## **[Place letter on official letterhead for the department.]**

## *[Date]*

## Dear [*name of independent external reviewer*]:

The Department of [*name of department*] is evaluating [*name of candidate*] for [*type of promotion; e.g., associate rank with continuing status; continuing status only; promotion to full rank*]. As a leading scholar in [*name of candidate*]'s field, we are requesting your assessment of the candidate’s record of work for quality, impact, and innovation. In making this decision, we ask you to consider any possible conflicts of interest (significant financial, personal, or other substantial interests with the candidate or their work) or significant collaboration that may require you to recuse yourself as an independent external reviewer. If you fit our definition of a collaborator, we ask that you submit a collaborator letter. We define collaborators as individuals who within the last 5 years have coauthored books, articles, abstracts, and grant proposals with the candidate. Collaborators also include individuals such as dissertation advisors, mentors and former coworkers who have worked so closely with a candidate that questions may arise about whether they can offer independent assessments of the candidate’s achievements. Co-authors of non-research publications (e.g. review or commentary) are not considered collaborators, nor are co-authors of mega-multi-authored publications, unless there has been close and direct collaboration. If you are unable to perform the evaluation or have questions about the process, please let me know as soon as possible. If you are willing and able to perform this review, please read the guidelines below.

In your review please consider The University of Arizona values an [inclusive view of scholarship](https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/content/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship) with the recognition that knowledge may be acquired and advanced through discovery, integration, application, teaching, and service. We recognize integrative and applied forms of scholarship that involve cross-cutting collaborations with business and community partners, including translational research, commercialization activities, and patents. The University of Arizona is also a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) which values the contributions of faculty that advance the capacity of the institution to serve Latinx students, and students from all underrepresented backgrounds, through scholarship, creative activity, teaching, mentoring and service.

We urge you to consider that the COVID19 pandemic, and related deepening of racial gaps, have taken a serious toll on faculty productivity and interrupted the career plans for many. In order to provide a fair review of the quality and impact of work, we ask that you consider the vastly different circumstances that faculty have been operating under, and adapting to, during the pandemic period. We require all candidates to describe how institutional and professional changes due to the pandemic may have impacted their workload distribution, productivity or trajectory of work.

**This sentence is included if the candidate is being considered for continuing status**: During the pandemic, the Office of the Provost has [offered faculty up to a two-year clock extension](https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/promotion-clock-delays). All clock-delays should not be treated as “extra time” in that they should not *raise* promotion-and-continuing status expectations. Rather, a clock-delay should be understood as a way to remediate for unexpected barriers to productivity. Accordingly, your evaluation should focus on quality and impact of the work while allowing for flexibility in the trajectory over time.

**This paragraph may be included if appropriate to the candidate**: The University of Arizona highly values interdisciplinarity, so we request that you also consider the candidate’s interdisciplinary contributions to teaching, research and service. The candidate participated in the following interdisciplinary activities: *[Names of units, projects, centers, institutes, and/or GIDPs]*. A description of the candidate’s interdisciplinary efforts in these programs is included in the dossier.

Within this context, we ask that you provide a substantive assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record and consider the following questions as appropriate based on the candidate’s job description and workload assignments:

* What is your evaluation of the candidate’s research, scholarship or creative activity? To what extent does it make a coherent, innovative, independent contribution to the literature, creative corpus, or methodology of the field? Is there evidence and promise of sustained research, scholarly or creative contributions and impacts?
* Please identify which aspects of the candidate’s work have been especially significant or influential in the field and why?
* How does the candidate's standing in the field compare with others at a similar stage in their careers?
* Has the candidate achieved regional, national, or international recognition in their field?
* How would you evaluate the candidate’s professional activities for service within the field?
* What are the significant contributions of their teaching/mentoring and your holistic evaluation of their teaching contributions?
* What is the impact and significance of their service contributions to the field?

The candidate has prepared a dossier that can be found by clicking ‘View Request’ and ‘Accept’ to read the following materials and provide an evaluation for [*name of candidate*]'s record:

* Section 1: Summary Data Sheet;
* Section 2: Summary of Workload Assignment;
* Section 2A: Pandemic Impact Statement;
* Section 3: Department / Unit and College Criteria;
* Section 4: Curriculum Vitae;
* Section 4B: Representative work (examples: articles, slides, audio and/or video recordings.);
* Section 5: Candidate Statement;
* Section 6: *(Optional, as appropriate)* Teaching Portfolio; and/or
* Section 7: *(Optional, as appropriate)* Leadership Service Portfolio;
* Section 8: (*Optional, as appropriate*) Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs (GIDP) Membership and Contributions.

*The candidate’s materials are only visible after selecting ‘View Request’ and scrolling to the bottom of screen to select ‘Accept’ to provide an evaluation letter.*

If you have information and recommendations based on these areas, we would appreciate your comments on them. **Finally, we ask that you specifically state if you recommend that the candidate be granted [indicate specific type of promotion, *for example: promotion to associate rank with continuing status; continuing status only; promotion to full rank*].** I greatly appreciate your willingness to invest your time in this process. Please include your *abbreviated* curriculum vitae with your review letter. Your recommendation will be treated with the greatest possible confidentiality permitted by the Arizona Board of Regents' policy and applicable law.

Please return your *signed* evaluation, on *letterhead* by *[date]*. If you are unable to do perform the evaluation or have questions about the process, please let me know as soon as possible.

My sincere thanks for your contributions to this review.

Regards,

*[Name and contact details for Dept Head, Chair or Director]*