

GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORTS

The Committee on Academic Personnel wishes to direct the attention of *ad hoc* committee members to two statements contained in the “Instructions to Appointment and Promotion Committees.” These instructions state that “Publications in research and other creative accomplishment should be evaluated, not merely enumerated.” Also, the review committee report “should include an appraisal of all significant evidence, favorable and unfavorable. It should be specific and analytical and should include the review committee’s evaluation of the candidate with respect to each qualification specified.”

We find that some *ad hoc* committee reports mainly reflect only the departmental chairperson’s letter, or those of external respondents. Hence, nothing new is added to the file. The members of *ad hoc* committees are chosen on the basis of their research competence in the specialized field of the candidate. Thus, the record of the *ad hoc* committee is a primary source for definitive evaluations, not only of the crucial items in the candidate’s bibliography, but also the full scope of the research program; works completed, and those in progress. The fact that a paper has been published in “a leading journal in the field” does not necessarily imply that the work is outstanding. Similarly, the fact that a paper appears in “unrefereed conference proceedings” does not necessarily imply that the work is undistinguished. Your evaluation of the quality of the work is important.

The *ad hoc* committee has the responsibility to make substantial comments on the candidate’s teaching and service records. These comments should not be limited to a reiteration of student or chairperson opinions. The members of the *ad hoc* committee, especially those from within the department, are encouraged to add first-hand evaluations of the candidate’s performance, and to correct any errors or omissions, which may exist in the record. Committee members may not, however, introduce substantive information not contained in the departmental letter, and prejudicial to the candidate. To do so may violate APM policies and invalidate the review.

Extramural letters are required for all promotion actions. If, in the opinion of the *ad hoc* committee, additional extramural letters are essential, the committee may ask the Vice Provost—Academic Affairs to solicit them. Wherever possible, a list of proposed respondents should be supplied to the Vice Provost with this request.

We emphasize that the *ad hoc* committee has an explicit charge to judge each item on its merits, and to record these value judgments in its report. When an *ad hoc* committee is divided in its overall opinion, it is particularly important for the report(s) to contain detailed appraisals of the evidence supporting each recommendation.