

APPHB Appendix L. - External Review Letters: Record & Procedures

Procedures for External Reviews of Impact/Quality of Scholarship

1. The purpose of external review letters is to assist with the assessment of the quality and significant of the scholarly activity of the faculty the faculty candidate.
2. Who should serve as an external reviewer? Reviewers must be external to UNC Charlotte and must have a sufficient record of accomplishment and expertise in the candidate's field of scholarship to make a sound professional judgment. In order to minimize conflict of interest, external reviewers who are close colleagues or collaborators, former professors or graduate students or other similar individuals should not be invited to serve as reviewers.
3. How many external reviews are required? At least three reviews are required to complete the review file. In order to secure at least three reviews, it is wise to invite 4-6 reviews.
4. Who identifies the reviewers? The list of reviewers is a collaborative effort between the faculty candidate and chair, chair designee(s), and/or dean. The faculty candidate is invited to submit a list of potential reviewers. The administrator selects reviewers from the list and adds additional reviewers. The final list reflects a balance between faculty-nominated and administrator-nominated reviewers. The final list of reviewers, their qualifications, and who nominated each is summarized in the **Record of External Letters for Promotion/ Tenure Reviews: Evaluation of Quality/ Impact of Scholarship** chart which is included in the review file.
5. Who contacts external reviewers? The department chair is responsible for contacting external reviewers. It is best professional practice for the chair to secure the reviewer's willingness to participate in the process before sending the review materials.
6. What materials should be provided to an external reviewer? At a minimum, each external reviewer should be given the following materials:
 - a. Specific guidelines for the assessment they are asked to provide
 - b. Adequate documentation to provide context for the items they are asked to assess

- c. A brief description of the department and the candidate's roles/ responsibilities
 - d. Candidates' materials as described in department and college guidelines (often including curriculum vitae, research statement, and representative publications)
 - e. A statement indicating that the external reviewer is not to make a determination about whether the candidate should be promoted or tenure conferred, but instead should focus on the quality of the scholarship and its impact
 - f. Notification that, per North Carolina law, the review process is an open one and their review will be open to the candidate
7. What is the deadline for the candidate to prepare the necessary materials? What is the timeline for the chair to contact the external reviewers? The candidate must submit the material to be sent to external reviewers, as identified by departmental guidelines, by the established departmental deadline, in no case no later than the close of the academic year. It is recommended that the chair contact external reviewers to determine their willingness to participate in the process no later than the end of the academic year and send out the review packets no later than June 1 in order to provide sufficient time to receive the reviews by the start of the fall semester.



UNC CHARLOTTE

Academic Affairs
9201 University City Blvd, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
t/ 704.687.5777 www.provost.uncc.edu

Appendix L. - External Review Letters: Record & Procedures

RECORD OF EXTERNAL LETTERS FOR PROMOTION/ TENURE REVIEWS: EVALUATION OF QUALITY/ IMPACT OF SCHOLARSHIP

Candidate's Name: _____

Academic Unit: _____

Name & Address of External Reviewer	Affiliation & Position	Reason for Invitation/Professional Qualifications/ Relationship to Candidate	Suggested by: * (check one)	
			Candidate	Chair/Dean

** It is important to have representation from both lists.*

Signature of Unit Director/Department Chair: _____

Date: _____

The faculty member has been given an opportunity to identify reviewers who should be excluded.