<Department Letterhead>

<Date>

Dr. Christopher Celenza

James B. Knapp Dean

Krieger School of Arts and Sciences

Or

Dr. T. E. Schlesinger

Benjamin T. Rome Dean

Whiting School of Engineering

Johns Hopkins University

3400 N. Charles Street

Baltimore, MD 21218

Dear Dean Celenza/ Schlesinger:

The ad hoc committee formed to consider the appointment/promotion of Dr. <Name> as Associate/Full Professor, with tenure, in the Department of <Dept Name> has completed its report, which the committee is pleased to present here. Note any relationships between ad hoc committee members and the candidate that might be perceived by a reasonable observer to constitute a conflict of interest or source of bias with respect to the candidate.

The ad hoc committee, consisting of Professor <Name> in the Department of <Dept Name> (chair) and Professor <Name> in the Department of <Dept Name> was formed on <Date>.

1. Note meeting with Academic Council liaison
2. Discuss how the committee came up with their long list of referee names- noting the number of referees on this list- and what influenced its reduction to a short list of names- noting the number of referees on this list
3. Discuss the details of obtaining letters, including pursuit of letters from late respondents and possible reasons for failure of referees to respond (i.e. Five requests were sent on August 15 to Profs. Smith, Jones, Johnson, Washington, and Turner. Of those five, three agreed to write (Jones, Johnson, and Washington). Smith did not reply despite a reminder email. Turner declined due to illness. Three additional requests were sent on . . . )
4. Discuss justification for using referees at the same rank as the candidate, if applicable

Please make a critical assessment of the entire dossier. In section below, please evaluate the “importance of the candidate’s scholarly research, citizenship and teaching to the academic program of the department.”

**Research**

Summarize the candidate’s research interests and accomplishments.

For appointment or promotion to Associate Professor:

1. Identify whether or not the candidate is seen as a “recognized leader among scholars at a similar stage of career development” and how that is (or is not) demonstrated in the dossier.
	1. What elements of the referee letters address the issue of leadership in the field?
	2. Please discuss the relevant evidence or metrics that you have used to come to a conclusion.
	3. What led you to conclude whether the candidate will continue to grow as a scholar?

Comment on whether or not the following are consistent;

1. The letters from referees suggested by the department and those suggested by your ad hoc committee.
2. The letters and the CV.
3. The candidate’s scholarly impact described by the letters and the impact found by consulting other sources (Scopus, Google Scholar, etc.,) as applicable to the field of the candidate.

Point out to Council where the letters of reference are in strong agreement and where there might be disagreement either in substance or in tone.

Put into context all of the other scholars to which the candidate is compared. Identify common comparisons and expand on the comparisons using any data available.

**Teaching and Mentoring**

Summarize the candidate’s teaching/mentoring accomplishments.

Note efforts made to improve teaching and to contribute broadly to pedagogy in the Department or School.

**Service**

Summarize the candidate’s service to their scholarly profession.

Summarize the candidate’s service to their department, School, and the University.

**Referee Recommendations**

Summarize the referee recommendations highlighting the context in which these recommendations are made. (For example, if a referee comments that the candidate would secure tenure at her/his institution, comment on the standard for tenure at the referee’s institution.)

**Final Recommendation**

Include the ad hoc committee’s recommendation based on entire dossier.

Sincerely,

<Chair’s signature>

<Chair’s name>

Ad Hoc Committee Chair

Professor of \*\*

<Second ad hoc member’s signature>

<Second ad hoc member’s name>

Ad Hoc Committee

Professor of \*\*

**Tips and suggestions:**

1. This report should be evaluative and not an advocacy statement.
2. While key statements should be pulled from referee letters, try to avoid simply summarizing each letter. Instead, share your interpretation of referees’ comments/sentiment.
3. It is strongly recommended that ad hoc report be kept to less than six pages.
4. There is no need to list attachments in your report.