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**Letters of Evaluation:**

* **Medical Instructor or Assistant Professor:** Three (3) letters of evaluation are required. These can be internal or external but preferably external
* **Associate Professor and Professor:** Six (6) letters of evaluation are requiredn from independent reviewers Duke University who are qualified to evaluate the candidate. Three of the six can be from evaluators internal to Duke.
* Reviewers should be at the level or higher than the candidate being recommended.

For example: For a candidate proposed at rank of Associate Professor with tenure, the reviewer should be at Associate Professor with tenure or Professor with tenure.

* External Letters of Evaluation
	+ In requiring external letters of support for appointment, promotion and tenure decisions, the **intent** is to obtain **broad** and **independent peer evaluation** of the candidate’s achievements, contributions and future potential.
	+ External letters should be sought from a broad sampling of institutions and not restricted to one or two.
* Internal Letter of Evaluation
	+ Internal letters should be sought from a broad sampling of faculty within but preferably outside the unit/division/department.
	+ A letter from Dr. Diana McNeill, Duke AHEAD or Dr. Mitchell Hefling from IPEC would be appropriate for faculty who have a major role in education.
* Letters should **not be**

-from close personal and professional associates or those who have played a significant role in the candidates training or career development (ie. direct mentor).

-from co-authors of a manuscript / book chapter **within the past 7 years** or emeritus professors– while letters from such individuals may be included in the dossier, these letters will not count towards fulfilling the stated minimum.

* Evaluation letters from collaborators of team science (such as from a network or study group) are acceptable if a direct result of the nature of the field/discipline.
* One evaluation letter from a collaborator on guidelines, policy statements, or similar publications of national professional societies is acceptable.
* The Faculty rank proposed should serve as a guide to judging individual situations.  If the minimum requirements for letters of evaluation cannot be met, the circumstances should be explained in the letter of recommendation from the Department Chair or Center Director.

Faculty Handbook

“*For considerations at the level of associate professor and professor, the DAPT Committee should solicit at least six (6) letters, at least three (3) of which must be from individuals external to Duke University of their choosing who are qualified to write on behalf of the candidate's scholarly contributions. with no more than three of the individuals coming from the list of the candidate. The DAPT Committee shall use its own discretion with regard to the list of reviewers the candidate does not wish used.”*

Guide for LOS content:

1. The letter writer should describe the basis of her/his knowledge of the candidate. E.g., “I became familiar with Dr. Smith’s work when they spoke at the International Society.” The letter write should not be a close personal or professional associate of the candidate or direct mentor.
2. Describe quality, independence, originality, and impact of candidate’s scholarship. E.g., “ I believe that Dr. Smith’s achievements places themwithin the top 10 percent of individual working in this field.”
3. Concerns, E.g.,  “Dr. Smith appears to have substantial grants support but few publications.”
4. Likelihood of promotion at the evaluator’s institution. E.g., “Based on my review of evidence that supports the quality and impact of scholarship of this candidate, I have no reservation that Dr. Smith would university.”