

Allard School of Law
CANDIDATE’S LIST OF EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Candidate: _____

Review type: _____

Policy and procedure

From [*Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC, 2023*](#)

5.5.2 The candidate will be asked to provide a list of **at least four potential referees**, of which at least two will be chosen by the Department for the final list of four referees. If additional referees are required at any time, the number selected from the list supplied by the candidate must never be less than the number of referees selected from the list supplied by the Department (i.e. equal numbers from each list are required or more from the candidate’s list than from the Department’s). The candidate should, if necessary, provide additional names so that there will always be at least one more potential referee on the candidate's list than the number of referees to be selected from the list.

5.5.4 Referees should be at **arm’s length** (except under the circumstances of New Appointments to be Considered by SAC (Section 9); that is, referees should be persons whose impartiality cannot be doubted. They may not include such categories as relatives, close personal friends, clients, former graduate thesis advisers, research supervisors, and should not include current or former colleagues where conflict of interest cannot be managed, grant co-holders or co-authors. They can include, for example, former instructors who were not supervisors or professional committee members. A referee may contribute to an edited volume or special issue, or the candidate may be published in a volume or special issue edited by the referee, without precluding an arm’s length review, but the referee must indicate the nature of collaboration, if any, before agreeing to serve.

This means that a referee could be a former instructor, but not a former instructor who was a supervisor, nor a former instructor who served together with the candidate on a professional committee. In rare situations where a referee has only served on a professional committee with the candidate, the Head should consider if it is an arm’s length relationship by questioning how often the committee met and whether the purpose of nature of the committee could lead to a conflict of interest.

In the Educational Leadership stream, arm’s length colleagues from within the University may be appropriate. In determining the admissibility of a letter of reference, the Head should take care to ensure that referees do not have a potentially compromising relationship such that the referee might somehow benefit from or be harmed by the candidate's reappointment, tenure and/or promotion.

- 5.5.7 It is generally understood that the higher the profile of the referees, the more credible their appraisals. Referees are normally at a rank above the candidate's current rank, except for the rank of Professors; however, it is understood that in some cases, it is appropriate to use referees at other ranks or in other professions. In those cases, the Head should provide a detailed statement of the reasons for selection of the referee and of their qualifications and accomplishments.
- 5.5.8 It is also generally understood that referees who are academics should be from universities or units of comparable or superior reputation to UBC. The Head should provide a reasonably detailed statement of the reasons for selection of each referee and of their qualifications and accomplishments. Heads should also consider a range of referees. Particularly in the case of promotion to Professor, a Head should solicit letters from referees outside of Canada as well as from Canadian institutions.
- 5.5.9 **The candidate must not communicate with potential referees about any aspect of the letter of appraisal or the tenure and/or promotion review;** doing so raises questions about their impartiality.
- 5.5.10 The candidate will not be informed of the names of the referees from whom letters are solicited.

Proposed external reviewers

<p>1. Name: _____</p> <p>Rank: _____</p> <p>Institution: _____</p> <p>Email: _____</p> <p>Arm's length?</p>
--

<p>2. Name: _____</p> <p>Rank: _____</p> <p>Institution: _____</p> <p>Email: _____</p> <p>Arm's length?</p>
--

3. Name: _____
Rank: _____
Institution: _____
Email: _____
Arm's length?

4. Name: _____
Rank: _____
Institution: _____
Email: _____
Arm's length?

Additional proposed external reviewers (optional)

5. Name: _____
Rank: _____
Institution: _____
Email: _____
Arm's length?

6. Name: _____
Rank: _____
Institution: _____
Email: _____
Arm's length?

Exclusions

The candidate may list any individual in their field that they have reason to believe would be biased in their assessment of the candidate's work, for reasons other than arm's length status.

1. Name:
Institution: _____
Reason for exclusion:

2. Name:
Institution: _____
Reason for exclusion:

3. Name:
Institution: _____
Reason for exclusion:

Other considerations:

The candidate may indicate other considerations in the selection of the external reviewers, such as (but not limited to) considerations relating to Indigenous scholarly activity and professional scholarly activity, languages used in their selected sample publications, or the breadth of areas addressed within their scholarly activity or educational leadership.