

**University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Faculty Division of Biological Sciences**

**Guidelines for Recommendations for Promotion or Appointment to Tenure Rank**

Effective May 2020

**Procedures Prior to Tenure Consideration:**

Newly appointed probationary tenure track faculty will be provided with a copy of these guidelines and University of Wisconsin-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 non-tenured 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. If a candidate's work is so broadly interdisciplinary that it would benefit from cross-divisional input, the department chair should alert the Divisional Committee as early as possible in the candidate's probationary period. 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. A decision on tenure must be made before the end of the sixth year of the tenure clock. Cases submitted earlier must meet the same criteria required for cases brought in the sixth probationary year. Under certain circumstances the probationary period can include time spent as an independent/tenure-track faculty member elsewhere. However, the candidate's dossier must demonstrate a trajectory of success at UW-Madison. Chairs should contact the Biological Sciences Divisional Committee chairs for guidance.

Candidates are not penalized for tenure-clock extensions which stop the tenure clock for a specific period of time and should feel comfortable requesting them under the campus-approved guidelines. The Biological Sciences Divisional Committee looks for the same level of accomplishment by the end of a candidate's tenure clock, regardless of extensions. The chair's cover letter for a dossier should identify both the original tenure clock end date and the amended tenure clock end date, with a new mandatory review date reflecting any extensions. However, the letter must not describe the specific circumstances or reasons for extensions. If a candidate applies for promotion based on the original tenure clock, even though tenure-clock extension(s) have changed the tenure clock end date, she or he will be considered for tenure at that time without prejudice.

A candidate's dossier and recommendation for promotion with tenure must be submitted early enough in the last year of the probationary period for appropriate review and consideration by the Divisional Committee ("see also Presentation of the Tenure Document"). 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 (teaching, research, and service as well as extension, community-engaged scholarship, and outreach if

appropriate) has been performed at a satisfactory level. A candidate should demonstrate excellence in at least one area of activity. Excellence can be documented in clearly defined areas, and/or through integrated synergistic combinations of research, teaching, and outreach or service. It is expected that all candidates will perform University and professional service. Although efforts to promote a diverse population of researchers, teachers and students and to encourage the participation of groups underrepresented in the candidate's field are valued in the consideration for tenure, departments must ensure that probationary faculty, particularly those of under-represented groups, are not required to take on more committee, service, and advising responsibilities than their peers, potentially compromising their ability to develop a strong record of scholarly accomplishments. Queries relevant to crafting of tenure documents should be directed to the Divisional Committees Coordinator in the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty.

## **Tenure Criteria**

### **General**

The criteria for the granting of tenure are governed by policies from the UW Board of Regents and rules of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. 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.

For more information on the committee's voting and reconsideration procedures, please see their Standing Procedures.

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 7.14.C of these rules. A copy of these criteria and standards shall be furnished to probationary faculty member(s) (see 7.05.A 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, especially during the probationary period, 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 creativity 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.

Recommendations for *Appointment* to tenure will be handled in the same manner as recommendations for *Promotion* to tenure. The committee recognizes that faculty make a wide variety of academic contributions. Thus, it is not possible to provide precise criteria for all potential tenure cases. It is the intent of the committee to evaluate all candidates in the fairest manner with the intent of enhancing University excellence.

### **Types of Cases:**

#### **1. Excellence in one area with significant accomplishment in a second area**

In this case, in order to qualify for tenure, the candidate must demonstrate excellence in at least one of the areas of research, teaching, or outreach, and significant accomplishment in one of the remaining two areas or in service. The area selected for excellence and the area selected for significant accomplishment must be specified in the chair's letter. 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 outreach, as a basis for promotion or appointment to tenure. It is recognized that the needs of departments and the position responsibilities of candidates differ.

#### **2. Integrated cases**

In some cases, the fairest means of evaluating a candidate's activities may be through assessment of the impact of accomplishments that were only achievable from integration of several areas of activity. The integrated case allows a candidate to demonstrate generation of new knowledge, scholarly creativity and substantial impact through synergistic activities distributed over more than one area. Cases of this type allow demonstration of excellence in instances where the three areas of achievement may be so closely integrated that it is not possible to unambiguously document and assign accomplishments to specific areas. In this case, the chair must indicate that an integrated case is being submitted and justify why this is appropriate in his/her letter. Evaluation of an integrated case should take into account the overall impact on a field or the target community. The synergy among the various areas of achievement must demonstrate excellence and meet the above criteria, as stated in Standards and Criteria of the Executive Committee of the Biological Sciences Division, for achieving tenure. Excellence is expected and it is incumbent on the department to document how the synergistic interaction of areas achieves this excellence.

#### **3. 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 outreach. However, the department must justify each extraordinary case by documenting truly exceptional performance. The usual documentation is required 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** and be documented, for example by scholarly publications in the area of teaching. 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** the evidence must demonstrate that the candidate's performance is outstanding and has achieved national and/or international recognition. 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, designing and implementing new or creative approaches to transferring the science and technology developed in research programs. Evaluation of quality should include evidence and outcomes that document the intellectual contribution of the outreach. **The impact of the candidate's contributions to outreach must extend beyond the campus.** The impact of these activities must be documented by recognized leaders in outreach outside the candidate's own department and outside the UW–Madison.

### **Criteria for Excellence or Significant Accomplishment in Specific Areas**

#### 1. Excellence or significant accomplishment in research

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, independent, coherent, and significant lines of research is important. Significant accomplishment in research is similar to the case for excellence but the body of work or the size of the research enterprise may be less extensive.

#### 2. Excellence or significant accomplishment in teaching

Excellence in teaching requires more than just a very high quantity or quality of teaching on campus. It also requires a national or international reputation as an expert in teaching and learning, demonstrated by impactful scholarly work in the advancement and development of teaching as an academic pursuit. In addition, significant accomplishment in teaching implies a substantial contribution to the educational mission of the university through classroom or clinical teaching, and often includes innovations in curricula.

Teaching through mentoring of trainees is expected, and may strengthen a case, but it cannot serve as the primary basis for accomplishment in teaching. Likewise, guest lecturing in courses, however well received, cannot serve as the primary basis for excellence or significant accomplishment in teaching in cases where the candidate has little role in defining the curriculum or in assessing students.

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

- A. When a case for either excellence or significant accomplishment 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. Peer reviewers should be accomplished teachers from within or outside the candidate's department.

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, documented 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 two 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 or significant accomplishment in outreach

Excellence in outreach may serve as a basis for tenure for those with formal appointments in an extension program or with a significant proportion of their appointment focused on outreach activities. A key component for excellence in outreach is the dissemination of information derived from scholarly inquiry for the benefit of society. Successful outreach will involve innovative practices, development of impactful programs and applications that have made continuing and substantial contributions at the local, regional, national or international level. It may also lead to transformative practices derived from clinical programs or community engagement for the benefit of society. A demonstrated capability to develop and sustain an independent, cohesive, and impactful outreach program is essential. Dossiers must document the outcomes of outreach and its impacts and, in addition, include evaluations by recognized outreach specialists in the candidate's field outside UW-Madison. Significant accomplishment in outreach is similar to the case for excellence but the body of work or the size of the outreach enterprise may be less.

### 4. Service

**Service cannot function as the "area of excellence"** for the granting of tenure, but it may serve as an area of significant accomplishment. In order to qualify for significant accomplishment in service, the candidate must engage in substantial service activities that demonstrate innovation and creativity and advance the mission of the University to support the generation and dissemination of knowledge and to serve the broader public good. Service activities meeting the criteria for significant accomplishment could include leadership in major campus, government, or non-governmental organization initiatives, or development, leadership and management of innovative educational programs or creation of clinical programs in the health or veterinary sciences. Medical or veterinary clinical practice, per se, cannot be used as the basis for significant accomplishment in service. For example, a health care or veterinary professional fulfilling their clinical obligations cannot also use this work as a basis for significant accomplishment in service, however innovative clinical or educational programs they develop and lead can be considered. Also, service activities that are disconnected from the University's academic mission, such as voluntary activities for charitable or religious organizations, are not considered germane. Medical or veterinary clinical practice also cannot be used as the basis for significant accomplishment in service. For example, a clinician fulfilling their clinical obligations cannot also use this clinical work as a basis for significant accomplishment in service.

Documentation of service and standards for evaluation of significant accomplishment are described at the end of Section 11 of this document (under the heading **Presentation of the Tenure Document**).

## 5. Integrated case

Tenure can be granted based on the overall impact of a faculty member's work on a field where the three areas of achievement (research, teaching, and either outreach or service) may be so closely integrated that it is not possible to clearly separate one area of "excellence" from another with "significant accomplishment". In an integrated case, it is expected that the faculty activities in teaching, research and outreach are integrated such that their impact upon the field of study, when viewed as a whole, is demonstrably enhanced through the synergies created among the areas of activity (i.e., have a multiplier effect). The threshold for an integrated case is established through the integration of select activities such that excellence is achieved. It is incumbent upon the candidate to demonstrate how one activity synergizes with another in a way that creates novel tools, treatments, ideas or knowledge to generate an impact on a field or the general public. Excellence is expected and it is incumbent on the department to document how the synergistic interaction of areas, with appropriate metrics and supporting documentation, achieves excellence. In an integrated case the relative contributions of the three areas may vary but evidence of significant and sustained impact within each area must be present. The types of impacts that a faculty candidate may have demonstrated to highlight excellence in an integrated case could, for example, include a number of the following:

- A. The candidate's activities, due to their integrated and synergistic nature, have had a **significant impact upon the field of study** that would not otherwise be present in the absence of such integration.
- B. Integration of the candidate's activities has contributed to the generation of new knowledge or development of new approaches to problem solving and/or teaching that indicates creativity and that the integration of activities has had substantial impact on the intended audience.
- C. Integration of the candidate's activities has enhanced teaching and mentoring excellence.
- D. Integration of the candidate's activities has enhanced, community outreach and engagement, service to the university, and/or the faculty candidate's profession.
- E. Integration of the candidate's activities has enhanced the effective communication of scholarly information to students, colleagues and the public.
- F. Integration of the candidate's activities has enhanced the scholarly environment of the University community.

### **Presentation of the Tenure Document**

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.

In developing documentation for promotion or appointment to tenure rank, the sequence and scope of the pertinent sections shown in the section "Mandatory Format", below, are to be followed carefully.

The Biological Sciences Divisional Committee requires that tenure dossiers be submitted electronically.

Please contact the Divisional Committees Coordinator ([divisional@secfac.wisc.edu](mailto:divisional@secfac.wisc.edu) or 608-263-5741) in advance of the deadline to request creation of a Box folder, providing the candidate's name and the name and e-mail address of the person who will upload tenure materials. Thank you.

Submit two bookmarked PDF documents in Box by noon on the [deadline day](#):

1. The dossier, described in the “Mandatory Format” section below.
2. The candidate’s publications appearing in the six years prior to consideration for tenure. Present the publications as a bookmarked, text-searchable PDF, with a bookmark for each publication.

Templates of the [dossier](#) and [publications](#) are available if departments wish to insert documents. However, departments may find it easier to first create the document and insert bookmarks later.

### **Mandatory Format**

Present the dossier as a bookmarked, text-searchable PDF, with a bookmark for each number and letter on the [checklist](#). The divisional committee does not require departments to include a table of contents and insert page numbers.

1. Letter from the dean requesting the advice of the executive committee of the biological sciences division.
2. Cover letter from department chair. The chair’s cover letter is critical for presenting the case for tenure. It should describe what a successful tenured faculty member in their discipline or department is expected to have accomplished and how the candidate meets those expectations. It should highlight the candidate’s independent, scholarly contributions to their discipline and the factors predicting that the candidate will continue to make strong contributions in their areas of excellence and significant accomplishment. It should educate the committee about discipline-specific practices, unusual career paths taken, and directly address potential limitations or weaknesses in the dossier, including explanations of any mitigating circumstances. In some circumstances a joint letter from the department chair and mentoring committee may be acceptable.

In addition, the 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 & 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.
- E. For an integrated case, the chair’s letter must provide a clear description of the integrated nature of the activities and their impact as described under the Integrated Case sections above. If the faculty member was not initially appointed with this intent or if the description of the appointment was adjusted during

the probationary period, the chair's letter should provide a narrative describing and justifying the underlying rationale for the changes.

- F. In the case of an appointment to two (or more) departments, the chair of the primary tenure-home department should solicit supporting information about the candidate's contributions and responsibilities to other programs or departments from the relevant program directors or department chairs.
3. A copy of the departmental tenure guidelines.
  4. Letter of appointment. Please redact salary information.
  5. Summary statement from departmental internal review, mentoring or executive committee (2-page maximum; required only for promotions).
  6. Background information on the candidate. Include:
    - A. Name
    - B. Formal education: include thesis titles and major professors for graduate work, and names and titles of post-doctoral mentors
    - C. Positions held: list chronologically and indicate length of service in each position, accounting for all years.
    - D. Honors and awards
    - E. Society memberships
  7. Summary Statement on Integration of Activities (1-page maximum). For integrated cases only, the candidate must provide a one-page summary statement regarding the overall nature of the integration of activities and how their integration achieves fulfills the criteria for tenure. Descriptions of how specific activity areas (research, teaching, outreach, service) are integrated within the whole should be provided in the Candidate Statements for those sections.
  8. Research Performance. Documentation must be presented to indicate that the candidate has developed an original, significant, and independent 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 record achieved after 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. Such collaborations can be very valuable, and are encouraged if they promote the University's mission and advance the candidate's case for promotion. However, the case for promotion still requires documentation of the individual research accomplishments of the candidate and clear demonstration of their ability to attract outside research support to support their program. The promotion dossier must ensure that the individual research

accomplishments of the tenure candidate are evident and distinguishable from those of their collaborators. Similarly, if research funding is handled jointly, there should be clear evidence of the role of the candidate in fundraising and describe the funds that are intended for the candidate's independent research program. The candidate's roles should be explained explicitly from external documentation (e.g., letters, peer review reports, and non-arm's length letters from co-investigators) in order to demonstrate the candidate's independent role in the group research project; general letters of support are not helpful.

Scholarly activity, engagement with diversity and inclusion, and community involvement. Efforts to promote inclusion of diverse populations at the University of Wisconsin-Madison or in the candidate's field are valued in tenure considerations. This statement is intended to explicitly recognize the contributions of faculty members who choose to put effort into these activities, but are not meant to imply that these are mandatory components of tenure and promotion documents. Please [see here](#).

A. Statement by candidate (2 pages maximum)

A description of the candidate's research program, major accomplishments to date, and goals for the future. For an integrated case, a specific description of the integration of research within the body of work should also be provided.

B. List of publications

Publications during the probationary period should be clearly distinguished from publications prior to the start of the probationary period. For each publication with multiple authors, the role(s) played by the candidate, their mentees/trainees, and any previous mentors must be indicated clearly. It is especially helpful if a one- or two-sentence narrative is added after each paper indicating the contributions of the candidate's research team. Indicate whether the candidate was senior/corresponding author and identify all authors who were directly supervised by the candidate (e.g., students, post-docs, technicians, scientists). Indicate the responsibility (%) of the candidate's research team for:

Key: (a) = concept development and design  
(b) = data acquisition  
(c) = analysis  
(d) = writing

In each case a single percentage should include both the effort of the candidate and any mentees that were directly supervised by the candidate alone. An example:

Example: "Co-author, Candidate, Co-author. Title of publication. *Journal Name*. Year; volume (issue): page-page. (a) 70%, (b) 90%, (c) 80%, (d) 90%. I served as primary author and I provided the intellectual framework of the project." (or, "I was senior author and mentor to the first author.")

The candidate should insert asterisks (\*) before the five publications from the probationary period that represent their most noteworthy scholarly contributions to the discipline.

Candidates can update their publication list at any point up to the date of the committee meeting by e-mailing the information to the Divisional Committees Coordinator. Papers submitted or accepted for publication should be so indicated. Manuscripts in preparation should not be included. Subdivide the material as follows:

- (1) Papers published in, or accepted by, refereed journals (list inclusive page numbers of each publication).

- (2) Papers submitted to refereed journals but not yet accepted for publication. Specify the journals and the dates papers were submitted.
- (3) Papers published in, or accepted by, non-refereed journals.
- (4) Invited papers, conference proceedings, and scientific abstracts published in conference proceedings. Indicate contributions if joint-authored.
- (5) Monographs or books published. Indicate contributions if joint-authored.
- (6) Chapters in books, videos or other appropriate media.
- (7) Invited editorial, technical reports, and other publications.
- (8) Patents

C. List of research presentations

A chronology of oral research presentations during the probationary period should be provided, including dates, title, location, and event/conference. Separate sections should be provided for UW, national, and international presentations. Only invited and/or competitive oral presentations delivered by the candidate should be included.

D. Research support

Competing successfully for peer-reviewed grants appropriate to the field of research serves as additional evidence of the stature and research capabilities of the candidate. A chronology of research support during the probationary period should be provided, including dates, level of funding, renewals, joint support, and pending proposals. Grant applications and awards during the probationary period should be clearly distinguished from grant applications and awards prior to the start of the probationary period. The candidate's role in the preparation of the grant proposal and performance of grant aims should be explained in a one- or two-sentence narrative after each grant. For all grants, indicate the amount of funding designated for the candidate's program. Candidates should include recent peer reviews of funded grants supplied by granting agencies reviews of grants that were close to the funding line or that they would like considered as part of this component of their tenure package also should be submitted. Peer reviews ~~should~~ must be included in their entirety (i.e., un-excerpted). Grant support can be updated at any time up to when the committee meets by sending an email to the Divisional Committees Coordinator.

Narrative examples:

"I served as PI of the grant proposal. I developed the overall concept. All preliminary data were generated by my laboratory and all grant funds were designated for my research group."

"I served as co-investigator of this grant. I provided some preliminary data for the proposal. I and a graduate student from my lab completed all of the experiments for one of the three aims of the grant. 25% of total funding went to my lab"

"I served as a PI on a multi-PI proposal. I was responsible for concept development and execution of the aim X, related to topic Y, and was the administrative contact for the proposal. 50% of the funding went to my lab."

9. Teaching performance. Evaluation of teaching performance requires the presentation of credible evidence obtained by peer reviews (see section 9.C.) as well as student feedback.

Teaching documentation to be provided:

A. Statement by candidate (2-page maximum)

The candidate should describe the goals and methods of his/her teaching program. For an integrated case, a specific description of the integration of teaching within the body of work should also be provided.

B. Summary of teaching activities

This should include a list of all courses taught with numbers of credits, numbers of students in each course, number of contact hours, and grade distribution for each course. Also relevant is any role the candidate has played in curriculum development. Teaching activity may be summarized in tabular form. An example is given below.

Template Tenure Teaching Summary (*sample data in gray italics*)

**Classroom Teaching (graduate & undergraduate)**

<b>Classroom Teaching (graduate &amp; undergraduate)</b>						
Years	Course Title	Credits	Students	Grade Distribution	Contact Hours	Format
<i>2018</i>	<i>Bio152 Intro to Biology</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>653</i>		<i>3h/wk x 5 wks</i>	<i>lecture</i>
<b>Guest Lectures (graduate &amp; undergraduate)</b>						
<i>2016, 2018</i>	<i>Micro 370</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>20-22</i>		<i>1 x 75 min</i>	<i>lecture</i>
<b>Medical School Teaching</b>						
Years	Course Title	Credits	Students	Grade Distribution	Contact Hours	Format
<i>2017, 18</i>	<i>Anatomy 400</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>80-95</i>		<i>3 x 75 min/yr</i>	<i>lecture</i>
<b>Clinical Teaching (postgraduate trainees/clinical trainees, including fellows and residents)</b>						
Trainee name and year(s) of training			Face-to-Face Contact Course		Teaching Context*	
<i>2018-19</i>	<i>Jane Doe</i>		<i>120 hours</i>		<i>clinic</i>	
<b>Continuing Medical Education Courses</b>						
Years	Course Title	Students	Hours	Grade Distribution	Sponsor-Venue	
<i>2017, 18, 19</i>	<i>IBD Update</i>	<i>~50</i>	<i>3h/year</i>		<i>Mayo Clinic</i>	
<b>Postdoctoral Mentees</b>						
Years	Name		Current Position			

2016-18	Xia Huang		Assistant Professor of Biology, U. Iowa
<b>Graduate Student Mentees</b>			
Years	Name	Degree Program	Current Position
2016 -	Nico Nueva	Ph.D. (CMB)	In progress

\*e.g., clinic, operating room, procedures suite, simulation center

It is useful to distinguish three kinds of teaching:

- (1) **Classroom teaching** may include lectures, seminars, laboratories, discussion sections, and workshops. Evidence must be presented that the candidate has developed and conducted a teaching or training program of high quality beyond giving many lectures. Special consideration should be given to new and innovative teaching methods and their effectiveness.
- (2) **Clinical teaching** may involve lecture, demonstration, one-on-one teaching in a clinical setting, and postgraduate and continuing education. The general criteria and evidence for high quality are the same for clinical teaching as for classroom teaching and equivalent data as outlined above should be provided and go beyond having many trainees present in clinical encounters. 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, the candidate's statement and the summary of teaching activities should include a description of the area(s) of clinical expertise and activities. This section should document how the candidate's clinical activities/expertise have been integrated into the candidate's clinical teaching. Since much clinical teaching is in a one-on-one or small-group clinical setting, **all** student feedback comments should be included.

Clinical contributions should be documented in the areas appropriate to the candidate:

- Professional degree training. Include the evaluation of lectures or courses given by the candidate and the evaluation of mandatory and elective clinical (clerkship) courses.
  - 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.
  - 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 would include tutoring one's own graduate students and postdoctoral fellows and may include journal clubs, lab meetings, as well as one-on-one tutoring. Provide information on the students trained, the role of the candidate in that training, and very briefly, the accomplishments of the students trained.

Documentation of achievements in increasing and encouraging diversity in clinical, classroom, and mentored teaching is encouraged.

C. Peer review

The mentoring committee should ensure that formal, evaluative peer review of the candidate's teaching is performed annually. For cases based on teaching excellence, include the entire ad hoc committee report (also see Excellence and Significant Accomplishment in Teaching for general information on peer review of teaching). Cases based on teaching excellence should include all departmental peer evaluations, based on multiple years of observation that critically evaluate the candidate's teaching to date and trajectory in instruction. For cases of significant accomplishment in teaching (section 9.B.), it is not necessary to include all peer reviews in the dossier, however at least two peer evaluations that critically evaluate the trajectory of the candidate's performance in instruction over multiple years should be included (2 page maximum).

Include brief information on the peer-review process used in evaluating the candidate. For example, the number of times the candidate was reviewed, the number of reviewers, and the criteria used in the review. Departments may find the [template peer review format useful](#).

D. Student feedback

Formal student feedback is an important means of evaluating teaching. Summaries of quantitative student evaluations, not individual comments, should be presented for the entire probationary period beginning in the second year. Provide all compiled individual student comments from only the two most recent courses taught. Include all comments, not selected comments. However, the committee is aware of limitations and bias in quantitative student evaluations. As such, in addition to traditional student evaluations, programs are encouraged to develop and include other forms of student feedback for the candidate, such as discussions with focus groups, retrospective evaluations, or indicators of effective learning based on student outcomes.

E. Supporting documentation:

- (1) Published materials. Publications related to teaching should be presented in the same format as outlined under Section 7B in Research Performance. Examples include published journal articles on teaching, textbooks, web-based or other electronic forms of delivery, etc. A brief statement should be added for each publication indicating the relationship of the publication to the teaching program.
- (2) Invited presentations. This list should focus on invited presentations that refer specifically to teaching. They may include continuing education or other workshops, individual lectures on teaching approaches, philosophy, or technique, or other presentations that relate to teaching activities. Presentations of research other than research into pedagogy should be included under Research Performance.
- (3) Grants and awards. These can include teaching awards at the local, regional, national, or international level; grants awarded to support teaching improvement; laboratory or other teaching facilities improvement; etc.
- (4) 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.

## 10. Outreach Performance

See: [\*Commitment to the Wisconsin Idea: A Guide to Documenting and Evaluating Excellence in Outreach Scholarship\*](#)

The case for excellence in outreach 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 innovation that are meritorious; and (3) program impact that is highly effective. In addition to the traditional activities of outreach faculty, it is also expected that candidates holding significant appointments in outreach or in Extension will have accomplishments in this area that are superior in quality and significant in quantity. The following format is suggested for presentation of accomplishments; however, a modified format may be necessary in unusual cases.

### A. Statement by candidate (2 pages maximum)

A description by the candidate of his/her outreach program, major accomplishments to date, and goals for the future should be presented. Include: (a) problems and objectives, (b) clientele served or engaged, (c) how subject matter has been utilized, (d) major accomplishments, giving special attention to scholarly content and leadership role, and (e) evaluation of impact. When appropriate for an integrated case, a specific description of the integration of outreach within the body of work should also be provided.

### B. Documentation of activities

- (1) 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 (See Section 8.B). Candidates may update their publication list at any point up to the date of the committee meeting by e-mailing the information to the Divisional Committees Coordinator.
- (2) Computer software or application development
- (3) Extension media development (websites and other social media, radio-TV programming, newspaper series, etc.)
- (4) Continuing education programs
- (5) Outreach presentations, including lectures, workshops, seminars, short courses and individualized instruction
- (6) Collaboration, planning and development of outreach activities
- (7) Special activities in the candidate's area of expertise

- (8) Documenting outreach efforts to groups that have not historically benefited from university-sponsored outreach is also encouraged.

## 11. Service Performance

### A. Statement by candidate (2-page maximum)

The candidate should provide a statement regarding their service performance. When appropriate for an integrated case, a specific description of the integration of service within the body of work should also be provided.

### B. University service

- (1) 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.
- (2) Major committee assignments.

### C. Professional service

- (1) 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.
- (2) Appointments or election to editorial boards of scientific journals and to office in national and international scientific and educational societies.
- (3) 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 is not applicable for demonstration of “significant accomplishment” in research, teaching, or service, but it can be included as evidence of a contribution to university, state, or national service. It 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.
- (4) Outreach service. Land grant colleges have a tradition of helping agricultural clientele solve problems. In certain instances, these outreach activities would not necessarily involve creation of innovative practices or program developments with impacts at the local, regional, national or international level and would best be categorized as a service activity. Evidence of outreach service 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), 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 outreach/extension.
- (5) Efforts to promote inclusion of diverse populations at the University of Wisconsin-Madison or in the candidate’s field are valued in the consideration for tenure.

For those candidates whose area of significant accomplishment is anticipated to be service/outreach, departments must institute methods for documenting the level of performance over a major portion of the probationary period. These may include, but are not limited to, published outputs such as committee reports or white papers, and invited evaluative letters describing the nature and impact of the candidate's service. Where possible, letters evaluating significant accomplishment in service should come from persons outside of UW-Madison or if the significant service is at the University, from persons who are not closely associated with the candidate.

## 12. Letters of Evaluation

- A. The selection of letter writers is the responsibility of the department (acting through its executive committee, the candidate's internal review committee, or the chair), not the candidate. Although it is understood that the candidate may provide a list of names of potential letter writers, such a list should only be used to inform, not dictate the selection process. To obtain an objective evaluation, the final list of evaluators should include names other than those suggested by the candidate. Include a thorough description of the process used to develop the list of people solicited for a letter of evaluation. Provide a list of all persons solicited for letters of evaluation. In addition, provide the number of names (not the identity of the letter writers) on the final list of letter writers that were chosen at the suggestion of the candidate, the number of names suggested by the mentoring or executive committee, and the number of names common to both lists.
- B. At least five (5) but no more than eight (8) letters must be "arm's length" and come from established nationally recognized authorities who are knowledgeable about the candidate's scientific discipline. They should come from persons outside of UW-Madison who are not closely associated with the candidate. "Arm's length" evaluations refer to those from individuals that have no vested interest in the candidate's success or attainment of tenure. Avoid soliciting letters from people unlikely to be knowledgeable about the candidate's area of expertise or from junior faculty. If under unusual circumstances more than 8 letters are received, all of them must be included. The most useful letters provide a thoughtful evaluation of the significance and impact of the candidate's contributions to their discipline.
- C. "Non-arm's length" individuals include any UW-Madison employee, the candidate's major professor, postdoctoral supervisors, research mentors, collaborators, recipients of joint funding, individuals with personal friendships outside of normal professional working relationships, or individuals with other vested interests in the candidate. Non-arm's length letters are only useful for clarifying a candidate's independence, the role of the candidate on multi-investigator research projects, or other unique circumstances or attributes that may not be covered by arm's length letters (e.g., individuals involved in group research). These non-arm's length letters should not be viewed as letters of evaluation or recommendation, but rather, should focus on documenting the role of the candidate in joint or team projects. No more than three (3) "non-arm's length" letters are allowed, except under exceptional circumstances. The candidate's specific role(s) and independence in collaborative projects should also be summarized in the Chair's letter (Section 2).
- D. For an integrated case, requests for letters should specifically evaluate the impact of the faculty member's integrated activities upon the field or the target community.
- E. The chair must certify in the cover letter of the tenure dossier 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, preferably in the form of a brief letter from the evaluator who declined.

- F. Respondents should be nationally recognized authorities – or, in the case of outreach/extension, regionally recognized authorities – in the candidate’s field, familiar with the candidate’s contributions, and able to provide an objective assessment of the candidate’s work and its significance for the broader discipline.

Provide brief statements on:

- (1) The qualifications of each expert from whom a letter was solicited. The department must document that the outside evaluators are recognized experts in the candidate’s research or outreach/extension area or a closely related area.
- (2) The relationship (past or present) between the expert and the candidate. It is essential that the referees be able to give objective evaluations of the candidate’s work.
- (3) Which letter writers (the number of names, not their identity) on the final list were chosen at the suggestion of the candidate, which were only suggested by the mentoring or executive committee, and which were common to both lists should be included.

- G. Provide a copy of the letter requesting evaluations.

The letter from the department soliciting outside letters of evaluation should be neutral in tone; that is, it should invite an objective assessment rather than simply an endorsement of the department’s opinion. This letter should follow closely the wording indicated in the appended template letter and must be free of any leading statements. If the letter requesting evaluations includes any phrases indicating perceived biases of the chair or other executive committee members (e.g. “We are planning to recommend \_\_\_\_\_ for tenure.”), the Biological Sciences Divisional Committee may request that additional letters be obtained from evaluators whose opinions have not been potentially biased by a soliciting letter. In this case, consideration of the candidate by the committee may be delayed until the new, unbiased letters are received.

Outside letters of evaluation are of particular value to the committee in determining a candidate’s national and international stature. However, outside letters that merely summarize the candidate’s accomplishments are not useful. Letter writers should be asked if the candidate is producing significant and important contributions in the chosen area of expertise, focusing on the candidate’s accomplishments since the beginning of the designated probationary time period. Letter writers should evaluate the quality and productivity of a candidate’s program with emphasis on the area in which the case is to be made (e.g., research, teaching, outreach). Letters should assess the candidate’s accomplishments and reputation relative to others in the discipline at the same career stage. Comments providing information on the specific nature of the contributions are preferred to general statements.

The template letter should be used for both arm's length and non-arm's length letters, but if other approaches are used to obtain non-arm's length letters, they need to be documented in the dossier and include the following statement:

“The letters of evaluation will only be read by tenured faculty in the candidate’s department, members of the university committees to whom the issue of tenure is presented, and the university administrators who are involved in the tenure process. The university will not release the identity of the letter writer, or the contents of letter unless obligated to do so by law or court order.”

13. Two representative publications from the probationary period that represent the candidate’s most noteworthy scholarly contributions to the discipline.

## Template Letter for Soliciting Arm's Length Letters of Evaluation

Dear Dr./Professor \_\_\_\_\_:

Assistant Professor \_\_\_\_\_ is under consideration for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. UW-Madison has four divisional executive committees which establish criteria for granting tenure in the social, biological, or physical sciences and in arts and humanities. Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_ will be reviewed by the Biological Sciences Divisional Committee. The guidelines for tenure from this Committee indicate that "criteria for granting tenure are intended to preserve and enhance the quality of this university's programs" and that "Tenure requires proof of excellence during the probationary period and convincing evidence that a high level of performance will continue. To achieve tenure, a candidate must demonstrate that they are an independent investigator with an ability to: (1) generate new knowledge or develop new approaches to problem solving and/or teaching that indicates creativity 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." We ask you to consider Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_'s accomplishments in light of these requirements [*include the paragraph that fits with the type of tenure case for the candidate*].

### **[For excellence in a primary area and significant accomplishment in a secondary area]**

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, tenure is granted based on demonstrated excellence in a primary area (research, teaching or outreach) and significant accomplishment in a secondary area (research, teaching, outreach, or service). We are considering Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_ for promotion based on excellence in \_\_\_\_\_ and significant accomplishment in \_\_\_\_\_.

### **[For an integrated case]**

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, tenure can be granted based on excellence demonstrated through the overall impact of a faculty member's work on a field where the three areas of achievement (research, teaching, and outreach or service) may be so closely integrated that it is not possible to clearly identify one area of excellence and one area of significant accomplishment. We are considering Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_ for promotion based on such an integrated case. In addition to assessments of the individual areas of Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_'s work as described below, please include in your evaluation an assessment of how the integration of these areas provides synergy to increase impact in the field and to the larger scientific and public community as appropriate.

### **[For cases based on only one area]**

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, tenure can be granted based on excellence in a single area. We are considering Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_ for promotion based on excellence in \_\_\_\_\_.

### **[For all cases]**

As a part of the tenure process at this university, the credentials of candidates for tenure are reviewed by a campus-wide elected committee of the faculty. 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 (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_'s \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ programs, focusing on the period during which Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_ was a tenure track faculty member. Also, please indicate the nature of your association with Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_.

Please provide a specific, objective evaluation of the quality and productivity of Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_'s research/teaching/outreach. Outside letters of evaluation help the committee in determining a candidate's national and international stature. However, outside letters that merely summarize the candidate's accomplishments as presented in the dossier are not useful. We request your perspective on whether the candidate is producing significant and important contributions in the chosen area of expertise, focusing on their accomplishments since the beginning of the probationary time period. In particular, please evaluate the

originality and significance of the candidate's program. Assessment of the candidate's accomplishments and reputation relative to others in the discipline at the same career stage is especially useful. If you believe the candidate would be promoted at your institution, please identify the specific accomplishments that made you draw this conclusion.

If appropriate, also please provide an objective evaluation of Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_'s outreach or service. What impact have his/her outreach accomplishments had on students, clients, patients, professional colleagues or on the discipline in general?

To aid you in your evaluation I have enclosed Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_'s Vitae, a description of his/her scholarly productivity and his/her most significant publications. If you are unable to write a letter, please indicate the reason.

Your letter will be read only by tenured faculty in our department, members of the university committees who are involved in the tenure process and university administrators who are involved in the process. The University of Wisconsin will not release your identity or the contents of your letter unless obligated to do so by law or court order.

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

Sincerely yours,

### **Template Letter for Soliciting Non-Arm's Length Letters of Evaluation**

Dear Dr./Professor \_\_\_\_\_:

Assistant Professor \_\_\_\_\_ is under consideration for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. UW-Madison has four divisional executive committees which establish criteria for granting tenure in the social, biological, or physical sciences and in arts and humanities. Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_ will be reviewed by the Biological Sciences Divisional Committee. The guidelines for tenure from this Committee indicate that "criteria for granting tenure are intended to preserve and enhance the quality of this university's programs" and that "Tenure requires proof of excellence during the probationary period and convincing evidence that a high level of performance will continue. To achieve tenure, a candidate must demonstrate that they are an independent investigator with an ability to: (1) generate new knowledge or develop new approaches to problem solving and/or teaching that indicates creativity 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."

We ask that you do not contribute a letter evaluating the case for tenure. Rather, please provide a letter specifically addressing the candidate's independence, explaining the candidate's role in and contribution to a particular project or activity on which you are listed as a contributor. In addition, even though you may have a personal connection to the candidate, it might be appropriate to comment on other aspects of the case for promotion that you may have knowledge about but that may not be apparent to the committee.

Thank you,