**External Evaluator Selection Checklist**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Candidate Information** |  |
| **Name** |  |
| **Current Rank & Department** |  |
| **Years in Current Rank** |  |
| **Decision Deadline, if any** |  |
| **Review Type** | c Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor  c Promotion to Full Professor  c Divisional Dean has been consulted |

|  |
| --- |
| **Briefly explain your process for assembling the list of potential reviewer names; this should be a collaborative process with senior faculty participation.** |
|  |

*Please include ALL suggestions on both lists, even if the lists overlap.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Department’s Suggestions** | **Candidate’s Suggestions** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Head’s Working List of External Evaluators** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name** | **Rank** | **Affiliation** | **Prior promo reviewer?** | **Not collaborator or co-author** | **No personal**  **relation-ship** | **Not a former colleague** | **Not on PhD comm** | **Not a postdoc advisor** | **Designated in file as (*pick one*)** | |
| **Unit List** | **Cand List** |
|  |  |  | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
|  |  |  | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
|  |  |  | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
|  |  |  | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
|  |  |  | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
|  |  |  | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
|  |  |  | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
|  |  |  | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
|  |  |  | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
|  |  |  | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
|  |  |  | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
|  |  |  | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

|  |
| --- |
| **Please explain any overlap between the prior-promotion reviewers and the proposed reviewers for the current promotion.** |
|  |

All external evaluation letters should be solicited from disciplinary and professional leaders with no more than a professional knowledge of or relationship to the candidate. An absolute majority must also come from reviewers selected independently by the unit rather than suggested by the candidate.

* Reviewers should be at or above the rank being sought, ideally at the rank of full professor, though an associate professor can serve as a reviewer, if that reviewer clearly represents an essential voice in the critical evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship/creative practice.
* Identify reviewers at comparable institutions.
* Reviewers should be leaders and respected colleagues in the disciplinary or professional field.
* Avoid reviewers with close relationships to the candidate. The following relationships should be considered disqualifying: dissertation advisor or member of doctoral committee; former departmental colleague; research collaborator within the review period; co-author within the review period. Close personal relationships are also problematic. Many other professional relationships are acceptable, but prospective reviewers who express concern about their ability to present an unbiased evaluation or are uncomfortable playing the role of an evaluator should be excused.

Additionally, external evaluators should not overlap with the reviewers for the candidate’s prior promotion except in rare, approved cases.