While this template is not required by the Office of the Provost, it is recommended as a helpful method to assist units during the selection of potential external evaluators for tenure-related faculty reviews. Please contact [otp@uoregon.edu](mailto:otp@uoregon.edu) if you have questions.

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

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

| **Potential Reviewers**  Please list ALL suggestions made by the department and by the candidate, even if the lists overlap.  Please note: the Office of the Provost has updated guidance about appropriate reviewers: <https://provost.uoregon.edu/external-letters-evaluation> [[1]](#endnote-2) | |
| --- | --- |
| **Department/Unit’s Suggestions** | **Candidate’s Suggestions** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

| **Head’s Working List of External Evaluators**  Please list the proposed external evaluators, using checkboxes to confirm that they are appropriate reviewers. This list will likely be a subset of the suggestions that were made by the department and the candidate, above.  *Check all boxes that apply. For names that overlapped on the lists above, check the box that shows the way you designate them for the file.* | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Rank** | **Affiliation** | **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** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. 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.

   [↑](#endnote-ref-2)