

*School of Medicine Adaptive Long Form Evidence Table  
(Promotion for Individuals Previously Conferred with Tenure or Currently in an Appointment  
for a Continuing Term)*

Promotion to the Rank of:	Scholarship: Usual Number of Letters	Comparative Evaluatons	Guidelines regarding scholarship	Teaching: usual number of letters	Guidelines regarding teaching	Other activities (includes clinical care): usual number of letters	Guidelines regarding other activities (includes clinical care):
Promotion from Associate Professor with tenure to Professor with tenure - <a href="#">University Tenure Line</a>	5 - 8 external letters required. <b>Note A</b> 3 - 5 internal letters are required.	Named comparison peers NOT required; however, they may be appropriate in some cases – see <b>Note B</b>	<b>Note C</b>	3 - 5 trainee letters are required. <b>Note D</b>	<b>Note E</b>	<b>Note F</b>	<b>Note G</b>
Promotion from Associate Professor with a continuing term to Full Professor with a continuing term - <a href="#">Non-Tenure Line - Research</a>	4 - 7 external letters required. <b>Note A</b> 3 - 5 internal letters are required.	Named comparison peers NOT required; however, they may be appropriate in some cases – see <b>Note B</b>	<b>Note H</b>	1 - 5 Trainee letters are required.	<b>Note I</b>	<b>Note F</b>	<b>Note G</b>
Promotion from Associate Professor with a continuing term to Full Professor with a continuing term – <a href="#">Non-Tenure Line - Teaching</a>	<b>Note J</b>	Named comparison peers NOT required	<b>Note J</b>	4 - 7 letters from internal and/or external referees are required. <b>Note J</b> Also, 5 - 10 trainee letters are required <b>Note D</b>	<b>Note K</b>	<b>Note F</b>	<b>Note G</b>

## Notes:

- A. The clear majority of external letters **obtained** should come from non-mentor, non-collaborator referees - as a general guideline, no more than 1 or 2 should come from mentors or collaborators.
- B. Named peer comparisons are NOT required for this action; however, in some cases the department may elect to use named comparisons in an attempt to strengthen a case for promotion. This should be done in consultation with the Office of Academic Affairs.
- C. Peers in the UTL: If a comparison peer set is used (not required), the peer set 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 at their home institutions. Consult OAA if any uncertainty.
- D. 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. Copies of all available standardized course evaluation summaries are expected. 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.
- E. 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 seven randomly selected remaining trainees. 9 out of the 10 letters were received. A letter was not received from Dr. \_\_\_\_ despite two follow-up attempts."
- F. No separate letters required, but some assessment is required by the School if the candidate has a clinical care role – see note F.
- G. If the candidate has a clinical care role at Stanford or one of Stanford's affiliates, Clinical Excellence Core Competency Evaluation (CECCE) forms should be obtained as described in the CECCE form instructions.
- H. Peers in the NTLR: If named peers are used, the 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.
- I. 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.
- J. If the candidate is an active scholarly contributor, 3 of the 4 - 7 external and/or internal letters required by the teaching section should also address the candidate's scholarly contributions. In other words, 4 – 7 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. These cases are unusual; please consult OAA in advance for guidance regarding this requirement and the mix of external and internal letters. Scholarship-specific letters, if required, may come from external and/or internal referees, as appropriate.
- K. 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."

End