

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FACULTY DIVISION OF THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POSITIONS INVOLVING TENURE

Effective May 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Timelines and Procedures

Criteria

Instructions for Submitting Materials

The Dossier

Introduction to the Case

- A. Dean's Approval
- B. Letter from the Department Chair
- C. Letter of Appointment
- D. Department Criteria

Materials Provided by the Candidate

- E. Curriculum Vitae
- F. Candidate's Statement(s)
- G. Statement on Overlap and Joint Authorship

Evaluation of Contributions to Knowledge and Culture

- H. Department Evaluation
- I. Letters from External Reviewers
- J. Representative Publication/Work

Evaluation of Teaching

- K. Department Evaluation
- L. Chronology of Teaching
- M. Course Materials
- N. Comparative Teaching Data
- O. Peer Evaluations

Evaluation of Service

- P. Department Evaluation

Supporting Materials

- 1. Publications
- 2. Dissertation
- 3. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Appendices

- 1. COVID-19 Pandemic Considerations
- 2. Considerations for Community-Engaged Scholarly and Activities Enhancing the Wisconsin Idea
- 3. Streamlined Tenure Process for Senior Hires
- 4. Curriculum Vitae Format
- 5. Guidance for Selecting Impartial External Reviewers
- 6. Template for Inviting External Reviewers

TIMELINES AND PROCEDURES

Departments are required to review faculty for promotion to tenure no later than the sixth probationary year. Most tenure cases are submitted to the divisional committees at this time. The Executive Committee of the Arts and Humanities Division meets in each of the nine months of the academic year and reviews recommendations for promotion from within the university from September through April and for appointments to tenure from outside the university, from September through May. The March divisional committee meeting is the last opportunity for review of promotion cases that have time remaining on the tenure clock beyond spring semester. Only in exceptional circumstances will the committee review internally-generated tenure cases in May. Departments are urged to send tenure recommendations to the Arts and Humanities Divisional Committee as early in the academic year as possible.

See committee's [standing procedures](#) for information on voting and reconsideration procedures.

Private communication with individual committee members is contrary to the proper conduct of the committee's affairs, and is to be avoided.

Please note that for senior hires who have already earned tenure at another institution and are to be appointed to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor with tenure upon their arrival at UW-Madison, there is a streamlined process of tenure review. That process is described in Appendix 3: Streamlined Tenure Process for Senior Hires.

CRITERIA

The divisional committee's criteria for appointment to tenure are intended to preserve and enhance the university's excellence, contributions to education, knowledge and culture. Tenure contributes to these objectives by giving faculty members the freedom to teach, inquire, create, publish, and serve with less concern for the immediate popularity or acceptability of their efforts than would be the case if termination of employment were a continual possibility. Tenure also permits the scholar to engage in long-term research and publication projects. But since tenure commits university and state resources indefinitely, the committee requires proof of excellence in past performance together with a credible forecast that a faculty member's intellectual vitality will continue for years to come. There is no entitlement to tenure based upon a record that is merely competent and satisfactory.

A candidate for tenure should have a national reputation. The dossier (described below) should demonstrate that the candidate's work is highly regarded by experts in the candidate's field who are members of peer academic institutions or leading arts organizations.

In judging a candidate's future contributions, the committee appraises all evidence in the dossier of scholarly or artistic excellence and productivity as found in: (1) relevant research and scholarly publications, artistic performances, and artistic or literary works; (2) teaching and the development of teaching materials; and (3) service to the institution, to the profession, and to the public. Research, teaching, and service encompass the activities essential for all faculty members, including those whose responsibilities emphasize outreach/extension.

In evaluating a candidate's research, teaching, and service, the committee will rely primarily on evidence from the probationary period. The probationary period includes any credit for prior probationary employment as stated in the letter of appointment. Prior work can demonstrate the development, direction, and breadth of the candidate's career. If a candidate's tenure case depends on work completed prior to the probationary period, the dependence should be explained in the chair's letter. Research samples sent to external reviewers should be limited to work completed during the probationary period at UW-Madison.

The committee recognizes that the diversity of the accomplishments of faculty members in and across different fields and with different budgeted responsibilities makes it impossible to frame precise standards for every potential tenure case. Each department should have its own guidelines. The general standards to be applied in

judging research, teaching, and service, and the role of faculty with significant outreach responsibilities, are set forth in this document.

A recommendation for promotion or appointment with tenure should identify the candidate's balance of responsibilities and accomplishments in research or creative expression, teaching, and service

A tenure recommendation for a candidate whose responsibilities are primarily in outreach/extension may be made on the basis of significant outreach/extension activities. In such cases the evidence must show that the candidate is recognized both within and outside the university in their field, and has made significant contributions to outreach/extension through an appropriate balance of teaching, research, and public service. The committee recognizes that interpretation and dissemination of the findings of research through teaching and service are the most important responsibilities in outreach/extension, but looks for quality publications in a relevant academic area.

The divisional committee also expects departments to explicitly recognize the value of work that engages with diverse communities to extend the longstanding scholarly traditions of research, instruction, and outreach articulated through the Wisconsin Idea. It also more generally encourages departments to highlight the ways in which candidates' work has supported the University's mission to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion. These efforts can include (but are not limited to) scholarship on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion, teaching practices that seek to address inequalities in the classrooms, and forms of community-engaged scholarship that give voice to underserved communities and underrepresented groups in the process of building and disseminating ideas. Significant contributions in these regards should always be counted toward the evaluation and assessment of candidates in the tenure process. To help document such work across research, teaching, and service, candidates are invited to submit a statement on Engaging with Diverse Communities in Section F of the tenure dossier described below. However, departments should also consider how they are attending to this work in their evaluation process, and should consult Appendix 2 on Considerations for Community-Engaged Scholarship and Activities Enhancing the Wisconsin Idea.

Cases brought before the end of the probationary period should meet all the criteria that a case brought in the sixth probationary year must meet; there is no higher standard for so-called early cases. All tenure dossiers must meet the same criteria regardless of when they are submitted. Candidates and departments should be aware that multiple requests for review are not permitted. These cases cannot be submitted for the April or May meetings.

Please also note that the divisional committee recognizes the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and encourages departments to acknowledge the challenges it has posed for research, teaching, and service. Please see Appendix 1: COVID-19 Pandemic Considerations.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING MATERIALS

Instructions for submitting the evidence to the committee are set forth below. A dossier that fails to follow these guidelines will not be reviewed.

The divisional committee requires two bookmarked, text-readable PDFs. The first will comprise the "Tenure Dossiers", and the second offers "Supporting Materials." Both are described in detail below. For special cases (sculpture, music, or other material that cannot be represented in PDF), please make arrangements with the divisional committee coordinator.

These files should be submitted by the deadline posted on the web site for the meeting at which the tenure case is to be considered. [Divisional committee meeting dates and deadlines](#) are posted online. (Note that the dean of the schools and colleges require at least one week to review departmental tenure recommendations prior to forwarding them to the divisional committee. Realistically, therefore, the departmental package must be ready to go at least five weeks prior to the committee's meeting. Check with your dean's office for the details of its requirements.)

A need may arise for submitting at a later date supplementary materials such as minority reports, testimonial letters, and petitions. All such communications must be in written form and must be submitted to the Divisional Committee Office. All materials received will be part of the public record. The divisional committee may request additional information and materials from departments.

Please consult the [Checklist of Materials for Tenure Recommendation](#) before submitting.

THE DOSSIER

The dossier will contain five overall types of material. First, the department will provide materials essential to introducing the candidate, their accomplishments, and the criteria for evaluation. Second, the dossier will include materials provided directly by the candidate. Third, the dossier will provide the evaluation of the candidate's scholarly contributions to knowledge and/or culture by both the department and external reviewers. Fourth, the dossier will turn to the department's evaluation of the candidate's teaching. And finally, the dossier will provide the department's evaluation of the candidate's service contributions.

INTRODUCTION TO THE CASE (Documents A, B, C, and D)

A. Dean's Approval

B. Letter from the Department Chair

The chair's letter should not be needlessly inflated. It should contain the following information:

1. **An explanation of the voting.** Describe your departmental rules for voting on tenure recommendations. Give the number of eligible voters in the departmental executive committee during the semester of the tenure decision, and the exact vote - including absences and abstentions - for the case at hand. The divisional committee expects all members of an executive committee to vote, but understands that full participation is not always possible. Since absences from an executive committee vote on tenure could signal a lack of support, please provide explanations, as far as possible, for all abstentions, absences, and negative votes, including a summary of the reasoning and/or evidence used by those who made a case against the candidate's promotion.

Any minority opinions expressed in the course of the executive committee's deliberations that were submitted to the department in writing must be included in the dossier. Members of the candidate's department should not communicate formally or informally with the members of the divisional committee to express either majority or minority opinions.

The divisional committee reserves the right to request a minority report for any reason.

2. **Years of probationary service on the tenure track** at the time of the departmental vote and, if different, at the time of the submission of the dossier. The chair's letter should note the number and duration of any extensions to the probationary period ("tenure clock") that were granted to the candidate, *however, to maintain confidentiality, the dossier should not contain any information about the reasons for the extensions, regardless of the reason.*
3. **An assessment of the candidate's special contributions** to the development of the department(s) and, in the event that the candidate is a member of an interdisciplinary cluster, to the development and advancement of the cluster. The committee must be convinced that this candidate serves the needs of the department(s) (and cluster) well and has established a pattern of scholarly or artistic productivity and teaching excellence in traditional academic, outreach/extension, or creative arts settings. The chair's

evaluation should balance commitments and responsibilities required or appropriate in one area against those in another. This is especially important where the candidate's accomplishments depart from conventional academic patterns or work across traditional disciplinary boundaries. Include a statement of what the department sees as the role (scholarly, professional) of the candidate. Comment on the original letter of appointment (see subsection C, below) regarding how expectations have been fulfilled. Where there has been some change in professional expectations, date, document, and discuss the circumstances. The chair's letter should also explain how evidence of teaching effectiveness was collected and evaluated.

The divisional committee recognizes community-engaged scholarship as a legitimate form of scholarly activity. In preparing cases that involve engaged scholarship, departments should define the nature of the work, include evidence of the work and its impact and importance in the candidate's field (and any other fields that it engages), and explain how it meets the criteria for excellence in research.

The committee also recognizes the value of work that crosses disciplinary boundaries. In cases where a candidate's work uses methodologies or approaches from more than one discipline, the chair's letter should make clear the extent to which the candidate's work, and in particular their use of methodologies or approaches other than those from the candidate's home discipline, meets the standards of excellence in all of the areas in which the candidate works. In the case of an interdisciplinary appointment, the chair of the tenuring department should solicit supporting information about the candidate's contributions to other programs or departments from the relevant program directors or department chairs; summaries of mentoring committee reports and other supporting material should also be included.

4. **Overall departmental evaluation.** A brief summary of the departmental evaluation of the candidate's qualifications and capabilities, demonstrated through achievement in the following areas:

- (1) scholarship, creative arts, or outreach/extension (see Part H);
- (2) teaching (see Part K);
- (3) institutional, professional, community, and cultural and artistic service (see Part P).

Candidates whose mission is partially or primarily in outreach/extension or who have significant continuing education responsibilities are also evaluated in each of the above categories, but please see [Commitment to the Wisconsin Idea: A Guide to Documenting and Evaluating Excellence in Outreach Scholarship](#).

If the chair considers a subcommittee report sufficient, that report may be part of the chair's letter. The chair's letter should not be a repetition or pastiche of materials included elsewhere in the dossier (such as the Contributions to Knowledge and Culture document or the Teaching Narrative). To reiterate the chair's letter should not be needlessly long. Instead, a good chair's letter will provide context for the evidence that will be presented later in the dossier.

*The burden of making an effective case falls on the department. Since the case must be explained to those unfamiliar with the subtleties of the candidate's professional field, the best presentation to the dean and to the divisional committee may well be different from that made within the department. **It is the duty of the department chair, for example, to note in their letter any practices or conventions proper to the discipline which might help the committee assess the candidate.** It is vital to include a detailed statement outlining the quality, quantity, and format (i.e., articles vs. books, performance venues) of scholarly, creative, or artistic productivity that is expected of assistant professors in the field, and how the candidate has met these standards. A strong chair's letter will also be sure to contextualize the selection of external letter writers and explain why these were the best evaluators to select (especially if there could be the appearance of a lack of arm's length relationship or a potential conflict of interest).*

C. Letter of Appointment

Include a copy of the original letter of appointment and of the position vacancy listing (PVL). Redact the salary and any mention of research funds.

D. Departmental Criteria

(As specified in *Faculty Policies and Procedures* 7.14.D)

MATERIALS PROVIDED BY THE CANDIDATE (Documents E, F, and G)

E. Curriculum Vitae

The curriculum vitae should be concise and accurate; dates should be inclusive, and details non-repetitive. Partial or complete duplications of projects/publications should be noted. Please format the CV according to Appendix 4.

F. Candidate's Statement(s)

1. Each candidate is to prepare a succinct statement on their future research and teaching plans for approximately the next five years. This should not be more than three to four pages.
2. If applicable, candidates conducting community-engaged scholarship and/or scholarly activity that promotes diversity, equity, and inclusion are invited to submit an additional statement on "Engaging with Diverse Communities" to detail these contributions.

G. Statement of Overlap and Joint Authorship

If there are any complete or partial duplications among the publications listed in items a. to j. in the Curriculum Vitae (item E), these should be described. In particular, the relationship between the doctoral dissertation and a book or articles derived from it should be noted and clarified. Other examples would be articles that have become chapters of a book, or works that have been translated, or the republication of an article in a collection with a different title. Where the candidate has collaborated with another scholar or artist, the nature and proportion of the work for which the candidate is responsible should be made clear.

EVALUATIONS OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNOWLEDGE AND CULTURE (Documents H, I, J)

H. Departmental Evaluation

The department should prepare a detailed report identifying and discussing the candidate's contributions.

This report should be sure to define or characterize the particular form of the candidate's competence, for example: an interest in historical, biographical, or philosophical problems; or in speculative thinking; or in synthesizing extant knowledge and research; or in applying research to such areas as pedagogy, outreach/extension, or public service; or in creating research tools such as bibliographies and digital archives; or in model building; or in literary, musical, or artistic criticism; or in museum exhibition development and curation; or in composing, writing, painting, or choreography; or in directing or performance; or in interdisciplinary integration of research findings which creates new knowledge or perspectives. Where appropriate, comment on items contained in Bibliography or Artistic Performance under E. Curriculum Vitae, above.

The report should then evaluate those contributions to scholarship and culture. Comment on the significance of prizes, honors, and awards the candidate or the candidate's students have won, commissions or museum acquisitions, and the like. Provide critical reviews of the candidate's work where available. If there are problems or weaknesses in any relevant area, address them directly. Include an evaluation of the quality and standing of the publication outlets, and performance and exhibition venues, commenting, for example, on which publications and exhibitions are refereed, and characterizing their standing. Briefly state the peer review process for each peer-reviewed publication and performance/ exhibition, in addition to explaining their quality and standing.

Overall, a successful candidate shall have demonstrated the ability to conduct research, produce scholarship, and/or create works of art that make an original contribution to knowledge and culture. The committee looks for evidence of originality, standing in the profession beyond the university and the state, and the likelihood of continued performance. Evidence of ability and promise in the area of research includes conduct of research with appropriate methods and rigor; conceptualizing and theorizing in an original way; synthesis, criticism, and clarification of extant knowledge and research; innovative collection or analysis of empirical data; relating research to the solution of practical problems.

In evaluating the record of candidates with outreach/extension responsibilities, the evidence must show that the candidate's work has significantly contributed to the translation and dissemination of the results of scholarly inquiry in their discipline for the benefit of society, and that this work has extended the knowledge base of the university or of the public.

In evaluating the record of candidates working across disciplines or units, the committee is interested in evidence that shows the contributions of the candidate to both the individual units in which she or he works, and to the interdisciplinary 'cluster' more broadly. In the case of engaged scholarship, evidence must make clear how such scholarship meets the criteria of excellence in research and/or creative expression.

In evaluating the record of candidates in the various areas of creative expression, the committee needs evidence of distinguished performance in terms of originality, scope, richness, and depth of expression.

Evidence of research performance and of a candidate's standing in a field includes: fiction, drama, poetry, scholarly books, monographs, editions, chapters, bulletins, articles in scholarly or professional journals (published or accepted for publication); photographs, slides, concert or other programs, scores, catalogues of exhibitions, tape recordings, motion pictures, videos, scene models, lighting plots, computer software, internet materials; awards, honors, or citations; reviews and other evaluations of the candidate's publications, performances, exhibitions, and manuscripts; citation of the candidate's work, if particularly frequent or laudatory; research awards, grants, and proposals; evaluations by authorities, especially those from other major universities, in the candidate's field of specialization; papers read at professional meetings, invited lectures at other universities and learned societies, invitations to participate in professional meetings, editorial positions with major professional journals, testimony before governmental committees, and professional honors, awards, and consultations; and professional service indicative of the candidate's standing in the field, such as serving on editorial boards in professional organizations.

Special notes about the performing arts: The divisional committee recognizes that the normal university duties of probationary faculty in the performing arts will impede access to national or international venues necessary for professional visibility, or commensurate with their artistic stature. When considering candidates in the performing arts, therefore, the committee will take into consideration such impediments and will consider evidence showing the potential of the candidate to obtain access to performance venues of greater prestige although some performance beyond the immediate community is expected. In addition to the five letters requested below, critiques by outside evaluators of campus or community performances or productions may be included in the dossier.

I. Letters from external reviewers

The department is to provide five to eight letters of evaluation of the candidate's abilities and accomplishments, from nationally or internationally recognized experts in the candidate's field outside this institution.

The expectation is that these external evaluators will all be *impartial* reviewers without a vested interest (in terms of finances, personal relationships, or reputation) in the candidate's success in this process. The divisional committee prefers letters from people at the rank of full professor, but when the professional cohort size is small, an associate professor may be a better option provided that the chair's letter contextualizes that choice. Moreover, the divisional committee prefers that the number of associate-level reviewers not exceed that of full-level reviewers. For more guidance on selecting and soliciting such letters, please see Appendix 5: Guidance on Selecting Impartial External Reviewers and Appendix 6: Template for Inviting External Reviewers.

Because the divisional committee expects to receive at least five letters free of concern about impartiality, it is strongly recommended that departments consider soliciting at least a sixth letter in the event that one of the five letters is ultimately disqualified. More than eight letters is considered excessive, however.

Prior to soliciting letters, the department should ask the candidate to provide a list of 2-3 experts well qualified to impartially evaluate the candidate's research. After receiving that list, the department will generate its own independent list of potential letter writers—none of which can duplicate names provided by the candidate, and which must be generated without any further involvement from the candidate. However, prior to generating its list, the department should ask the candidate for very clear guidance in terms of defining the field(s) of study from which the department should be looking for evaluators beyond the 2-3 names suggested by the candidate. While the committee prefers letters from experts in the candidate's field, departments may consider specialists from adjacent fields, when the main field of study is small and finding a sufficient number of impartial letter writers is challenging as a result. As always, such a choice should be carefully contextualized in the chair's letter, which should also clearly describe the respective field, including its size and anything else that might be relevant for the committee to know. Once the candidate and the department have prepared their independent lists, the department can begin soliciting letters, inviting up to two names from the candidate's list and relying on the department's list for the other three or more letters solicited.

Once these letters are received, they should be included in the dossier along with:

1. The candidate's list of potential reviewers.
2. The department's list of potential reviewers.
3. A copy of the letter sent to these experts.
4. A list of the materials submitted for evaluation. Reviewers should receive the candidate's current curriculum vitae, a substantial and representative sample of the candidate's work from the probationary period, including entire book or book manuscript, if appropriate to the candidate's discipline, and the candidate's statement of future research plans.
5. Biographical information about the referees—a *brief* bio-bibliographical sketch of each referee's standing in the field and major publications not to exceed one paragraph.
6. All communication related to obtaining letters of recommendation, including communication with those who decline to write letters, must be in writing (letter or email). Copies of all communication must be

submitted to the divisional committee as part of the dossier. The divisional committee will not consider letters solicited independently by the candidate.

In the interest of obtaining an entirely objective appraisal of the candidate, Wisconsin Public Records Law allows letters of evaluation to be treated as confidential from the candidate.

Please note that the examples in Appendix 6: Template for Inviting External Reviewers are intended as guidelines; they should be adapted as needed.

J. Representative Publication/Work

One representative sample of the candidate's publications, or in the arts, a representative work sample, should be included in the dossier. This could be a journal article or a chapter of a book, or a sample of another type of scholarly contribution equivalent in scope. If the representative publication is written in a language other than English, or if there are substantial passages in the representative publication in a language other than English, a translation should be provided. If there are problems meeting this requirement, the department should speak with the chair of the divisional committee.

Cases in the creative and performing arts may face special problems in satisfying this requirement. If there is any doubt as to how this requirement is to be met, confer with the chair of the divisional committee.

For artists and scholarship based in performance, reviews of one representative theatrical, musical, or literary performance; of exhibitions and individual works of art; and of essays and works of drama, fiction, and poetry should be submitted. For research scholars, reviews of published work should be included alongside their publications in the Supporting Materials, not in the dossier.

EVALUATION OF TEACHING (Documents K, L, M, N, and O)

K. Department Evaluation

The committee requires a narrative discussion and evaluation of the candidate's teaching at this university, and at other institutions to the extent that such information can be obtained. The narrative should make the case for the candidate's strong record of effective teaching. It should also include a description of all of the candidate's teaching assignments and an evaluation of the candidate's performance as a teacher in each semester. A statement should be made regarding the fit between the candidate's teaching history, the programmatic needs of the department, and the teaching duties discussed in the letter of appointment. Deviation from the terms of appointment, or from the department's normal teaching load, requires explanation. Teaching should be appraised with reference to both departmental needs and advances in the field.

The successful candidate should have a strong record of effective teaching, assessed through the candidate's commitment to teaching, success in the communication of material, and stimulation of learner interest and other characteristics as a teacher. Evidence of these characteristics should be furnished. If any historical or current problems or weaknesses with teaching exist, they should be addressed in the chair's letter and in the narrative of teaching. Some candidates may deserve credit for significant, innovative development of instructional techniques and materials which affect academic programs in their department or discipline. Mention evidence of any special commitment to the instructional life of the institution, such as a readiness to reshape and strengthen a program. Procedures adopted or admired by colleagues within or outside the candidate's department should be documented. Honors or awards for teaching, as well as funding for curriculum development, are also evidence of excellence in teaching. Other noteworthy contributions might include teaching in addition to regular duties, collaborative efforts, and interdisciplinary instructional activities. Mention should be made of teaching assistant supervision (although such supervision is not required for tenure).

Evaluation of teaching ability and performance must take into account the range of approaches to teaching within the university. No candidate is expected to be equally proficient in all teaching situations: excellence must be demonstrated in those teaching situations most appropriate to the candidate's teaching mission and responsibilities. Beside the variations attributable to individual personality and style, there are distinctions among types of teaching situations both on and off campus—lectures, discussion sections, seminars, noncredit courses, institutes, workshops, media presentations, laboratory instruction, clinical teaching, in-service training, media courses, correspondence and distance-learning courses, individual tutorials, advising and consulting, and consultative exchanges with client groups. Specifics about how learners benefitted from teaching should be addressed.

L. Chronology of Teaching

The department should also provide the committee with a clear chronology of teaching that lists each course taught for each semester during the probationary period.

M. Course Materials

The dossier should include at least one representative sample of syllabi per instructional level as well as descriptions and samples of any significant instructional materials prepared by the candidate (textbooks, workbooks, applications of instructional technology and innovative uses of information technology).

N. Comparative Teaching Data

The dossier should not rely exclusively on any one measure of teaching effectiveness. We encourage departments to include multiple forms of student feedback, such as discussions with focus groups, retrospective evaluations, or evidence of student learning outcomes. If alternative methods of evaluation are being used by the department instead of the above, they must be carefully explained and contextualized. To provide evidence of the candidate's effectiveness as the instructor of specific courses, the department should provide the following based on course assignments and evaluations conducted each semester during the probationary period. In the case of faculty teaching for more than one unit, summaries and comparisons should be made in each unit.

1. **Sample evaluation form:** the dossier must include a sample copy of the student evaluation form(s) used for the candidate's courses. The sample should include a clear key to the evaluation scores, if numerical metrics are used. If more than one form was used, or if forms from more than one unit were used, the semester and year in which each form was used should be indicated.
2. **Student evaluation scores:** if your department conducts quantitative evaluation surveys, please provide the overall scores for each course in the chronology of teaching during the probationary period, compared to the department mean.
3. **Teaching load comparison:** a brief comparison between the candidate's teaching load and the average teaching load for probationary faculty in terms of the number of courses per semester or year, as well as the level of instruction (introductory, specialized, graduate seminar), the number of students and credits taught, and the number of contact hours expected. Information should also be provided concerning the manner in which duties are assigned.
4. **Grade distribution:** for each semester during which the candidate taught, a comparison should be provided between the grade distribution and mean evaluation scores in all the candidate's classes and the mean grade distribution and evaluation scores in all classes in the department.

If candidates have taught at other institutions during the probationary period, comparative teaching data from these institutions should be solicited and, if provided, presented in the fullest degree possible, with the understanding that there is no presumption that such evidence is comparable to our own.

O. Peer Evaluations

All reports on class visits by tenured colleagues, whether within or outside the department, should be submitted in full. There should be at least two visits with accompanying reports by different observers for each teaching year of the candidate's probationary period. Whenever possible, the reports should cover different courses, semesters, and levels of instruction. Any deviations from these guidelines for peer evaluations should be explained in the chair's letter. For candidates who have been substantially involved in outreach/extension programs, letters should be included from recognized outreach leaders and professional experts in the candidate's field.

Assessment of the effectiveness of the candidate's major program contributions and teaching abilities by workshop participants, trainees, and clients are also helpful in evaluating outreach/extension teaching performance.

EVALUATION OF SERVICE (Document P)

P. Department Evaluation

Significant service contributions strengthen a case for tenure, particularly in the case of faculty with significant continuing education responsibilities, but cannot be the primary basis for a tenure recommendation. If a tenure recommendation is based on administrative service as the major activity of the candidate at the present time, or if tenure is sought for an administrative appointment from the outside, evidence of excellence in teaching and research must also be presented to demonstrate the candidate's ability to fulfill teaching or research functions when their administrative activities come to an end.

The committee acknowledges that service demands on faculty members with joint appointments may be more onerous than is the norm for appointments in a single department.

Service activities fall into three general categories: institutional, professional, and public, as defined below. Service activities should be briefly described and adequate documentation should be available if requested. The committee welcomes identification of activities in and across these categories that support the Wisconsin Idea and/or efforts to promote diversity and inclusiveness.

1. **Institutional:** The effective operation of the university requires a high degree of faculty participation in faculty governance, on departmental and university committees, in administrative roles, student advising, and the like. All faculty must share in these tasks, but the divisional committee recognizes that a heavier burden should fall on the shoulders of already-tenured faculty members.
2. **Professional:** Service to one's profession or academic discipline may occur at local, state, national, or international levels. Professional service includes: serving as an officer or member of a board, committee, or task force of a professional group; on-site visits; reviewing research proposals or manuscripts; organizing and participating in professional and technical meetings such as training institutes, workshops, conferences; and continuing professional education.
3. **Public:** Part of the university's mission is to serve the state and the public. Public service includes membership on committees and boards; preparation of publications, articles and reprints for the public; testifying at public hearings; speaking to or consulting with public bodies; and participating in or organizing workshops and conferences. (Note that such activities are of interest to the committee to the extent that they are professional in essence. Participation in activities in one's capacity as a citizen is not

ordinarily considered.) Public service activity shall be evaluated according to the level of skill and success in communicating and applying the knowledge of one's field of professional competence.

The committee recognizes that for faculty with outreach/extension responsibilities, public service is a major, or even a primary, duty. The documentation in such cases must demonstrate either how the candidate is meeting the outreach/extension needs of the public through the teaching, coordination, and evaluation of outreach/extension programs; or how the candidate's work may have aided in shaping public policy. Evidence should be presented showing that a candidate with continuing education responsibilities has been able to identify program needs, develop and teach programs to address those needs, use new and existing information in program development, deliver programs to the public skillfully, and evaluate those programs.

SUPPORTING MATERIALS

The second, bookmarked PDF should include materials organized into the following three categories: publications, dissertation, and evidence of teaching effectiveness. Please note, however, that some reviewers prefer hard copies of already published books, so please provide those as well, if possible. Any hard copies of these supplementary materials itemized below will be returned to the department.

- 1. Publications:** The committee requires each of the candidate's publications, monographs, articles accepted for publication (i.e. not yet in print), and book manuscripts. Documentary evidence of acceptance for publication, and referees' reports on book manuscripts-should accompany accepted materials not yet published.

The committee will also review such evidence of accomplishment as photographs, catalogues of exhibitions, audio and video recordings, models, computer software, drawings, performance reviews and similar materials.

Uncompleted works and works not yet accepted for publication are considered by the committee to be works in progress. Evidence of work in progress (for example, manuscript copies and referees' reports) may be submitted as part of the supplementary materials; however, the committee's primary focus will be on works published or accepted for publication.

A brief abstract in English should be provided for all works written in languages other than English.

- 2. Dissertation:** For tenure cases at the rank of Associate Professor in fields in which the Ph.D. is the terminal degree, provide the Ph.D. dissertation if defended within the last ten years.
- 3. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness:** The originals of all student course evaluations are to be provided to the divisional committee. We highly encourage additional forms of documenting teaching effectiveness, such as discussions with focus groups, retrospective evaluations, or evidence of student learning outcomes.

All course syllabi not included in the main dossier above should also be included, as well as full copies of any textbooks, workbooks, applications of instructional technology and innovative uses of information technology.

APPENDIX 1

COVID-19 PANDEMIC CONSIDERATIONS

The Arts and Humanities Divisional Committee is sensitive to the significant challenges posed to probationary faculty by the COVID-19 pandemic. These circumstances have real impacts, both professional and personal, that require sensitivity and special consideration during the tenure and promotion process. On the one hand, the divisional committee recognizes that the pandemic has disrupted research progress and fundamentally changed the demands of teaching and service. The Committee has therefore created opportunities for the tenure dossier to contextualize a candidate's achievements within these ongoing challenges—including when those impacts may be felt for some time beyond the most obvious and immediate phases of the pandemic. On the other hand, the divisional committee continues to be committed to identifying and mitigating the potential for implicit bias in the evaluation process, refusing to pressure candidates to share health, family, or other personal information. To those ends, the divisional committee suggests that candidates and departments preparing dossiers consider the following guidelines:

1. Faculty impacted by COVID-19 should submit requests for tenure clock extensions to the Provost's office. The reason(s) for extensions should not be disclosed to the divisional committee in the tenure dossier.
2. Divisional committees will treat COVID-19 tenure clock extensions like any other extension. As before, their review of tenure dossiers will be non-prejudicial with regard to extensions and will not assume any norm for the length of a review period.
3. As part of its responsibility to contextualize the candidate's accomplishments and explain the evaluation criteria and process, the chair's letter in the tenure dossier may indicate if the candidate's productivity was negatively impacted by COVID-19 and explain how the Department has weighed that impact in the evaluation of the case. This may include (but need not be limited to) discussion of the pandemic's impact on presentation venues, publishing processes, human subjects research, teaching demands, etc. As always, the chair's letter should not disclose confidential information related to the candidate's health, family status, or other personal information. Divisional committees will accept claims of COVID-19 impact at face value instead of evaluating whether the circumstances warrant such consideration. Ideally, the chair's letter will explain how the candidate's accomplishments, while impacted by the pandemic, warrant promotion given the merits of the case.
4. Mentor committees and department chairs should anticipate COVID-19 related issues that may affect a candidate's promotion and encourage the candidate to apply for extensions early.
5. Divisional committees expect that the Provost's office will prepare for and accept requests for additional extensions since the impact of pandemic is not clear and likely will affect several years of productivity. To avoid repetitive/persistent extension without promotion, broader or alternative ways to assess productivity may be needed. To that end, the divisional committees also recommend that Departments take proactive steps to revisit their criteria and communicate clear expectations for how candidates will be evaluated in this context.

APPENDIX 2

CONSIDERATIONS FOR COMMUNITY-ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP AND ACTIVITIES ENHANCING THE WISCONSIN IDEA

Through long-standing tradition, articulated as the Wisconsin Idea, the University of Wisconsin-Madison has sought to extend scholarly traditions of research, instruction, and outreach through engagement with diverse communities. Through campus policies, the University of Wisconsin-Madison also supports efforts to promote equity, diversity and inclusion among its students, staff, and faculty. These efforts can broadly range from scholarship on issues of equity, diversity and inclusion to engagement with a wide range of communities including under-represented groups. Faculty make significant contributions to both that should be recognized and valued.

This document provides guidance on how community engaged scholarship (CES) and scholarly activities in support of diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) can be recognized and valued in tenure and promotion documentation. These are presented as separate components, though the same individuals may be involved with both. For some of our faculty, a reciprocal relation is present. CES can amplify efforts to promote DEI, particularly in working with communities comprising under-represented populations. DEI is a fundamental practice of CES and may be part of the motivation for pursuing this approach to scholarship. Colleagues reviewing dossiers and documents can use the following criteria for understanding the nature, scope, and quality of CES and scholarly activities to promote DEI. Note: this description of criteria for recognizing contributions does not imply that these are mandatory components of tenure and promotion documents. It is intended to provide means to explicitly recognize the contributions of faculty members who choose to put effort into these activities.

Community engaged scholarship entails a partnership of University knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship and generate mutual benefits. It can include community-based research; teaching and experiential learning oriented to community needs; outreach and engagement to uplift communities, strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; and any combination of these to enhance employment and sustainable community development, address critical societal issues, and contribute to the public good. The criteria for high-quality engaged scholarship can include the candidate's demonstration of:

- 1) Clear academic and community change goals.
- 2) Adequate preparation in relevant knowledge domains and disciplines.
- 3) Grounding in community needs and interests, recognizing strengths and assets of both community and institution.
- 4) Appropriate scholarly methods, community engagement techniques, and socially and ethically responsible conduct.
- 5) Documented community impact, evaluated from academic and community perspectives.
- 6) Significant results disseminated to scholarly domains.
- 7) Significant results discussed with communities and disseminated through appropriate media.
- 8) Reflective critique: lessons learned to improve scholarship and community engagement.

Scholarly activities to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion can take many forms. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. These contributions can be grounded in the creation of formal theoretical frameworks and methodologies. It is important to note that scholarly achievement and engagement with diversity, equity, and inclusion may manifest in other critical ways that advance the academic mission of the institution by fostering a teaching and learning environment that is more diverse, equitable, and inclusive. This engagement may reflect the active promotion of practices and policies that support under-represented or disadvantaged groups as affected

by race, culture, gender and sexuality, socioeconomic status, mental or physical disability, and any other form of exclusion. Below are some examples of the kinds of activities that might be documented in a tenure dossier:

- 1) Conducting scholarly work related to the solution of practical problems of individuals, groups, organizations, or communities.
- 2) Research in a scholar's area of expertise that addresses and contextualizes historical and current inequalities.
- 3) Evidence of efforts to advance equitable access to education.
- 4) Active mentoring and advising of minority students or new faculty members and academic staff.
- 5) Creating an inclusive and respectful classroom.
- 6) Public or campus service that addresses the needs of under-served communities – particularly service on committees at all levels of governance where people of color are under-represented.
- 7) Student recruitment and faculty/staff hiring practices oriented to opening opportunities for under-represented groups.
- 8) Leading initiatives and activities focused on increasing awareness and knowledge of equity, diversity and inclusion among the campus community.
- 9) Research in a scholar's area of expertise that addresses inequalities.
- 10) Serving on committees at all levels of governance where people of color are underrepresented.

APPENDIX 3

STREAMLINED TENURE PROCESS FOR SENIOR HIRES

Many senior hires have long since satisfied the qualifications for tenure at UW-Madison. Preparation of the same type of packet as an assistant professor at the end of the probationary period burdens departments and, sometimes, hinders the hiring process. The difficulty of obtaining student evaluations and other historical teaching data from departments from which we are seeking to draw faculty also leads to dossiers that cannot be completed in the same detail as for candidates with years of experience teaching here on campus. To overcome these challenges, the divisional committee offers a streamlined process for compiling dossiers in the case of senior hires to be appointed with tenure, with the following provisions.

1. A senior hire is defined as an individual who has fully passed the tenure process and been granted tenure in another academic institution more than 5 years ago. In this context, a senior hire should currently be a full professor (or advanced associate) in another academic institution.
2. If the senior hire is being recruited for an administrative position at UW–Madison, a tenure-worthy record is still required. In evaluating recent (post-tenure) accomplishments in research, teaching, and service, the divisional committee will take into account both the length of time that the senior hire has devoted to administration elsewhere and the administrative position that is being assumed at UW–Madison. For example, persons hired to be department chairs should have ongoing scholarly accomplishments whereas persons hired for full-time higher administrative positions might not have significant recent scholarly accomplishments (for instance, if the person was serving as a Dean or Provost elsewhere or if the person has held a position in government).
3. Departments must opt into the streamlined case procedure. They can do so by consulting with the divisional committee chair and/or coordinator before submitting a streamlined case. For various reasons, departments might want to submit a traditional case.
4. The divisional committee reserves the option to request more information from the department, including letters from external evaluators, on any streamlined case.

With those understandings in mind, the compilation of a dossier for a senior hire can follow the simplified format below rather than the “Instructions for Submitting Materials” described in the main Tenure Guidelines. Each streamlined dossier should include

- A. Letter of Approval from the Dean.
- B. Letter of Appointment.
- C. Departmental Tenure Guidelines.
- D. The candidate’s full, current curriculum vitae, in a format of their choice.
- E. A letter from the department chair which includes:
 1. a description of the hiring process and applicant pool.
 2. a record of the Executive Committee vote on the hire, with explanation of any split votes.
 3. a justification for a positive tenure decision based on department tenure guidelines as well as evaluation of the senior hire’s accomplishments in research, teaching, and service.
- F. All materials from the job search, which include:
 1. the position vacancy listing (PVL),

2. the senior hire's cover letter,
 3. all letters of recommendation (at least 3),
 4. the senior hire's research statement (maximum 2 pages),
 5. the senior hire's teaching statement (maximum 2 pages),
 6. any other material submitted as part of the application process.
 7. two additional letters from impartial Full Professors in the senior hire's field (see Appendix 5 for guidance).
- G. A monograph, or three shorter publications, or a project of equivalent significance that is representative of the senior hire's best recent scholarship.
- H. Evidence of teaching effectiveness for the most recent period of teaching (no more than 2 years), which should include at a minimum:
1. student evaluations with written comments,
 2. syllabi for course taught.
- I. If the senior hire has had or will have significant service, outreach, or extension responsibilities, a description of one program or initiative that the candidate has been involved in should be provided.

The committee recommends that the following materials be shared with the two impartial reviewers: D, F4, and G.

APPENDIX 4

CURRICULUM VITAE FORMAT

Candidates preparing their CVs for their dossiers should organize the information in the following way:

Name.

Formal college and university education.

Title of dissertation and name(s) of supervisor(s).

Positions held, listed chronologically (account for any gaps).

Honors, grants, and awards since Ph.D. or other terminal degree.

Positions held that require scholarly competence (editorial boards or other positions which involve refereeing articles for publication, research boards of scholarly organizations, positions requiring consultation for foundation or government grants, membership in professional organizations, and the like).

Bibliography in accepted bibliographic form, indicating number or range of pages and publication status, as listed below:

- a. Books and monographs.
- b. Editions and collections.
- c. Articles and contributions to edited volumes and handbooks (both print and digital).
Peer-reviewed publications should be marked “[P]”.
- d. Textbooks.
- e. UW-Extension and other continuing education publications: teaching materials, media productions, study guides, and similar items proper to the continuing education mission.
- f. Book reviews and other critical reviews.
- g. Computer software.
- h. Lectures and scholarly papers presented; conference organization; participation in panels and service on juries; consultancies, advice provided, and similar matters.
- i. Work submitted for publication but not yet accepted (give particulars).
- j. Work in progress (give a statement concerning its nature, status, and estimated date of completion).

In the case of candidates in the arts, include as well:

- a. Exhibitions, commissions, works performed, plays directed, performances given, and so on. Group the listings according to standard professional criteria (international/national/statewide/regional/local significance; solo/group; juried/invitational, etc.).
- b. Grants, awards, residencies, catalogs, collections, archives, and other relevant professional credentials.

Complete semester-by-semester list of courses taught at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and other contributions to the university’s instructional mission. The latter should include guest lectures, production of educational materials, seminars led, and workshops and conferences organized around topics of curriculum and pedagogy.

List honors and master’s degree theses and Ph.D. dissertations directed, and thesis and dissertation committees sat on.

Service (see N for definitions and discussion):

- a. Institutional service.
- b. Professional service.
- c. Public service.

APPENDIX 5

GUIDANCE FOR SELECTING IMPARTIAL EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

The tenure process has often been described as one where external letter writers are meant to be at “arm’s length” to the candidate. That term is meant to convey the ideal of a letter writer who is close enough to the candidate’s area of research specialization that they can make an informed and expert evaluation of it, but not so close so as to be a collaborator in the research or otherwise invested, personally or professionally, in the work being evaluated.

What the divisional committee seeks are external reviewers who are sufficiently knowledgeable to evaluate the candidate’s research and can do so in an impartial way without being vested interested in that candidate’s success. Avoid soliciting letters from people unlikely to be knowledgeable about the candidate’s area of expertise. But also avoid external letter writers who might be perceived to have an immediate and obvious interest or potentially benefit from the success of the case.

Personal benefit can take many forms. Letter writers may not be perceived as impartial if they have personal or significant professional relationships with the candidate or if they or their institution stands to gain from continued association with the candidate once tenured and promoted. Candidates’ former advisors and professors, close postdoctoral supervisors, frequent collaborators, recipients of joint funding, and friends should especially be avoided.

Departments are therefore strongly encouraged to explicitly ask potential letter writers about their prior association with a candidate when making the invitation and to move on to other potential evaluators if any concerns about vested interest arise.

This does not mean that the best letter writer is one who has never met the candidate; often, part of the strength of a candidate’s case comes from their established reputation and meaningful participation in the chosen field of study. Merely having met a candidate, or having reviewed their work as an outside reader, does not necessarily detract from a letter writer’s suitability; however, the department has a responsibility to explain what the relationship is, why it is essential for that letter writer to weigh in on the work, and how that relationship falls short of compromising the letter writer’s ability to be impartial. The chair’s letter should do this work of contextualizing the selection process and explaining the rationale with which the department weighed these considerations. In some cases, a department may worry that the divisional committee will not share its assessment of a letter writer’s impartiality, and can use the chair’s letter to justify the choice. In other cases, a department may feel that it was not possible to secure sufficiently knowledgeable external evaluators without involving people who had been closely associated with the candidate in some way. In such a scenario, the burden is on the chair’s letter to explain why this is unavoidable and preferable to the alternatives. The limited size of a given field will not be considered sufficient explanation on its own without additional context.

When the divisional committee returns a case to the department, it’s usually because the Committee deems one or more of the external reviewers to be insufficiently impartial.

While the divisional committee does prefer letters from scholars at the rank of full professor, it prioritizes impartiality over rank. If an associate professor can be invited to write a letter instead of a full professor whose impartiality might be more questionable, it is strongly advised to approach the associate professor instead. It is typically easier for a chair’s letter to explain why an impartial associate professor is the best fit to evaluate a candidate than a full professor who may have had a prior association or collaboration with the candidate. It is advised the departments do not request letters from more associate professors than full professors.

If departments have concerns or further questions about the impartiality of a particular reviewer, they can reach out to the chair and/or the coordinator of the divisional committee to discuss those cases.

APPENDIX 6

TEMPLATE FOR INVITING EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Dear _____:

The Department of _____ is considering the [promotion or appointment] of [title & name] to the position of [Associate or Full] Professor with tenure. We are soliciting letters of appraisal of [name's] research [and/or extension/outreach] activities to aid us in our deliberations. Appraisals are being solicited from leading authorities in the candidate's area of concentration and in related areas. We would appreciate your appraisal of this candidate.

For your information we are enclosing a resume for [candidate] which includes a listing of their publications, conference addresses, [extension/outreach publications,] and research funding along with representative publications.

If you are personally acquainted with the candidate, please note in your assessment the length of time you have known the candidate and the nature of the association. **If your association with the candidate has been substantial and/or sustained, please make us aware of this upon receiving this request so that we can appropriately evaluate any arm's-length issues before proceeding with your letter.**

It would be most useful to us if your appraisal could cover the various aspects of the candidate's research [and/or extension/outreach] efforts. It is particularly important that it give specific evaluations of the quality and impact of the candidate's most important contributions, and their standing in the field during the period of review from [20XX to 20XX].

We seek-a critical review of the candidate; as such, your addressing, as you are able, the following specific points will be particularly helpful:

- the degree of originality, imagination, and creativity demonstrated in the candidate's research,
- the candidate's most important results for the specialty area, but also for the broader field of [_____].
- the candidate's productivity, in both research output and in the securing of extramural funding, as measured by the norms of the field.
- the candidate's standing overall as a scholar both in the specialty area and in the broader field
- [For extension/outreach candidates: the candidate's development and implementation of a high quality extension/outreach program.]
- whether the candidate would merit [promotion or appointment] to a tenured position within your own department [if in academia] and in other, leading departments in the candidate's area.

Please include any additional information that you feel is particularly relevant with respect to [promotion or appointment] to a tenured position.

Please also bear in mind the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in your evaluation. The pandemic has affected the productivity and pace at which probationary faculty progress towards promotion. UW-Madison is sensitive to the extenuating circumstances and disruptions created by the pandemic including limited access to campus research spaces and resources, transitioning to remote learning, restricted travel, among other major changes. We also are sensitive to unconscious biases that reviewers may experience when evaluating a promotion dossier. Because pandemic mitigation efforts may lead to variation in probationary periods, we encourage you to evaluate the candidate based on the [20XX-20XX] review period we noted above, with no prejudice or predetermination of a norm or set number of years a candidate should need to merit promotion. Though tenure clocks may be

extended, tenure standards have not been relaxed. Reviewers should continue to consider the quality of the candidate's work, the impact they have had on their academic field, and their professional trajectory, putting these accomplishments in context with the added challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic.

[required paragraph] Your letter will be read only by tenured faculty in the Department of [name of department], members of university committees to whom the issue of tenure is presented and university administrators who are involved in the process. The university will not release your identity or the contents of your letter to others without your prior approval or unless obligated to do so by law or court order.

In order to meet university deadlines, it is crucial that I receive your comments by [date]. I know how much time it requires to prepare thoughtful and informative letters of evaluation. On behalf of the faculty, I thank you sincerely for your important contribution to this review process.