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Please include in your response brief comments 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.

3. On the basis of the information available to you, where do you rank 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: top 5 percent; top 10 percent; top quarter; top half? The names of those with whom you are comparing the candidate would be very helpful.

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 his/her work such that you would recommend him/her for tenure/promotion? In your judgment, would the candidate be awarded tenure/promoted at your institution?

6. Apart from his/her scholarly work, do you know any contributions the candidate has made to the development of his/her subject in Canada or elsewhere—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 his/her subject?

*arm’s length – no prior relationship with the candidate, whether personal or professional, must be able to provide an impartial opinion