

*School of Medicine Adaptive Long Form Evidence Table  
(New Untenured Appointment for a Term of Years)*

<b>Appointment to the Rank of:</b>	<b>Scholarship: Usual Number of Letters</b>	<b>Comparative Evaluatons</b>	<b>Guidelines regarding scholarship</b>	<b>Teaching: usual number of letters</b>	<b>Guidelines regarding teaching</b>	<b>Other activities (includes clinical care): usual number of letters</b>	<b>Guidelines regarding other activities (includes clinical care):</b>
Assistant Professor, no prior faculty experience (UTL, MCL, NTLR)	3 total letters required <b>Note A</b>	Named comparison peers NOT required		<b>Note C</b>	<b>Note D</b>	<b>Note E</b>	<b>Note F</b>
Assistant Professor, has prior faculty experience (UTL, MCL, NTLR)	3 external letters required <b>Note G</b>	Named comparison peers NOT required		1 - 3 trainee letters required	<b>Note H</b>	<b>Note E</b>	<b>Note F</b>
Associate Professor without tenure - <a href="#">University Tenure Line</a> <b>Note X</b>	6 external letters required <b>Note I</b> <b>Note W</b>	5 named comparison peers REQUIRED - review guidelines for peer set consideration carefully ( <b>Note J</b> )	<b>Note J</b>	3 - 5 total trainee letters required <b>Note K</b>	<b>Note L</b>	<b>Note E</b>	<b>Note F</b>
Associate Professor or Full Professor, fixed term - <a href="#">Non-Tenure Line -Research</a>	6 external letters required. <b>Note I</b> <b>Note W</b>	5 named comparison peers REQUIRED - review guidelines for peer set consideration carefully ( <b>Note M</b> )	<b>Note M</b>	1 - 5 Trainee letters required	<b>Note N</b>	<b>Note E</b>	<b>Note F</b>
Associate Professor or Full Professor - <a href="#">Non-Tenure Line - Teaching</a>	Scholarship – specific referee letters <u>may</u> be required <b>Notes O, P</b>	Named comparison peers NOT required	<b>Notes O, P</b>	6 total letters from internal and/or external referees, 5-10 trainee letters required <b>Notes O, P</b>	<b>Note Q</b>	<b>Note E</b>	<b>Note F</b>
Associate Professor or Full Professor - <a href="#">Medical Center Line</a>	5 external letters required <b>Note I</b> <b>Note W</b>	Named comparison peers NOT required	<b>Note R</b>	3 - 5 total trainee letters required <b>Note S</b>	<b>Note L</b>	<b>Note T</b>	<b>Note U</b>

## Notes:

- A. Mix of internal and external at department's discretion. Presumably many letters will come from mentors. Letters from search process are acceptable for inclusion in the long form, even if solicited by the candidate, as long as they discuss scholarship and teaching, and clinical care if applicable.
- B. <removed>
- C. Trainee letters are not required by the University but may be required by the School in some cases (see note D).
- D. If candidate has had significant teaching and/or mentoring experience, some assessment of teaching and/or mentoring performance (such as evaluation forms and/or 1 - 3 trainee letters, as applicable) should be provided.
- E. No separate letters required, but some assessment is required by the School if clinical activities are planned (see note F).
- F. If a clinical care role is planned for the candidate, some assessment of clinical performance should be provided. If the candidate is currently at another institution or has very recently arrived at Stanford, this assessment might be provided in comments in external referees' letters and/or in clinical evaluation forms from the candidate's home institution. If the candidate has been providing clinical care at Stanford or one of Stanford's affiliates, Clinical Excellence Core Competency Evaluation (CECCE) forms should be obtained from Stanford colleagues as described in the CECCE form instructions.
- G. Supplemental internal letters may be solicited at department's discretion. At least one external independent (non-mentor, non-collaborator) letter is required by the School for UTL candidates and recommended for NTLR candidates. It is understood that the preponderance of letters may come from mentors and advisors; however, input from non-mentor, non-collaborator referees may strengthen the application for more experienced or recognized candidates.
- H. Letters from trainees are to be solicited by the department. To increase the likelihood of candid responses, it is preferable that at least some of the evaluation letters come from recent former (as opposed to current) trainees.
- I. The majority of letters received should come from non-mentor, non-collaborator referees - as a general guideline, no more than 1 or 2 should come from mentors or collaborators. Supplemental internal letters may be solicited at department's discretion
- J. Referee and Peer sets should be selected to allow calibration of candidate's distinction and recognition across a broadly defined field (hundreds of researchers working in the area). All or most of the peers should be scholars who would likely receive tenure at Stanford. In general, the School recommends selection of peers who are tenured (or expected to be tenured) at their home institutions. Consult OAA if any uncertainty.
- K. If the candidate is expected to direct graduate study, include the names and dates of doctoral graduates for whom the candidate was the principal advisor, and include letters from those individuals wherever practicable. In addition, if applicable, evaluations should normally be sought from current doctoral students and postdoctoral fellows who are directly supervised by the candidate. Evaluations may take the form of letters, or they may be in the form of a summary of confidential conversations with a member of the evaluation committee. Summaries of all available standardized course evaluations are required. Results of peer reviews of teaching, summaries of individual course evaluation forms, representative transcribed comments from such forms, etc. should be submitted as available and applicable.
- L. If a large number of trainees are available from whom to solicit evaluation letters, use a random sampling process to determine the trainees who should be solicited. (For small courses and for individually supervised student projects, the entire set of students should be solicited for letters.) There should be a minimum of 2 follow-up requests to non-respondents. The department should document the process used to generate trainee letters, following the guidelines just described, should include tallies of the number of letters requested and received. For example, the department might state, "The candidate provided us a list of 12 former and current trainees. The departmental evaluation committee solicited letters from all three of the candidate's current doctoral trainees and two randomly selected remaining trainees. Four of the five letters were received. A letter was not received from Dr. \_\_\_\_ despite two follow-up attempts."

- M. Peer set should be selected to allow calibration of candidate's distinction in the relevant field. Due to differences in the institutional roles of NTLR faculty, the breadth of scope of comparison fields in the NTLR may be narrower than for comparable actions in the UTL. Consult OAA for guidance. All or most of the peers should be scholars who would likely be appointed at Stanford.
- N. Teaching evidence in addition to the trainee letter(s) is not expected; however, if teaching evidence is available and appropriate to the candidate's intended role, it may be included.
- O. If the candidate is an active scholarly contributor, 3 of the 6 external and/or internal letters required by the teaching section should also address the candidate's scholarly contributions. In other words, 6 total referee letters are required and may come from internal and/or external referees; if the candidate is an active scholarly contributor, 3 of these letters should address the scholarly work – see note P. These cases are unusual; please consult OAA in advance for guidance regarding this requirement and the mix of external and internal letters. Scholarship letters, if required, may come from external and/or internal referees, as appropriate.
- P. 6 letters from internal and/or external referees assessing the candidate's pedagogical contributions are required. As in note O, if the candidate is an active scholarly contributor, 3 of these 6 external and/or internal letters should assess the candidate's scholarly contributions. In addition, 5 - 10 trainee letters are required. Results of peer reviews of teaching, summaries of individual course evaluation forms, representative transcribed comments from such forms, etc. should be submitted as available and applicable. If the candidate is expected to direct graduate study, include the names and dates of doctoral graduates for whom the candidate was the principal advisor, and include letters from those individuals wherever practicable. In addition, if applicable, evaluations should normally be sought from current doctoral students and postdoctoral fellows who are directly supervised by the candidate. Evaluations may take the form of letters, or they may be in the form of a summary of confidential conversations with a member of the evaluation committee
- Q. Solicitation letter should provide referees with description of the candidate's role and the evaluative criteria so that referees may provide an informed and meaningful assessment. If a large number of trainees are available from whom to solicit evaluation letters, use a random sampling process to determine the trainees who should be solicited. (For small courses and for individually supervised student projects, the entire set of students should be solicited for letters.) There should be a minimum of 2 follow-up requests to non-respondents. The department should document the process used to generate trainee letters, following the guidelines just described, and should include tallies of the number of letters requested and received. For example, the department might state, "The candidate provided us a list of 12 former and current trainees. The departmental evaluation committee solicited letters from all six of the candidate's current doctoral trainees and four randomly selected remaining trainees. 9 of the 10 letters were received. A letter was not received from Dr. \_\_\_\_ despite two follow-up attempts."
- R. Evaluation letters must include assessment of the candidate's scholarly contributions.
- S. Summaries of individual course evaluation forms, representative transcribed comments from such forms, etc. should be submitted as available and applicable.
- T. MCL: No separate clinical letters required, but some assessment is required by the School (see note U).
- U. MCL: If a clinical care role is planned for the candidate, as is the norm for the MCL, some assessment of clinical performance must be provided. If the candidate is currently at another institution or has very recently arrived at Stanford, this assessment might be provided in comments in external referees' letters and/or in clinical evaluation forms from the candidate's home institution. If the candidate has been providing clinical care at Stanford or one of Stanford's affiliates, Clinical Excellence Core Competency Evaluation (CECCE) forms should be obtained from Stanford colleagues as described in the CECCE form instructions.
- V. There are no Assistant Professor (Teaching) appointments at Stanford.
- W. Supplemental internal letters may be solicited at department's discretion.
- X. As a matter of practice, the School of Medicine does not appoint, reappoint or promote to Full Professor without tenure in the UTL.

End