, your opinion on whether Dr. [name] would be promotable to Associate Professor at your institution would carry a great deal of influence.

Example 2
Promotion in the clinical faculty track is typically based on one’s creative work in the areas of clinical education and clinical program development and service delivery, engagement at the university, local, state, and national levels, and dissemination of one’s work through publications and presentations. Research (discovery) is not required for promotion in the clinical track. Consequently, we would appreciate your opinion of the importance of [name’s] work in his or her areas of [fields] as well as his or her clinical and academic teaching and service/engagement. Your frank evaluation of the candidate is essential for the review process.

Example 3
In particular, we want your opinion of the importance of Dr. [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 will lead to significant results in his or her field? To what extent is the candidate’s independent research likely to make an impact upon his or her field? We are also interested in learning whether his or her scholarship represents the work of a person who has the potential to achieve a position of leadership in his or her field of endeavor. And finally, how does this candidate compare with others for whom you have served as an external referee?

3. Statement to be included when a candidate has received a tenure-clock extension

Please note that Dr. [name] 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 for promotion candidates who did not receive such an extension.

4. Statement about the confidentiality of letters (required)

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.

5. Closing, with the deadline and a request for information about the referee’s credentials (required) and relationship with the candidate, if any (required)

Example 1 (of request for information about the relationship with the candidate, which may be placed earlier in the solicitation letter)
Please feel free to add anything else that you believe might be of help to us in evaluating Dr. [name’s] record. Also, it would be helpful for us to learn whether you know Dr. [name] and, if so, for how long and under what circumstances.
Example 2
For your comments to receive full consideration, we need to have your letter by [date]. In your letter, please describe the extent of your relationship, if any, with Dr. [name]. If you could include a curriculum vitae or a short biographical sketch, I can better describe your qualifications. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at [number] or email me at [address]. Thank you for your time and assistance.

Examples of the Full Text of an External Referee Solicitation Letter
The following pages show how the various elements of a request for an external referee’s evaluation can be assembled into a complete letter. Thanks go to Chris Agnew, Head of the Department of Psychological Sciences, for sharing these letter templates. Heads of other units are free to create their own templates, but as noted above, some text (e.g., about the confidentiality of referees’ letters) is prescribed by the University.
Dear Dr. XXXX,

I greatly appreciate your willingness to write a letter of evaluation regarding the scholarly accomplishments of Assistant Professor XXXX, who is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of Psychological Sciences. To assist you in your evaluation, I have enclosed Dr. XXXX’s promotion document and five publications chosen by Dr. XXXX as representative of her/his work. If you would like copies of any other publications listed on 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 show promise of continued professional growth and recognition. In particular, we want your opinion of the importance of Dr. XXXX’s work, its range and depth, and the quality of its presentation. Has the candidate demonstrated her/his ability to conduct independent research? Has the candidate initiated a research program that has or will lead to significant impact on her/his field? We are also interested in learning whether or not her/his published work has appeared in what you consider to be high-quality journals that are appropriate for articles in her/his field, and whether her/his scholarship represents the work of a person who has the potential to achieve a position of leadership in her/his field. Finally, I would appreciate knowing whether you would recommend Dr. XXXX for promotion to Associate Professor at a major research university like Purdue. Your frank evaluation is an essential part of our review process.

INCLUDE FOLLOWING STATEMENT IF RELEVANT: [Please note that Dr. [name] 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 for promotion candidates who did not receive such an extension.]

Your evaluation will become a part of Dr. XXXX’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. XXXX. 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 September 15, 20XX. In addition to sending it electronically, I will also need to receive a hard copy that I can include with the promotion documents. Please do not hesitate to contact me (phone 765-49X-XXXX; e-mail XXXX@purdue.edu) if you have any questions or are in need of additional information. Thank you very much for your time and effort in helping us review Dr. XXXX’s credentials for promotion.

Sincerely,

XXXX, Ph.D.

Professor
Dear Dr. XXXX,

I greatly appreciate your willingness to write a letter of evaluation regarding the scholarly accomplishments of Associate Professor XXXX, who is being considered for promotion to Full Professor in the Department of Psychological Sciences. To assist you in your evaluation, I have enclosed Dr. XXXX’s promotion document and five publications chosen by Dr. XXXX as representative of her/his work. If you would like copies of any other publications listed on 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. XXXX’s research, its impact on the field, and her/his potential for continued scholarly contributions. It is also helpful when referees comment on the quality and appropriateness of the journals in which a promotion candidate’s articles have appeared. I would also appreciate knowing whether you would recommend Dr. XXXX for promotion to Full Professor at a major research university like Purdue. Your frank evaluation is an essential part of our review process.

Your evaluation will become a part of Dr. XXXX’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. XXXX. 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 September 15, 20XX. In addition to sending it electronically, I will also need to receive a hard copy that I can include with the promotion documents. Please do not hesitate to contact me (phone 765-49X-XXXX; e-mail XXXX@purdue.edu) if you have any questions or are in need of additional information. Thank you very much for your time and effort in helping us review Dr. XXXX’s credentials for promotion.

Sincerely,

XXXX, Ph.D.
Professor