**School of Medicine Adaptive Long Form Evidence Table**

*For use with University Long Form B5 (New Appointment Conferring Tenure or a Continuing Term of Appointment)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment to the Rank of:</th>
<th>Scholarship: Usual Number of Letters</th>
<th>Comparative Evaluations</th>
<th>Guidelines regarding scholarship</th>
<th>Teaching: usual number of letters</th>
<th>Guidelines regarding teaching</th>
<th>Other activities (includes clinical care): usual number of letters</th>
<th>Guidelines regarding other activities (includes clinical care):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment to Associate Professor or Professor conferring tenure - University Tenure Line</td>
<td>8 - 12 external letters required. Notes A, G</td>
<td>5 named comparison peers REQUIRED</td>
<td>Note B</td>
<td>5 - 10 trainee letters are required. Notes C, D</td>
<td>Note I</td>
<td>Note E</td>
<td>Note F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment to Professor conferring a continuing term - MCL</td>
<td>8 - 12 external letters required. Notes A, G</td>
<td>named comparison peers NOT required</td>
<td>Note H</td>
<td>3 - 5 trainee letters are required. Note D</td>
<td>Note I</td>
<td>Note E</td>
<td>Note F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes – Form B5:**

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. The referee and peer sets should be selected to allow calibration of the 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.

C. 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 required. 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.

D. 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."

E. No separate letters required, but some assessment is required by the School if the candidate has a clinical care role – see note F.

F. 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.

G. Supplemental internal letters may be solicited at the department’s discretion.

H. Evaluation letters must include assessment of the candidate's scholarly contributions.

I. Summaries of individual course evaluation forms, representative transcribed comments from such forms, etc. should be submitted as available and applicable.