Selecting Evaluators for Promotion
(IMPORTANT – please read)

External Evaluators should be peers who are generally acknowledged experts in your field and who do not have a close relationship with you. Letters may not come from:

- Collaborators or co-authors
- Pre-doctoral and post-doctoral advisors
- Residency directors or fellowship advisors
- Previous advisees or trainees
- Faculty from previous institutions who might have supervised you during your training, or who were your colleagues at the time you were there

Internal Evaluators must be from outside your home and secondary/joint departments but can be from other SOM departments or other schools. In addition to the external evaluator rules above, letters may not come from:

- Department Chairs
- Faculty Committee on Appointments and Promotions (FCAP) members

Who makes a good reviewer?

- A colleague from a committee on which you serve or served
- A colleague from your professional society or association
- A colleague who has heard you present or vice versa
- An expert in your field who is familiar with your work

What else should I know?

- Evaluators (internal and external) must be at or above your proposed rank
- The list should include a variety of institutions (but not your previous institutions)
- Candidates should NOT contact the evaluators
- All received letters, even those that are in conflict, must be included in the nomination packet but will not count toward satisfying the required number of letters.
- If you have a joint appointment outside the SOM, a letter of evaluation from the chair of the department or dean of that school must be included with your packet. This letter will not count toward the minimum number of required internal letters.
- Your Department Chair should approve your proposed list of evaluators.

Assembling the list:

- Follow the template below!
- Include contact information for all evaluators and put in alphabetical order
- Include full title and a brief biosketch about the person (2 – 3 sentences)
- Include a brief relationship statement (1 – 2 sentences) written in third person
- Specifically state how you know the person
- If there is no direct relationship, state that but also include how you are aware of the person’s expertise in the field
  - Did you hear the person speak at a conference?
  - Have you followed the person’s research over the years?

**Letter Requirements for Promotions/Appointments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Required minimum number of letters to be submitted to SOM</th>
<th>Recommended number of names to submit on evaluator list to department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8 total. At least 6 external &amp; 2 internal required.</td>
<td>Provide 12 external and 4 internal names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Professor</td>
<td>8 total. At least 6 external; others may be internal or external.</td>
<td>Provide 12 names and 4 internal names</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical, Research Track or MEST</th>
<th>Required minimum number of letters to be submitted to SOM</th>
<th>Recommended number of names to submit on evaluator list to department*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>4 total. At least 2 external; others may be internal or external.</td>
<td>Provide 6 external and 2 internal names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Professor</td>
<td>3 total. At least 2 external; others may be internal or external.</td>
<td>Provide 6 external and 2 internal names</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Your department may recommend additional names be submitted