

GUIDELINES FOR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROMOTION OR APPOINTMENT TO TENURE RANK

FACULTY DIVISION OF THE BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON
OCTOBER 1999

PROCEDURES PRIOR TO TENURE CONSIDERATION

Newly appointed probationary tenure track faculty will be provided with a copy of these guidelines and UW-Madison *Faculty Policies and Procedures* by the Secretary of the Faculty. If there are questions concerning the guidelines, persons may consult the chair of the Executive Committee of the Biological Sciences Division or the Coordinator of the Divisional Committee. Departments will create an internal review committee for each nontenured faculty appointee at the time of initial appointment. That committee should monitor the progress of the tenure track faculty member throughout the probationary period in accordance with *Faculty Policies and Procedures* 5.21, make suggestions for improvement, and provide peer review when the departmental executive committee considers promotion. For extension faculty with program responsibilities that are largely interdepartmental in nature, one or more program-area peers should be added to the internal review committee.

Proposals for promotion should be submitted when the departmental executive committee and dean consider that the candidate's contributions justify such action. For most candidates, promotion is considered in the fifth or sixth year. A decision on tenure must be made before the end of the sixth year. Any recommendation for promotion to tenure for a person in the terminal year of the probationary period must be submitted to the Executive Committee at least three months before the May meeting. Departments are encouraged to review Chapter 7 of the UW-Madison *Faculty Policies and Procedures* regarding faculty appointments and especially 7.07, which provides procedures for action on probationary appointments and contains information on notification of candidates and their appearance at evaluation meetings.

It is the responsibility of the candidate, during the probationary period, to develop the record of accomplishment required for a promotion to tenure. Regardless of the areas of scholarly activity on which a candidate's case is based, there must be evidence that all academic activity required of the candidate (from among teaching, research and extension) has been performed at a satisfactory level. A candidate should spend sufficient time to attain excellence in some area of activity. It is expected that all candidates will perform University and professional service.

TENURE CRITERIA

General

The criteria for the granting of tenure are governed by state statute and the rules of the University of Wisconsin. Relevant passages may be found in the UW System mission statement and the UW-Madison *Faculty Policies and Procedures*. The statement from *Faculty Policies and Procedures* follows:

7.14 (paragraphs B, C, and D) CRITERIA FOR THE GRANTING OF TENURE

In applying its professional judgment to the decision to recommend or not to recommend tenure, the departmental executive committee or ad-hoc committee under 7.10.C has the obligation to exercise its discretion in the interest of improving the academic and professional quality of the department; departmental executive committees or ad-hoc committees may not decline to recommend tenure for any reasons which are legally impermissible or which violate principles of academic freedom.

Each divisional executive committee shall establish written criteria and standards it will employ in recommending the granting of tenure. These criteria and standards shall assure that the granting of tenure is based on evidence of (1) teaching excellence; (2) a record of professional creativity, such as research or other accomplishments appropriate to the discipline; and (3) service to the University, to the faculty member's profession, or professional service to the public.

Each departmental executive committee shall establish written criteria and standards it will employ in recommending the granting of tenure. These criteria and standards shall be consistent with 7.14C of these rules. A copy of these criteria and standards shall be furnished to probationary faculty member(s) (see 7.05A of these rules) and shall be filed with the appropriate dean(s) and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost. A copy of the departmental criteria along with a statement showing how they were applied to the candidate shall be forwarded with a departmental recommendation for tenure.

**Standards and Criteria of the Executive Committee
of the Biological Sciences Division**

The Executive Committee's criteria for granting tenure are intended to preserve and enhance the quality of this university's programs. Tenure requires proof of excellence in past performance and convincing evidence that a high level of performance will continue. To achieve tenure, a candidate must demonstrate an ability to: (1) generate new knowledge or develop new approaches to problem solving and/or teaching that indicates creativeness and has substantial impact on the intended audience; (2) effectively communicate scholarly information orally and in written form to students, colleagues and the public; and (3) enhance the scholarly environment of the University community. There is no entitlement to tenure based on a record that is merely competent and satisfactory.

The committee recognizes that the contributions of faculty will differ and that it is not possible to provide precise criteria for all potential tenure cases. It is the intent of the committee to evaluate all candidates--those with credentials that do not fit neatly with the guidelines as well as those that do--in the fairest manner with the intent of meeting the goal of enhancing University excellence.

Except where differences are unavoidable, recommendations for appointment to tenure will be handled in the same manner as recommendations for promotion to tenure.

1. Excellence and significant accomplishment in research

Excellence and significant accomplishment in research refer to the generation of knowledge and its communication to the scientific community. The candidate must have developed an original research program of high quality which is making a continuing and substantial contribution to science. The development of one or more coherent and significant lines of research is important.

2. Excellence and significant accomplishment in teaching

Significant accomplishment in teaching refers to the quality of the candidate's classroom or clinical teaching. Mentor teaching may strengthen a case but cannot ordinarily serve as the primary basis for accomplishment in teaching. Excellence in teaching requires a national or international reputation as demonstrated by scholarly work.

Meaningful evaluation of teaching performance requires the availability of credible evidence obtained by peer review as well as student evaluations. Thus the committee has established the following system of peer review for teaching.

- a. When a case for either significant accomplishment or excellence in teaching is to be made, the department is required to provide evaluation based on peer review of the candidate's teaching activities covering the probationary period.

The exact format of the peer-review process is at the discretion of the department. The peer review should be continuing, beginning in the second year. There should be substantial observation of the candidate.

- b. When a tenure case is to be based on teaching as the primary area of excellence, the department, in

addition to the ongoing departmental peer review, must provide additional credible evidence for excellence in teaching. It is recommended that an ad hoc peer-review committee composed of two or more members from outside the department be appointed by the departmental executive committee.

Selection of a credible committee is essential and it is recommended that faculty who themselves are known to be excellent teachers be selected. In order to provide time for a substantive review and evaluation, the ad hoc committee should begin its work not later than one and one-half years before submission of the case for tenure. The review should consist of interviews with the candidate and members of the department to review the candidate's teaching activities and materials and to ascertain the candidate's role in the departmental teaching mission. Most important, repeated direct observation of all of the candidate's teaching activities (classroom, laboratory and/or clinical) is essential. The ad hoc committee will submit a written report to the departmental executive committee regarding the merits of the candidate's teaching but should make no recommendation for or against promotion. The department is to include the entire ad hoc committee report in the tenure document.

3. Excellence and significant accomplishment in outreach/extension

Under most circumstances, excellence in outreach/extension may serve as a basis for tenure only for those with a formal appointment of at least 50 percent in an outreach/extension program. Extension activities result in the dissemination of information and the application of the results of scholarly inquiry in basic and applied disciplines for the benefit of society. The impact tends to be statewide but may extend to regional, national, or even international clientele. Program funding and publication tend to be state, regionally, or internationally oriented. It is, therefore, necessary that the case documents innovative program developments and applications that have made a continuing and substantial contribution to state, regional, or international development. A demonstrated capability to develop an independent, cohesive, and integrated extension program is essential.

Evidence of excellence and significant accomplishment must be provided by recognized outreach/extension specialists in the candidate's field outside UW-Madison. The candidate must demonstrate that (1) designed and implemented programs are innovative and of high quality, (2) a favorable impact has resulted from these programs, and (3) successful outreach/extension research results have been published in an effective manner.

4. Service

Service cannot function as the primary area (i.e., as the area for demonstration of excellence) for the granting of tenure, but it may serve as an area of significant accomplishment. Types of service and standards for evaluation are described at the end of section 5.D of this document (under the heading PRESENTATION OF THE TENURE DOCUMENT).

Usual Cases Based on Two Areas

In most cases, in order to qualify for tenure, the candidate must demonstrate achievements that are judged to be excellent in at least one of the areas of research, teaching, or extension, and must have shown significant accomplishment in one of the remaining two areas. It is recognized that the needs of departments and the position responsibilities of candidates differ. By **excellence** and **significant accomplishment**, the committee is referring to quality of performance. The amount of time expended in areas can vary widely; the committee will assess quantity in relation to time allocation. The importance of a candidate to the program of the department or school may not replace excellence in teaching, research, or extension as a basis for promotion or appointment to tenure.

Extraordinary Cases Based on Only One Area

When the overall program of the candidate's department can be shown to benefit from a candidate's strong emphasis on a single area, recommendation for tenure may be based solely on excellence in teaching, research, or extension. The department must justify each extraordinary case by documenting truly exceptional performance. The kinds of documentation required to support promotion to tenure in an extraordinary case are similar to those required in a usual case, with the following amplifications.

For recommendations based solely on **research**, the evidence must show that the candidate is one of the very best in his/her field and that the candidate is exceptionally creative, productive, and recognized nationally and internationally as a leader in an area of the biological sciences.

For recommendations based solely on **teaching**, the evidence must clearly indicate that the candidate is a truly outstanding teacher, has contributed creatively to the art and practice of teaching in the field, and has achieved national and/or international recognition. **The impact of the candidate's contributions to teaching must extend beyond the campus.** The committee will emphasize evaluations furnished by colleagues outside the candidate's own department and outside the UW-Madison, especially evidence provided by recognized educators in the candidate's field.

For recommendations based solely on **outreach/extension**, the evidence must demonstrate that the candidate's performance is outstanding and so recognized statewide and regionally, if not nationally. Evidence must be presented to show that the candidate is fully aware of current subject matter and issues in the field and has demonstrated outstanding leadership in initiating innovative techniques and designing and implementing new and creative approaches to transferring the science and technology developed in research programs. The impact of these activities must be documented.

PRESENTATION OF THE TENURE DOCUMENT

General

In accordance with the procedures of the particular college or school, the dossier must contain either a letter of transmittal from the appropriate dean (including the vote of college or school promotion committees if they are involved) or a statement from the department chair that the dean has been consulted and is requesting the advice of the Executive Committee.

Most cases will be based on significant accomplishment in two areas (from teaching, research and extension) with excellence in at least one. These cases are described above (see "Usual Cases Based on Two Areas"); extraordinary cases based on a single area of excellence are described above (see "Extraordinary Cases Based on One Area).

In developing documentation for promotion or appointment to tenure rank, the sequence and scope of the pertinent sections shown below are to be followed carefully. **All pages of the document must be numbered.** Folders or binders for the document are discouraged; it is most convenient for the committee if the pages are stapled together.

Fourteen copies of the tenure document must be forwarded to the Divisional Committee Office. **All 14 of the dossiers should contain two representative publications.** In addition, the document must be accompanied by **two sets of the candidate's remaining publications.** Publications will be returned to the department. Send materials to: Divisional Committee Office, 134 Bascom Hall.

Mandatory Format

All submissions to the divisional committee will use the following format. Although it is recognized that all categories will not apply to all candidates, the document must follow the outline and headings listed below.

1. Table of Contents (self-explanatory)
2. Cover letter from Department Chair

The cover letter must include:

- A. The number of eligible voters on the department executive committee during the semester of the tenure decision and the exact vote, including absences or abstentions. Indicate the percentage of votes required for acceptance by the department.
 - B. The total number of years counted on the candidate's tenure clock at UW-Madison and elsewhere at the time of the department vote and, if different, at the time of submission of the dossier. Total years must agree with the official "Faculty Probation Record" maintained by the Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis for the Secretary of the Faculty.
 - C. Define and document the responsibilities of the candidate as fully as possible, including the actual percentages of time allotted to teaching, research, extension, and service. If the candidate's relationship to, or role in, the department is not likely to be clear to a reviewer from outside the department, provide adequate documentation.
 - D. If a candidate is being presented as an extraordinary case, it must be so stated in the cover letter with full justification. If a candidate is presented as a usual case, the area of excellence and of significant accomplishment must be clearly stated.
3. Letter of appointment
 4. Summary Statement from Departmental Internal Review Committee (maximum of one page)
 5. Background Information on the Candidate. Include:
 - A. Name
 - B. Formal education: include thesis titles and major professors for graduate work.
 - C. Positions held: list chronologically and indicate length of service in each position, accounting for all years.
 - D. Honors and awards
 - E. Society memberships
 6. Performance
 - A. Teaching

It is useful to distinguish three kinds of teaching: (1) **Classroom teaching**: may include lectures, seminars, laboratories, discussion sections, and workshops. (2) **Clinical teaching**: may involve lecture, demonstration, one-on-one teaching in a clinical setting, and postgraduate and continuing education. (3) **Mentor teaching**: tutoring one's own graduate students and postdoctoral fellows; may include journal clubs, lab meetings, as well as one-on-one tutoring. The following provides specific detail regarding subheadings in the mandatory format.

 - (1) **Classroom teaching**

Evidence must be presented that the candidate has developed and conducted a teaching or training program of high quality. Special consideration should be given to new and innovative teaching methods and their effectiveness.

- (a) **Statement by candidate** (maximum of two pages)
The candidate should describe the goals and methods of his/her teaching program.
- (b) **Summary of teaching activities**
This should include a list of all courses taught with numbers of credits, numbers of students in each course, and grade distribution for each course. Also relevant is any role the candidate has played in curriculum development.
- (c) **Peer review**
All departmental peer-review evidence on the candidate must be presented. As noted previously, the committee expects that this evidence will be based on substantial observation. Include brief information on the peer-review process used in evaluating the candidate—for example, number of times reviewed, number of reviewers, criteria used in the review. For cases based on teaching excellence for which an ad hoc independent peer review was conducted, include the entire ad hoc committee report. (See also section above (Excellence and Significant Accomplishment in Teaching) for general information on peer review of teaching.)
- (d) **Student evaluations**
Student evaluations are an important means of evaluating teaching competence. These evaluations must be comprehensive and completed by a majority of the candidate's students. Student evaluations should be presented for the entire probationary period beginning in the second year. Evidence to be presented includes summaries of teaching evaluations; do not include raw evaluations. Provide student comments from at least the two most recent courses taught. Include all comments, not selected comments. Also provide an interpretation of the evaluation scale used, perhaps by comparing the candidate's scores to those of other instructors teaching similar courses.

(2) **Clinical teaching**

The general criteria and evidence for excellence are much the same for clinical teaching as for classroom teaching and the appropriate data as outlined above under (1) **Classroom teaching** should be provided. However, since excellent patient care is essential to, and an integral part of, clinical teaching, the clinical teacher must demonstrate excellence and innovation in his/her clinical area. Therefore, in the candidate's statement (previous page) and in the summary of teaching activities (previous page), a description of the area(s) of clinical expertise and activities should be included. In this part or other appropriate parts of the tenure document the relationship of innovative and outstanding clinical contributions to the candidate's clinical teaching should be documented (e.g., in what ways the clinical activities/expertise have improved teaching). In addition, since much clinical teaching is in a one-on-one or small-group clinical setting, all student comments should be included from student evaluations (previous page).

If promotion is proposed on the basis of excellence in clinical teaching as the primary area, a candidate must have made a greater than normal contribution to clinical teaching. In addition there must be evidence of creativity and innovation, outstanding impact on students' professional growth and the recognition of excellence by peers.

Contributions should be documented in the areas appropriate to the candidate as follows.

- (a) **Professional degree training.** Include the evaluation of lectures or courses given by the candidate and the evaluation of mandatory and elective clinical (clerkship) courses.
- (b) **Postgraduate training.** Documentation of the quality of the candidate's teaching should be provided by fellows, residents, and other clinical trainees. Special emphasis should be placed on evaluation by graduates of training programs, taking into account adequacy of

preparation for practice and continued professional learning. Document encouragement given by the candidate to house staff to engage in scholarly activity (manuscripts, abstracts, etc., produced by house staff). The candidate's special contributions to teaching or to the teaching program should be identified.

- (c) **Postgraduate and continuing education courses for practitioners.** Documentation should be provided to show the quality of teaching and its impact on practitioners in the field.

(3) **Mentor teaching**

Provide information on the students trained, the role of the candidate in that training, and very briefly, the accomplishments of the students trained.

(4) **Supporting documentation**

- (a) **Published materials.** Publications related to teaching should be presented in the same format as outlined below under **Research**. In addition, a brief statement should be added for each publication indicating the relationship of the publication to the teaching program.
- (b) **Invited presentations.** Self-explanatory.
- (c) **Grants and awards.** Self-explanatory.
- (d) **Other.** Include any other documentation of teaching merit. This should be organized clearly and concisely and should include a limited selection of such information as course outlines, handouts, grading techniques, examinations that demonstrate the quality of the candidate's teaching. This section should be summarized by briefly justifying each item included.

B. **Research**

Documentation must be presented to indicate that the candidate has developed an original and significant research program of high quality. For a UW-Madison probationary faculty member being considered for promotion to tenure, there must be clear evidence that an independent and productive research program has been established while a member of the UW-Madison faculty. Independence is usually documented by the published research achieved beyond the candidate's period of formal pre- and postdoctoral training. There is no set number of publications that qualifies research performance for an evaluation of excellence or significant accomplishment. Quality is more important than quantity. However, evidence must be provided of a consistent and continuing publication record in what are generally considered to be excellent peer-reviewed publications appropriate to the candidate's field. Well-defined goals must be evident in one or more coherent and significant lines of research.

In some cases untenured faculty may choose to conduct part of their research programs together with other tenured faculty either as individuals or through the auspices of a research center. Although such collaborations can be valuable, key elements in the case for tenure are the *individual* research accomplishments of the candidate and a clear demonstration of the ability to attract outside research support adequate to support the program. Thus, care must be taken to ensure that the individual research accomplishments of the tenure candidate are clearly evident and are distinguishable from those of the other collaborators. Similarly, if research funding is handled jointly, there should be clear evidence of the role of the candidate in this fund raising. Letters from co-investigators may assist in this demonstration, but these points must be addressed explicitly in external documentation (e.g., letters and peer review reports).

- (1) **Statement by candidate** (maximum of two pages)

A description of the candidate's research program, major accomplishments to date, and goals for the future.

(2) **Publications**

For each publication with multiple authors, the role played by the candidate must be indicated. It is most helpful to the committee if a one or two-sentence narrative is added after each paper indicating the part played by the candidate. Separate consideration must be given to the responsibility of the candidate for: (a) concept development and design, (b) data acquisition, (c) analysis, and (d) writing. Papers submitted or accepted for publication should be so indicated. **Manuscripts in preparation should not be included.** Subdivide the material as follows:

- (a) Papers published in, or accepted by, refereed journals (**list inclusive page numbers of each publication**).
- (b) Papers submitted to refereed journals but not yet accepted for publication. Specify the journals and the dates papers were submitted.
- (c) Papers published in, or accepted by, nonrefereed journals.
- (d) Invited papers published in conference proceedings.
- (e) Monographs or books published. Indicate if joint-authored.
- (f) Chapters in books.
- (g) Books or conference proceedings edited. Indicate specific roles.
- (h) Contributed papers and/or abstracts.
- (i) Technical reports and other publications.
- (j) Patents

By means of asterisks in the left margin, have the candidate identify from the above list the five publications considered most noteworthy.

(3) **List of invited research presentations**

(4) **Research support**

Competing successfully for peer-reviewed grants appropriate to the field of research can serve as additional evidence of the stature and research capabilities of the candidate. A chronology of all present and past research support should be provided, including dates, level of funding, renewals, joint support, and pending proposals. If the candidate is a co-principal investigator, the candidate's role in the preparation of the grant proposal should be annotated. Peer reviews supplied by granting agencies can be very helpful and should be included.

C. **Outreach/Extension**

The case for excellence in outreach/extension must be based on clear evidence that the candidate, in his or her area of expertise, has engaged in independent scholarly endeavors that demonstrate conclusively: (1) leadership, organizational and communicative skills that are truly outstanding; (2) productivity and innovativeness that are meritorious and (3) program impact that is highly effective. In addition to the traditional activities of outreach/extension faculty, it is also expected that candidates holding appointments of more than 50 percent in outreach/extension will have accomplishments in outreach/extension research that are superior in quality and significant in

quantity. The following format is suggested for presentation of accomplishments; however, a revised format may be necessary in unusual cases.

(1) **Statement by candidate** (maximum of two pages)

A description by the candidate of his/her extension program, major accomplishments to date, and goals for the future should be presented. Include (a) problems and objectives, (b) clientele served, (c) how subject matter has been utilized, (d) major accomplishments, giving special attention to scholarly content and leadership role, and (e) evaluation of impact.

(2) **Activities documentation**

- (a) **Publications.** All publications, with the exception of those in preparation and articles on original research, should be listed here. Publications should be grouped in two categories: (1) single print publications (those not intended to be revised and reissued periodically) and (2) series publications (those intended to be updated and reissued periodically). Publications submitted but not yet accepted, and those accepted but not yet in print, should be identified. It will be of great help to the committee if a short statement is made after each publication indicating the level of scholarly input (e.g., a revision of a periodical, or an extensive review and summation of simple data and concepts from a few sources, or an in-depth review and interpretation of complex data and concepts from numerous sources) and additionally for multiple-author publications, the role played by the candidate (concept, data acquisition, analysis, writing).
- (b) Computer software development.
- (c) Extension media development (radio-TV programming, newspaper series, etc.).
- (d) Continuing education programs.
- (e) Extension presentations, including lectures, workshops, seminars, short courses and individualized instruction.
- (f) Collaboration, planning and development of extension activities.
- (g) Special activities in the candidate's area of expertise.

D. **Service**

Documentation should include evidence of:

(1) **University service**

- (a) Present and past administrative assignments in the department, school, college, or University. If administrative service is considered the basis of a strong service contribution, there must be supporting evidence of outstanding quality and importance of this activity to the University.
- (b) Major committee assignments.

(2) **Professional service**

- (a) Service on state, regional, national, and international review panels, study sections, committees, and other public service groups insofar as these services provide evidence of competence in an area of the biological sciences.
- (b) Appointments or election to editorial boards of scientific journals and to office in national and international scientific and educational societies.

- (c) **Clinical service.** In addition to generation and dissemination of knowledge, clinical departments have a responsibility to provide care of the highest quality to patients as a necessary basis for education of professional, graduate and postgraduate students. This service, although exemplary, may not lend itself to documentation under teaching or research. Evidence of clinical service should include a synopsis of clinical responsibilities, documentation of patient care by publication or dissemination of case studies and new approaches to care, and evaluation of clinical performance by peers in the candidate's own and related professional specialties.
- (d) **Outreach.** There is a tradition at land grant colleges of helping agricultural clientele solve various problems. Evidence of outreach activities should include a synopsis of outreach responsibilities, documentation of such activities (e.g., outreach presentations such as lectures, workshops, or individualized advising; publication of bulletins or research related to outreach activities), and evaluation of outreach performance by peers. It must be noted

that service/outreach may not serve as an area of significant accomplishment for those whose declared primary area of performance is in extension.

For those candidates whose area of significant accomplishment is anticipated to be service/outreach, it is expected that departments will have instituted methods for documenting the level of performance over a major portion of the probationary period.

7. Letters of Evaluation

At least five, and preferably no more than eight, letters of evaluation, solicited by the department chair, must be provided by recognized authorities in the candidate's own field. The majority of the letters must be outside letters from recognized authorities in the candidate's field who have NOT been responsible for any portion of the candidate's training or have not been close professional collaborators of the candidate. Outside means not from UW-Madison. The professional and/or familial relationship of the author of the letter to the candidate must be specified by the chair. The chair of the department will provide the committee with a brief description of the stature and qualifications of the evaluators and a copy of the letter requesting the evaluations. The chair must certify in the cover letter of the tenure document that all letters of evaluation received are included in the document. Also the names and addresses of those who were invited to submit letters of evaluation, but did not do so, must be provided. The reason for the lack of response should be stated, if known.

Reviewers should be asked to evaluate thoroughly the quality and productivity of a candidate's program with emphasis on the area in which the case is to be made. The letters should address the question of whether the candidate is producing significant and important contributions in the chosen area of expertise. Comments providing information on the specific nature of the contributions are preferred to general statements. Outside letters of evaluation are of particular value to the committee in determining a candidate's national and international stature.

In the area of teaching, letters from peers at UW-Madison are specifically requested and desirable.

In the interest of obtaining an entirely objective appraisal of the candidate, Wisconsin Public Records Law allows letters of evaluation to be treated as confidential from the candidate. If the evaluator wishes a letter to be treated as confidential, this must be explicitly stated as a condition of the evaluator's response. It is the responsibility of the department chair to so inform evaluators.

Sample Letter 1
Biological Sciences Division

Sample letter seeking peer review for excellence in research and significant contributions in extension/outreach.

TO: External Referees of Tenure Candidates

Dear Dr. _____:

Assistant Professor _____ is under consideration for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, faculty are promoted on the basis of excellence in a primary area (research, teaching, or extension/outreach), and significant accomplishment in a second area (research, teaching, extension/outreach, or service). We are placing Professor _____ up for promotion based on excellence in research and significant accomplishments in extension/outreach.

Letters of critical appraisal from outside referees are of the utmost importance in documenting the quality of performance of candidates for tenure at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. We therefore ask that you provide a substantive evaluation of Professor _____'s research and/or extension/outreach programs. Also please indicate the nature of your association with Professor _____.

Please provide a specific, critical evaluation of Professor _____'s work rather than general statements of uncritical praise. We would appreciate it if you could provide an objective evaluation of the originality, quality, and significance of his/her research accomplishments. Have his/her research findings contributed significantly to the field? How?

If appropriate, also please provide an objective evaluation of Professor _____'s extension/outreach. What impact have his/her extension/outreach accomplishments had on students, clients, or on the discipline in general?

To aid you in your evaluation I have enclosed Professor _____'s vita, a description of his/her research and extension/outreach programs, and his/her most significant publications.

In the interest of obtaining an entirely objective appraisal of the candidate, Wisconsin State Statutes allows letters of evaluation to be treated as confidential from the candidate. If you wish your letter to be treated as confidential, this must be stated explicitly in the letter.

On behalf of the faculty, I sincerely thank you for your important contribution to this review process.

Sincerely yours,

Sample Letter 2
Biological Sciences Division

Sample letter seeking peer review for excellence in teaching or research and significant contributions in research or teaching.

TO: External Referees of Tenure Candidates

Dear Dr. _____:

Assistant Professor _____ is under consideration for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, faculty are promoted on the basis of excellence in a primary area (research, teaching, or extension/outreach), and significant accomplishment in a second area (research, teaching, extension/outreach, or service). We are placing Dr. _____ up for promotion based on excellence in _____ and significant accomplishments in _____.

Letters of critical appraisal from outside referees are of the utmost importance in documenting the quality of performance of candidates for tenure at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. We therefore ask that you provide a substantive evaluation of Dr. _____'s teaching and/or research programs. Also please indicate the nature of your association with Dr. _____.

Please provide a specific, critical evaluation of Dr. _____'s teaching capabilities rather than general statements of uncritical praise. We would appreciate your objective opinion about those aspects of Dr. _____'s teaching that are particularly outstanding. What impact have his/her teaching accomplishments had on students? How have his/her accomplishments affected teaching in the discipline in general? What do you consider to be his/her most significant contributions to teaching in the field?

If appropriate, also please provide an objective evaluation of the originality, quality, and significance of his/her research accomplishments. Have his/her research accomplishments contributed significantly to the field? How?

To aid you in your evaluation I have enclosed Dr. _____'s vita, a description of his/her teaching and research programs, and his/her most significant publications.

In the interest of obtaining an entirely objective appraisal of the candidate, Wisconsin State Statutes allows letters of evaluation to be treated as confidential from the candidate. If you wish your letter to be treated as confidential, this must be stated explicitly in the letter.

On behalf of the faculty, I sincerely thank you for your important contribution to this review process.