# Letters of Evaluation

**FOR APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION AT A PROFESSORIAL RANK**

During the process of evaluation for academic appointment and promotion, letters will be solicited by the Office of Faculty Affairs from individuals (evaluators) who can comment on the qualifications of the faculty member under consideration.[[1]](#footnote-1) The list of names of potential evaluators will be generated by the Department Chair, following discussions with the faculty member.

Some evaluators must be impartial national or international authorities in the candidate’s field that can be called upon for expert opinion.

Guidelines for impartiality include:

1. The evaluator has not been a trainee or mentor of the candidate
2. The evaluator has not been a contemporaneous colleague at the same institution (including WCMC)
3. The evaluator is not a co-investigator or co-author within the past five years (with the exception of large multi-center clinical trials or research consortia)

Others will be evaluators who can comment on prominence, potential and current expertise, national reputation, and specific contribution of the candidate to the academic mission of the Medical College. These evaluators can be faculty members who may not fulfil the above criteria for impartiality, but can directly comment on the service and excellence of the faculty member. These evaluators should be external to the Department of the faculty member.

The table below provides guidance as to the required number of names that must be submitted and the minimum numbers and types of letters required to present the recommendation to the Committee of Review.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Appointment/Promotion** **To** | **Required # of Names**[[2]](#footnote-2) | **Received letters required (minimums)** |
| Unmodified Title[[3]](#footnote-3) |  |  |
|  Professor | 9 names | 3 impartial + 3 more (any type) = 6 minimum |
|  Assoc. Professor | 6 names | 3 impartial + 2 more (any type) = 5 minimum |
|  Asst. Professor | 2 letters | 2 letters (at least 1 impartial preferred) = 2 minimum |
|  |  |  |
| Modified Title[[4]](#footnote-4) |  |  |
|  Mod. Professor | 9 names  | 3 impartial + 1 more (any type) = 4 minimum |
|  Mod. Assoc. Professor | 6 names | 2 impartial + 2 more (any type) = 4 minimum |
|  Mod. Asst. Professor | 2 letters | 2 letters = 2 minimum |

**This Information is to be completed and submitted to your Department Chair/Division Chief/Department Administrator or Appointment Administrator**

**Faculty Candidate Name (Last, First, Middle):**

**Candidate Evaluations – List of Authorities**

**IMPORTANT NOTE: Please read page 1 above prior to completing this list of authorities with particular attention to the definition of impartiality that is described on page 1. Please complete each section in its entirety.**

In addition to the required number of evaluators, please consider including two additional impartial, extramural evaluators who may be called upon to write letters on your behalf, if needed (e.g. the required number of evaluators are not available or are unresponsive). Please mark these evaluators as “alternates”.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator #1** |  |
| Name/Degree |  |
| Academic Rank/Title |  |
| Institution |  |
| Street AddressCity, State, Zip Code |  |
| Phone # |  |
| E-mail Address |  |
| What is the candidate’s relationship to the evaluator?Does the evaluator meet the definition ofimpartiality as described on page 1? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator #2** |  |
| Name/Degree |  |
| Academic Rank/Title |  |
| Institution |  |
| Street AddressCity, State, Zip Code |  |
| Phone # |  |
| E-mail Address |  |
| What is the candidate’s relationship to the evaluator?Does the evaluator meet the definition ofimpartiality as described on page 1? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator #3** |  |
| Name/Degree |  |
| Academic Rank/Title |  |
| Institution |  |
| Street AddressCity, State, Zip Code |  |
| Phone # |  |
| E-mail Address |  |
| What is the candidate’s relationship to the evaluator?Does the evaluator meet the definition ofimpartiality as described on page 1? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator #4** |  |
| Name/Degree |  |
| Academic Rank/Title |  |
| Institution |  |
| Street AddressCity, State, Zip Code |  |
| Phone # |  |
| E-mail Address |  |
| What is the candidate’s relationship to the evaluator?Does the evaluator meet the definition ofimpartiality as described on page 1? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator #5** |  |
| Name/Degree |  |
| Academic Rank/Title |  |
| Institution |  |
| Street AddressCity, State, Zip Code |  |
| Phone # |  |
| E-mail Address |  |
| What is the candidate’s relationship to the evaluator? Does the evaluator meet the definition of impartiality as described on page 1? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator #6** |  |
| Name/Degree |  |
| Academic Rank/Title |  |
| Institution |  |
| Street AddressCity, State, Zip Code |  |
| Phone # |  |
| E-mail Address |  |
| What is the candidate’s relationship to the evaluator? Does the evaluator meet the definition of impartiality as described on page 1? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator #7** |  |
| Name/Degree |  |
| Academic Rank/Title |  |
| Institution |  |
| Street AddressCity, State, Zip Code |  |
| Phone # |  |
| E-mail Address |  |
| What is the candidate’s relationship to the evaluator? Does the evaluator meet the definition of impartiality as described on page 1? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator #8** |  |
| Name/Degree |  |
| Academic Rank/Title |  |
| Institution |  |
| Street AddressCity, State, Zip Code |  |
| Phone # |  |
| E-mail Address |  |
| What is the candidate’s relationship to the evaluator? Does the evaluator meet the definition of impartiality as described on page 1? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator #9** |  |
| Name/Degree |  |
| Academic Rank/Title |  |
| Institution |  |
| Street AddressCity, State, Zip Code |  |
| Phone # |  |
| E-mail Address |  |
| What is the candidate’s relationship to the evaluator? Does the evaluator meet the definition of impartiality as described on page 1? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator #10** |  |
| Name/Degree |  |
| Academic Rank/Title |  |
| Institution |  |
| Street AddressCity, State, Zip Code |  |
| Phone # |  |
| E-mail Address |  |
| What is the candidate’s relationship to the evaluator? Does the evaluator meet the definition of impartiality as described on page 1? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator #11** |  |
| Name/Degree |  |
| Academic Rank/Title |  |
| Institution |  |
| Street AddressCity, State, Zip Code |  |
| Phone # |  |
| E-mail Address |  |
| What is the candidate’s relationship to the evaluator? Does the evaluator meet the definition of impartiality as described on page 1? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator #12** |  |
| Name/Degree |  |
| Academic Rank/Title |  |
| Institution |  |
| Street AddressCity, State, Zip Code |  |
| Phone # |  |
| E-mail Address |  |
| What is the candidate’s relationship to the evaluator? Does the evaluator meet the definition of impartiality as described on page 1? |  |

1. Letters for Assistant Professor level appointments or promotions will be solicited by the Department directly. The Office of Faculty Affairs solicits evaluation letters for Associate Professor and Professor rank appointments. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Academic Rank of Evaluator is equal to or higher than the candidate’s. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For example, Professor of Medicine [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For example, Professor of Clinical Medicine; Professor of Research in Medicine; Clinical Professor of Medicine [↑](#footnote-ref-4)