

I. How the process works: (a general guide, esp. Biology Divisional Committee for Tenure)
Cmte has 11 members, attempt to maintain balance across biology disciplines. Meet monthly or more often Sept - May, read 30-40 cases each year. Members take work very seriously.

Everyone reads & evaluates & discusses all cases, but the cases are presented by 2 reviewers who are knowledgeable in the scholarly area of the candidate. Most cases have an area of Excellence (usually research) and an area of Significant Accomplishment (usually teaching). Most cases are discussed for 30-50 minutes before voting. Highly individualistic, case-by-case approach. There is no formula.

II. What the Committee Looks For:

1. Evidence of impact and quality of scholarship

A. RESEARCH: Publications in peer-reviewed journals, competitive Federal grants, other grants

- **How many pubs?** Depends on quality & impact. As few as 6 were enough for one candidate, but 20 were not enough for another. Pay attention to journal quality.
- **How much grant funding?** Again, depends. NIH and NSF are well-regarded because the process is well understood and the standards are known to be high. Being lead PI is valued: better one lead grant than being secondary PI on five. Funding only from pharmaceutical industry can raise questions of intellectual independence, especially if research is all clinical trials for one company.
- **Clinical research is valued, but it must be scholarly** (*see Standards for Professional Practice*).
- Candidate should make full use of their Research Statement to explain his/her scholarly vision and highlight the importance of her/his major accomplishments. Avoid both false modesty & hype.

B. TEACHING: Peer & student evaluations; clear documentation of teaching load and effort; publications (pedagogical research, textbooks); invited talks on teaching; mentor & clinical teaching clearly listed (but mentor teaching cannot serve as primary basis for teaching accomplishment)

C. OUTREACH/CLINICAL: Evidence of leadership: scholarly clinical publications, evidence that candidate's work has changed practice in the field (new programs, standards); invited presentations, workshops, training seminars.

2. National/International Profile

- Outside evaluation letters from *arm's-length* experts in the field. At least 6, no more than 10.
- Invitations to speak at other institutions, meetings, serve as grant panel/study section member, evidence of leadership position in the field.

III. Excellence in one area and significant accomplishment in another. Doing only a few hours of classroom teaching/year will not allow candidate to build a record of accomplishment. Consider teaching in Biocore or Bio 151/152, or teaching an upper-level seminar in the area of expertise. A single round in a course is not enough; teaching effort should be consistent over the years.

IV. Strong letter from department explaining the standards of the field, relative quality of candidate's journals and funding sources; any special circumstances such as size of clinical load and nature of teaching. Place the candidate's record in context for an imaginary colleague who is expert in basic biology but does not understand clinical practice or medical school teaching. Explain everything, even what seems obvious within your department. Address any problems, don't ignore them.

V. Follow the required Biology Division format for tenure document. Committee reads many dossiers and it creates difficulty if members must search to find the various parts of a case. Failure to follow format suggests sloppiness and can reflect poorly (even if unfairly) on the candidate.