External Reviewer Description

Dentistry Faculty Affairs asked for a total of 12 external reviewers to solicit letter from. Eight should be recommended by the candidate and four recommended from the chair. The dean has the discretion to remove names from the list of 12 and add names if he/she chooses.

From the list of twelve, the Provost Office requires that at least five letters of recommendation from “arm’s-length” external reviewers, and more than five are highly desirable.

- All of the external review letters that were received by the appointing unit(s) must be included. These letters should be from reviewers at or above the rank of the appointment being considered. If the circumstances necessitate letters from out-of-rank reviewers, those should be explained.
- In addition to the above rank requirement, the following track requirements apply:
  - external reviewers who are tenured faculty can review a candidate being appointed to the tenure-track Instructional, Clinical Instructional, and Research Professor tracks.
  - external reviewers who are Clinical Instructional track faculty can only review a candidate being appointed to the Clinical Instructional track.
  - external reviewers who are Research Professor track faculty can only review a candidate being appointed to the Research Professor track.

  Note: if, for example, an external reviewer who is a Clinical Instructional track faculty were to review a candidate being appointed to the Instructional tenure-track, the letter from the reviewer would not be counted as one of the required five arm's length letters.

- The letters should be truly evaluative and at "arm's length." For candidates on the Instructional tenure track or the Research Professor track, the "arm's length" letters should be from persons who are outside the present institution of the candidate and who did not work or train with the candidate at other institutions. While letters from persons who have served as a candidate’s teacher, adviser, mentor, *co-author, *major research collaborator, or have been in the same department as the candidate or co-taught a course, can be especially helpful (because they can be presumed to have a good sense of both the person and the work), it is also true that their own reputations are involved in the work being evaluated. If such letters are included, they must be in addition to the minimum requirement of five "arm's length" letters. Letters from persons who may be unknown to the candidate, but may have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate’s qualifications, are of greater value. *Note: We will allow letters from persons who have been a co-author, major research collaborator, or former faculty colleague if the most recent association occurred over 10 years prior to the candidate’s expected start date.

- Please note that when both an outside reviewer and the candidate are members of the same large cooperative/research group that publishes abstracts and manuscripts with an expanded number of co-authors, the outside reviewer can be considered an arm's length reviewer if he/she and the candidate have not personally interacted in the research effort. In these cases, we ask that the dean provide a statement noting the absence of a direct collaboration.

- It is important that the Clinical track parallel the Instructional tenure track and Research Professor track in that it is the regional/national impact on one’s field that should justify a senior academic rank. However, “arm’s length” letters from persons who may not be known to the candidate, but who have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate’s qualifications, are unlikely to tell the
story insofar as teaching and clinical work are concerned. Therefore, it is allowable, for Clinical track faculty only, to have up to two of the five “arm's length” evaluative letters from local sources. The two letters from local sources can be from the candidate's current institution as long as the local sources are outside of the candidate's department and have seen the clinical work and actual teaching but are not mentors or scholarly collaborators. At least three of the remaining letters would need to be “arm's length” as ordinarily defined for the Instructional tenure track and the Research Professor track.

- Non-academic reviewers (e.g., employed at the NIH or a major research institute) may be included in the required five "arm's length" letters but only if it is stated that, for those individuals who do not typically hold an academic title, their rank is equivalent or higher to the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered.

- Letters from reviewers at the University of Michigan may be included in the offer package but they will not be considered "arm's length."