



UNIVERSITY SENATE
Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee

Report and Recommendation on
S-0811 Changes to Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions

1. THE CHARGE

S-0811 **Changes to Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions:** Review the process by which external letters are solicited and utilized in the reappointment/promotion process. Include a response to the issues raised by Senator Eric Allender regarding changes made to the 2008-09 Academic reappointment/Promotion Instructions. Respond to Senate Executive Committee by January 2011

Issues raised by Senator Allender:

Consider whether changes made to the 2008-09 Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions appropriately serve the University's process of evaluation for promotion with tenure and to senior ranks. Form No. 3-a, "Confidential Letter Cover Sheet,"¹ has been newly revised to add the following requirement:

C. Referee recommended by (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Candidate | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Chair/Program Director | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Colleague | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Dean | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The Senate is asked to consider this new requirement and whether it effectively reinstates, in part, a "ranking" of external letters. A process for separate "lists"² of external reviewers set forth in the Instructions many years ago was eliminated, in part, because the lists were being used in ways that discounted or provided less weight to letters received from reviewers recommended by the candidate. The integrity and weight applied to external letters is best determined by evaluators considering the reputation and expertise of the evaluators themselves, not by considering who recommended them as experts. External reviewers are explicitly asked in the letter of solicitation to disclose any relationship to the candidate and his/her prior basis of knowledge of the candidate's work. This advisory, coupled with the required "Report on External Confidential Letters" (Form No. 3), provides the information needed by internal evaluators to assess the quality of the external evaluation. A "check box" to indicate who recommended which referee will serve no useful purpose in the evaluation process and may, instead, create unwarranted biases and confusion throughout the evaluation process as to how the information should be interpreted.

¹ Full form is in Appendix I.

² An "A" list was used to indicate that external reviewers were not recommended by the candidate; "B" to indicate that the reviewers were recommended by the candidate; and "C" list was used to identify external reviewers the candidate requested not be solicited.

2. SUMMARY

The Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee (FPAC) was asked to consider whether the inclusion of a checkbox list appropriately serves the University's process of evaluation for promotion.

Having carefully evaluated the advantages and disadvantages of such an inclusion, the FPAC has concluded that the inclusion of a checkbox list, if not actually prejudicial, is at the very least perceived as such by the faculty of this university. This perception may be due, at least in part, to the past history of the "A", "B" and "C" lists that were abolished at the insistence of the faculty. In addition, the FPAC concluded that the intended purpose of including such a checkbox list would be more effectively accomplished through other changes in the Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions.

As a result, the FPAC recommends that the administration:

- discontinue the use of the checkbox list on Form No. 3-a.

In addition, to address issues of accountability by chairs and deans, and to ensure that a list of credible and knowledgeable external evaluators has been compiled, the FPAC recommends that:

- evaluators be asked more emphatically by the solicitation letter to disclose in their evaluation letter the nature of their relationship, if any, with the candidate;
- chairs be required to assert that at least six of the letters in the packet are "at arm's length" independently of who recommended the evaluator (if less than six are included, a strong case should be made for an exception); and
- chairs be required to stress in the narrative the relationship, if any, of each evaluator to the candidate.

During the discussions on the charge, the FPAC identified additional areas of concern with respect to policies governing the solicitation of letters from outside evaluators. In particular the FPAC contends that it is not helpful to the overall objectivity of the process that letters from co-authors and collaborators are, if not outright inadmissible, at the very least considered by candidates and chairs alike as such. The FPAC includes in its recommendations on the current charge the following related recommendation:

- that faculty be informed, by inclusion in the appointment/promotion annual instructions, that letters from collaborators and/or co-authors will be accepted in special cases³ in which the nature of the field makes such evaluators the most appropriate.

3. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The FPAC met and discussed the charge in nine sessions (2/27/09, 3/27/09, 9/25/09, 10/23/09, 12/4/09, 1/29/10, 3/26/10, 4/30/10, and 9/24/10). The Committee invited EVPAA Dr. Philip Furmanski and Dr. Mary Gibson, Professor Emerita and Staff Representative, AAUP, and discussed the subject of the charge with both. Discussions were frank and revealing even if, on occasion, issues were not

³ One such case would include fields in which the list of co-authors on a single publication is so lengthy as to make irrelevant any issue of too close personal collaboration or relationship, and co-authorship alone is not an adequate means of judging the relevance of close personal collaboration or relationship

necessarily viewed the same way by all present. The issue also was discussed at some length at the Senate Executive Committee with EVPAA Furmanski at the time the charge was issued.

It was ascertained that the (re)introduction of a list is unpopular with faculty, especially faculty who have been at Rutgers for some time, at least in part because of the negative connotations associated with the previously used “A”, “B” or “C” list. At the time, designation to the “A” list (reviewers not recommended by the candidate) gave an external letter more weight than designation to the “B” list (reviewers recommended by the candidate). The practice was finally discarded, to the general relief of the faculty. The new process attaches a checkbox list before every external letter. In that regard, it is perceived by many as being even more prejudicial than the old, discarded policy.

The committee is aware that the AAUP has taken issue with the changes, claiming that they were unilaterally made, and has taken the case before PERC. The FPAC does not wish to take a position in a labor dispute, but is concerned with the academic impact of this change on the promotion instructions. In addition, the FPAC points out that, if prior consultation with bodies such as the University Senate or the New Brunswick Faculty Council had been sought, then at least the previous history of the “A”, “B” or “C” list would have been more widely known, considered and appreciated.

At the very beginning of deliberations, the committee expressed concern with the required degrees of separation between the candidate and potential evaluators, as well as the impact this change might have on networking between candidates and peers. Thus, two interrelated issues emerged: the utility and impact of the use of the newly introduced checkbox list, on one hand, and the academic ramifications of real or perceived exclusion of collaborators from the set of external letters, on the other. The committee decided to deliberate on both issues.

In discussions with the Senate Executive Committee, EVPAA Furmanski explained that one reason for the checkboxes is to keep chairs accountable. For example, outside evaluators who, according to the chair, have no relationship with the candidate will on occasion describe a personal or collaborative relationship with the candidate in their letter.

The FPAC invited EVPAA Furmanski to provide more background on the current charge. He clarified that the change originated with the PRC. The PRC makes several changes each year to smooth out the promotion process. Two years earlier, the PRC wanted to include more information on Form No. 3 that provides background on why any given individual was selected as an external reviewer. The PRC did not discuss the prior, discarded policy of grading letters as “A”, “B”, etc. In this system, the outside letters tended to be devalued if the evaluator was close to the candidate. The check-off on the current form is not considered by the PRC to be a devaluation system.

Dr. Furmanski further stated that the PRC operates on the premise that the more information it has, the more fair its members can be. Outside letters are necessary to understand how a candidate fits within the full context of the academic enterprise. The PRC looks for balance in the letters. In some cases, the letters are too “perfect.” In other cases, negativity in letters comes from people who are not connected to the candidate and may not be aware of the significance of the candidate’s work. This possibility is particularly important for candidates who work across disciplinary boundaries. Further, it is the department’s job to explain negativity in letters, but some departments fail when, among other oversights, they do not understand the significance of the candidate’s work. The PRC will sort through

issues some departments have not. In addition, some letter writers exhibit a lack of judgment, and the checkbox is used to “impeach our own witnesses.” Who selected this person? The PRC will call in the dean or chair to explain. Finally, the checkboxes provide a measure of quality control. If all letter writers are suggested by the candidate, then the department chair is not doing a proper job. Often, packets that are not well developed from an intellectual point of view correlate with the lack of care with which the outside letters are selected.

It was suggested by a committee member that better instructions to the department may cure at least two of these issues: listing who recommended the letters is a minimalist way of obtaining this type of information; and the appearance of “taint” is sometimes in play, as well.

Dr. Furmanski replied that the instruction process is carefully structured. Trainings of the person who oversees the process are held in all schools each year in order to go through the process and point out changes. Regarding the issue of taint, Dr. Furmanski stated that there is no relationship between the proportion of letters suggested by any one person in the process or the outcome. The goal is to promote a process whereby the chair and candidate develop a fuller, more balanced packet. Planning should be done early in the process. What the PRC now sees more frequently is that chairs include more language in the narrative section of the form to clarify any given answer in the checkbox. In case the chair does not have experience in selecting the best referees, the suggestion is that candidates go to the dean, who can solicit more letters, or that candidates and chairs call members of prominent journals’ editorial boards to recommend reviewers who are familiar with the field.

Finally, Dr. Furmanski stated that the PRC does not rely on the narrative instead of the checkboxes because its members just are not getting the information they need there. The FPAC considered this comment in its deliberations and based one of its recommendations upon it.

The FPAC discussed Dr. Furmanski’s comments at length. The committee approached the issue on the premise that the objective is to compile a list of reviewers who are knowledgeable with respect to the scholarly expectations at peer research universities and are also credible. The latter requires that they both are familiar with the work of the candidate and have no conflict of interest.

Naturally, other peer institutions face the same challenge. There is some variation in the requirements set at peer institutions. For example, the University of Illinois solicits letters from within the University (but outside a candidate’s school) to provide evidence of interdisciplinary work. Some institutions drop the least-supportive letter from the process. A non-exhaustive web search indicated that many peer institutions require that the list should include a "reasonable number" of letters from scholars who have not been closely associated with the candidate either as colleagues, friends, or collaborators in research⁴. Instructions from other institutions⁵ suggest that letters from collaborators may, however, be crucial, especially if the extent of the candidate’s contribution in collaborative projects is not easily ascertained.

The same search failed to identify any peer institution that utilizes a checkbox list attached to each external letter for that purpose. Indeed, the only other example of that practice known to FPAC

⁴ At UCSB, a "reasonable number" is interpreted to mean "half of the letters."

⁵ <http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/P&T%20Section%20VII-%20External%20Reviewers.pdf>

members is the old practice at Rutgers of characterizing letters as belonging to the “A”, “B” or “C” list. The FPAC has no reason to doubt the assertion that the PRC does not use the checkbox list in the same way to assign relative weights, but the committee believes that there has been a clear message from the administration and the PRC that letters from collaborators will not count as much, and whether this message was intended or not, this is the way it has been interpreted.

In committee discussions, concern was expressed that junior faculty might not network sufficiently because that practice might work against them at promotion time. It is the committee’s opinion that candidates should be networking with other researchers and should not be penalized for it, especially in narrow scientific fields in which so few faculty members are working. Such a penalty sends the wrong message to junior faculty and can negatively affect their careers. In many fields, these individuals are the only scholars sufficiently familiar with the candidate’s work to comment intelligently on it. It should be possible in special cases to solicit letters from reviewers who are not “at arm’s length,” and it should be the responsibility of the chair or dean to justify using referees who are crucial to the process. One committee member suggested that, if one is doing his/her job, then he/she should know all the important people.

Input on this particular aspect also came from outside the Senate in several forms. One colleague asked the question: “If a junior faculty member tells me a Nobel Laureate has proposed a collaboration, what should I advise? Decline so you can use him as a referee for tenure?” A colleague, who is member of two National Academies for having opened a new field, sent one of the co-chairs an e-mail message⁶ with respect to the practice of discouraging letters from scientific collaborators and the scarcity of such collaborators in emerging fields.

These issues were discussed with Dr. Furmanski. Our understanding is that he suggested that exceptions can, and have been made in such cases. The FPAC realizes that this information is not available to either candidates or supervisors, and based one of its recommendations on the need to disseminate the information by including it in section F⁷ of the Academic Reappointment/ Promotion Instructions.

Recommendation 1: The Senate recommends that section F of the Academic Reappointment/ Promotion Instructions be amended to explicitly include a statement that, if extenuating

⁶ “I am writing about the process of getting references for a promotion case. I learned today that references cannot be close friends or close colleagues of the candidate being considered for promotion. That policy seems to make little sense as you can be forced to seek references who don't sufficiently know your work or its impact. Consider the ultimate case of someone who has pioneered a new field or a new technology and everyone who currently works in the new field or new technology is basing their efforts on the vision of the creator. In this extreme case, there might be no one who has not been a close friend or colleague and thus the field of potential references becomes vanishingly small as all good references are invalid since they knew the pioneer so well. In my own field of digital signal processing, for the first decade or so after the technology became viable, the set of creators of the technology (mainly at MIT and Bell Labs) got to know and work with all the major contributors to the field (in fact efforts were created to bring all workers in the field to a set of workshops and meetings on a regular basis so as to best disseminate the knowledge and advances). If anyone needed a set of promotion references, the only viable people were your close friends and colleagues. In any case, it appears to be somewhat backwards to eliminate as a reference anyone who is qualified to comment on the work of an individual--no matter what relationship to the individual.”

⁷ Appended as Appendix II

circumstances with respect to the candidate and/or the field warrant it, the option exists for altering the balance of evaluators considered “at arm’s length” by soliciting more letters from external reviewers who know the candidate than is the usual practice. The chair would be expected to make a case in the narrative for such an exception.

The FPAC concluded that although the newly introduced checkbox was used to improve the process, potential for misuse was overlooked. The characterizations of “misleading,” “inaccurate” and “prejudicial” were offered. The FPAC considers that the potential for prejudice is substantial and that, at the very least, the checkbox list sends too strong a message to junior faculty. Such a message may stifle collaborations that are crucial in disciplines in which most funding is awarded to consortia. Besides, the simple label of the relationship is not what is essential. A description of the relationship in a narrative would be more informative and more useful. The checkbox is not about the relationship, but instead simply about who suggested the letter. The PRC may be able to make the distinction, but the perception among the faculty is that there is a one-to-one correlation between the origin of the suggestion came from and the perceived degree of separation. In addition, the utility of the checkbox form also was questioned on the basis that it carries no information on what transpired before the form was filled out. For example, candidates could send friendly senior colleagues into the chair’s office to suggest a name, thus the most successful candidates will be those who have friends who are working on their behalf. As a result the process often is distorted and the checkbox is not a good proxy for whether, in fact, the process was properly conducted.

Recommendation 2: The Senate recommends that the Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions be amended by removing Section C from Form No. 3-a.

If the point is to have confidence of independent judgment, then what one would want to hold chairs accountable for is that a significant proportion of the letters writers are not close colleagues of the candidate. Indeed the latter is not guaranteed by a checkbox that labels the letter as not suggested by the candidate. It does not follow that letter writers suggested by the candidate are “not at arm’s length” and *vice versa*. Indeed, at least one public AAU makes the distinction. Attachment G in the packets of the University of Michigan⁸ suggests that all four combinations⁹ are possible.

Furthermore, basing judgment of independence on who suggested the letter writer may discount those who are truly independent simply because they are on the candidate list. The candidate often knows the best people from whom to solicit letters, and it may be difficult to find other faculty members in the department who can recommend referees of similar quality.

The FPAC therefore decided that a certification by the chair that six of the letters were written by people who were “at arm’s length” would be more useful. In addition, this practice would hold the chair accountable if less than six letters indicated such a relationship. It would let each letter speak for itself and would make it harder for anyone to make a prejudgment.

⁸ http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/Attachment%20G.pdf

⁹ i.e., arm’s length – suggested by the department; arm’s length – suggested by the candidate; not arm’s length – suggested by the department; not arm’s length – suggested by the candidate.

Recommendation 3: The Senate recommends that the Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions be amended in a manner that will require that the chairs completing appointment or promotion packets should certify on Form No. 3, or another appropriate place, the number of external evaluation letters that were from evaluators assessed to be “at arm’s length” from the candidate. If that number is less than six, then a detailed justification must also be included. In addition, chairs should be required to describe, at the end of each biosketch, the relationship of the evaluator to the candidate.

If the external letter itself will be used to convey the information on the extent of the relationship of the evaluator to the candidate, then what is needed is for the letter to convey in the first sentence the nature of the relationship of the letter writer to the candidate, which is the natural way that most would write a recommendation letter anyway.

A request that specifies “How and for how long the referee has known the candidate” as the first item on the solicitation letter seems to be sufficient for the University of Washington¹⁰. The relationship of the referee with the candidate is included in the chair’s narrative on the external letters¹¹. The FPAC decided to recommend a similar policy, and that a sentence on “How and how long” should be more emphatically required by the solicitation letter so that the relationship between referee and candidate is featured prominently in the letter. The FPAC based one of its recommendations on this premise.

Recommendation 4: The Senate recommends that appendices G-1 to G-5, as well as appendix G-II, to the Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions be amended in a manner that will place additional emphasis in the request for information from external evaluators on their relationship to the candidate.

The solicitation letter¹² sent by the chair to the referee does not, in our opinion, stress adequately the need for the referee to start his/her letter with a description of “How and how long.” Indeed, the request for this information is left to the end and is bundled with a request for a biosketch or a CV:

I am writing to ask if you would send me a confidential letter assessing Professor (name)'s scholarship. We would especially like your evaluation of the originality and quality of (his/her) achievements, their impact upon the field, and the value of (his/her) contributions to the profession. We would also appreciate your assessment of Professor (name)'s accomplishments relative to others in comparable positions in the discipline nationally and internationally, as well as your judgment of whether (his/her) work meets the requirement for someone being considered for promotion at your institution. In addition, if you are able to comment upon Professor (name)'s teaching and/or service to the profession, we would appreciate receiving your assessment in these areas.

¹⁰ http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/faculty/promotion_tenure.html

¹¹ A statement from the chair should describe the qualifications of the external reviewers, their relationship (if any) with the candidate, the manner in which they were chosen, and the reasons for the choices. This may be included in the chair's letter or on a separate page. Do not submit the reviewers' *curriculum vitae*.

¹² Appendices G-1 to G-5 and G-II to the Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions; G-1 is copied here as Appendix III

We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise and current research interests, and/or *curriculum vitae*. Finally, please advise us of your relationship to the candidate, if any, and the prior basis of your knowledge of the candidate's work, if any.

In the opinion of the FPAC, it would not be surprising if that information was similarly placed at odd points in the recommendation letter or omitted altogether. By contrast, the University of Washington stresses the "How and how long" prominently and at the very beginning of the information solicited¹³:

Your letter, which we need to have no later than _____ should contain the following information:

- How and for how long have you known the candidate?
- Your view of the significance, independence, influence and promise of the candidate's work, and the degree of his/her national/international reputation.
- Some comparison of the candidate's accomplishments with others at a similar career stage in the same or related fields.

In the opinion of the FPAC, a simple reorganization of the priorities in the solicitation in the format of the University of Washington bulleted list would go a long way to ensure that the information on the relationship between the external reviewer and the candidate will appear prominently, and most probably, at the beginning of each letter. A simple reshuffling could be as follows:

I am writing to ask if you would send me a confidential letter assessing Professor (name)'s scholarship and provide the following information:

1. Please advise us of your relationship to the candidate, if any, and the prior basis of your knowledge of the candidate's work, if any.
2. We would especially like your evaluation of the originality and quality of (his/her) achievements, their impact upon the field, and the value of (his/her) contributions to the profession.
3. We would also appreciate your assessment of Professor (name)'s accomplishments relative to others in comparable positions in the discipline nationally and internationally, as well as your judgment of whether (his/her) work meets the requirement for someone being considered for promotion at your institution.
4. In addition, if you are able to comment upon Professor (name)'s teaching and/or service to the profession, we would appreciate receiving your assessment in these areas.

We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise and current research interests, and/or *curriculum vitae*.

¹³ http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/letters/chairs_letter_solicitation.html

4. RESOLUTION

In Support of the University Senate's Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee's Report and Recommendation:

Whereas, the University Senate Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee has examined and reported on the "Changes to Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions"; and

Whereas, the University Senate has reviewed the Committee's report and its Recommendation, finding said recommendation to be sound and in the best interests of Rutgers University;

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Rutgers University Senate endorses the "Report and Recommendation on S-0811 Changes to Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions" and urges the Administration to implement its recommendations.

Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee 2010-11

Gould, Ann, SAS-NB (F), Co-Chair

Panayotatos, Paul, GS-NB (F), Co-Chair

Abercrombie, Elizabeth, GS-N (F)

Boylan, Edward, FAS-N (F)

Carr, Deborah, SAS-NB (F)

Creese, Ian, GS-N (F)

Ellis, Nancy, PTL-C (F)

Fernandez, Vivian, VP for Faculty & Staff Resources (non-senator)

Finegold, David, SMLR Dean (A)

Fishbein, Leslie, SAS-NB (F)

Gurfinkiel, Israel, FAS-C (F)

Gursoy, Melike, Engineering (F)

Janes, Harry, SEBS (F)

Levine, Justine, NB Staff

Markert, Joseph, RBS-N/NB (F)

Mojaddedi, Jawid, SAS-NB (F)

Niederman, Robert, GS-NB (F)

Simmons, Peter, Law-N (F)

Thompson, Frank, SPAA (F)

Thompson, Karen, PTL-NB

Wagner, Mary, Pharmacy (F)

APPENDIX I

FORM NO. 3-a

CONFIDENTIAL LETTER COVER SHEET

Candidate's Name		Date	
Department			

Referee:

Title:

Institutional Affiliation:

A. Referee's relationship to candidate and his/her work (check all that apply):

1. None known
2. Present or past colleague (at same institution as a student, postdoctoral fellow, or faculty member)
3. Past mentor (specify relationship)
4. Collaborator (worked with or co-authored papers)
5. Professional acquaintance (explain, i.e. met at conference, served on panel together, etc.)

6. Other (explain) _____

B. Referee's knowledge of candidate's work based primarily on (check all that apply):

1. Candidate's publications and cv
2. Conference presentations
3. Personal knowledge and discussions

4. Other (explain) _____

C. Referee recommended by (check all that apply):

- 1. Candidate
- 2. Chair/Program Director
- 3. Colleague
- 4. Dean

Referee's field of expertise:

Explanation of referee's professional standing and additional comments concerning his or her suitability to serve as a referee for this candidate:

APPENDIX II

F. External Confidential Letters of Evaluation

A minimum of seven external confidential letters of evaluation from qualified persons shall be obtained by the candidate's department chair and/or by the candidate's dean. External referees should be selected on the basis of their standing in the field and the institutions with which they are associated, and should normally be at the rank of full professor. All letters obtained in regard to this candidacy must be included in the promotion packet and forwarded to all levels of review. Preliminary solicitation letters and the responses thereto, unsolicited letters, and letters from within the University are not included within this category. External letters are not required for reappointment without tenure, but are required for non-tenure track appointments/promotions equivalent to the rank of Associate Professor and above, and for new faculty hires with tenure.

Prior to the solicitation of external letters, the department chair shall submit to the dean a recommended list of referees for each candidate, accompanied by a clear explanation of the suitability of the referee, the relationship of the referee to the candidate and his/her field of study, and documentation demonstrating the referee's professional standing. The department chair shall make available to the dean any list submitted by the candidate of persons from whom he/she prefers letters not be solicited. Chairs, in developing lists of appropriate referees to submit to the dean, shall consult the candidate about appropriate experts in his/her field of study, but the selection of external referees must be made by the department chair and dean. After consultation with the candidate and dean, the department chair shall send a preliminary solicitation letter (Appendix G) to individuals he/she has selected to serve as external referees. The preliminary solicitation letter may be sent via e-mail. The text of the preliminary solicitation letter shall not be modified and use of the preliminary solicitation letter is required. The preliminary solicitation letter and the responses thereto do not become part of the promotion packet. It is the chair's responsibility to keep a copy of the preliminary solicitation letters or e-mails, a list of recipients of the preliminary solicitation letter, dates sent, and responses, confidentially, in the department until evaluations, grievances, remands, etc. are completed. Under no circumstances shall the candidate contact experts whose names he/she has submitted for consideration, or engage in any substantive discussion about his/her promotion case with any individual whom he/she knows to be serving as an external referee. The presumption is that a chair and his/her dean will reach a consensus as to an appropriate list of referees. However, in the event of a disagreement, a chair is neither obliged to solicit, nor prohibited from soliciting, any particular referee. Similarly, in conducting his/her evaluation of the candidacy as set forth in Section L. below, the dean, at his/her discretion, may solicit letters from additional external referees. Such additional letters shall be submitted to evaluative bodies in accord with the procedures set forth in Section H, in which case all letters received after December 1, and until the addition of the dean's letters, shall be submitted.

Sample letters of solicitation are attached in Appendices G-1 through G-II. Letters of solicitation for confidential outside letters of recommendation shall be consistent with the promotion criteria applicable to the candidate. A department, with the prior approval of the dean and chancellor, or the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, may modify the text of the sample letter of solicitation.

No reference which might identify the writers of the confidential letters shall be made in any portions of the promotion materials. Letters will be numbered and may be referred to by

their respective number in the narrative statements. Letters of solicitation shall be sent to external referees early enough to permit the referee to complete an appropriately analytical and informative review of the candidate's credentials and to permit reviewing bodies adequate time to consider evaluators' responses.

The original external confidential letters of evaluation, together with a brief explanation of the suitability and professional standing of the referee and the relationship of the referee to the candidate (Form 3-a), and one copy only of the sample letter of solicitation (attached to Form 3), must accompany the original promotion packet forwarded to the dean. Submission of an e-mailed or faxed copy of the external confidential letters of evaluation is acceptable provided that the e-mailed or faxed copy is on official letterhead with the referee's electronic signature. Do not include the vitae of referees. All letters received must be submitted for review to all levels of evaluation, except that letters which are received after the December 1 deadline for submission to the chancellor or the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs will not be considered unless the dean has requested additional letters during his/her consideration of the packet.

External confidential letters solicited in a previous year may be used again and included under Form 3. However, selectivity of such letters is not permitted even if the candidacy was later withdrawn pursuant to Section Q; therefore, either all or none of the letters solicited in a previous year must be included, and they must be covered by a copy, supplied by the dean's office, of the earlier Form 3. Preliminary solicitation letters and the responses thereto are not included in this category. If new letters are solicited and if any of the external referees solicited in a prior year are solicited again, then all of the external referees previously solicited (excluding those who declined to evaluate the candidate in response to the preliminary solicitation letter) must be resolicited when the packet being reviewed is the same packet used in a prior evaluation and/or the prior solicitation occurred in either of the two immediately prior years.³

In all circumstances, copies of the external confidential letters are to remain in the department chair's office, and the chair shall inform the appropriate tenured members of the department that such letters are available for review.

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX G-1

SAMPLE LETTER – SOLICITATION OF EXTERNAL CONFIDENTIAL EVALUATION FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL TEACHING/RESEARCH FACULTY
(For individuals who are candidates for promotion to Professor II, refer to Appendix G-II)

Dear (name):

The (department) of the (college/school/faculty) is considering the promotion of (tenured/untentured) (current rank and name) to (associate professor/professor) (with/without tenure) effective July 1, 20_.

To assist the department and the University in this consideration, it is the University's practice to solicit written evaluations from specialists outside the University in the candidate's field. These letters are essential in assisting us to evaluate Professor (name)'s scholarly achievements and professional standing in comparison with colleagues in (his/her) field.

I am writing to ask if you would send me a confidential letter assessing Professor (name)'s scholarship. We would especially like your evaluation of the originality and quality of (his/her) achievements, their impact upon the field, and the value of (his/her) contributions to the profession. We would also appreciate your assessment of Professor (name)'s accomplishments relative to others in comparable positions in the discipline nationally and internationally, as well as your judgment of whether (his/her) work meets the requirement for someone being considered for promotion at your institution. In addition, if you are able to comment upon Professor (name)'s teaching and/or service to the profession, we would appreciate receiving your assessment in these areas.

We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise and current research interests, and/or curriculum vitae. Finally, please advise us of your relationship to the candidate, if any, and the prior basis of your knowledge of the candidate's work, if any.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of Professor (name)'s curriculum vitae. If you would like to have copies of any of the publications beyond those which I have enclosed, I will be happy to send them to you. Because our departmental deliberations must be concluded by (date), I would appreciate your response by no later than (date). If you are unable to respond by then, please let me know.

I want to assure you that the University will make every effort to maintain the confidentiality of the letter you write. Let me express in advance our deep appreciation for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

(Chairperson)

Enc.