Date

Reference Provider

Re. ***Faculty member***

Dear Dr.----------:

Dr. Faculty Member, an Assistant/Associate Professor with/without permanent tenure in the Department of Name in the School of Medicine at UNC-Chapel Hill, is being considered for promotion to Associate/Full Professor with permanent tenure. If successful, this promotion would become effective on or about Date. We write to seek your opinion about Dr. Name’s worthiness for this promotion. To aid in your review of his/her qualifications and contributions, his/her *Curriculum Vita* and a couple of his/her most recent and/or most important publications are enclosed.

At UNC, promotions in the tenure track are typically based upon excellence in one of three specific pathways (i.e., *research; clinical scholarship;* and *educational scholarship*). In his/her particular case, the Department of Name is basing its recommendation on *research*. Faculty members whose primary focus is research are expected to demonstrate their scholarship by publishing peer-reviewed papers describing their original research. In addition, their academic and scholarly productivity should be reflected by success in competing for peer-reviewed research support. In addition, we pay particular attention to the issue of “Team” Research. While the evaluation of accomplishments in research has traditionally focused on a faculty member’s individual achievements (e.g., first and senior authorships, funding as the principal investigator on grant awards, invitations to make presentations on national or international forums, etc.), it has become increasingly clear that the present and future of biomedical science is placing more and more emphasis on interdisciplinary team activities. Therefore, we ask that you pay particular attention to Dr. Name’s contributions to interdisciplinary teamwork, as these activities are also given careful consideration when a faculty member here at UNC is being considered for promotion. Factors such as originality, creativity, indispensability, and unique abilities are particularly relevant when making this evaluation.

We also expect faculty members who are being promoted in the tenure track to have achieved a national reputation for excellence in their respective field. Soliciting input from external, independent reviewers such as you is essential in establishing the national reputation of a given faculty member. Toward this end, we would value your evaluation as to the importance of Dr. Name’s area of study and the significance of the contributions he/she has made to it. We are also particularly interested in your opinion of his/her stature relative to his/her peers nationally. Additional activities and/or responsibilities that are often used to demonstrate one’s national reputation include: documented participation in national and international symposia; membership on study sections, editorial boards, and/or advisory panels; election to office in national and international academic and/or professional societies; invitations to present lectures and seminars at other academic centers and at national professional meetings; awards from national professional organizations; and any other indicators of visibility that extend beyond the boundaries of UNC-Chapel Hill and the state of North Carolina. It is understood that many of these activities (e.g., service on study sections, election to national office, etc.) tend to occur somewhat later in an academic career. Thus, evidence used to document the national reputation of a given faculty member must be commensurate with the academic level of the individual under review.

Please understand that, here at UNC-CH, promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor is tightly linked to a decision regarding the granting of tenure. Thus, either Dr. \_\_\_\_\_\_ will be promoted and granted permanent tenure or he/she will have no choice but to leave the university. In this letter, we are asking for your opinion as to Dr. Name’s suitability for promotion and/or tenure according to the APT criteria described above that are in place here at UNC-CH. It would not be helpful, nor would it be relevant to state that: “*Dr. Name would qualify for promotion at our institution, but would not yet be appropriate for tenure.”*

We will appreciate any assessment you are able to make about the quality of Dr. Name’s teaching and professional service contributions. While we do recognize that these areas are often more difficult to assess than is scholarship, any evaluative comments that you can provide to us will be valued. In addition, we will benefit from having your thoughts regarding Dr. Name’s interpersonal skills, his/her organizational citizenship, as well as any other intangibles you might be able to share with us.

In preparing your response, we do ask that you provide us with the following information:

1. Your opinion as to whether or not you would recommend Dr. Name for this promotion
2. A brief summary of your reasons for this opinion
3. A description of your relationship (if any) with Dr. Name

Finally, please understand that your letter will become a part of Dr. Name’s personnel file. As such, our state law mandates that it be open to Dr. Name should he/she request to review it.

Thank you very much for your willingness to assist us with this important process. We do recognize the substantial amount of time and effort required to provide us with this assessment of Dr. Name. Please understand that time is of the essence in this process. Therefore, we ask that you notify Dr. Chair’s Name as soon as possible if you will not be able to provide us with your review within four weeks of the date of this letter. His/her e-mail address is: name@med.unc.edu

Sincerely,

Chair of Department

Other titles if any

Chair of Department of Name