Faculty Action Process Overview
Promotion to Tenured Associate Professor

The following materials provide a brief overview of the promotion to tenured associate professor process at The Wharton School. Included are a description of the curriculum vita requirements, as well as sample letters that are used for the solicitation of reviewers.

General note for academic year 2019-20:
The Provost’s Office is implementing Interfolio in Fall 2019. There may be some modifications with regard to how review materials are collected, as well as some changes to the required materials for the Provost’s Staff Conference reviews. As soon as this information is finalized, it will be broadly disseminated to all faculty members.

Note that the Wharton requirements for the materials that are used for our internal reviews, as described on the following pages, will not be changed as a result of the Interfolio implementation.

Candidate’s responsibilities

The faculty member:

1. prepares a current CV, including grant information.

2. supplies copies of all publications. All departments will require PDF versions; some may also require hard copies of books.

3. identifies which publications he/she considers to be his/her three best publications.

4. prepares and writes a research statement AND a teaching statement.

5. supplies three names of reviewers who are not members of the University of Pennsylvania faculty. All reviewers must be either tenured associate professors or full professors.

6. provides syllabi and samples of teaching materials.

7. signs a memo, provided by the department, certifying that he/she has reviewed and submitted the materials for which he/she is responsible.

Summary of Events

1. The candidate supplies the required materials as noted above.

2. A special website will be created where ALL of the candidate’s publications may be accessed. The website also includes the CV and both statements. The URL will be provided to the candidate and to all reviewers (internal, external, senior departmental faculty, and members of the Wharton Personnel Committee). The website may be updated during the review process by the request of the candidate, as appropriate. For example, if a paper is accepted during the review cycle, the website and CV may be updated to reflect the change. The Director of Faculty Administration is responsible for the management of these websites.
3. The department chair selects three tenured faculty members to serve on a departmental reading committee. This committee independently evaluates the candidate's research and prepares a written report. The report may (but need not) address the candidate’s teaching and service. A supplemental report which comments on the letters received on the case may also be prepared by the committee. The department chair usually addresses teaching, service, and the review letters in his/her letter.

4. The department prepares a Teaching Evaluation Statement. The Teaching Evaluation Statement may be prepared by the department chair, by the departmental reading committee, or by another faculty member(s) designated by the department chair. (The guidelines for the preparation of the department’s teaching statement are included in this packet.)

5. The department prepares a list of proposed external (outside of the University) reviewers, all of whom must be tenured associate or full professors. This list is comprised of the names of eight or more reviewers recommended by the department chair, the reading committee, and/or other senior members of the departmental faculty. The names must follow strict guidelines as determined by the provost’s office. For example, the list may only include one co-author. These guidelines are included in this packet. (These are referred to as the “primary” names.)

6. If the department includes any names that are outside the guidelines (e.g., extra co-authors, additional reviewers from the same institution, a reviewer from a non-peer institution), the department must provide justification.

7. The candidate provides three names of reviewers who are not members of the University of Pennsylvania faculty. All reviewers must be either tenured associate professors or full professors. No other restrictions, other than academic rank, are placed on these names. For example, the candidate may name co-authors and/or members of his/her thesis committee. The reviewers nominated by the candidate are always solicited. (These are referred to as the “candidate” names.)

8. The lists of external reviewers are managed in an online system developed by the Provost’s Office. Department staff will input all of the names, department's and candidate’s, into the Provost’s system. All known relationships to the candidate and/or to the department must be disclosed. As well, any justifications for names outside the guidelines are input to the system. The submitted online form progresses electronically through several steps for approvals: department chair, director of faculty administration, deputy dean, and provost’s office. No letters are solicited until final approval by the provost’s office.

9. The dean’s office solicits review letters from outside reviewers. The candidate’s CV, research statement, teaching statement, and copies of the three best publications are sent to all reviewers. The URL for the candidate’s website is also provided to the reviewers.

10. A minimum of six external letters must be received from the names proposed by the department (primary names). Any additional letters received over this minimum will be included in the case, regardless of the source.

11. If there is an expected shortfall in receiving the required minimum number of letters, additional names must be submitted and approved through all levels, followed up by the solicitations of these newly added reviewers. The same guidelines as noted above must be followed.
12. Letters from internal reviewers (Penn faculty members) are not required, unless the faculty member holds a secondary appointment. In those instances, at least one letter from the secondary department(s) must be received. The rank of the faculty member solicited for review must be tenured associate or full professor. The department may solicit additional internal letters if desired.

13. All internal letters are solicited by the department. The department determines who will be solicited for internal reviews; no approval by the deputy dean or provost is required. The candidate’s CV, research statement, teaching statement, and copies of the three best publications are sent to the internal reviewers. The URL for the candidate’s website is also provided to the reviewers. If internal letters are solicited, a summary list of all internal reviewers, showing the outcome of each solicitation, is included in the case.

14. The approved list of external reviewers, along with a summary list of all reviewers showing the outcome of each solicitation, is included in the case.

15. Once the case is complete, the tenured faculty in the department review the case and vote on the promotion to tenured associate professor.

16. The department chair writes a letter to the Dean reporting the vote on the candidate. If approved by the department, this letter summarizes the relevant discussion on the case.

17. If approved by the department, the complete case is compiled by the department and sent to the Wharton Personnel Committee (WPC) for review. (The WPC is an advisory committee to the Dean. It is composed of eight (or more) full professors, each from a different department.) The case consists of: the letter from the department chair, the departmental reading committee report, the candidate’s CV, the departmental Teaching Evaluation Statement, the candidate’s teaching evaluations since the time of the initial faculty appointment, the approved list of reviewers, a summary tally list of solicitations, all review letters, the candidate’s research statement, the candidate’s teaching statement, and the three best publications. The candidate’s complete set of publications and all submitted teaching materials are also provided to the Committee.
18. The WPC votes and provides a recommendation to the dean. The dean decides if the case should go forward to the Provost. If the dean forwards the case to the Provost for review at a Provost’s Staff Conference (PSC)* meeting, then a letter from the dean and a report from the WPC are added to the case.

19. If approved by the PSC and the Board of Trustees, the candidate is promoted to Tenured Associate Professor, usually effective July 1 of the upcoming academic year.

Notes:

- All letters and departmental reports are confidential, including the names of all reviewers.
- Consideration for promotion to tenure is contingent upon United States citizenship or US permanent residency.

* The Provost’s Staff Conference is an advisory body to the Provost that meets to consider proposals for academic appointments and promotions. Currently, the Provost’s Staff Conference is composed of the Provost, as chair; the Vice Provosts for Education, Faculty, Global Initiatives, and Research; the deans of the School of Arts and Sciences, Wharton School, School of Engineering & Applied Science, and Perelman School of Medicine; and four or five additional positions, which rotate. Approved appointments and promotions are forwarded to the President for consideration and then to the Trustees for approval.
Curriculum Vitae: Guidelines for Wharton Format

- All CV’s submitted for a faculty review must be dated and must be current.
- The country of citizenship, including US citizenship, must be identified. If applicable, current visa status information must be included on the CV.

a. **First page:** The first page must contain the candidate’s full name and business address. (Due to privacy concerns, we recommend that personal information such as the social security number, home address, private phone numbers, and date of birth are not included on the CV.)

b. **Educational background:** It is important that the candidate’s highest educational degree be identified. The dates of each degree must be included.

c. **Employment history:** This section generally includes both academic and non-academic post-PhD employment. Other post-college employment may be listed at the discretion of the candidate.

d. **Publications:** A list of all publications must be included as part of the CV. The publications must be numbered. On co-authored papers, all authors’ names should appear exactly as published in the journal or other publication. **Do not use “with” terminology.** If the custom of a journal is to list authors in alphabetical order, this should be noted.

*Important Information for Appointments/Promotions that Require a Review of the Candidate’s Publications:*

The copies of publications that are submitted as part of the review process must be numbered and must correspond exactly to the list of publications in the curriculum vitae. The candidate may update his/her CV during the review process; however, the numbering of the publications must remain the same, even if the changed status of a paper necessitates moving the citation to a new section of the CV, for example, from “under review” to “published.”

The publications’ section of the CV must be divided into subsections as follows:

1. Articles **published or forthcoming** in refereed journals;
2. Articles **submitted** to refereed journals; include information on version (e.g., 2nd review), date submitted, and title of journal;
3. Other articles, including chapters in books;
4. Books (include the number of pages);
5. Invited papers;
6. Reports and other materials (e.g., cases, reports published by a research center or department).
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c. **Research in Progress:**

1. Working papers do not have to be listed on the CV; however, if they are, they must be numbered and copies of these publications must be supplied as needed for departmental and/or personnel committee review.

f. **Other CV content:**

1. Service on committees, professional service, editorial board work, or other indications of good citizenship within the institutional and professional community should be listed.
2. Honors and awards may be included here (grant information appears separately; see below for instructions).
3. Listings of courses taught and/or developed may be included on the CV at the candidate’s discretion.
4. If applicable, the names of PhD students on whose dissertation committee the candidate has served should be included. The candidate should note his/her role on the committee, and should also note any placement information about graduates.

g. **Grant Activity**

(listing must begin on a new and separate page and must be the final portion of the CV)

1. Grant information is to be listed in chart form, using the following template. Separate charts must be used for past, current, and pending grants and must be labeled accordingly. This information is a Provost’s Staff Conference requirement.

**Grant Activity** [use this heading at the beginning of the listing]

**Current Grants** [sample heading for chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Grant</th>
<th>Funding Agency</th>
<th>Period of Grant</th>
<th>Type of Grant</th>
<th>Role in Grant</th>
<th>Annual Direct Cost</th>
<th>Annual Indirect Cost</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Research and Teaching Statements

Statements prepared for promotion and tenure reviews are a valuable assessment tool and provide an important opportunity for faculty members to reflect on their contributions in the areas of research, teaching, and service. Promotion and tenure candidates must provide two separate statements. The first statement focuses on research. The second statement focuses on teaching.

Statements are one component of the materials sent to reviewers, the Wharton Personnel Committee, and are part of the final case that is sent to the members of the Provost’s Staff Conference.

In all aspects of the statements, faculty members should avoid jargon and abbreviations. It is important to remember that statements are read by faculty members whose expertise may be in a different field. Each section of the statements – especially the section describing research – should be clear, accessible, and meaningful to readers from any department of the Wharton School, and indeed from any department of the University.

Research Statement

There is no set rule for how long the statements should be; however, the provost’s office recommends that the research portion be no longer than five to seven pages. Statements need to be long enough to make the case that the work is important and programmatic, but they should not be so long that readers cease being engaged and interested.

The candidate should explain his/her research interests and identify themes of scholarship. Research statements should also highlight the interrelationships between a candidate's completed projects, work in progress, and projected work. It should provide an indication of the contributions of the candidate’s research. Research statements should not be a compendium of abstracts.

The candidate’s three-best papers must be identified and the descriptions of these papers should be part of the flow of the research statement, showing the connections of this work to the overall research accomplishments and goals.
**Teaching Statement**

The teaching statement must be a separate document. The expectation is that up to four pages should be sufficient for the statement, but a longer document is acceptable if appropriate. The statement should provide an overview of the candidate's learning goals and pedagogical approaches. The statement should detail how the candidate engages students.

The statement should include information and a short description of the courses taught. If a course has been revamped or was created/developed by the candidate, that information should be described. Any teaching innovations and/or creation of course materials (e.g., textbooks, cases) can be mentioned as well. The candidate should provide a description of how their teaching materials are utilized in the courses.

The candidate may address his/her quantitative ratings and student comments, as well as steps taken to improve and enhance teaching (e.g., content redesign, coaching, sitting in colleagues’ classes, etc.).

It is appropriate to mention any awards or recognition received for teaching.

Other activities related to teaching should be described. These activities may include items such as undergraduate/MBA student advising, role as a course head, and role in team-taught courses.

The candidate should note any formal advising of doctoral students and his/her role on the committee (e.g., chair, member). Placements of doctoral students should be noted here, even if the information is included on the CV.
Syllabi and Course Materials

The candidate must submit the most recent syllabi and other course materials, for all courses taught for student credit.

In addition to the syllabi, the candidate should submit, for each course taught, a representative sample of their teaching materials. These materials are meant to provide insight into what is taught and how it is taught. A full accounting of material is not necessary.

The preference is for materials developed by the candidate. The candidate may include materials that were created in collaboration with others. The candidate should indicate the degree of his/her involvement in the development and/or modification of the submitted teaching materials. (This information may be included in the teaching statement.)

The materials submitted may include, but are not limited to, lesson plans/notes, lecture slides, and assessments (e.g., assignments and exams), cases, interactive exercises, simulations, and videos. Only cases developed and written by the candidate should be included (i.e., no third-party cases).
Instructions for Reading Committees
for
Promotions to Tenured Associate Professor

The department's reading committee report must independently evaluate the candidate's research. The candidate's writings should be evaluated by the reading committee, not just summarized. If appropriate, this evaluation may include comments on the quality of the journals (or other outlets) in which the candidate has published. The reports may (but need not) address teaching or service as the chair usually discusses these issues in his/her letter.

The department must provide a Teaching Evaluation Statement report for inclusion in the case; therefore any discussion of teaching in the reading committee report is not expected nor required.

It is recommended that the reading committee report be prepared independently of the review letters. If desired by the committee members or the department chair, the committee may create a supplement to the initial report that addresses the content of the review letters. However, such a supplement may not be necessary as the chair usually discusses these issues in his/her letter.

The committee may (but need not) make a recommendation on the proposed appointment/promotion.

**IMPORTANT:** If a faculty member has had one or more extensions to his/her tenure clock, the reading committee must be informed of the following University policy:

> The policy of The Wharton School and the University of Pennsylvania is to evaluate each candidate who has been granted an extension as if he or she had been in probationary status for the normal duration, rather than the longer apparent time in service.
Guidelines for Department Report on Teaching Activity
Tenure and Promotion Cases

 Applies to: Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor and candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

 Purpose: To provide comprehensive information about a candidate’s teaching in a consistent format across all departments. The departmental teaching statement (see below) is designed to summarize and explain information on the candidate’s teaching history and accomplishments, which in some instances may repeat information in other parts of the case.

 Period to be addressed: For promotion to associate professor with tenure from the time of hire to the promotion decision. For promotion to full professor, the focus will be on the six years prior.

 Materials to be included:

 1.) Teaching Evaluation Statement about the candidate’s teaching (instructions below).

 2.) Summary table or spreadsheet reporting information about a course (term, course, title, course enrollment, overall quality of instructor, overall quality of course, course difficulty). (Instructions are below.)

 3.) Course evaluations:
   a. All evaluation reports from the online course evaluation system and other sources (if online reports are not available for the entire period).
   b. All student comments from the online evaluation system.

 Placement in Case: Teaching materials should be ordered as follows:

 1. Teaching Evaluation Statement;
 2. Summary Table;
 3. Evaluation reports with the student comments, when available.
**Departmental Teaching Evaluation Statement**

The Teaching Statement may be prepared by the department chair, by the departmental reading committee, or by another faculty member(s) designated by the department chair. The name(s) of the individual(s) who authored the Statement must be provided.

It is anticipated that the Statement will be no more than three pages in length. The statement should:

A. Summarize and evaluate the candidate’s teaching efforts.
B. Discuss areas of concern or success.
C. Highlight and discuss several representative student comments that reflect the scope of student feedback.
D. Provide a conclusion on the candidate’s overall quality of teaching, in particular with respect to the candidate’s efforts to engage students and to communicate the applicability of the content.

If relevant for a candidate, the Statement may also discuss:

A. Role as a course head or part of a course that is team-taught.
B. Student advising of undergraduates and MBAs.
C. Work for the doctoral program, including advising doctoral students.
D. Teaching innovations; course development (relevant comments about syllabi can be included); and/or creation of course materials (e.g., textbooks, cases).
E. Quantitative ratings from student evaluations, including any trends, and how the course ratings align with those of other faculty in the department teaching the same or similar courses, etc.
F. Exceptional work by the candidate related to teaching. Include information on any awards or recognition received by the candidate for teaching.
G. The candidate’s support of (mentoring) the teaching efforts by other faculty.
H. The candidate’s teaching in Wharton’s non-degree programs (e.g., executive education and life-long learning).
### SUMMARY OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES
for NAME OF FACULTY MEMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th># OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>OVERALL QUALITY OF INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>OVERALL QUALITY OF COURSE</th>
<th>COURSE DIFFICULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>BEPP 201</td>
<td>Introduction to Business Economics and Public Policy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>FNCE 238</td>
<td>Capital Markets</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>MGMT 701</td>
<td>Strategy and Competitive Advantage</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>MKTG 225/793</td>
<td>Retailing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

************************************************************************

- Information on the ratings scale should be noted (e.g., scale = 0 to 4, where 4 = excellent).
- The chart must be in reverse chronological order as in the example above.
- If desired, graduate and undergraduate courses may be separated and each presented in a separate reverse chronological listing. This is optional.
Guidelines for Selection of External Consultants
Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
(excerpted from the Provost’s Guidelines, October 2018)

This document serves as a guide to assist in the selection of external consultants. External consultants must be approved by the Provost before solicitation.

General Recommendations for Selecting Primary Consultants

The selections should include at least eight consultants who are not currently affiliated with the University of Pennsylvania. Former Penn faculty members who have been gone for five or more years are eligible, as long as there are no other close associations to the candidate. A disclosure should be made stating that the consultant is a former Penn faculty member.

- Ideally, consultants should represent an array of top tier institutions but no more than two consultants from the same institution should be selected. More than two consultants from the same institution may be approved IF they are in different schools or departments of the institution.

- Direct association such as co-authors, former colleagues, co-organizers, co-editors, or editor of a book or collection in which the candidate contributed should be kept to a minimum (generally, no more than two primary consultants) and must be disclosed to the best of your knowledge.

- If additional consultants are needed at any stage of the process, the same criterion and approvals are required.

The candidate should not be privy to the selections or involved in any discussion about the selection of primary consultants.

General Recommendations for Candidate Selections

- The candidate must select up to three consultants.

- These selections should be submitted to the department by the candidate before the department commits to their selections. The candidate may also provide information and reasoning for consultants they do not believe will give a fair review.

- External means External: Anyone affiliated with the University of Pennsylvania is not eligible. An exception may be granted if the candidate received his/her degree from Penn and wishes to include his/her dissertation advisor or any member of the dissertation committee.

- Candidates may use thesis advisors, colleagues, co-authors or collaborators, but should be kept to an absolute minimum and relationship must be disclosed.
Considerations for all Consultants—Academic Rank

- The number of primary consultants allowed at the rank of Associate Professor is limited to two. All other consultants must be ranked at the Professor level.
- Limit the number of emeritus professors to no more than two; emeritus faculty must be active.
- Limit the number of reviewers from industry to no more than two.
- Limit the number of international reviewers to no more than three.

Consultant Qualifications

- Stating simply that the consultant is an “expert” or “specialist,” or indicating the level of the consultant’s recognition (regional, national, international) in their given field without supporting the statement with facts is not sufficient.

To illustrate the point above, refer to the following samples for appropriate descriptors of consultants’ qualifications:

- Regionally, nationally or internationally recognized for making advances in … (indicate the exact field of study)
- Member of consortium that provides services (indicate type) in the field of… (describe the specific area)
- Pioneered the … (provide description).
- Discovered the … (provide description).
- Member of the team that …(provide description)
- President (or Chair) of … (name of Society, Committee, etc.); include year(s) office(s) held.
- Editor of … (state name of professional journal, etc.)
- Author of … (publication related to area of expertise of the candidate)
- Winner of … (prize or award in related area of expertise)

If selection(s) do not meet the recommendations above but the Department or School believes the consultant is essential in evaluating the candidate, an explanation for making the selection(s) should be included in a memo attached to or included as a comment in the appropriate section of the form.

Contact with External Consultants

- Once the list is approved, the Department Chair, Personnel Committee Chair, or Dean may contact the external consultants to ascertain his or her willingness to review the candidate.
- There should be no attempt to determine if the consultant is willing to provide a positive evaluation of the candidate’s work.
- If a letter of evaluation has not been received by the stated deadline, the Department Chair, Personnel Committee Chair, or Dean may reach out to an external consultant for the sole purpose of determining whether the consultant intends to send the requested letter.
- The Department Chair, Personnel Committee Chair, or Dean may delegate the task of contacting external consultants to a staff member.
SAMPLE NOTIFICATION LETTER FOR
UPCOMING TENURE REVIEW OR CONVERSION TO TENURE

Your appointment as (Assistant Professor/Associate Professor without tenure) ends June 30, _____, and your mandatory tenure review is scheduled for the academic year (date). I would be happy to discuss the process with you fully at any time, and to work together with you over the year.

If you choose to initiate the review process, you will need to provide the following:

1. An updated curriculum vitae (format attached).
2. The names of up to three external reviewers to be consulted on your behalf, including their:
   a) name and highest degree;
   b) primary academic or other appointment (i.e., title and rank);
   c) current mailing address, telephone number(s), and email address;
   d) identification of field & relevance to your field of research;
   e) a brief description of their standing in the field; and
   f) a brief description of any present and/or previous relationship between yourself and the consultant.

These first two items MUST be provided to me no later than (due date goes here/recommend no later than August 1).

The following materials must also be provided, no later than (due date goes here/recommend no later than September 15):

3. A research statement. This statement should also identify your three most significant publications/papers, including information on your choices.
4. A teaching statement.
   Guidelines for these statements are attached.
5. Copies of each of your three most significant publications/papers both hard-copy and PDF.
6. Copies of ALL other publications/papers listed on your CV, both hard-copy and PDF.

All University of Pennsylvania faculty are expected to uphold the highest standards for professional conduct and ethical behavior. Faculty are expected to treat everyone in the work environment, including colleagues, learners, research team members, staff, and visitors with courtesy, respect and dignity. Faculty are responsible for cultivating a respectful and inclusive work environment, for modeling professional conduct, and for responding to unprofessional behavior on the part of others. All faculty are expected to adhere to applicable University and Wharton School policies and procedures. Professional conduct, as well as research, service, and teaching will be considered as part of the evaluation for reappointment, granting of tenure, and promotion to full professor.

I am also reminding you of the University’s “Policy on Extension of the Probationary Period,” (Faculty Handbook Policy I.I.E.3) and the timely filing requirements relating to the specific circumstances under which the probationary period may be extended. There are special limitations regarding filing a request for an extension once the mandatory year has begun; in particular, no extension may be requested after the external letters have been solicited. If you believe that you may be eligible for an extension to your tenure clock, please contact me as soon as possible. If you have not notified me by October 1, _____ it will be noted as confirmation that no qualifying event is expected during your mandatory year.

If the tenure process is to proceed on schedule, it is essential that the deadlines noted above be met. If you submit your materials after (second due date from above), we will make every effort to process your case quickly but it may not be possible to have it completed by June 30, _____.

Therefore, if you have not responded by DATE (recommend October 1) it will be taken that you have waived your right to a review in your mandatory review year and that you have waived your right to one full year's notice of non-reappointment as stipulated in the Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators.

Sincerely,

Department Chair

Cc: Deputy Dean
   Director, Faculty Administration

I acknowledge receipt of the information outlined above and have kept a copy of this notification for my records. I further acknowledge that neither the department, school nor the university is obligated to undertake a review of my candidacy during my terminal year.

PRINTED NAME AND SIGNATURE
Dear ________________:

Dr. (name), who is currently an (Assistant/Associate Professor) in the Department of (department name) of the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, is being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure. We would appreciate your help in evaluating this candidate's scholarly achievements.

The University expects that those promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure will be excellent teachers and mature scholars whose achievements have won exceptional recognition both by scholars outside the University and by the candidate's faculty colleagues, and whose presence on the faculty enhances the prestige of the University. Promotion to this rank is not a recognition of length of service, but rather of outstanding scholarship and excellent teaching. In making your evaluation, which should focus on the achievements of the candidate, it would be helpful if you would:

1. evaluate the scope and significance of the candidate's scholarly achievements and their importance within the general discipline;
2. comment upon the degree of recognition achieved in the candidate's discipline, noting (his/her) most distinctive contributions;
3. rank the candidate relative to the leading scholars in the same field of study and at a comparable level of professional development
4. evaluate the candidate's likelihood of achieving a similar faculty position and rank at the leading institutions in this discipline;
5. provide any information or insight that you have on the candidate’s skill and effectiveness as a teacher and communicator;
6. provide any additional insights that may be helpful in determining whether or not to recommend promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

For your convenience we enclose Dr. ________________’s curriculum vitae, three of (his/her) publications, as well as (his/her) research and teaching statements. If you would like to see any of (his/her) other publications for your review, you may contact me or access the following website: URL HERE.

It is the policy of the University of Pennsylvania that external letters be held in confidence. However, in the event of litigation or a governmental investigation, the candidate or others may gain access to the information contained in these letters.

We would appreciate receiving your evaluation by (Date – 4 wks from date on letter) since the review process requires all materials to be in hand as early in the academic year as possible. If you would prefer to return your review letter via email, please send it to: EMAIL ADDRESS GOES HERE.

We are very grateful for your help in this matter.

Sincerely,
Dear ____________________:

Dr. (name), who is currently a (Assistant/Associate Professor) in the Department of (department name) of the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, is being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure. We would appreciate your help in evaluating this candidate's scholarly achievements.

The University expects that those promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure will be excellent teachers and mature scholars whose achievements have won exceptional recognition both by scholars outside the University and by the candidate's faculty colleagues, and whose presence on the faculty enhances the prestige of the University. Promotion to this rank is not a recognition of length of service, but rather of outstanding scholarship and excellent teaching.

In making your evaluation, which should focus on the achievements of the candidate it would be helpful if you would:

1. evaluate the scope and significance of the candidate's scholarly achievements and their importance within the general discipline;
2. comment upon the degree of recognition achieved in the candidate's discipline, noting (his/her) most distinctive contributions;
3. rank the candidate relative to the leading scholars in the same field of study and at a comparable level of professional development
4. evaluate the candidate's likelihood of achieving a similar faculty position and rank at the leading institutions in this discipline;
5. provide any information or insight that you have on the candidate’s skill and effectiveness as a teacher and communicator;
6. provide any additional insights that may be helpful in determining whether or not to recommend promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

For your convenience we enclose Dr. ____________________’s curriculum vitae, three of (his/her) publications, as well as (his/her) research and teaching statements. If you would like to see any of (his/her) other publications for your review, you may contact me or access the following website: URL HERE.

Dr. ______________ has been granted an extension to the mandatory review period in keeping with the University’s policies. It is important to note that we evaluate the productivity of each candidate who has been granted an extension as if he or she had been in probationary status for the normal duration.

It is the policy of the University of Pennsylvania that external letters be held in confidence. However, in the event of litigation or a governmental investigation, the candidate or others may gain access to the information contained in these letters.

We would appreciate receiving your evaluation by (Date − 4 wks from date on letter) since the review process requires all materials to be in hand as early in the academic year as possible. If you would prefer to return your review letter via email, please send it to: EMAIL ADDRESS GOES HERE.

We are very grateful for your help in this matter.