**15NN. CASE STATEMENT CHECKLIST (TENURE REVIEWS)**

**Case Statement Checklist**

**Reviews for Promotion to Tenured Professor**

Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University

Please use this checklist with the “Case Statement Template (Tenure Reviews)” to ensure that you have completed all the required parts of the case statement. This checklist is for internal departmental use; it does not need to be submitted to the assistant dean or included in the final dossier.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Completed** | | **Case Statement Item** |
| **Yes** | **No** |
|  |  | **A. Executive Summary** |
|  |  | [Please provide a one-paragraph executive summary of the candidate’s contributions and the department’s recommendation.] |
|  |  | **B. Background and Context** |
|  |  | 1. **Field Definition**   [Please describe the candidate’s field. The field definition should be sufficiently broad that the candidate’s impact beyond their own specialization can be determined. For instance, the field definition may situate the candidate’s area of specialization within a broader field; or the definition may speak to the “Venn diagram” of the candidate’s impact, i.e., not only the immediate subfield in which they work, but the adjacent subfields and fields affected by this work.] |
|  |  | 1. **Context**   [Please discusshow the candidate’s field fits into the department’s academic plan. Discuss how this appointment would relate to FAS/SEAS faculty working in similar or adjacent intellectual fields. Describe the teaching needs that the appointment would address.] |
|  |  | **C. Summary of the Review Process** |
|  |  | 1. **Key Dates**   [Please list key dates, such as and not limited to:   * The date that the department chair/SEAS Dean met with the candidate to discuss the review process and materials that the candidate should submit by the September 1 (for academic-year appointments) or March 1 (for calendar-year appointments) deadline. * The dates of review committee meetings and departmental meetings about the case. * The date that the department sent requests for the required arm’s length external letters and for any letters from collaborators or mentors or “internal external” letter writers.] |
|  |  | 1. **Continuity**   [Please provide a summary of measures that the department took to foster appropriate continuity between the candidate’s associate review and tenure review (e.g., overlap in external letter writers; the encouraged overlap in review committee membership; progressive development of the field definition over the course of successive reviews; efforts to reach a developmental understanding and assessment of the candidate’s teaching, advising, mentoring, etc.). |
|  |  | **D. Comparands** |
|  |  | 1. **Comparands Sent to Letter Writers**   [Please provide the list of comparands that the department originally sent to letter writers: names, home institutions, and links to each comparand's home page, with a brief rationale for each comparand.Explain how this comparand list reflects an appropriately broad definition of the field and represents a range of career experience conducive to shedding light on the current standing and future trajectory of the candidate.] |
|  |  | 1. **Substitutions**   [If any letter-writers have opted to substitute different comparands, indicate who made substitutions and what substitutions they made.] |
|  |  | 1. **Comparands as Letter Writers**   [If any comparands (as infrequently occurs) were also asked to write an external letter (with their name removed from the comparand list in the letter that requested their evaluation), please note that here.] |
|  |  | 1. **Diversity**   [Discuss any efforts to make the comparand list diverse, including gender and racial/ethnic diversity.] |
|  |  | **E. Letter Writers** |
|  |  | 1. **Solicitations and Responses**   [In each of these three categories—a) required arm’s-length external letters; b) optional letters from collaborators or mentors); and c) optional “internal external” letters—please describe how many letters were solicited, how many requests were declined, how many letters were received, and any inferences from the pattern of responses.] |
|  |  | 1. **Rationale**   [Please describe the logic underlying the composition of the letter writer group (especially in cases where the candidate is multidisciplinary).] |
|  |  | 1. **Diversity**   [Discuss any efforts to make the list of letter writers diverse, including gender and racial/ethnic diversity.] |
|  |  | **F. The Intellectual Case for the Candidate** |
|  |  | 1. **Summary of Contributions**   [Please provide a summary of the candidate’s scholarly contributions.] |
|  |  | 1. **Analysis**   [Please provide an analysis of whether these contributions meet the intellectual criteria for tenure, including the impact the candidate has had on the field (e.g., whether the candidate is setting the agenda in the field), an indication of the candidate’s trajectory (how the candidate has distinguished themself from their cohort and is emerging as among the most influential figures in the field), and the candidate’s potential for future contributions.  This analysis should clearly draw on both the required arm’s length external letters (including comparison of the candidate with the comparands), any optional “internal external” letters or letters from collaborators or mentors, and the considered judgments of departmental faculty. Short quotes from the letters may be included but should not substitute for robust analysis of the letter contents and their relation to the department’s deliberations. Please directly address any letters that provide negative evaluations of the candidate.] |
|  |  | **G. Teaching, Advising, Mentoring**  [Please providean evaluation of teaching, advising, and mentoring effectiveness and impact in a variety of settings with both undergraduate and graduate students (and postdocs, as relevant). In particular: |
|  |  | 1. **Teaching**   Please provide:   * An explicit statement of what the department’s teaching expectations are/were for the tenure-track faculty member * A discussion of how the faculty member was mentored in developing their teaching portfolio * A discussion of how the faculty member’s offerings contribute to the department’s stated goals * For context, how this teaching portfolio compares to others in the department or field, to help calibrate the candidate’s contributions * An assessment of the candidate’s effectiveness and impact through their teaching. The FAS endorses a developmental view of the candidate’s teaching, advising, and mentoring. With this in mind, please assess and reflect on aspects of their professional progression and on how they have addressed any areas of concern. |
|  |  | 1. **Advising and Mentoring**  * Please describe how many undergraduates, graduate students, and (as relevant) postdoctoral fellows the department contacted for advisee and mentee feedback, how many in each category declined to respond, and how many sent feedback. * Please provide a summary of advisee and mentee feedback solicited by the department chair from current and former advisees and mentees. You may include quotes from the advisee or mentee feedback as long as the quotes do not reveal the identity of the advisee or mentee. * Please provide an assessment of how the candidate has made an impact through their advising and mentoring. * To help calibrate the candidate’s contributions, please indicate how the candidate’s advising and mentoring responsibilities compare to others in the department or field.] |
|  |  | **H. Service/Citizenship**  [Please provide an evaluation of the candidate’s service/citizenship in the department, School, University, and broader academic community. In particular: |
|  |  | Please provide:   * A discussion of the guidance that the department gave the candidate in developing as a citizen * An indication of how the candidate’s service load compares to others in the department or field, to help calibrate the candidate’s contributions * A discussion of the candidate’s impact in this realm.] |
|  |  | **I. Degree/Curricular Standing Committee Comments** |
|  |  | [Please include any verbatim evaluation(s) from the chair(s) of the undergraduate degree/curricular standing committee(s) of which the candidate is a member, accompanied by the review committee's reflections on the evaluation(s).] |
|  |  | **J.** **Candidate Talk** |
|  |  | [If available, please include a link to a videotaped talk (ideally, a talk the candidate gave before coming up for tenure).] |
|  |  | **K. Summary of the Department's Discussions of the Case** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | **L. Strengths and Weaknesses** |
|  |  | [Please provide a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s case, as noted in the letters and in the internal conversations of both the review committee and the department. This analysis of strengths and weaknesses should reflect in-depth and rigorous committee and departmental deliberations of the candidate’s entire dossier.] |
|  |  | **M. Departmental Vote** |
|  |  | [Please provide a record of the department vote, by name, with an “as of” date for the vote tally.] |
|  |  | **N. Signatures** |
|  |  | [Please include the signature of the primary author of the statement.] |