

Appointment Solicitation Letter Samples

(rev. 11/07)

Appointment as

- [Assistant Professor \(Ladder-Rank\)](#)
- [Associate or Full Professor \(Ladder-Rank\), Step I - V](#)
- [Professor \(Ladder-Rank\), Step VI – IX](#)
- [Professor \(Ladder-Rank\), Above Scale](#)
- [Professor In Residence](#)
- [Professor of Clinical X](#)
- [Adjunct Professor](#)
- [Health Sciences Clinical Professor](#)
- [Research Scientist](#)
- [Project Scientist](#)
- [Specialist](#)

SAMPLE: Appointment as Assistant Professor (Ladder-Rank)

Current date

Professor Henry Jones
Department of Archaeology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for appointment to the tenure-track position of Assistant Professor, effective July 1, 2008.

For such appointments, the University of California requires letters of evaluation from experts in the field. I write to ask if you can assist us by providing a frank assessment of Dr. Doe's research/creative activity and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these scholarly accomplishments warrant appointment at the proposed level.

Appointment to the level of Assistant Professor is made on the basis of potential for excellence in research or creative activity, teaching, professional activity, and service to the university and the professional community, in the expectation that the appointee will meet the standards for tenure by the time a promotion decision is due.

It is my hope that you will be able to provide a critical evaluation of Dr. Doe's work. A detailed evaluation serves us better than a testimonial summary. To aid you, I am enclosing a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae and copies of recent publications. It would be most helpful if you addressed:

- Dr. Doe's primary scholarly or creative contributions and their impact or potential for impact on the field
- How Dr. Doe's accomplishments compare to those of other scholars in the field at a similar level
- The quality of the venues in which Dr. Doe's work has appeared
- Dr. Doe's independent productivity and creativity and/or role in co-authored work
- How Dr. Doe would rate as a candidate for a similar position at your institution

If you are able to comment on Dr. Doe's potential as a teacher and mentor and/or service to the profession, this would also be very helpful.

In addition, I would appreciate it if you could comment on your relationship with Dr. Doe, particularly if you have been a mentor or collaborator. This information should be included below the signature block, not in the body of your letter, to ensure that your identity remains confidential (please see confidentiality statement, below).

In order for your comments to be considered, I ask that you respond no later than April 1, 2008. You may e-mail your letter to me if you prefer. My e-mail address is departmentchair@ucsd.edu.

I recognize that writing a detailed assessment represents a significant demand on your time. The University of California regards peer review as essential to maintaining the quality of its faculty, and we greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Confidentiality Statement

Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

SAMPLE: Appointment as Associate Professor (all steps) or Full Professor, Steps I – V
(Ladder-rank series)

Current date

Professor Henry Jones
Department of Archaeology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for appointment to a tenured position as [Associate/Full] Professor, effective July 1, 2008.

For such appointments, the University of California requires letters of evaluation from experts in the field. I write to ask if you can assist us by providing a frank assessment of Dr. Doe's research/creative activity and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these scholarly accomplishments warrant appointment at the proposed level.

We are required to demonstrate the high quality of Dr. Doe's research or creative activity and scholarly accomplishments, teaching ability, and professional service. It is my hope that you will be able to provide a critical evaluation of Dr. Doe's work. A detailed evaluation serves us better than a testimonial summary. To aid you, I am enclosing a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae and copies of recent publications. It would be most helpful if you addressed:

- Dr. Doe's primary scholarly or creative contributions and their impact on the field
- How Dr. Doe's accomplishments compare to those of other scholars in the field at a similar level of seniority
- The quality of the venues in which Dr. Doe's work has appeared
- Dr. Doe's independent productivity and creativity and/or role in co-authored work
- How Dr. Doe would rate as a candidate for a similar position at your institution

If you are able to comment on Dr. Doe's accomplishments as a teacher and mentor and/or service to the profession, this would also be very helpful.

In addition, I would appreciate it if you could comment on your relationship with Dr. Doe, particularly if you have been a collaborator. This information should be included below the signature block, not in the body of your letter, to ensure that your identity remains confidential (please see confidentiality statement, below).

In order for your comments to be considered, I ask that you respond no later than April 1, 2008. You may e-mail your letter to me if you prefer. My e-mail address is departmentchair@ucsd.edu.

I recognize that writing a detailed assessment represents a significant demand on your time. The University of California regards peer review as essential to maintaining the quality of its faculty, and we greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Confidentiality Statement

Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

SAMPLE: Appointment as Professor (Ladder-Rank), Step VI – IX

Current date

Professor Henry Jones
Department of Archaeology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for appointment to a tenured position as Professor, Step [VI/VII/VIII/IX], effective July 1, 2008.

For such appointments, the University of California requires letters of evaluation from experts in the field. I write to ask if you can assist us by providing a frank assessment of Dr. Doe's research/creative activity and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these scholarly accomplishments warrant appointment at the proposed level.

The University of California has nine steps at the full professor rank. Steps VI through IX are reserved for professors who have achieved continuous and highly distinguished scholarship, service, and teaching, recognized nationally or internationally. They are expected to be prominent leaders and to have made important contributions to their fields.

It is my hope that you will be able to provide a critical evaluation of Dr. Doe's work. A detailed evaluation serves us better than a testimonial summary. To aid you, I am enclosing a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae and copies of recent publications. It would be most helpful if you addressed:

- Dr. Doe's main contributions and their impact on the field
- How Dr. Doe's accomplishments compare to those of other scholars in the field at a similar level of seniority
- The quality of the venues in which Dr. Doe's work has appeared
- Dr. Doe's independent productivity and creativity and/or role in co-authored work
- How Dr. Doe would rate as a candidate for a similar position at your institution

If you are able to comment on Dr. Doe's accomplishments as a teacher and mentor and/or service to the profession, this would also be very helpful.

In addition, I would appreciate it if you could comment on your relationship with Dr. Doe, particularly if you have been a collaborator. This information should be included below the signature block, not in the body of your letter, to ensure that your identity remains confidential (please see confidentiality statement, below).

In order for your comments to be considered, I ask that you respond no later than April 1, 2008. You may e-mail your letter to me if you prefer. My e-mail address is departmentchair@ucsd.edu.

I recognize that writing a detailed assessment represents a significant demand on your time. The University of California regards peer review as essential to maintaining the quality of its faculty, and we greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Confidentiality Statement

Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

SAMPLE: Appointment as Professor (Ladder-Rank), Above Scale

Current date

Professor Henry Jones
Department of Archaeology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for appointment as Professor, Above Scale (Distinguished Professor), effective July 1, 2008.

For such appointments, the University of California requires letters of evaluation from experts in the field. I write to ask if you can assist us by providing a frank assessment of Dr. Doe's research/creative activity and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these scholarly accomplishments warrant appointment at the proposed level.

The University of California divides the full Professor rank into nine steps. The normal period of service is three years at each of the first eight steps and four years at Step IX. Beyond these steps is the Above Scale designation, which is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance and service are excellent.

It is my hope that you will be able to provide a critical evaluation of Dr. Doe's work. A detailed evaluation serves us better than a testimonial summary. To aid you, I am enclosing a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae and copies of recent publications. It would be most helpful if you addressed:

- Dr. Doe's main contributions and their impact on the field
- How Dr. Doe's accomplishments compare to those of other scholars in the field at a similar level of seniority
- The quality of the venues in which Dr. Doe's work has appeared
- Dr. Doe's independent productivity and creativity and/or role in co-authored work
- How Dr. Doe would rate as a candidate for a similar position at your institution

If you are able to comment on Dr. Doe's accomplishments as a teacher and mentor and/or service to the profession, this would also be very helpful.

In addition, I would appreciate it if you could comment on your relationship with Dr. Doe, particularly if you have been a collaborator. This information should be included below the signature block, not in the body of your letter, to ensure that your identity remains confidential (please see confidentiality statement, below).

In order for your comments to be considered, I ask that you respond no later than April 1, 2008. You may e-mail your letter to me if you prefer. My e-mail address is departmentchair@ucsd.edu.

I recognize that writing a detailed assessment represents a significant demand on your time. The University of California regards peer review as essential to maintaining the quality of its faculty, and we greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Confidentiality Statement

Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

SAMPLE: Appointment as Professor In Residence

Current date

Professor Henry Jones
Department of Nephrology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Nephrology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for appointment as [Assistant/Associate] Professor In Residence, effective July 1, 2008.

For such appointments, the University of California requires letters of evaluation from experts in the field. I write to ask if you can assist us by providing a frank assessment of Dr. Doe's research/creative activity and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these scholarly accomplishments warrant appointment at the proposed level.

At the University of California, candidates for appointment in the Professor In Residence series are evaluated using the same standards as those for the Professor (tenure-track and tenured) series; i.e., they are expected to demonstrate the same high quality of research and scholarly accomplishments, teaching ability, and professional service. The primary difference is the manner in which the positions are funded. Although positions in the Professor In Residence series are not tenured, they confer membership in the Academic Senate.

It is my hope that you will be able to provide a critical evaluation of Dr. Doe's work. A detailed evaluation serves us better than a testimonial summary. To aid you, I am enclosing a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae and copies of recent publications. It would be most helpful if you addressed:

- Dr. Doe's main contributions and their impact on the field
- How Dr. Doe's accomplishments compare to those of other scholars in the field at a similar level of seniority
- The quality of the venues in which Dr. Doe's work has appeared
- Dr. Doe's independent productivity and creativity and/or role in co-authored work
- How Dr. Doe would rate as a candidate for a similar position at your institution

If you are able to comment on Dr. Doe's accomplishments as a teacher and mentor and/or service to the profession, this would also be very helpful. *[For Assistant rank, substitute if appropriate: "If you are able to comment on Dr. Doe's potential as a teacher and mentor and for service to the profession, this would also be very helpful."]*

In addition, I would appreciate it if you could comment on your relationship with Dr. Doe, particularly if you have been a mentor or collaborator. This information should be included below the signature block, not in the body of your letter, to ensure that your identity remains confidential (please see confidentiality statement, below).

In order for your comments to be considered, I ask that you respond no later than April 1, 2008. You may e-mail your letter to me if you prefer. My e-mail address is departmentchair@ucsd.edu.

I recognize that writing a detailed assessment represents a significant demand on your time. The University of California regards peer review as essential to maintaining the quality of its faculty, and we greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Confidentiality Statement

Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

SAMPLE: Appointment to Professor of Clinical X

Current date

Professor Henry Jones
Department of Nephrology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Nephrology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for appointment as [Assistant/Associate] Professor of Clinical Nephrology, effective July 1, 2008.

For such appointments, the University of California requires letters of evaluation from experts in the field. I write to ask if you can assist us by providing a frank assessment of Dr. Doe's professional expertise and creativity and the degree to which they are recognized inside and outside our own institution, and your opinion as to whether these scholarly accomplishments warrant appointment at the proposed rank.

The Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Clinical Nephrology) series is reserved for faculty who have demonstrated expertise, dedication and achievement in the clinical and educational activities within and outside the UCSD School of Medicine.

At the University of California, appointment to the Professor of Clinical X series requires that we demonstrate the high quality of Dr. Doe's teaching, clinical competence, expertise and activity, creative work, and University and public service. Although this is not a tenured position, it confers membership in the UC Academic Senate.

It is my hope that you will be able to provide a critical evaluation of Dr. Doe's work. A detailed evaluation serves us better than a testimonial summary. To aid you, I am enclosing a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae and copies of some recent publications. It would be most helpful if you addressed:

- The quality of clinical performance
- Demonstrated teaching abilities
- The quality of scholarly or creative activities and impact on their field
- How this candidate would rate for a similar position at your institution

I would also appreciate it if you could comment on your relationship with Dr. Doe, particularly if you have been a mentor or collaborator. This information should be included below the signature block, not in the body of your letter, to ensure that your identity remains confidential (please see confidentiality statement, below).

In order for your comments to be considered, I ask that you respond no later than April 1, 2008. You may e-mail your letter to me if you prefer. My e-mail address is departmentchair@ucsd.edu.

I recognize that writing a detailed assessment represents a significant demand on your time. The University of California regards peer review as essential to maintaining the quality of its faculty, and we greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Confidentiality Statement

Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

SAMPLE: Appointment as Adjunct Professor

Current date

Professor Henry Jones
Department of Archaeology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for appointment as [Assistant/Associate] Adjunct Professor, effective July 1, 2008.

For such appointments, the University of California requires letters of evaluation from experts in the field. I write to ask if you can assist us by providing a frank assessment of Dr. Doe's research/creative activity and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these scholarly accomplishments warrant appointment at the proposed level.

At the University of California, candidates for appointment in the Adjunct Professor series are evaluated using the same standards as those for the Professor (tenure-track and tenured) series; i.e., they are expected to demonstrate the same high quality of research and scholarly accomplishments, teaching ability, and professional service, although the degree of emphasis on each criterion may vary. Positions in this series are not tenured.

It is my hope that you will be able to provide a critical evaluation of Dr. Doe's work. A detailed evaluation serves us better than a testimonial summary. To aid you, I am enclosing a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae and copies of recent publications. It would be most helpful if you addressed:

- Dr. Doe's main contributions and their impact on the field
- How Dr. Doe's accomplishments compare to those of other scholars in the field at a similar level of seniority
- The quality of the venues in which Dr. Doe's work has appeared
- How Dr. Doe would rate as a candidate for a similar position at your institution

If you are able to comment on Dr. Doe's accomplishments as a teacher and mentor and/or service to the profession, this would also be very helpful. *[For Assistant rank, substitute if appropriate: "If you are able to comment on Dr. Doe's potential as a teacher and mentor and for service to the profession, this would also be very helpful."]*

In addition, I would appreciate it if you could comment on your relationship with Dr. Doe, particularly if you have been a mentor or collaborator. This information should be included below the signature block, not in the body of your letter, to ensure that your identity remains confidential (please see confidentiality statement, below).

In order for your comments to be considered, I ask that you respond no later than April 1, 2008. You may e-mail your letter to me if you prefer. My e-mail address is departmentchair@ucsd.edu.

I recognize that writing a detailed assessment represents a significant demand on your time. The University of California regards peer review as essential to maintaining the quality of its faculty, and we greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Confidentiality Statement

Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

SAMPLE: Appointment as Health Sciences Clinical Professor

Current date

Professor Henry Jones
Department of Nephrology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Nephrology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for appointment as Health Sciences [Assistant/Associate] Clinical Professor, effective July 1, 2008.

For such appointments, the University of California requires letters of evaluation from experts in the field. I write to ask if you can assist us by providing a frank assessment of Dr. Doe's teaching ability, clinical competence, and scholarly/creative accomplishment, and your opinion as to whether these accomplishments warrant appointment at the proposed level.

It is my hope that you will be able to provide a critical evaluation of Dr. Doe's performance and professional standing as a teacher and clinician, as well as an assessment of his achievements in original or scholarly work. A detailed evaluation serves us better than a testimonial summary. To aid you, I am enclosing a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae and copies of some recent publications.

It would be most helpful if you addressed:

- The quality of clinical performance
- Demonstrated teaching abilities
- The quality of scholarly or creative activities such as research, publications, presentations, contribution to practice guidelines, patient teaching materials, etc.
- How this candidate would rate for a similar position at your institution

In order for your comments to be considered, I ask that you respond no later than April 1, 2008. You may e-mail your letter to me if you prefer. My e-mail address is departmentchair@ucsd.edu.

I recognize that writing a detailed assessment represents a significant demand on your time. The University of California regards peer review as essential to maintaining the quality of its faculty, and we greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Confidentiality Statement

Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

SAMPLE: Appointment as Research Scientist

Current date

Professor Henry Jones
Department of Archaeology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for appointment as [Assistant/Associate] Research Scientist, effective July 1, 2008.

For such appointments, the University of California requires letters of evaluation from experts in the field. I write to ask if you can assist us by providing a frank assessment of Dr. Doe's research and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these accomplishments warrant appointment at the proposed level.

Appointees in the Research Scientist series function as independent investigators, have complete responsibility for their research programs, and are leaders or have the potential for leadership in their fields. The ability to sustain an independent research program is an important criterion for appointment. Research Scientists normally are (or will be) fully self-funded principal investigators.

It is my hope that you will be able to provide a critical evaluation of Dr. Doe's work, as a detailed evaluation serves us better than a testimonial summary. To aid you, I am enclosing a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae and copies of recent publications. I ask that you address the following considerations:

- Dr. Doe's main contributions and their impact on the field
- How Dr. Doe's accomplishments compare to those of other scholars in the field at a similar level of seniority
- The quality of the venues in which Dr. Doe's work has appeared
- How Dr. Doe would rate as a candidate for a similar position at your institution
- Dr. Doe's independent productivity and creativity and/or role in co-authored work

[The following sentence is only applicable to Associate and Full Research Scientists:] If you are able to comment on Dr. Doe's service to the profession, this would also be very helpful.

In addition, I would appreciate it if you could comment on your relationship with Dr. Doe, particularly if you have been a mentor or collaborator. This information should be included below the signature block, not in the body of your letter, to ensure that your identity remains confidential (please see confidentiality statement, below).

In order for your comments to be considered, I ask that you respond no later than April 1, 2008. You may e-mail your letter to me if you prefer. My e-mail address is departmentchair@ucsd.edu.

I recognize that writing a detailed assessment represents a significant demand on your time. The University of California regards peer review as essential to maintaining the quality of its faculty, and we greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Confidentiality Statement

Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

SAMPLE: Appointment as Project Scientist

Current date

Professor Henry Jones
Department of Archaeology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for appointment as [Assistant/Associate] Project Scientist, effective July 1, 2008.

For such appointments, the University of California requires letters of evaluation from experts in the field. I write to ask if you can assist us by providing a frank assessment of Dr. Doe's research and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these accomplishments warrant appointment at the proposed level.

Appointees in the Project Scientist series make significant and creative contributions to a research or creative project in an academic discipline. Appointees in this series may be either ongoing members of research teams or employed for a limited period of time to contribute high-level skills to specific research programs. Normally, Project Scientists carry out research or creative programs with faculty supervision and need not demonstrate fully independent research or research leadership. Appointees in the Project Scientist series do not have teaching responsibilities.

It is my hope that you will be able to provide a critical evaluation of Dr. Doe's work, as a detailed evaluation serves us better than a testimonial summary. To aid you, I am enclosing a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae and copies of recent publications. I ask that you address Dr. Doe's ability to make significant, original and creative contributions to a research program or project.

In order for your comments to be considered, I ask that you respond no later than April 1, 2008. You may e-mail your letter to me if you prefer. My e-mail address is departmentchair@ucsd.edu.

I recognize that writing a detailed assessment represents a significant demand on your time. The University of California regards peer review as essential to maintaining the quality of its faculty, and we greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Confidentiality Statement

Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

SAMPLE: Appointment as Specialist

Current date

Professor Henry Jones
Department of Archaeology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for appointment as [Assistant/Associate] Specialist, effective July 1, 2008.

For such appointments, the University of California requires letters of evaluation from experts in the field. I write to ask if you can assist us by providing a frank assessment of Dr. Doe's research skills and experience, and your opinion as to whether these accomplishments warrant appointment at the proposed level.

Appointees in the Specialist series engage in research in specialized areas and make contributions to a research project. They have no teaching responsibilities. Most Specialists are appointed to provide special skills, experience, and knowledge for research projects. A Specialist provides considerable independent input into the planning and execution of research, but generally works under faculty direction.

It is my hope that you will be able to provide a critical evaluation of Dr. Doe's work, as a detailed evaluation serves us better than a testimonial summary. To aid you, I am enclosing a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae and copies of recent publications. I ask that you address Dr. Doe's ability to perform specialized research as described above.

In order for your comments to be considered, I ask that you respond no later than April 1, 2008. You may e-mail your letter to me if you prefer. My e-mail address is departmentchair@ucsd.edu.

I recognize that writing a detailed assessment represents a significant demand on your time. The University of California regards peer review as essential to maintaining the quality of its faculty, and we greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Confidentiality Statement

Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.