UMass Chan
Category 2 Letters of Evaluation Prep Checklist

Letters of evaluation are required for the review of candidates for appointment, promotion and tenure. Category 2 letters are required for Associate Professor and Professor ranks and provide essential information to reviewers on the evaluation of a candidate's contributions, achievements, and their academic reputation outside UMass Chan Medical School. The guidelines for letters of evaluation can be found on the OFA website: https://www.umassmed.edu/ofa/forms-guidelines/

The **ideal Category 2 letter** establishes the candidate's regional, national or international (based on rank and criteria) reputation. The letters should be from an authority in the field who knows the candidate well enough to highlight their accomplishments and address unique aspects of their career but not someone who would be perceived as having a positive bias or conflict in evaluating the candidate. For example, Category 2 letters could be solicited from individuals:

- who have worked with the candidate on a review panel, advisory board, guideline committee, or committee for a public or professional organization, or who have co-authorship in position papers, guidelines, professional group or conference reports (even if these efforts have resulted in publication in the past three years)
- who work in the same field, but do not currently collaborate with the candidate, and may have witnessed the candidate present at meetings or other institutions

This checklist was created to further assist with assembling a list of qualified category 2 reference writers. Please answer the following question for each of your potential category 2 letter writers. If the answer is no for **all** of the following questions, then the potential evaluator is a viable category 2 writer. If the answer is yes to any of the following questions, the potential evaluator may still be eligible as a category 1 writer.

- Are they a personal friend or relative?
- Are they a collaborator on **more than** 3 grants or scholarly works (not counting large group collaborations)?
- Is there other evidence of a close personal, professional or financial relationship?

Over the Past Three Years:
- Are they a collaborator, or named with the candidate, on a current, pending or completed funding award?
- Are they a co-author on any scholarly works, including publications, abstracts and presentations with this person (not including co-authorship in position papers, professional group, or conference reports)?
- Were they a peer in training, including but not limited to, residency, fellowship, post-doctoral training, or a close clinical colleague or supervisor (i.e, same department/or division) at a current or prior institution?
- Were they a former training program director, supervisor (e.g., division chief), or formal mentor?
- Is there other evidence of a close personal, professional or financial relationship (as identified either by the candidate or evaluator)?

Beyond the three-year window, potential evaluators should be viewed from the perspective of the DPAC or PAC reviewer: *would the known relationship between the candidate and evaluator cause a reasonable person to question the evaluator's impartiality?* Individuals who would not be considered impartial by this screening test should not be solicited for Category 2 letters. Individuals who are collaborators and/or who have a close professional relationship may, however, write Category 1 letters.