

**UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO
GUIDELINES FOR EXTERNAL REFEREES**

Established:	28 May 2015
Revised:	21 June 2023
Supersedes:	N/A
Responsible/Originating Department:	Office of Vice-President, Academic and Provost
Executive Contact:	Associate Vice-President, Faculty and Academic Life
Related Policies, Guidelines & Procedures:	1. Policy 77 – Tenure and Promotion

External assessments of the quality and significance of the candidate's published work are an important component of the review process for tenure and promotion at the University of Waterloo. In your response, we also ask that you briefly comment on each of the questions listed below. In addition, please feel free to refer to any other matters which you believe may assist the University in arriving at a decision. Please be as specific as possible in your response.

1. Were you aware of any of the candidate's scholarly work before now?

2. If you were aware of the candidate's scholarly work previously, please advise immediately if there is a conflict of interest, or if you would not consider yourself to be at arm's length to the candidate. A conflict of interest is a conflict between a person's duties and responsibilities regarding the review process, and that person's private, professional, business or public interests. There may be a real, perceived, or potential conflict of interest when:

- The referee and the candidate are or have been in a marital, familial, sexual, or financial/business relationship.
- The referee or the candidate is the PI of a currently funded research initiative that includes the other.
- The referee and the candidate currently have a joint funding application under review.
- The referee and the candidate are close collaborators on a research initiative, regardless of funding.
- The referee and the candidate have co-published in the last six years, currently have a co-authored publication under review, or are planning to co-publish in the near future.
- The referee or the candidate was the Masters, PhD, other terminal degree, or postdoctoral supervisor of the other.

A conflict of interest may be deemed to exist or perceived as such when:

- The referee and the candidate have had long-standing scientific or personal differences.
- The referee feels for any reason unable to provide an impartial review of the application.

We also invite you to refer to the definition of Conflict of Interest published by the [Federal Research Funding Organizations](#).

3. On the basis of the information available to you, how would you compare the candidate as a researcher/scholar/innovative designer relative to others working in the candidate's field with comparable background and at a similar stage in academic development? How would you assess

the candidate's recent work, especially while at the University of Waterloo, and the general trajectory of their research?

4. To what degree is the candidate's work original and creative? How much impact and/or influence has it had on the candidate's area of research/scholarship, and on the subject more generally? Very high? Average? Modest? Low?

5. Assuming that the candidate satisfactorily meets other criteria, is the scholarship as revealed by both the quantity and the quality of their work such that you would recommend them for tenure/promotion based on the criteria laid out in Policy 77 of the University of Waterloo? In your judgment, would the candidate be awarded tenure/promoted at your institution or at an institution of similar stature as the University of Waterloo? Please provide rationale or context for your assessment.

6. Apart from their scholarly work, do you know any contributions the candidate has made to the development of their subject in Canada or internationally, e.g., through activities in learned societies, organizing conferences, peer adjudication panels, governmental commissions? In your opinion how significant have these activities been from the standpoint of promoting teaching/scholarship in their subject?