Letter to external referees for promotion to Associate Professor on Term

*The substantive responses of at least six referees who hold an “arm’s-length” relation to the candidate will be sought to clarify the strengths (in a comparative context) of an internal candidate for promotion to Associate Professor on Term from Assistant Professor. The list of external must be approved by the relevant divisional dean and the FAS Dean’s Office. These letters must be solicited and reviewed by the department or program prior to its making a recommendation to forward the case or not forward the case to the relevant Tenure and Appointments Committee.*

Dear Professor [Referee Name]:

Thank you for agreeing to assist us in evaluating the promotion of Professor [Candidate Name] from the rank of Assistant Professor to that of Associate Professor on Term (i.e., without tenure) in the [SELECT ONE: Department/Program] of [Department Name] at Yale. The [SELECT ONE: Department/Program] faculty who will be voting on this case greatly appreciate your willingness to evaluate [SELECT ONE: his/her/their] qualifications for this promotion.

The standard for promotion to Associate Professor on Term at Yale University requires significant published research and scholarship representing early demonstrations of disciplinary or interdisciplinary leadership; excellent teaching and mentoring of students; and engaged university citizenship.

We would be grateful for your assessment of Professor [Candidate Name]’s scholarly achievements and [SELECT ONE: his/her/their] impact on the field at this stage of [SELECT ONE: his/her/their] career, speaking specifically to the question of whether [SELECT ONE: his/her/their] published research and scholarship demonstrate early-career disciplinary or interdisciplinary leadership. Comparisons you could make to other individuals in this field—both those at the candidate’s career stage, and those who are more advanced leaders in the field—would be especially helpful to us. Anything you could add about [SELECT ONE: his/her/their] teaching and professional service would be most welcome as well. Please begin by explaining how well and in what capacity you know the candidate.

Professor [Candidate Name]’s materials may be accessed through Interfolio once you accept the request.

On behalf of us all, I thank you in advance for your assistance. It would be most helpful if we could have your confidential response by [Response Deadline]. There is no need for a hard copy; the electronic version is sufficient. Your letter will assist not only the professors of the [SELECT ONE: Department/Program], but also the committee at Yale that evaluates promotions in the event that the [SELECT ONE: Department/Program] recommends Professor [Candidate Name] for promotion to this non-tenured Associate position.

Your letter will be kept in strict confidence, read only by the voting members of the [SELECT ONE: Department/Program], by full professors on the appropriate Tenure and Appointments Committees, and by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Dean’s Office. Please keep in mind that these readers will include both experts and non-experts in the candidate’s field of research.

We thank you in advance for offering your wisdom and expertise in this evaluation.

Sincerely,

[Chair Name]

Chair, [SELECT ONE: Department/Program] of [Department Name]

*Template updated 1/6/2021*

Guidelines for referees

We would be grateful if you would consider the points below as you prepare your letter.

1. What are the candidate’s principal scholarly contributions, and what is your critical assessment (both strengths and weaknesses) of the originality, quality, and impact of the candidate’s scholarship?
2. What is your overall appraisal of the candidate’s record of achievement and productivity? (Tenure clocks, of course, can differ for candidates for a number of reasons such as child rearing, national service, and disability. Please be assured that any such adjustments of the clock will be factored into our understanding of your comments about productivity.)
3. What is your assessment of the intellectual trajectory of the candidate’s work? If the candidate is not currently among the foremost leaders in the field in the world, are they likely to rise to that status within the next few years?
4. Is the candidate’s work in their subfield relevant to scholars in broader or adjacent fields or disciplines, and if so, how?
5. We welcome comments on the candidate’s field, the quality of scholarship within it, and its relationship to broader contours of the disciplines.
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