MEMORANDUM

TO: Thanh Truc Nguyen, CPM Chair
   Curriculum Research and Development Group

FROM: Reed Dasenbrock
      Vice Chancellor
      for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: External Evaluation Requirements

Attached is the survey that CPM asked OVCAA to conduct concerning policies of our peer and benchmark institutions having to do with the selection of external references for tenure and promotion and the timetable for getting letters. We were able to find policies for 11 of our 12 peer institutions. In my analysis, though there are variations campus to campus, eight of the 11 have demonstrably stronger language on the conflict of interest issue than the current Mānoa guidelines, so in my judgment, the proposed new language would bring us up to the standard of our peer institutions. The exceptions are LSU and the University of Tennessee, with language close to our current policy, and the University of Utah, which does not go beyond a general statement about needing "an objective assessment of the quality of the candidate’s work." No institution has a precise time line for obtaining the letters, and the time line is only mentioned in some of the University of Virginia guidelines, so this seems to be an area in which there is little overall policy guidance.

I hope this is helpful in your committee’s consideration of the proposed changes concerning how we obtain external letters as part of our tenure and promotion process.

Attachment

c: Assistant Vice Chancellor Beverly McCreary
   SEC Chair Susan Hippensteele
**EXTERNAL EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY (CSU)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies re External Evaluations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 5 letters required; however, max of 2 may be from list submitted by candidate
- Reviewers should be at a rank equal to or higher than rank being sought
- Reviewers should be from a peer institution, or have a nationally-known reputation
- Candidate may suggest reviewers, but only 2 may used in dossier
- Reviewer should have no professional relationship with candidate

| **Sources** | Documentation for Tenure and Promotion Application, rev Spring 2010: http://www.provost.colostate.edu/index.asp?url=Resources/faculty_affairs |

**EXTERNAL EVALUATION POLICIES/REQUIREMENTS**

**SURVEY OF PEER INSTITUTIONS**
### Policies re External Evaluations

- 6 letters (max) permitted
- Reviewers should be tenured
- Reviewers should be from a peer institution, or have a nationally-known reputation
- At least 1 (but not all) of reviewers should be suggested by candidate
- Candidates may submit names (max 3) of excluded reviewers
- Reviewers should not be colleagues whom the candidate has frequently collaborated

| Solicited Letters of Evaluation from Professionals in the Field, outside the Institution (six maximum). Letters should be solicited from appropriate professionals in the field and chosen for their ability to evaluate the candidate's activities and accomplishments impartially. They should generally be tenured professors at peer institutions or individuals of equivalent stature outside of academe who are widely recognized in the field. Letters should primarily focus on the aspects of the candidate's work that qualify as scholarship. While in some cases this might mean a focus on one area such as teaching or research, in others it might entail a focus on a mixture of scholarship in teaching, research/creative activities and/or extension/prfessional practice. At least one of the reviewers, but not all, should be suggested by the candidate. Candidates may consult with ISU colleagues about appropriate reviewers and their institutions. Candidates may submit a list of up to three people in their field who will not be contacted as reviewers. This request, if made, must be put forward at the same time candidates submit names of potential reviewers. Letters soliciting outside review of a candidate's work must make clear what is to be covered by the reviewer. These letters sent by the department soliciting external reviews may optionally include or exclude asking reviewers their opinions about whether candidates would or should receive tenure and/or promotion at the reviewer's institution or at Iowa State University. The department must make any request regarding this summative question consistent for all candidates and all reviewers.

| Solicited Letters of Evaluation from Professionals in the Field, outside the Institution (six maximum). Letters should be solicited from appropriate professionals in the field and chosen for their ability to evaluate the candidate's activities and accomplishments impartially. They should generally be tenured professors at peer institutions or individuals of equivalent stature outside of academe who are widely recognized in the field. Letters should primarily focus on the aspects of the candidate's work that qualify as scholarship. While in some cases this might mean a focus on one area such as teaching or research, in others it might entail a focus on a mixture of scholarship in teaching, research/creative activities and/or extension/prfessional practice. At least one of the reviewers, but not all, should be suggested by the candidate. Candidates may consult with ISU colleagues about appropriate reviewers and their institutions. Candidates may submit a list of up to three people in their field who will not be contacted as reviewers. This request, if made, must be put forward at the same time candidates submit names of potential reviewers. Letters soliciting outside review of a candidate's work must make clear what is to be covered by the reviewer. These letters sent by the department soliciting external reviews may optionally include or exclude asking reviewers their opinions about whether candidates would or should receive tenure and/or promotion at the reviewer's institution or at Iowa State University. The department must make any request regarding this summative question consistent for all candidates and all reviewers.

| Sources | Iowa State University Faculty Handbook, Section 5.2, “Promotion and Tenure of Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Appointments”: http://www.provost.iastate.edu/faculty/handbook/current/section5.html#section-5.2 |
Policies for External Evaluations

- 5-6 letters requested; 3 minimum required

- Reviewers should have a rank higher than the rank being sought (except for candidates for full professor)

- Reviewers should be from Research I or II institutions. Dean's permission required for reviewers from non-Research I or II institutions or non-academic reviewers.

- Only 1 reviewer per institution

- Candidate, voting faculty and chair will develop list of reviewers; voting faculty and chair will select reviewers. Candidate will not be informed of identity of reviewers.

- Reviewers should not have been a candidate's major professor for a graduate degree or postdoctoral advisor

- While the primary responsibility for the evaluation lies with the LSU faculty and administrators, objective evaluations from appropriate off-campus professionals can make a significant contribution to the review process. All recommendations for promotion and/or tenure must be accompanied by letters of evaluation from recognized experts in the candidate's field, none of whom may be a member of the LSU faculty. In the case of an assistant professor or associate professor candidate, the external evaluator must be of higher rank than the candidate. Care should be given to selecting evaluators who are free of bias. In some cases, letters of evaluation are from experts with a rank lower than the candidate, who is not the candidate's major professor or postdoctoral advisor.

- In most cases, letters of evaluation should come from faculty employed at institutions with Carnegie Rankings of Research I or II. Deans can grant special permission to accept letters from other colleges and universities, individuals who have served as a candidate's major professor for a graduate degree, or postdoctoral advisor for a graduate degree. No more than one letter may come from any institution. The candidate, eligible voting faculty, and chair will develop lists of potential evaluators.

- Both the faculty and chair are responsible for selecting the evaluators. The final confidential list of evaluators will include a brief statement of their qualifications, professional rank, and institution of employment. The list will be presented to the dean for approval prior to contacting the evaluators.

- After approval by the dean, the chair will contact proposed evaluators to determine willingness to participate. The candidate will not be informed of the identity of evaluators. Should a candidate develop knowledge of the identity of evaluators, she/he will not contact evaluators at any time during the review process. Normally, five to six evaluation letters are to be requested. If fewer than three such letters are received, the candidate should be informed. If fewer than three letters are returned at any time during the review process, the candidate will be informed.

- No information from the evaluator's letters will be divulged to the candidate...
### Policies re External Evaluations

- 5 letters (min) required; 8 letter (max) permitted
- Reviewers should be tenured or of equivalent stature
- Candidate submits list of potential reviews, from which at least 3 are selected by dept. chair. However, in the dossier, no more than half of the external letters may be from reviewers selected by the candidate.
- Reviewers should not be solicited from co-authors, co-principal investigators, former professors, or former students. Nor should reviewers be clients or others whom the candidate has directly served in his/her work.

Solicited Letters of Evaluation from Outside Leaders in the Field (5 minimum, 8 maximum for professorial faculty; 4 for Faculty Research Assistants and Instructors). Letters should generally be from leaders in the candidate's field, chosen for their ability to evaluate the candidate's scholarly work. Letters should not be solicited from co-authors, co-principal investigators, former professors, or former students. If such letters are necessary, include an explanation and state why the evaluator can be objective. Letters should generally be from tenured professors or individuals of equivalent stature outside of academe who are widely recognized in the field. External letters for professorial faculty should never be solicited from clients or others whom the candidate has directly served in his/her work. For FRA's and Instructors, the letters can be from internal evaluators who have worked with the candidate but can objectively evaluate the candidate's dossier. Careful consideration should be given to minimizing conflict of interest when choosing all evaluators. The candidate may submit a list of individuals meeting these criteria and, from this list, at least three will be selected by the department chair or head (or chair of the unit's Promotion and Tenure Committee). The other reviewers are to be selected by the chair, head, dean, or faculty committee according to practices determined within the unit. All letters must be requested by the department chair, head, dean, or the unit's promotion and tenure committee chair, not the candidate. Provide a brief (paragraph) description of the outside evaluators that makes it clear that they meet the criteria. Clearly indicate which outside reviewers were chosen by the candidate. In the final dossier, no more than half of the outside reviewers can be chosen by the candidate.

### Sources

### UNIVERSTY OF CALIFORNIA – DAVIES

#### Policies re External Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 5 – 8 letters usually expected in dossier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviewers should be at a rank equal to or higher than rank being sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviewers should be well-known/respected in their field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Candidate submits list of potential reviewers. Chair makes second list of potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviewers. Then Chair selects reviewers on each list, including a “reasonable” number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of persons nominated by the candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Candidate may submit names of excluded reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviewers should not be solicited from people who have a connection with the candidate, e.g.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they are not a recent mentor, collaborator, or advisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extramural letters reviewing the candidate's qualifications for promotion, or advancement to Professor, Step VI and Above Scale, are requested by the Chair (faculty should not request them directly from reviewers). The candidate submits a list of outstanding researchers in his/her field who could write such letters and the Chair, in consultation with the departmental faculty, makes up a second list of potential extramural reviewers (not revealing the names to the candidate). The Chair then solicits letters from reviewers on each list, asking for an evaluation of teaching, research, and service, and an opinion as to whether the candidate would likely be considered for promotion at the reviewer's institution. Many reviewers do not feel that they can knowledgeably comment on any area other than the research record, and they restrict their remarks to that activity. These letters are considered to be confidential...

'Arm's length' means reviewers who are qualified to evaluate the work, but have no connection with the candidate, e.g., they are not a recent mentor, collaborator, or advisor. This assures that reviewers do not have a conflict of interest (See UCD APM 220 Exhibit B).

Between 5-8 letters are usually expected in the review dossier. Regardless of number however, reviewers find that detailed, informative, evaluative, arm's length letters are the most valuable. Reviewers will look to see if the extramural referees: • Are well known/respected in their field; • Are at least of rank comparable to the position being sought; • Discuss the impact of the candidate's research; • Consider the candidate's career to be on an upward trajectory.

... In accordance with established policy applicable to the personnel action under consideration, the chair shall solicit letters of evaluation of the candidate from qualified persons, including a reasonable number of persons nominated by the candidate. All such letters received shall be included in the file; unsolicited letters that are used shall also be included in the file. In soliciting or receiving unsolicited letters of evaluation, the chair should include, attach or send a statement regarding the confidentiality of such letters. The Provost and Senior Vice President—Academic Affairs shall issue guidelines for the contents of statements. The candidate may provide in writing to the chair names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, for reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications or performance. Any such statement provided by the candidate shall be included in the personnel review file.

#### Sources

- Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) Concerning the Academic Personnel Review Process at UC Davis: [http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/frequently_asked_questions.htm#Whatis](http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/frequently_asked_questions.htm#Whatis)
**Policies re External Evaluations**

- 5 letters requested; min of 4 required. 2 reviewers should be nominated by candidate; at least 2 reviewers should not have been nominated by candidate.
- Reviewers should be tenured
- From a peer institution, or have a nationally-known reputation
- Candidate submits list of potential reviewers (6 max); at least 2 reviewers should be suggested by candidate
- Candidates may submit names (max 3) of excluded reviewers
- Reviewers should not be the candidate’s terminal degree advisors, postdoctoral advisors and personal friends

The second key responsibility of the PTU head is to obtain objective and impersonal external appraisals of the quality of the candidate's contributions from persons highly qualified to provide an assessment. Preferably five such appraisals will be obtained, but in any event the PTU evaluation cannot be conducted with fewer than four external appraisals available, at least two of which must be from a list of potential external evaluators supplied by the candidate. Assessments should not be sought from terminal degree advisors, postdoctoral advisors and personal friends. Appendix C describes this process more fully, and Appendix D provides a sample form for requesting external letters of evaluation. The candidate constructs a list of up to six potential external evaluators and their qualifications as reviewers. The PTU head must select and include in the dossier letters of evaluation from at least two of the candidate’s designated external reviewers and will inform the candidate in writing when the letters have arrived. The candidate also constructs a list of no more than three individuals who may not be contacted as external evaluators. There should be no contact at all with these individuals during the promotion and/or tenure review. The dossier must also include at least two letters from individuals not on the candidate’s approved list. If one or two of the external evaluators cannot or do not respond, another letter may be requested, maintaining a balance of letters from the candidate’s list of letters and from the PTU’s list. All letters of evaluation must be included in the dossier.

**Sources**

### UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY (UK)

**Policies re External Evaluations**

- 6 letters (min) required. At least 4 reviewers should not have been nominated by candidate.
- Reviewers should be from a peer institution. Reviewers from research-oriented universities will be given more weight.
- Reviewers should be recognized experts in their disciplines.
- Candidates may submit names of excluded reviewers. Request will be taken into consideration.
- Reviewers should be arm's length from candidate, i.e., should not be the candidate's dissertation advisor or post-doctoral supervisor.

The following provisions apply to the solicitation of outside letters by the educational unit administrator:

1. A promotion or tenure dossier shall include a minimum of six (6) letters of evaluation from qualified persons outside the University. These outside letters are crucial in promotion and tenure reviews. (b) The letters from outside of the University shall be obtained by the educational unit administrator directly from appropriately qualified persons selected in part from, and in part independent of, suggestions of the individual being considered for promotion or tenure. (c) At least four (4) of the letters from outside of the University shall come from reviewers selected by the educational unit administrator independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure. (d) Outside letters from scholars at research-oriented universities shall be given the most serious consideration, except in promotion and tenure reviews involving faculty employees whose assignments do not include significant research responsibilities. Where deemed appropriate by the unit administrator, letters from persons affiliated with prestigious non-academic institutes, centers or specialized schools may be used. (e) The letters from outside of the University shall be accompanied in a promotion and/or tenure dossier by a written statement by the educational unit administrator indicating for each letter whether or not the name of the respondent had been suggested by the individual under consideration and, if known, whether or not the respondent had been a previous faculty colleague of the individual.

In addition, we offer the following considerations for the selection of and guidance conveyed to outside evaluators:

- They are recognized experts in their disciplines;
- They are at peer or benchmark institutions;
- They stand at arms-length from the candidate (e.g., not dissertation advisor or post-doctoral supervisor). We encourage educational unit administrators to ask candidates beforehand if there are external reviewers whom they wish to avoid for justifiable concerns about conflicts of interest. The department/college is then free to discuss and decide whether or not to accept any or all of the restrictions offered by the candidate. The educational unit administrator must explain in his or her letter any deviations from the expected norms identified above (e.g., the leading expert in the world happens to be at a four-year college).

**Sources**

- Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and the Granting of Tenure:
- Provost's Memorandum of August 19, 2010 - Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure:
  - [http://www.uky.edu/Provost/APFA/Promotion_Tenure/2010-11_Appointment_Reappointment_Promotion_Tenure_Procedures.pdf](http://www.uky.edu/Provost/APFA/Promotion_Tenure/2010-11_Appointment_Reappointment_Promotion_Tenure_Procedures.pdf)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies re External Evaluations</th>
<th>No specific criteria indicated.</th>
<th>COULD NOT LOCATE SPECIFIC GUIDELINES ON SEEKING EXTERNAL EVALUATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Policies re External Evaluations</strong></th>
<th>A minimum of four letters of evaluation are required: all four from outside the institution, all from individuals independent of the candidate, two from a list of provided by the candidate and two from individuals selected by the Department Chair or Dean, as appropriate. Ideally, all of the letters should come from Research Institutions. The purpose of these letters is to provide an independent and unbiased assessment of the individual's national and international reputation. Therefore, the request from the Department Chair or Dean to prospective writers of outside letters of evaluation should be phrased neutrally and should not solicit an affirmative response or recommendation. A copy of the letter requesting an evaluation of the candidate should be included in the dossier. The letters may not be from individuals who have been directly involved with a candidate, e.g., a collaborator, mentor, previous co-worker, former dissertation chair, etc., but may be from individuals who know the candidate through professional interactions, e.g., reviewed the candidate's publications or served on review committees together. In addition to the minimum four required independent letters, any number of additional letters from any source may also be submitted. These may be from individuals within the institution with whom the candidate has collaborated or from former colleagues, collaborators, mentors or other individuals connected with the candidate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources</strong></td>
<td>• How to Present an Effective Dossier to the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee; <a href="http://provost.unc.edu/policies/aptdossier">http://provost.unc.edu/policies/aptdossier</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE – KNOXVILLE

#### Policies re External Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 (min) letters required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewers should have a rank equal to or higher than rank being sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate may submit list of potential reviewers; however, final list of reviewers must be drawn from diverse sources and shall in no case be taken solely from the list furnished by the candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidates may submit names (max 3) of excluded reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewers should not be the candidate's former teachers or students or who do not have expertise in the candidate's area of specialization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The process for obtaining external letters of assessment

The department head manages the process of obtaining external letters of assessment. Dossiers shall include at least three letters from external evaluators assessing the quality and importance of the candidate's research/scholarship/creative activity.

1. **Identifying and contacting external evaluators.** The department head should initiate the process of obtaining external letters of assessment far enough in advance of the review process that letters are in the dossier and available to peer review committees and administrators at all levels of review. If letters arrive after the review process has begun, please follow the procedure in Part IV.A.2.

2. **Method for obtaining external assessments.** The department head shall be responsible for providing a statement explaining the method by which the external evaluators were selected. Department heads shall obtain assessments from experts in the candidate's particular area of specialization who are qualified to give authoritative assessments of the candidate's work both with respect to quality and to productivity.

   i. Normally, the department head requests names of potential external evaluators from the faculty member under review as well as from faculty colleagues and experts external to the university. The final list of those contacted to serve as external evaluators must be drawn from diverse sources and shall in no case be taken solely from the list furnished by the candidate.

   ii. Department heads shall not request external assessments from the candidate's former teachers or students or from evaluators who do not have expertise in the candidate's area of specialization. External evaluators shall be asked to describe the nature of their association with the candidate.

   iii. Department heads shall request external assessments from individuals who hold higher rank than the candidate. In general, it is inappropriate to request assessments from non-tenured assistant professors for candidates for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor or from assistant or associate professors for candidates for promotion to professor.

   iv. Department heads will send to the external evaluators information and documentation for use in preparing the external assessment including the *curriculum vitae*, appropriate supporting materials concerning research/scholarship/creative activity, and the departmental and collegiate criteria statements for promotion and/or tenure.

   v. The department head shall be responsible for providing a brief biographical statement about the qualifications of each external evaluator; special attention should be given to documenting the evaluator's standing in his or her discipline as part of the biographical statement.

#### Sources

### Policies re External Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies re External Evaluations</th>
<th>No specific criteria indicated in policy.</th>
<th>External evaluations. The purpose of external evaluations is to provide an objective assessment of the quality of the candidate's work and its impact on the academic and/or professional community at large. Along with the actual review, the external evaluator should describe his/her qualifications and relationship to the candidate. The department chairperson should make sure that any letters of evaluation from outside the department are requested early enough for the letters to arrive and be included in the candidate's file before the program and department RPT advisory committee meetings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Sources

- Policy 6-303, Rev. 20: Retention, Promotion, and Tenure: [http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html](http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html)
| Policies re External Evaluations | UVA’s policies did not specify requirements for selecting external evaluators; it appears that each school or division sets its own policy and procedure. However, a review of some of UVA’s schools’ websites indicated that the following procedural:

UVA – College of Arts and Sciences: . . . eight to ten letters, solicited from outside experts competent to assess the candidate’s work and professional standing, accompanied by a letter from the chairperson identifying all referees solicited for references and providing a brief description of their qualifications to assess the candidate’s work. (One person should be designated to solicit and receive such letters.) The letter requesting appraisal should be neutral in tone; a sample copy should be included in the dossier. Please see Appendix at the bottom of this page for sample letter to external reviewers for tenure cases. In the dossier, include (1) a list of the reviewers with brief comments on their credentials; the list must be divided explicitly and clearly into reviewers suggested by the candidate and those suggested by the ad hoc committee; (2) a copy of the e-mail giving approval of the list from the relevant divisional Associate Dean; (3) a copy of the sample letter sent to external reviewers; (4) a copy of all e-mail and paper correspondence from prospective reviewers (both acceptances and declines), and finally (5) the review letters themselves. In addition to the list in (1) above, indicate clearly on each letter whether the recommender was the choice of the candidate or that of the department. Please note that tenure and promotion dossiers will be returned to department chairs if all of the materials and information listed in 1-5 above are not included.

Department of Psychology: Outside experts: Eight to ten letters from experts outside the department will be required. Every effort will be made to solicit letters from leading figures in the candidate’s field of specialty. The Chair of Department or chair of ad hoc committee will write a letter, neutral in tone, to potential external reviewers in the late summer or early fall of the academic year in which the tenure decision will be made, requesting their help and submitting the candidate’s CV. At least four of the outside experts approached will be from the candidate’s list, although no more than 50% may come from the list of names provided by the candidate. If a referee accepts the task, the chair will send copies of the candidate’s publications, manuscripts and other relevant material. Outside experts will receive the candidate’s material early in the fall semester; they are asked to complete their evaluations by October 15, if possible, and by Oct 30th at the very latest.

Sources | • UVA – College of Arts and Sciences http://artsandsciences.virginia.edu/facultystaff/hiringsupport/faculty/renewal_promotion.html
• Department of Psychology: See http://minerva.acc.virginia.edu/~psych/fac-hb/Tenure.htm