UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN
UWMILWAUKEE
®

Division of Professions
Executive Committee

PROCEDURES AND EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT TO TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

May 2018

Pursuant to *The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Policies and Procedures* Chapter 3 and in accord with any Senate Actions, the Executive Committee of the Division of Professions has been assigned the responsibility of reviewing the applications for:

(a) promotion and appointment to associate professor with tenure
(b) promotion and appointment to full professor with tenure, and
(c) promotion to associate professor where tenure has been granted at a lower rank

The primary purpose of the Committee's review is to evaluate the performance of those individuals requesting consideration in order to determine whether they meet the stated criteria.

The Executive Committee of the Division of Professions has developed and presents in this document the criteria and procedures used when considering candidates seeking promotion, tenure, or appointment with tenure. Information requested in accordance with these criteria and procedures must be provided by the individual candidate and/or the executive committee of the department or school.

Before an individual's request for promotion will be considered by the Executive Committee of the Division of Professions, the individual's department/college/school executive committee and dean must have specific and explicit written criteria and personnel procedures for promotion, appointment, and tenure decisions currently in use by the department and school of those persons requesting consideration. This information must be disseminated to members of the department, college/school, as well as to the Executive Committee of the Division of Professions. Both the department/college/ school and the Dean's criteria and procedures should be attached to their letter of transmittal.

I.   EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

A candidate for promotion to **associate professor** and/or appointment to tenure must demonstrate strengths in (a) research, scholarship, and contributions to the candidate's professional field, (b) teaching, and (c) service, and give evidence of continued commitment in each of the three areas.

The candidate for promotion or appointment to **full professor** must provide evidence that during

1

tenure as associate professor, there was (a) national and/or international recognition for significant research, scholarly and professional contributions in the candidate's professional field, (b) high quality of and significant contribution to teaching, and (c) significant service contributions.

The following provides a brief overview for each of the three criteria used to evaluate a candidate for tenure and promotion. A more detailed listing of specific items considered in the assessment of a candidate is provided in Section III, <u>Materials to be Submitted for Review</u> and Appendix A, Checklist for Promotion/Appointment Files Submitted for Review to the Division of Professions Executive Committee

A.   <u>Research, Scholarship, and Professional Activities</u>

The candidate's research, scholarship, and professional activities will be evaluated as to whether they are well-conceived and developed, and relevant and critical to the profession. These activities and products will also be evaluated with respect to their impact on and acceptance in the profession, as measured by dissemination in scholarly and professional journals and other appropriate media. The candidate's research, scholarly, and professional activities will also be assessed for evidence of continuing contribution.

B.   <u>Teaching</u>

1.   Instruction.
This category of teaching is designed for any candidate who engages in any type of direct instruction, including professional development and outreach activities.

The candidate will be evaluated on the basis of demonstrated competency and excellence in (a) course design, (b) instructional skill and (c) innovative approaches. The candidate must demonstrate mastery of knowledge in the areas taught, competency in organization and presentation of course materials, conscientiousness and fairness in relationships with students, skill and instruction, and commitment to developing better approaches to teaching.

2.   Program Development and Management.
This category of teaching is designed for any candidate responsible for program development and management, including but not limited to outreach activities, professional development, curriculum coordination and review.

The candidate's contributions to program development and management will be evaluated with respect to accurate and timely identification of potential student groups and programs desired by them. In addition, the efficiency of management and delivery will be considered. The program development will be assessed for evidence of depth of understanding of subject area and student needs. Creativity and innovation in program development and delivery will also be evaluated.

C.   <u>Service</u>

The candidate's service to (a) the University and its various units, (b) student organizations, (c) the academic/professional community, and (d) the lay community will be assessed. Contributions will be evaluated with respect to the degree of participation, level of responsibility, demonstrated leadership, and the significance of the products or results of the activity.

II.   **PROCEDURES**

A.   <u>Initiating Divisional Review Procedure</u>

1. Advisory recommendations for (a) promotion and appointment to associate professor with tenure, (b) promotion and appointment to full professor, and (c) promotion to associate professor where tenure has already been granted, are made by executive committees of departments to their respective deans.

2. If a department or school's executive committee forwards a positive recommendation for promotion, the dean shall forward the recommendation to the Divisional Executive Committee with a request for advice, together with all materials received in support of the recommendation. The department's/school's executive committee is responsible for the organization, accuracy, and completeness of all materials submitted.

B. Review Meetings of the Division of Professions

1. The candidate (including external candidates) is strongly encouraged to attend the meeting of the Division of Professions Executive Committee to provide clarification of the materials submitted. Additionally, the initiating department may identify candidate representative(s) and/or an observer to attend the Division meeting. A representative may actively participate in the case presentations, clarifying and promoting the candidate's case but may not participate in or observe the Division Committee's voting deliberations. An observer may not participate in any part of the meeting but may observe both the presentation and voting deliberations; (s)he must sign a confidentiality statement.

2. In accordance with Wis. Stats. Sec. 19.85, the "Open Meetings" law, an individual who is being considered for tenure by the Divisional Executive Committee may request an open meeting. In accordance with Section 3.14(3), *The University of Wisconsin- Milwaukee Policies and Procedures*, candidates for promotion to the rank of professor may also request an open meeting. For information about Open Meetings, go to http://www.uwsa.edu/gc-off/deskbook/woml.htm

C. Notification of Action

1. Recommendation of positive action by the Executive Committee of the Division of Professions is made to the dean with copies to the candidate and to the chairperson of the department/college/school executive committee.

2. Recommendation of negative action by the Executive Committee of the Division of Professions is sent first to the chair of the department/college/school executive committee with a copy to the candidate. This makes it possible for the executive committee of the department/college/school/college to request reconsideration by the Executive Committee of the Division of Professions before the advice is forwarded to the dean.

3. A written statement of reasons will accompany each negative recommendation made to the department/college/school executive committee and will accompany each uncontested or reconsidered negative recommendation made to the dean.

D. Reconsideration

The department/college/school executive committee has the right to request a reconsideration of the decision within ten (10) working days of the Divisional Executive Committee's vote. The candidate's executive committee chair must call for an official meeting of the unit's Executive Committee to determine if there is adequate support for reconsideration. The vote in support of the reconsideration is to be sent to the Professions Divisional Executive Committee office as part of the statement requesting a reconsideration meeting. The Professions Divisional Executive Committee must meet within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the request. If no request for reconsideration is received, the negative advice with a written statement of reasons shall be

forwarded to the dean at the end of the initial ten (10) working day period. (Procedures of negative advice and appeal are further specified in Chapter 5.17, of *The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Policies and Procedures*.) While it has not been the practice of the Committee to include a statement to the dean about the reasons for the action, the Committee may do so.

III.   MATERIALS TO BE SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW

The chair of the department/college/school executive committee is responsible for ensuring that materials submitted are complete and in the proper form and order, and delivered to and retrieved from the Divisional Committee Administrator. Review of the candidate's materials will not be scheduled until all materials are received in proper form, as verified by the Chair of the Divisional Executive Committee. Questions concerning materials to be submitted should be directed to the Chair of the Divisional Executive Committee. All materials must be organized and submitted in electronic form.

A file with all supporting materials (including letters of support, publications, teaching evaluations, documentation of major service contributions, etc.) must be submitted in digital format (as is practical) for the Divisional Committee's review and consideration. These materials will provide the basis for the Divisional Committee's consideration. The electronic version must be transmitted via a flash drive or OneDrive/SharePoint link. (*Please note that the entire path, including the file name and folder names, must contain fewer than 200 characters.)* The committee strongly recommends that the electronic documents be organized into folders that are named and numbered in a manner that corresponds to the listing below.

Because the Division of Professions Executive Committee's recommendations for promotion, appointment, and tenure decisions are principally based on materials presented by the candidate's department, the executive committee of the department or school is responsible for verifying the authenticity and completeness of the materials submitted.

The following is a list of materials that must be included in the file.

A.   Administrative Items: Checklist, Letters, Statements, and Related Supporting Documents

   1.   Checklist: Include the Division of Professions file checklist (Appendix A). Note that all items on the checklist should be included in the file. In those cases, where an item on the checklist is NOT included in the file, a brief explanation for the omission(s) must be provided.

   2.   Internal Letters and Supporting Documents

      a.   Candidate Preference Letter: A letter from candidate stating preference for open or closed meeting.

      b.   Dean's Transmittal Letter: Transmittal letter from the dean requesting the advice of the Divisional Executive Committee with a copy of the **college/school** criteria and procedures attached.

      c.   Departmental Transmittal Letter: Transmittal letter from the executive committee of the department/college/school to the dean, indicating that committee's recommendation, the recorded vote (specify the number of Ayes, Nays, abstentions, and those not voting), and the number of executive committee members eligible to vote.

      d.   Departmental Criteria: A copy of the departmental criteria and procedures for promotions, appointments, and tenure.

e.   Departmental Justification Letters: (Optional) Letters (preferably, confidential) from one or more department faculty members who are tenured, and the chairperson of the department/college/school executive committee. Such letters are only required if the department's transmittal letter does not address the points below.

Suggested items for discussion in these letters include:
- General description of the candidate's scholarly contributions.
- Candidate's teaching and service contributions to the department.
- Candidate's future potential in the department and the University.
- Other justification for the candidate's promotion.

3.   External Review Letters and Supporting Documentation

a.   External Review Letters: At least three and at most five external review letters assessing the candidate's materials submitted for review. The Committee much prefers confidential letters and expects the department to have a clear process for maintaining the confidentiality of such letters.

The external reviewers should meet the following criteria:
- The reviewers must hold academic rank at least as high as the rank that the candidate is being considered for. For candidates for associate professor with tenure, the committee very much wants at least one reviewer to hold full professor rank.
- The reviewers' credentials and professional standing should be equivalent or exceed the department's criteria for promotion to associate or full professor, as appropriate. In general, there should be evidence that the reviewers' scholarship has received national or international recognition.
- The reviewers must be impartial and come from outside the University. This excludes former and current co-workers; co-authors; co-PIs; major academic professors and advisors; individuals who had financial or contractual obligations with the candidate; or other persons with whom the candidate has established an extensive working relationship, currently or in the past, unless the relationship is far enough in the past and of such modest extent that a conflict of interest no longer exists.
- While it makes sense for candidates to help the department identify domain experts, the committee strongly prefers that the selection of the reviewers be clearly independent of the candidate's personal preferences. For example, the candidate could identify domain experts by specifying relevant domain keywords or by specifying relevant publication venues whose editors or program committee members might be suitable reviewers. Having the candidate specify particular reviewers suggests less independence. Under any circumstances, the solicitation of confidential letters must take place without consultation of the candidate, and individuals who submit letters will be identified only to members of the Executive Committee, the Dean, the Division of Professions Executive Committee and Campus Administration.

The letter requesting the review should explicitly request the reviewer's comments on certain topics. Appendix C shows a sample letter that represents a good starting point for departments. The relevant topics are:
- Whether the letter is confidential or open.
- The nature of the reviewer's present and past relationship to the candidate

- The reviewer's credentials and professional standing
- The reviewer's assessment of the candidate's achievements in the areas of research, teaching, and service. Generally, review letters for promotion to associate professor will focus on research and scholarship. Review letters for promotion to full professor are more likely to be able to also address teaching innovation and service outside the university, where those are relevant topics. The Committee generally does not expect reviewers to assess classroom teaching or service at UWM.
- The reviewer's comments on the strength of the journals and conference proceedings in which the candidate has published and/or the grants received by the candidate.
- The reviewer's assessment of the candidate's standing in the field, which might include
  - comparison to other scholars in the field, possibly using terms like "top half" or "top quarter", or how the candidate compares to colleagues at similar stages of their careers;
  - statements about the candidate's suitability for promotion under UWM's promotion criteria or at peer institutions to UWM; or
  - statements of the impact of the candidate's work both inside and outside academia.
- Note: The use of superlatives without analysis of work is not helpful.

The committee may choose to reject letters that suggest a substantial conflict of interest or where the recommender lacks sufficient stature in the field. The committee may also choose to reject letters that fail to address important aspects of the evaluation of the candidate.

b. A statement describing the extent to which the candidate was involved in identifying potential reviewers.

c. A list identifying all letters solicited and all letters received by the department/college/school executive committee. This list should contain for each letter solicited:
- Name, rank and institution of potential reviewer
- Whether the reviewer was specifically suggested by the candidate
- Whether the potential reviewer agreed to write a letter
- Whether a letter was received from the potential reviewer

d. A copy of the letter from the department executive committee to the reviewer requesting the evaluation. The letter must make clear whether the reviewers' letters are or are not confidential. Appendix C shows a suggested letter from department executive committees to reviewers.

e. A list of the materials that were forwarded to each reviewer for review, unless the request letter makes that clear.

4. Candidate's cover narrative:

Candidates must include a cover narrative statement justifying their tenure/promotion. This narrative should address the expectations of the candidate's department and highlight significant accomplishments with regard to research and scholarship, teaching, and service. We also encourage a statement defining what the candidate will do in the future and how this will have an impact on UWM and the community. The committee suggests that

narrative statements be 4-5 pages in length.

5.   Endorsement/Recommendation Letters: (Optional)

Internal and external letters of recommendation or endorsement (as contrasted with the letters of assessment from internal and external reviewers described above) providing support based on the candidate's material or personal knowledge of the candidate's abilities may be included. These letters are not confidential.

B.   Candidate's Vita
The Vita should follow the Division of Professions established numbering format provided in Appendix B. Items within the individual categories may be placed in chronological or reverse chronological order. Documentation (described in Section III) should not be included in the Vita itself (see Appendix B for sample vita). The committee will accept a CV in the format that was used to apply for the position at UWM but encourages the candidate to follow the university's established numbering format. If the candidate does not have an item listed – write in "none"

Note that a candidate for promotion to full professor should provide:
- A full Vita of the candidate's professional career.
- Full documentation of contributions **since receiving tenure** (see Section III for documentation).

C.   Documentation of Research, Scholarship, and Professional Contributions
Listed below are support materials that should be included in the file. Each item should be listed and numerically referenced in the vita.

1. Copies of publications, grant proposals, proprietary and non-proprietary technical reports, textbooks, training manuals, instructional aids, competitive and non-competitively selected professional papers, computer software, psychometric and evaluative instruments, professional exhibits, professional oral presentations, video and audio productions, models, projects, drawings, and other appropriate media.

Unless there is a reason that it is not possible, all of these items should be included in the electronic version of the candidate's file. There may be rare cases where a satisfactory electronic version of an item cannot be feasibly produced. In such cases, a physical artifact may be submitted. Recent experience suggests that such cases are vanishingly rare.

2. Letters of acceptance for materials accepted for future publication or other dissemination.

3. Documentation to describe and identify the quality of dissemination media should include:
    a. a description of the media (i.e., "Contains reports of original research, demonstrations, evaluations, and other articles covering current aspects of harmonic systems. Published monthly.")
    b.   method of selection, refereed – non-refereed
    c.   audience and orientation (e.g., professional, academic, general public)
    d.   evidence of quality, such as rejection rates, impact factors, the number of citations for candidate's papers

4. Description of candidate's contribution to collaborative research. (e.g., data analysis, conceptualization, writing)

5. Impartial reviews of candidate's work, list of citations, copies of awards, and any other supporting documentation not listed above that may be available.

D.   Documentation of Teaching

1. Summary chart of overall scores from quantitative evaluations of teaching by all students for each credit course taught in the last five years. This summary should also include: (a) explanatory information to aid in interpretation of the evaluations, (b) a description of the conditions under which the data were collected (e.g., degree of anonymity), and (c) comparative evaluations scores for the department/college/school faculty. If overall scores for teaching are weak, candidates are encouraged to include scores on individual items in the student evaluation instruments.

2. Copies of the written comments from students' evaluation forms are optional. The candidate's department/college/school may choose to submit a representative sample of written comments. For example, one course each semester so that the package (a) includes a representative balance of graduate and undergraduate courses and (b) provides a basis for historical comparisons (e.g., for a course taught throughout the candidate's career).

3. A statement by the department/college/school executive committee, or members of it, describing the candidate's teaching ability. This statement should be based on the results of regular and systematic peer reviews of the candidate's teaching. These reviews should include an assessment of the candidate's course syllabi, instructional methods, and observations of actual teaching performance. This statement should reference the dates of these reviews.

4. A representative sample of course outlines, syllabi, and other instructional materials. A statement highlighting course innovations (video-tapes, team teaching, simulations), if applicable, should be attached.

5. Written descriptions of any program development activities, including reviews and evaluations by professional peers.

6. Written descriptions of any development, implementation and/or management of Outreach/Continuing Education courses and/or professional training workshops.

7. Copies of awards or other recognition for outstanding teaching.

E. Documentation of Service

1. The candidate should provide a detailed listing of all service to
   a) the University and its various units,
   b) student organizations,
   c) the academic/professional community, and
   d) the lay community in concert with the University's vision statement.

2. For the last five years, the candidate should provide a description of
   a) duties, roles and responsibilities for each major service activity,
   b) accomplishments or products produced by the service activity,
   c) his/her relative contribution to these accomplishments or products, and
   d) assessments of his/her performance and contributions.

3. Letters or other documents that clarify, verify, and depict the candidate's performance in major service roles and the importance of that service should be included.

APPENDIX A

Checklist for Promotion/Appointment Files Submitted for Review
to the Division of Professions Executive Committee

The following is a checklist for materials that must be included in the file of candidates seeking promotion or appointment to Associate & Full Professor. It is to be completed by the chair of the relevant (department, college, or school) executive committee or individual (other than the candidate) responsible for forwarding the file.

For more specific information on each item see the Divisional Criteria, Sections III, IV, V.

Submit a digital version of all materials. The digital version must be transmitted via a flash drive or OneDrive/SharePoint link. (*Please note that the entire path, including the file name and folder names, must contain fewer than 200 characters.*)

A. Administrative Materials: Checklist, Letters, Statements, and Related Supporting Documents	
A.1	Candidate's Name, email address, and phone number.
	Name of Department Chair or Contact, email address, and phone number.
A.2.a	Letter from candidate stating preference for open or closed meeting.
A.2.b	Transmittal letter from the dean requesting the advice of the Divisional Executive Committee.
A.2.c	Transmittal letter from the executive committee of the department/college/school to the dean, indicating that committee's recommendation and the recorded vote.
A.2.d	Copy of the department and school/college criteria for promotion. Include the dean's procedures if different than the school/college's procedures.
A.2.e	Letter from department assessing candidate's research and scholarly work, teaching and service contributions to the department and future potential in the department and the University. **[Only to be included if confidential]**
A.3.a	Minimum of three letters from external reviewers assessing the candidate's materials submitted for review with brief resume/vitae of reviewers. Review section A.3.a carefully for specifics about the letters. **[Only to be included if confidential]**
A.3.b	A statement describing the extent to which the candidate was involved in identifying potential reviewers.
A.3.c	A list identifying all letters solicited and all letters received by the department/college/school executive committee. This should include a description of the candidate's involvement in identifying possible external reviewers.
A.3.d	Copy of the letter from the department executive committee to the external reviewer requesting the evaluation and indicating what materials were forwarded for review.
A.3.e	A list of the materials that were forwarded to each reviewer for review, unless the request letter makes that clear.

A.4	A narrative statement in which the candidate highlights significant accomplishments with regard to research and scholarship, teaching, and service and describes what the candidate will do in the future and how this will have an impact on UWM and the community.
A.5	*Optional:* Internal and external letters of recommendation or endorsement providing support based on the candidate's material or personal knowledge of the candidate's abilities.

B. Candidate's Vita *(see format in Appendix B)*

C. Documentation of Research, Scholarship, and Professional Contributions

C.1	Electronic versions of all publications, grant proposals, proprietary and non-proprietary technical reports, textbooks, training manuals, instructional aids, competitive and non-competitively selected professional papers, computer software, psychometric and evaluative instruments, professional exhibits, professional oral presentations, video and audio productions, models, projects, drawings, and other appropriate media. (Some materials may be submitted only in physical form if impractical to submit digitally.)
C.2	Letters of acceptance for materials accepted for future publication or other dissemination, if applicable.
C.3	Summary document describing journal quality.
C.4	Summary document describing candidate's contribution to collaborative research.
C.5	Impartial reviews of candidate's work, list of citations, copies of awards, and any other supporting documentation not listed above that may be available.

D. Documentation of Teaching *(list in chronological order)*

D.1	Summary chart of overall scores from the quantitative evaluations of teaching by all students for all credit courses taught in the past five years .
D.2	Copies of the written comments from students' evaluation forms if provided.
D.3	A statement by the department/college/school executive committee, or members of it, describing the candidate's teaching ability.
D.4	A representative sample of course outlines, syllabi, and other instructional materials.
D.5	Written descriptions of any program development activities, including reviews and evaluations by professional peers.
D.6	Written descriptions of any development, implementation and/or management of Outreach/Continuing Education courses and/or professional training workshops.
D.7	If applicable, copies of awards or other recognition for outstanding teaching.

E. Documentation of Service *(list in chronological order)*

	Description of service to the University and its various units, student organizations, the academic/professional community, and the lay community in concert with the University's vision statement.

APPENDIX B

Format for Candidate's Vita

1.   Name of Candidate

2.   General Information

   2.1   Formal education (include institutions, dates degrees obtained, areas of specialty).

   2.2   Significant continuing education (major training, seminars, courses, post doc education, including certification and licensing requiring continuing education, etc.) not to include professional meeting at which an individual is a presenter.

   2.3   Academic and professional positions held (list chronologically with no time left unaccounted for).

3.   Research, Scholarship, and Professional Activities

   NOTE: For candidates seeking promotion to full professor, accomplishments during the candidate's tenure as associate professor should be clearly distinguished from previous activities.

   3.1   Articles and papers published or accepted for publication in academic and professional print and electronic journals. The following information on quality and reputation of the dissemination media should be included with each publication or in a table: Journal title; Circulation (local, national, international); Selection method of selection (invited, refereed, non-refereed); Journal rank within discipline – the greater the decimal fraction the higher the journal rating in the discipline; Scientific Impact factor of the journal (a measurement of a journal's citations in other works compiled by the Institute for Scientific Information) The greater the impact factor, the more often publications in that journal are cited by authors in the same field of endeavor. Audience orientation (academic, clinical, industry, government)

   3.2   Books, monographs, and other publications published by major university or commercial publishing houses and other appropriate publishers.

   3.3   Chapters in books published by appropriate publishers (indicate method of selection).

   3.4   Proprietary and non-proprietary technical reports.

   3.5   Training manuals (indicate publisher, method of selection, and range of distribution).

   3.6   Computer software (indicate publisher, method of selection, and range of distribution).

   3.7   Instructional aids (indicate publisher, method of selection, and range of distribution).

   3.8   Psychometric and evaluative instruments (indicate publisher, method of selection, and range of distribution).

   3.9   Research projects conducted and grants received (indicate source and amount).

   3.10   Book reviews, editorials, interviews, and other minor publications.

3.11   Papers and other presentations at academic and professional meetings (indicate method of selection, audience, formal paper or notes, and whether the candidate presented the work herself).

3.12   Editorials, reviews, and interviews of one's research by others.

3.13   Video and audio productions (indicate publisher, method of selection, and range of distribution).

3.14   Reports of completed research, professional, or demonstration activities (indicate nature of external or internal support and means of dissemination).

3.15   Projects or other professional work published (indicate method of selection and range of dissemination).

3.16   Projects or other professional work exhibited or otherwise disseminated other than through the print media (indicate where exhibited, what other media, and where heard or seen, and method of selection).

3.17   Articles, papers, chapters, or projects under review (indicate status and method of selection).

3.18   Research proposals under review (indicate status).

3.19   List research or professional awards, ranking in competitions, etc.

3.20   Other significant research, scholarship, and professional activities, completed or in progress, not listed elsewhere, but deemed significant.

4.   Teaching

NOTE: For candidates seeking promotion to full professor, teaching during the candidate's tenure as associate professor should be clearly distinguished from previous teaching.

4.1   Instruction in the Classroom, Laboratory, Studio, or Clinic

4.1.1   List of all courses taught within the last five years specifying number of credit hours, undergraduate, graduate, or nondegree level, and number of students.

4.1.2   Student supervision: student academic advising, internships, supervision of Master's and Doctoral theses, independent readings and research.

4.1.3   Teaching awards or other teaching honors, including recognition by student organization.

4.2.   Program Development, Implementation, and Management (as part of assigned workload and under the auspices of UWM)

4.2.1   List of programs offered, including courses offered, number of students, number of times presented, number of hours, number of instructors, and number of credits, if applicable.

4.2.2   Organizing colloquia, institutes, workshops, or other programs.

4.3.   Other Teaching Activities (not covered elsewhere, but deemed significant)

5. <u>Service</u>

NOTE: For candidates seeking promotion to full professor, service during the candidate's tenure as associate professor should be clearly distinguished from previous service.

5.1 Membership or leadership in department, school, college, division, university, or system committees and/or task forces.

5.2 Major responsibility for coordination of programs, departments, or centers.

5.3 Involvement in student activities.

5.4 Service and or membership and office, or other position of leadership, held in a professional organization (e.g. committee membership, elected chair, appointed secretary, seminar directory, etc.).

5.5 Special assignments for professional organizations, and/or participation at professional meetings (directing or moderating seminars, workshops, institutes, etc., or participating as speaker, reactor, discussant, etc., not conducted as part of assigned load or under the auspices of UWM).

5.6 Awards and honors for service to the candidate's profession.

5.7 Community, regional, state, and national activities not covered elsewhere but deemed significant. (<u>Indicate whether activity was paid or not.</u>)

APPENDIX C

SUGGESTED LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Dear Professor _____:

Dr. _____ is being considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor with tenure in the Department of _____. The department executive committee seeks your confidential evaluation of the materials Dr. _____ has submitted for consideration, and your conclusion as to whether these materials establish a record of (a) research, scholarship, and professional activities, (b) teaching, and (c) service that warrants promotion and tenure at an institution of UWM's caliber. I am forwarding to you the materials submitted for review. Please use these materials as the basis for your evaluation and conclusion.

Because this is a request for evaluation, not a request for endorsement or recommendation, the use of superlatives without analysis or mention of specific indicators that support such assessments will not be helpful in our deliberations. Please comment on the quality of the journals or other forms of dissemination in which the candidate is published. It can also be helpful for you provide an assessment of the impact of the candidate's work and of the candidate's standing in the scholarly field. A copy of our departmental criteria for tenure and promotion is enclosed to aid you in your assessment.

In your response, we also ask that you indicate the nature and length of your acquaintance with Dr. _____.

Finally, we ask that you provide us with a brief resume that documents your scholarly activities and your standing in the field. This will give reviewers at UW-Milwaukee some useful context for your comments as they make their own determination on the question of promotion and tenure.

External reviews are an integral and critical part of the review process for promotion and tenure at UWM. We recognize the burden this request entails and sincerely thank you for your willingness to undertake such a time-consuming task. To maintain the confidentiality of this, evaluation will be returned to you at the completion of the promotion/tenure process.

Sincerely,

_____, Chair
Department of _____

Enclosure: (Department criteria for promotion/tenure; Division of Professions Procedures and
               Evaluative Criteria)

Division of Professions Criteria Revision:

October 1974	Revised September 1986	Revised May 1998	Revised May 2011
Revised October 1976	Revised May 1987	Revised Sept. 1999	Reaffirmed April 2012
Revised December 1976	Reaffirmed September 1987	Reaffirmed October 2000	Editorially revised May 2013
Revised October 1977	Revised April 1988	Editorially Revised Oct. 2001	Editorially revised May 2014
Reaffirmed Sept. 1978	Revised May 1989	Revised August 2002	Editorially revised May 2015
Revised July 1979	Editorially Revised Sept. 1989	Revised August 2003	Editorially revised May 2016
Reaffirmed Sept. 1980	Editorially Revised Sept. 1990	Revised October 2004	Editorially revised May 2017
Revised October 1981	Reaffirmed May 1991	Revised April 2005	Editorially revised May 2018
Revised May 1982	Revised August 1992	Revised June 2006	
Revised May 1983	Editorially Revised Aug. 1994	Revised June 2007	
Revised September 1983	Editorially Revised May 1995	Revised June 2008	
Revised September 1984	Revised May 1996	Reaffirmed June 2009	
Revised September 1985	Revised May 1997	Reaffirmed April 2010	