

Review Solicitation Letter Samples

(revised June 2008)

Review for

[Promotion to Associate Professor \(Ladder Rank\)](#)

[Promotion to full Professor \(Ladder Rank\)](#)

[Advancement to Professor \(Ladder Rank\), Step VI](#)

[Accelerated advancement to or through Professor \(Ladder Rank\), Step VI](#)

[Advancement to Professor \(Ladder Rank\), Above Scale](#)

[Accelerated advancement – general](#)

[Promotion in Professor In Residence series](#)

[Promotion in Professor of Clinical X series](#)

[Promotion in Health Sciences Clinical Professor series](#)

[Promotion in Adjunct Professor series](#)

[Promotion in Research Scientist series](#)

[Promotion in Project Scientist series](#)

[Promotion in Specialist series](#)

SAMPLE: Review for promotion to Associate Professor (Ladder Rank)

Current date

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

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for promotion to Associate Professor, with tenure, effective July 1, 20XX.

For such actions, 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 or creative activity and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these accomplishments warrant promotion at this time.

Promotion to tenure is awarded on the basis of excellence in research or creative activity, teaching, professional activity, and service to the University and the professional community.

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
- 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 publications
- Whether Dr. Doe would qualify for promotion to tenure 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 [*date*]. 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: Review for promotion to full Professor (Ladder Rank)

Current date

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

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for promotion to the rank of full Professor, effective July 1, 20XX.

For such actions, 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 or creative activity and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these accomplishments warrant promotion at this time.

Promotion to the full Professor level is awarded on the basis of sustained excellence in research or creative activity, teaching, professional activity, and service to the University and the professional community.

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
- 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 publications
- Whether Dr. Doe would qualify for promotion to full Professor 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 [*date*]. 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: Review for advancement to Professor (Ladder Rank), Step VI

Note: Although the UC system uses Roman numerals (VI, VII, etc.) to denote steps, Arabic numerals (6, 7, etc.) may be used for better readability in letters to external referees.

Current date

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

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for advancement to Professor, Step 6, effective July 1, 20XX.

For such actions, 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 or creative activity and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these accomplishments warrant such advancement at this time.

The University of California divides the rank of full Professor into nine steps. The normal period of service is three years at each of the first eight steps and four years at Step 9. Advancement to Step 6 requires a career review and evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, excellent teaching, and highly meritorious service. In addition, great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in scholarly or creative achievement or in teaching is required.

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
- 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 publications
- Whether Dr. Doe would qualify for such an advancement 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 [date]. 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: Review for accelerated advancement to or through Professor (Ladder Rank), Step VI

Note: Although the UC system uses Roman numerals (VI, VII, etc.) to denote steps, Arabic numerals (6, 7, etc.) may be used for better readability in letters to external referees.

Current date

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

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for a ___-year accelerated advancement from Professor, Step ___, to Professor, Step ___, effective July 1, 20XX.

For such actions, 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 or creative activity and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these accomplishments warrant such advancement at this time.

The University of California divides the rank of full Professor into nine steps. The normal period of service is three years at each of the first eight steps and four years at Step 9. Advancement to (or through) Step 6 requires a career review and evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, excellent teaching, and highly meritorious service. In addition, great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in scholarly or creative achievement or in teaching is required.

An accelerated advancement allows a faculty member to pass over one or more steps. It rewards extraordinary contributions in research and creative activity, teaching, and service and other scholarly and educational contributions and requires demonstration of both unusual achievement and exceptional promise of continued growth.

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
- 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 publications
- Whether Dr. Doe would qualify for such an advancement 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 [*date*]. 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: Review for advancement to Professor (Ladder Rank), Above Scale

Note: Although the UC system uses Roman numerals (VI, VII, etc.) to denote steps, Arabic numerals (6, 7, etc.) may be used for better readability in letters to external referees.

Current date

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

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for advancement to Professor, Above Scale (Distinguished Professor), effective July 1, 20XX.

For such actions, 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 or creative activity and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these accomplishments warrant such an advancement at this time.

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 9. 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
- Whether Dr. Doe would qualify for such an advancement 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 [*date*]. 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 information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

SAMPLE: Review for accelerated advancement – general

Note: Although the UC system uses Roman numerals (VI, VII, etc.) to denote steps, Arabic numerals (6, 7, etc.) may be used for better readability in letters to external referees.

Current date

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

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for a ___-year accelerated advancement from [*rank/step*] to [*rank/step*], effective July 1, 20XX.

For such actions, the University of California may seek 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 or creative activity and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these accomplishments warrant such an advancement at this time.

At the University of California, the ranks of Assistant, Associate, and full Professor are divided into several steps, and a normal period of service (two, three, or four years) is designated for each step. An accelerated advancement allows a faculty member to pass over one or more steps. It rewards extraordinary contributions in research and creative activity, teaching, and service and other scholarly and educational contributions and requires demonstration of both unusual achievement and exceptional promise of continued growth.

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
- 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 publications
- Whether Dr. Doe would qualify for such an advancement 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 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 [*date*]. 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: Review for promotion in Professor In Residence series

Current date

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

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for promotion to [Associate/full] Professor In Residence, effective July 1, 20XX.

For such actions, 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 or creative activity and professional standing, and your opinion as to whether these accomplishments warrant promotion at this time.

At the University of California, the Professor In Residence series parallels the Professor (tenure-track and tenured) series, and the review practices and standards for promotion are equivalent. Appointees in both series are expected to demonstrate the same high quality of research and scholarly accomplishments, teaching, 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 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
- 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 publications
- Whether Dr. Doe would qualify for such a promotion 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 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 [date]. 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: Review for promotion in Professor of Clinical X series

Current date

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

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Radiology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for promotion to [Associate/full] Professor of Clinical Radiology, effective July 1, 20XX.

For such actions, 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, creativity, and recognition inside and outside our own institution, and your opinion as to whether these scholarly accomplishments warrant promotion at this time.

The Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Clinical Radiology) series is reserved for faculty who have demonstrated expertise, dedication, and achievement in clinical, educational, and scholarly activities within and outside the UCSD School of Medicine. For promotion, the University of California requires demonstration of the high quality of Dr. Doe's teaching, clinical competence, expertise, creative and scholarly work, and University and public service. Although this is not a tenured position, it confers 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 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
- Whether this candidate would qualify for such a promotion 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 [date]. 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: Review for promotion in Health Sciences Clinical Professor series

Current date

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

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Radiology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for promotion as Health Sciences [Associate] Clinical Professor, effective July 1, 20XX.

For such actions, the University of California requires letters of evaluation. 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 accomplishments, and your opinion as to whether these accomplishments warrant promotion at this time.

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.

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.

In order for your comments to be considered, I ask that you respond no later than [date]. 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: Review for promotion in Adjunct Professor series

Current date

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

Dear Professor Jones:

The Department of Marine Archaeology at the University of California, San Diego, is considering Dr. John Doe for promotion to [Associate/full] Adjunct Professor, effective July 1, 20XX.

For such actions, 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 accomplishments warrant promotion at this time.

At the University of California, candidates for promotion 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 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
- 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 publications
- Whether Dr. Doe would qualify for such a promotion 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 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 [date]. 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: Review for promotion in Research Scientist 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 promotion to [Associate/full] Research Scientist, effective July 1, 20XX.

For such actions, 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 promotion at this time.

Research Scientists are expected to engage in independent research equivalent to that required for the Professor (tenure-track and tenured) series. They function as independent investigators, have complete responsibility for their research programs, and are leaders in their fields. Normally they are fully self-funded principal investigators. Appointees in this series have no formal teaching responsibilities, but are expected to engage in University and/or professional service at the Associate level and above.

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
- Dr. Doe's independent productivity and creativity and/or role in co-authored work
- Whether Dr. Doe would qualify for such a promotion at your institution

[The following sentence is only applicable for promotion from Associate to full, since service is not required at the Assistant level.] 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 [date]. 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: Review for promotion in the Project Scientist series

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 promotion to [Associate/full] Project Scientist, effective July 1, 20XX.

For such actions, 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 promotion at this time.

The criteria for advancement in the Project Scientist series are demonstrated significant original and creative contributions to a research or creative project. Project Scientists are not required to carry out independent research or develop an independent research reputation, and normally they work with faculty supervision. Project Scientists may engage in University and public service, but they 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 demonstrated success in making 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 [date]. 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: Review for promotion in the Specialist 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 promotion to [*Associate/full*] Specialist, effective July 1, 20XX.

For such actions, 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 promotion at this time.

Specialists engage in research in specialized areas and make contributions to a research project. Most are appointed to provide special skills, experience, and knowledge for research projects. They have no teaching responsibilities. Specialists provide considerable independent input into the planning and execution of research, but generally work 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 demonstrated success in performing specialized research as described above.

In order for your comments to be considered, I ask that you respond no later than [*date*]. 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.