**Checklist: Department Chair’s Statement for Faculty Promotion Dossier (Tenured/Tenure-Track)**

**Important to Note**

* **For the proposed rank of Associate Professor with tenure:** Department Chair Statement must discuss what evidence there is – and the strength of the evidence – that the candidate is independently driving a program of research that has garnered an **established national reputation** and includes independent extramural funding as appropriate for the field.
* **For the proposed rank of Professor with tenure:** Department Chair Statement must discuss what evidence there is – and the strength of the evidence – that the candidate is independently driving a program a program of research that has garnered a **sustained national / emerging international reputation** and includes independent extramural funding as appropriate for the field.

**Resources:**

* Examples of Evidence of Achievement Documents:
  + [Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty](https://s3.us-east-1.amazonaws.com/ut-dms-prod-intranet-s3-bucket/Examples-of-Evidence-of-Achievement-Tenured-and-Tenure-Track-Faculty.pdf)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Required items to check for in the Department Chair’s Statement** | **Task Completed: Y/N** |
| Ensure proposed track and rank and tenure status are included. |  |
| Explain the timing of the promotion review.   * Provide affirmation for accelerated review (if applicable). * Provide affirmation for promotion after an extended time in rank (if applicable for tenured faculty). |  |
| For tenure-track candidates: Refer to the Mid-Probationary Review Summary in the dossier. Reflect on the mid-probationary review and the progress that the candidate has made in addressing any concerns raised during the review. |  |
| For tenured candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure: Refer to Comprehensive Periodic Review Summary in the dossier (if applicable). Reflect on any comprehensive periodic reviews for tenured associate professors and the progress that the candidate has made in addressing any concerns raised during the review. |  |
| Ensure the chair statement’s focus is on candidate’s accomplishment **during time at rank.** |  |
| Describe the percent effort that the candidate is devoting to service across mission pillars areas, including: clinical, research, education, and administration. |  |
| Accomplishments in alignment with the candidate’s designated Area of Excellence:   * Ensure primary Area of Excellence is indicated in the statement. * Discuss activities in the Area of Excellence and areas of review with a focus on the **impact and trajectory** of their work during the time at rank, including: * Scholarly contributions * Clinical activities * Service and/or leadership * Educational activities and innovations * Mentorship * Community-facing scholarship |  |
| Assessing candidate contributions to the field.   * Describe the standards of excellence in the discipline. * Include information about the significance of the candidate’s field to the strategic priorities of the department and Dell Med. * Summarize the prestige/quality of the scholarly outlets and describe their alignment with expectations for rank being considered for promotion. * Independently assess the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses. |  |
| Reflect on the letters from external reviewers:   * Do not quote extensively from the reviewers’ letters, instead focus on key take aways. * Address any concerns raised by the reviewers. * If external reviewers identify peers for comparison, provide a high-level comparison of the key metrics for the candidate with those of the peers. |  |
| Include a summary of the Executive Committee’s discussion.   * Clearly indicate the vote outcome and recommended action. * Explain the rationale for the committee’s vote and resulting recommendation. * Explain negative votes (if applicable) including feedback from the committee. |  |
| Reflect on the statements prepared by the Executive Committee (EC) in each of the areas of review. Contextualize the candidate’s contributions compared with the norms in the field.   * If not thoroughly addressed in the EC Statement, describe the candidate’s scholarly contributions in rank relative to the standards of excellence in the field.   + Explicit contextualization and assessment of the candidate’s scholarly trajectory and sustainability based on the candidate’s demonstrated productivity, current and future funding (where relevant), and in-progress and in-preparation works.   + Evaluation of citations should be included as part of the evaluation of scholarly trajectory, if appropriate for the discipline. * For candidates that have designated Educational Leadership as their area of excellence: If not thoroughly addressed in the executive committee statement, assess the candidate’s teaching performance, efforts to address challenges, and trajectory and contributions to the department’s teaching mission. |  |
| For tenure-track candidates:   * Assess the level of independent research activity in rank in alignment with expectations for the rank being considered for promotion. * Explain any continuing collaboration with former advisor(s) and/or mentor(s) and extensive collaborations with peer or senior faculty members. |  |
| For tenured candidates:   * Assess the level of independent research activity and research leadership roles in rank. * If the candidate’s effective time in rank is longer than the normative period for their discipline, the evaluation must focus on the candidate’s record during the most recent normative time in rank. |  |
| **Chair Attestation on Professionalism**   * Chair to provide attestation that the promotion candidate acts as a role model of professionalism and collegial behavior to all members of the health care team. * Chair to review learner evaluations in the dossier and address any areas of intervention.   + Should the dossier include learner evaluations with negative comments from learners, include information on efforts made by the candidate to resolve, mentor, improve – as applicable. |  |
| Your recommendation   * Describe the relative strength of your overall recommendation (e.g., strongly recommend or recommend). * Clearly state recommended outcome\* (this will be documented in the Promotion Review and Voting Sheet) * A list of possible outcomes by rank/track is included in the table below. |  |

**\*Recommended outcomes that must be explicitly stated in the Chair Statement by rank/track and time of review:**

|  |
| --- |
| Possible Outcomes for On Time Review of Tenure-Track Assistant Professor:   * Be promoted to associate professor with tenure; * Be promoted to associate professor and be moved to a professional-track appointment; * Remain at the assistant professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment; * Be placed on a terminal appointment for the next year. |
| Possible Outcomes for Accelerated Review of Tenure-Track Assistant Professor:   * Be promoted to associate professor with tenure; * Be promoted to associate professor and be moved to a professional-track appointment; * Remain at the assistant professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment; * Be placed on a terminal appointment for the next year; * Be denied promotion and remain a tenure-track assistant professor until mandatory review year. |
| Possible Outcomes for On Time Review of Tenure-Track Associate Professor:   * Award tenure in the rank of associate professor; * Be promoted to professor with tenure; * Be promoted to professor and be moved to a professional-track appointment; * Remain at the associate professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment; * Be placed on a terminal appointment for the next year, which would be the seventh year. |
| Possible Outcomes for Accelerated Review of Tenure-Track Associate Professor:   * Award tenure in the rank of associate professor; * Be promoted to professor with tenure; * Be promoted to professor and be moved to a professional-track appointment; * Remain at the associate professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment; * Be placed on terminal appointment for the next year; * Be denied promotion and remain a tenure-track associate professor until mandatory review year. |
| Possible Outcomes for On Time Review of Tenure-Track Professor:   * Be awarded tenure in the rank of professor; * Remain at the professor rank and be moved to a professional- track appointment; * Be placed on a terminal appointment for the next (i.e., eighth) year. |
| Possible Outcomes for Accelerated Review of Tenure-Track Professor:   * Be awarded tenure in the rank of professor; * Remain at the professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment; * Be placed on terminal appointment for the next (i.e., eighth) year; * Be denied promotion and remain a tenure-track professor until mandatory review year. |
| Possible Outcomes for Associate Professor with Tenure:   * Be promoted to professor with tenure; * Be denied promotion to professor with tenure. |