

Guidelines for Annual Review of Assistant Professors School of Journalism and Mass Communication

Summary of Review Process during Probationary Period

Assistant Professors receive guidance and evaluation during the probationary period from their annual Review Committee, mentor and the Executive Committee. The goal of the feedback is to provide constructive advice to maximize the chance for attaining tenure. Extension of the annual contract beginning in the second probationary year requires that the assistant professor be making steady progress toward tenure in research, teaching and service in a manner appropriate to his or her stage in the probationary process.

The Department Chair will assign a two-person committee to review assistant professors in January, at the start of the spring semester. By mid-February assistant professors submit their annual activity reports to their Review Committee and to the Department Chair. By the end of March, the Review Committees will submit written evaluations to the Department Chair, who will distribute these reports to the Executive Committee. (The Review Committee should share a draft of their evaluation with the assistant professor prior to submitting a final version to the Department Chair).

Reviews in year 3, 5 and 6 are typically more comprehensive and thorough than in other years. Years 3 and 5 are important for assessing the trajectory of the case towards tenure. Year 6 is important because the review serves as an important component of the final tenure packet.

Overview of the Annual Review Process

Assistant professors are reviewed each spring semester. A recommendation must be made on whether to renew an assistant professor's contract for another year, promote the assistant professor or terminate the contract.

Preparation of Annual "Activity Report": In consultation with the Review Committee and mentor, and using the SJMC template as a guide, each assistant professor prepares a report summarizing research, teaching and service for the previous calendar year.

Review Committee Report: The Review Committee examines the activity report and submits a written evaluation on the assistant professor's work to the Department Chair. At the end of this written evaluation, the Review Committee will make a recommendation to the Executive Committee on contract extension or promotion.

Assistant Professor's Input: Assistant professors should meet with the Review Committee during the review process and also be given a chance to review the written evaluation and the option of providing a response that may be added to the draft submitted to the Executive Committee. A final draft will go to the Director.

Executive Committee Vote on Renewal or Non-Retention: The Executive Committee votes on whether or not to recommend to the Dean of the College a one-year extension of the contract in years 2 through 5 of the probationary period.

Executive Committee Vote on Promotion or Non-Retention: No later than the assistant professor's 6th probationary year, the Executive Committee must vote on whether to recommend promotion to associate professor with tenure or to recommend non-retention.

An Executive Committee recommendation to promote requires a 2/3 majority of the Executive Committee members present at the meeting and voting yes or no. Abstentions do not count in the determination of the 2/3 majority. Committee members must be present to vote. The Executive Committee has the option of recommending early promotion for faculty members who have met the criteria for promotion before the 6th probationary year.

Communication of Vote and Advice to Assistant Professors: The Department Chair communicates the vote tally and further advice or evaluation of the Executive Committee in writing to the assistant professor within five working days of the meeting.

Post-Review Meetings: After the Executive Committee votes the Review Committee meets with the assistant professor for a discussion of the final evaluation report. Assistant professor have the option of responding to the review and/or meeting with the Department Chair to discuss any aspect of the review and progress toward tenure.

Recommendation of Renewal or Non-Retention to the Dean: The Department Chair communicates the recommendation of the Executive Committee on renewal or non-retention to the Dean of the College.

Recommendation of Promotion: With a vote of 2/3 in favor of promotion, the Department Chair, in close consultation with the Review Committee, prepares the case for promotion according to the guidelines of the appropriate Divisional Committee and forwards the full dossier to the Dean of the College. The Dean reviews the packet and forwards it to the appropriate Divisional Committee. The Divisional Committee reviews the case, votes and makes its recommendation on promotion or non-retention to the Dean, Provost, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor. The Chancellor's recommendation goes to the Board of Regents for final approval.

Faculty Policies and Procedures (FP&P): Campus policies on probationary period, annual review and granting of tenure can be found in FP&P 7.04-7.15.

Academic-Year Calendar for Annual Review

The schedule will generally follow the calendar below. For Assistant professors whose appointments begin in January or whose tenure clocks have been extended, an alternate schedule may be adopted.

	Assistant Professors Going Up for Tenure	Continuing Assistant Professors
May	Department Chair assigns a Review Committee. The Review Committee, Department Chair and the assistant professor going up for tenure develop a list of potential outside letter writers. The number of reviewers will be determined by Review Committee and Department Chair.	
June-August	The Department Chair solicits reviews from scholars in the assistant professor's field of study.	
September	By the end of the month, Department Chair sends review materials to letter writers (representative research, research statement and CV).	
October	With guidance from Review Committee, assistant professors going up for tenure should begin assembling tenure dossier, if they have not already begun to do so. This process will take much care and attention to detail. The Secretary of the Faculty maintains a checklist of items that must be included in the dossier as well as file of exemplary dossiers for consultation.	The Department Chair will assign a two-person Review Committee to review all assistant professors.
November	The Review Committee, the Department Chair and the assistant professor going up for tenure will remain in close contact about the status of the tenure dossier as different parts of it are being assembled. The assistant professor may be getting feedback on various aspects of the dossier and revising and updating materials to be included in the final tenure packet.	Assistant professors will be in touch with their Review Committee about the review process.
December	Outside review letters are expected to arrive at this point (at the latest). The Department Chair will begin to finalize the tenure packet.	
January	Department Chair will distribute the cover letter for the tenure dossier along with the outside letters to the Executive Committee.	
February	Executive Committee reviews the tenure packet materials and votes on the case. Department Chair submits tenure dossier to Dean of College; dossier forwarded to Divisional Committee in time for case to be heard at March meeting.	Assistant professors submit their annual activity reports to their Review Committee and to the Department Chair.
March		Assistant professor progress to tenure evaluations from Review Committees due to Department Chair.
April		Executive Committee hears Review Committee evaluations of assistant professor and votes on whether to renew assistant professor contracts.
May	Executive Committee considers plans for tenure cases, if any, for the following year.	

Status in the Probationary Period

The “probationary period” for assistant professors is typically 7 years on tenure track, with recommendation on promotion made during the 6th probationary year. The phrase “year in probationary period” refers to the year on the tenure clock, not year at UW-Madison. The letter of offer specifies what year in the probationary period the assistant professor will begin. Changes in the tenure clock are allowed by university policy, especially for reasons related to family and illness. For example, a request for an adjustment of up to one year based on the birth or adoption of a child may be sent by the faculty member to the provost (with copies to the Department and the Dean) within one year of the birth or adoption. (Approval of such requests is presumed.) Requests for tenure-clock extensions based on other issues (e.g., disability, chronic illness, or significant responsibilities with respect to elder care or dependent care) should be sent by the faculty member to the Department Chair and should be made before the beginning of the 6th probationary year. (Approval of requests based on factors other than childbirth or adoption must be approved by the departmental Executive Committee, the dean, and the University Committee before action is taken by the provost.)

Criteria for Promotion

The Executive Committee recommends tenure and promotion based on evaluation of the assistant professor’s record of research, teaching and service. The Executive Committee requires proof of excellence in past performance as well as high expectation that a faculty member’s productivity and intellectual contributions will continue well into the future. There is no entitlement to tenure based upon a record that is only competent and satisfactory.

A strong record in research includes an original and coherent body of work, focused on a well-defined area or topic, that moves significantly beyond the candidate’s Ph.D. dissertation. Such work should have been peer-reviewed and should reflect the highest standards of intellectual and methodological rigor. The Executive Committee also considers the candidate’s standing in the profession, nationally and internationally.

For an “integrated case,” the Executive Committee would like to see a creative-intellectual publication record that is integrated with the candidate’s teaching and service. A creative-intellectual publication record includes traditional social science and humanities-oriented research published in peer-reviewed journals as well as professionally oriented material appearing in a wider variety of venues and formats. Excellence in the level and quality of integration among research, teaching and service is the operative standard. For integrated-case candidates the expectation is that (a) the candidate’s publication record be programmatic and of high quality, with research appearing in peer-reviewed venues and professionally oriented writing appearing in high-visibility professional venues in a variety of formats and (b) the candidate produce creative-intellectual material that has clear application value for groups such as communication practitioners, journalism and mass communication educators, policy makers and activists.

For all candidates, a strong record in teaching should be demonstrated through evidence such as peer and student evaluations, course and curriculum development, syllabi

and other pedagogical materials. In the area of service, the record should show engagement with the department, campus and national associations at a level deemed appropriate by the Department Chair, Review Committee, mentor and other colleagues.

Review Committee

Each spring semester, the Department Chair will appoint a two-person Review Committee for each assistant professor on tenure track. Typically, one member of the Review Committee will carry over from one year to the next. The Review Committee for assistant professors going up for tenure will be assigned in fall semester. Good communication between assistant professors and their Review Committee is essential for steady progress towards tenure.

Function: As a subcommittee of the Executive Committee, the Review Committee has two functions: (a) provide advice and mentoring to the assistant professor on research, teaching and service and (b) evaluate the assistant professor's progress toward tenure and recommend extension, non-retention or promotion to the Executive Committee. In the case of assistant professors going up for tenure, the Review Committee works closely to assist in the preparation of materials to be included in the tenure dossier.

Membership of Review Committee: Two members of the Executive Committee serve as the assistant professor's Review Committee. One member typically rotates off after one year. If a member of the Review Committee cannot serve for whatever reason, the Department Chair appoints another member of the Executive Committee as a replacement.

Mentor

In consultation with the assistant professor, the Department Chair appoints a mentor during the assistant professor's first year. The mentor is not assigned to the assistant professor's Review Committee. Mentors may be replaced for a variety of reasons after consultation with the appropriate colleagues.

The role of the mentor is to offer support, guidance and advice on getting through the probationary period, including the expectations and procedures of the Department, College Dean and the Divisional Committee. It is important that the assistant professor and the mentor work together to define roles and set goals for their interactions. The mentor could advise the assistant professor on, for example, the preparation of materials for the annual review; reading drafts of grants, papers, or books prospectuses; teaching and other professional activities; finding research or funding opportunities; making connections with colleagues in the field; and so on. The mentor also may assist, as needed or as requested, in communication between the assistant professor and the Department Chair, the Review Committee and the Executive Committee. The mentor should be available for advice on the informal as well as the formal aspects of Department culture, policies and procedures. Please consult the "Questions for Mentors" document in Appendix A for more details.

Template for Annual Report of Activities

Please consult the “Faculty Report of Activities Template” document in Appendix B.

Peer Observations of Classroom Teaching

Divisional Committees require peer observation of the teaching during the assistant professor’s probationary period. Members of the Review Committee will arrange with the assistant professor the times and dates of observation. The observer and assistant professor may choose to meet before and/or after the observation to discuss teaching goals, techniques and tools. A written evaluation written by the observer should be part of the Review Committee’s evaluation. The peer observation of teaching is likely to be included in the tenure dossier.

Preparation for Promotion Review

Letter Requirements: Though the Social Studies and Arts and Humanities Divisional Committees provide slightly different wording, both require at least five letters from respected senior scholars in a position to evaluate the candidate’s research. The letter writers must at “an arms length” from the candidate, meaning that these individuals “(a) are not and have not been UW-Madison faculty, (b) did not mentor the candidate, (c) have not collaborated with the candidate (d) have no personal interest in the candidate’s success or attainment of tenure” (quoted from Division of Social Studies Statement of Criteria and Effective Recommendations Regarding Tenure, June 8, 2015).

Selection of Letter Writers: The candidate’s Review Committee and the Department Chair, with input from the candidate, will compile a list of letter writers. This list should be finalized early in the fall semester, preferably by the end of September. The identities of the letter writers are not made available to the candidate.

Candidate’s Research Statement: While the letter writers are being solicited and the list is being finalized, the candidate should be working on his or her Statement of Research, which will be included with the materials sent to the outside letter writers. This statement is a succinct statement (2 single-space pages) of the candidate’s research including main problems addressed, contributions to the field and plans for future work.

Material Sent to Reviewer: Letter writers should receive the candidate’s CV, research statement, and representative samples of his or her work. Letter writers should receive the candidate’s materials by the end of October (at the very latest) with an expectation that their evaluations be returned to the Department Chair by December 31 (at the very latest).

Access to Outside Letters: Letters received from the reviewers are confidential and will be available only to the Department Chair and members of the executive committee while the tenure dossier is being prepared. The candidate does not have access to the letters.

Other Materials for the Tenure Dossier: The candidate, in consultation with the Review Committee and Department Chair, should review the list of materials required for the tenure dossier. The Divisional Committees provide a helpful checklist. The candidate will have to collect or prepare several kinds of documents including a current CV, copies of publications and citation rates, teaching statement, teaching evaluations, description of

service activity, etc. (Checklists from Social Studies and Arts and Humanities Divisional Committees are in Appendix C.)

Faculty Policy and Procedures

The School of Journalism and Mass Communication Annual Review process is consistent with the requirements of Faculty Policy and Procedures (FP&P). Chapter 7 of FP&P covers faculty appointments, renewals, promotions and non-retentions. Chapter 8.15 covers faculty grievance procedures.

APPENDIX A

Questions for Mentors

The role of the mentor is to offer support, guidance and advice on getting through the probationary period, including the expectations and procedures of the Department, College Dean and the Divisional Committee. It is important that the assistant professor and the mentor work together to define roles and set goals for their interactions. The mentor could advise the assistant professor on, for example, the preparation of materials for the annual review; reading drafts of grants, papers, or books prospectuses; teaching and other professional activities; helping create opportunities and connections; and so on. The mentor also may also assist, as needed or as requested, in communication between the assistant professor and the Department Chair, the Review Committee and the Executive Committee. The mentor should be available for advice on the informal as well as the formal aspects of Department culture, policies and procedures.

The assistant professor and his or her mentor might use the following list of questions to remind them of issues they need to discuss.

Department Culture	Who are the key people in the department?
	What are appropriate ways to raise different kinds of concerns or issues and with whom?
	Who can help me set up an email account, find out about photocopying, textbook ordering, filing grades and grade changes, reimbursements, and so on?
	How do people find out about and get nominated for awards and prizes?
	What professional organizations are important to join?
Research	How does the Institutional Review Board work?
	How can students get credit for participating in my research projects?
	How do I find grant opportunities?
	Are there successful grant proposals that I can read?
	Are there research projects or research groups in the department that I should get involved with?
	How do I get involved with a departmental research group?
	What are the divisional committees and how do they work?
	What conferences should I attend?
	What are the best journals to publish in?
	How much should I be publishing?
	How can I increase my visibility in the field?
Teaching	What classes do I need to teach?

	How do I get a good teaching schedule?
	How does the timetable committee work?
	How do I handle student problems?
	How much graduate student advising is appropriate?
	How are teaching evaluations handled and weighed?
Service	What are important committees to serve on?
	Are there committees to avoid as a junior faculty member?
	How is service documented and weighed?
Promotion and Tenure	What are the department's criteria for promotion and tenure?
	Who (or what) can clarify these criteria?
	How does one build a tenure file?
	Who sits on the tenure review committee and how are they selected?
	How should I prepare for my annual review?
	Are my research, teaching and service at an appropriate level for year in rank?
	Is my job description matching the work I'm doing?

APPENDIX B

FACULTY REPORT OF ACTIVITIES --- TEMPLATE ---

University of Wisconsin-Madison School of Journalism and Mass Communication

REPORT OF FACULTY ACTIVITIES January 1 though December 31, YEAR

NAME, Rank, Start Date

Please provide a 250-500 word summary of your major accomplishments, particularly what you are most proud of during the year. This should highlight “output” as well as other effort you think should count. Do describe why the year is atypical if it is – in any of the particular categories of research, teaching, or service.

TEACHING

Classes Taught

- Should include: Number, Title, Type (e.g. Undergraduate Skills or Graduate Seminar), Semester Taught, number of students, whether it was a new prep or needed significant training or revamping;
- Include average teaching evaluation score for effective teacher and one other metric of your choosing

Student Supervision

- Independent studies, internships, research projects
- Major Advisees
- Thesis and PhD Committees
- Other kinds of supervision/mentoring

Activities Toward Pedagogical Professional Development

Please limit this to teaching-related activities (professional training, guest lectures, faculty mentoring, etc.)

RESEARCH

Book/Monographs/Journal Articles (published during year)

- Cite
- Sentence explaining the article and what went into it (explain as if person not of your paradigm)
- Percentage work if co-authored
- Whether there is a contract, journal is refereed, etc.

Essays, Book Chapters, Other Publications

Conference Papers & Presentations

Research In Progress

- Cite
- Sentence with specific details explaining what you are doing and what progress you have made this year, including data collection trips, grant applications, mentoring of student workers, drafts of manuscripts, and other helpful information. *

Awards & Research Support

- Organization and amount (if applicable); could also include a note about the significance of the award, whether there are co-PIs, how much work it was to apply, etc.
- This should also include grant applications in progress (indicating if it was a letter of inquiry or full proposal and its status)

SERVICE*

SJMC Committee/Advising service

University -wide service

Service in other Departments

Service outside the university, including reviewing, peer evaluations, editorial boards, association positions, etc.

PUBLIC/PROFESSIONAL WORK*

Invited Panels

Media Mentions

Consultant Work

Center Work not already mentioned above

Other Professional Service

* All of these should state time commitment, particularly in instances of significant duties or singular tasks from that year that consumed copious amounts of time (such as being in charge of restructuring a curriculum, drafting a proposal, negotiating with another department, or other significant duties beyond meeting attendance).

Checklist of Materials for Tenure Recommendation in the Social Studies

Candidate name:

Department:

Please see [Tenure Guidelines](#) for full requirements.

Part One: The dossier.

Submit the dossier as a bookmarked PDF, with a bookmark for each Roman numeral and capitalized letter on the checklist. The divisional committee does not require departments to include a table of contents and insert page numbers.

If an activity relates to some combination of teaching, service, research or outreach, document it in the section that seems most logical, but provide clear explanation of the other dimensions of the activity. You may modify the order of documentation to enhance the logical flow of information.

- I. Letter of approval from the dean
- II. Letter(s) of appointment
- III. Letter from department chair, including:
 - A. Nature of appointment
 - B. Explanation of the vote of executive committee
 - C. Years of probationary service
 - D. Department evaluation of candidate's teaching, research and service
 - E. Summary of the standards of research excellence
- IV. Additional letters (for interdisciplinary appointments only)
- V. Curriculum vitae (see guidelines for full requirements)
- VI. Letters of evaluation (at least 5 letters, none from UW-Madison) and a summary document about the process of obtaining letters. Also include a copy of the letter to the referees soliciting evaluation. Create a separate bookmark for each letter, the summary document, and the sample letter to external reviewers.
- VII. Teaching
 - A. Chronology of teaching experience and department summary of contextual factors
 - B. Candidate's teaching statement (2 pages maximum)
 - C. Teaching materials
 - D. Organized summary of student evaluations, and comparative evaluation of teaching. State how evaluations were administered. Provide a sample copy of each evaluation instrument that shows the questions asked.
 - E. Peer reviews of teaching
 - F. Record of student advising, consultations, and research supervision
 - G. Honors or other recognition for teaching
 - H. Other evidence of the extent, scope and quality of teaching activities
 - I. If applicable, evidence of teaching for candidates with little formal teaching experience
- VIII. Service
- IX. Research
 - A. Candidate's statement of future research plans (2 pages maximum)
 - B. Contributions to coauthored publications
 - C. Evaluation of peer-reviewed journals, and acceptance rates if applicable
 - D. Evidence of acceptance for publications "in press"
 - E. Two representative publications
- X. Outreach (if candidate has an outreach appointment)

Over, please

Part Two: Supporting materials.

Supporting materials may be submitted electronically or in hard copy (or a combination of the two). If submitting electronically, create one bookmarked PDF, with a bookmark for each section (e.g., Dissertation, Publications, Course Evaluations, Syllabi, Additional Materials).

For senior hires, include materials from the most recent six-year period.

- A. Ph.D. dissertation or equivalent, unless terminal degree was earned more than 10 years ago
- B. All publications and manuscripts of works accepted for publication. Optionally include unpublished manuscripts, grant proposals or other evidence of work in progress. If submitting in hard copy, provide two copies. If submitting electronically, each publication should have its own bookmark.
- C. Originals of all student course evaluations of teaching, scanned or in hard copy. If submitting electronically, each set of evaluations should have its own bookmark.
- D. Syllabi for all courses taught. Include only the most recent syllabus for each course unless documenting significant changes in a syllabus over time. If submitting in hard copy, provide two copies. If submitting electronically, each syllabus should have its own bookmark.
- E. Any other lengthy supporting materials relevant to documenting research, teaching, service or outreach, depending on their nature

Preparing and Submitting Materials:

Submit the **dossier** and **publications** as two bookmarked PDF documents in Box by noon on the [deadline day](#). Please contact the divisional committees coordinator (divisional@secfac.wisc.edu or 608-263-5741) in advance of the deadline to request creation of a Box folder, providing the candidate's name and the name and e-mail address of the person who will upload tenure materials. Thank you.

Contact: Divisional Committees
133 Bascom Hall
Email: divisional@secfac.wisc.edu
Telephone: 608-263-5741

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FACULTY DIVISION OF THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POSITIONS INVOLVING TENURE
Effective February 2015

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, and for appointments to tenure from outside the university, from September through April. 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 that intend to recommend promotion in the spring semester must, therefore, have dossiers and the other materials delivered to the Divisional Office (133 Bascom Hall) by the deadline for the April meeting or, in the case of candidates with time remaining on the tenure clock beyond spring semester, by the deadline of the March meeting. Departments are urged to send tenure recommendations to the Arts and Humanities Divisional Committee as early in the academic year as possible.

CRITERIA AND FORMAT

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. Part V of 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 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.

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. (These categories are defined and discussed below.)

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 his or her 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.

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

MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES

The divisional committee requires a bookmarked, text-readable PDF of the tenure dossier, plus supporting materials in electronic or hard copy. See [Checklist of Materials for Tenure Recommendation](#). For special cases (sculpture, e.g.), please make arrangements with the divisional committee coordinator.

Submit materials at least three weeks before the divisional committee meeting. [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 four 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.

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

Cases brought early should meet all the criteria that a case brought in the sixth probationary year must meet. 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. These cases will not be considered at the April or May meetings.

1. Publications

The committee requires each of the candidate's publications, monographs, articles accepted for publication, and book manuscripts, either electronically or in hard copy. If presented in hard copy, submit two copies of everything except book manuscripts (only one copy of each book manuscript is required). Documentary evidence of acceptance for publication, and referees' reports on book manuscripts, if available, should accompany accepted materials not yet published.

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 with other 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.

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.

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. Submit either electronically or in hard copy.

3. Student Course Evaluations

The originals of all student course evaluations are to be provided to the divisional committee, either electronically or in hard copy.

Any hard copies of materials itemized above will be returned to the department.

4. The Dossier

The dossier will contain the following:

- A. DEAN'S APPROVAL
- B. LETTER FROM THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

This 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. Provide explanations, as far as possible, for 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.
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 (C), below) regarding how original expectations have been fulfilled. Where there has been some change in professional expectations, date, document, and discuss the circumstances.

The divisional committee recognizes 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 her or his 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. **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 G);
 - (2) teaching (see Part J);
 - (3) institutional, professional, community, and cultural and artistic service (see Part NI).

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 [https://www.secfac.wisc.edu/documents/Resource_Extension_Wisconsin-Idea.pdf].

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 pastiche of materials included elsewhere in the dossier (such as the letters from experts and student course evaluations).

Copies of the annual reports submitted by the candidate's oversight committee to the departmental executive committee (FPP 7.05.D.), and copies of any written responses by the candidate to the annual reports may be included, at the end of 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 his or her 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.

C. LETTER OF APPOINTMENT

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

D. DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR TENURE
(as specified in *Faculty Policies and Procedures* 7.14.D)

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. The format for the CV is as follows:
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.

F. CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT

Each candidate is to prepare a succinct statement on his or her future research and teaching plans for approximately the next five years. This should not be more than three to four pages.

G. CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNOWLEDGE AND CULTURE

1. Departmental evaluation and discussion of the candidate's contributions. The 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 his or her 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.

The specific items in the dossier under this section are:

- a. **A definition or characterization** of 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; or in model building; or in literary, musical, or artistic criticism; 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.

- b. **An evaluation of the candidate's 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.

- c. **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 presented as evidence of professional attainment and competence.

2. 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.

3. **Letters of evaluation.** 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. Five letters should remain the norm. More than eight letters is considered excessive.

A copy of the letter sent to these experts;

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, including entire book, manuscript, if appropriate to the candidate's discipline, and the candidate's statement of future research plans.

Biographical information about the referees – either a 1-2 paragraph bio-bibliographical sketch of each referee's standing in the field and major publications, or a brief résumé not exceeding 2-3 pages per referee.

Provide five to eight letters of evaluation of the candidate's research, teaching and (when relevant) outreach/extension abilities and accomplishments from recognized experts in the candidate's field. The department will explicitly inform the committee of the procedures used in selecting the outside reviewers and obtaining letters, and whether they were received before or after the departmental vote to recommend promotion. The letters must come from persons outside of UW-Madison who have not been closely associated with the candidate. Letters from individuals such as the candidate's major professor, close postdoctoral supervisors, frequent collaborators, recipients of joint funding, or others who may have a substantial interest in the work evaluated should be avoided. Avoid soliciting letters from people unlikely to be knowledgeable about the candidate's area of expertise. The divisional committee prefers letters from people at the rank of full professor. If the submitting department is concerned that an evaluator may not be considered an independent evaluator by the committee, the reason(s) for such independence should be contained in the summary document.

Ideally, three recommenders should be selected from a list of scrupulously independent people prepared by the department, and two should be selected from a list prepared by the candidate.

All replies received must be submitted to the divisional committee. 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.

Templates for solicitation letters to be sent to outside reviewers are attached to this document. These templates are intended as guidelines; they should be adapted as needed.

- H. **Statement on 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.
- I. **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.

TEACHING

The candidate should have a strong record of effective teaching. The following should be evident in the record: the dossier should provide an assessment of 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 problems or weaknesses exist, they should be addressed. 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. 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.

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.

This portion of the dossier should include the following:

- J. Narrative of Teaching with complete chronology of courses taught: the committee requires a narrative discussion and complete chronology 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.

Honors or awards for teaching, as well as funding for curriculum development, are also evidence of excellence in teaching.

- K. Comparative teaching data: provide 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.

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.

- L. Teaching 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. These may include textbooks, workbooks, applications of instructional technology and innovative uses of information technology. Copies of such materials should be included as supplemental materials.
- M. Teaching evaluations: 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 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. Also required are a tabulated summary of the scores of all student evaluations and an analysis of the scores and comments on the evaluations. In the case of faculty teaching for more than one unit, summaries and comparisons should be made in each unit. For each of the candidate's courses please provide: enrollment totals at the end of semester, the number of course evaluations received, and the grade distribution for the course.

The originals of all course evaluations should be provided to the committee, separately from the dossier. These will be returned to the department.

Teaching evaluations from other institutions should be solicited and presented in full, with the understanding that there is no presumption that such evaluations are comparable to our own.

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

All reports on class visits by tenured colleagues, whether within or outside the department, should be submitted in full. There should be one or two visits for each teaching year of the candidate's probationary period, and preferably at least one visit for each semester. The reports should cover different courses and different levels of instruction. 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.

SERVICE

- N. 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 his/her 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; 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 things 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.

NEW: TEMPLATE LETTER TO REVIEWERS (Standard)

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 teaching [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 [his/her] publications, conference addresses, [extension/outreach publications,] and research funding along with representative publications.

It would be most useful to us if your appraisal could cover the various aspects of the candidate's research and teaching [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 [his/her] standing in the field. Further, should the department decide to recommend the promotion [appointment] of [title/name], all materials pertinent to that decision - of which your letter is an integral part - will be forwarded to the Executive Committee of the Division of Arts & Humanities for a further review of the candidacy. The Executive Committee is an elected committee of senior faculty throughout the arts and humanities at UW-Madison; the committee is obligated to pass judgment on the candidacy, though its decision is advisory to the dean. Along with our department, the committee seeks 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, and the impact of the candidate's research activities on the field. It is particularly useful to identify the candidate's most important results, and to comment on their significance not only 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 role and contributions in any collaborative research and in obtaining joint research funding should be assessed, if applicable.

The candidate's standing overall as a scholar both in the specialty area and in the broader field. In particular, please cite how the candidate's work compares with that of specific, nationally and internationally recognized scholars [and extension/outreach specialists] at a similar stage in their careers.

The candidate's effectiveness in communication, special accomplishments in the mentoring of graduate students, and/or evidence of pedagogical skills that indicate that the candidate would be effective in the mentoring of graduate students and formal classroom teaching.

[For extension/outreach candidates: Evidence that the candidate has developed and implemented a high quality extension/outreach program that has had a significant impact.]

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.

If you are personally acquainted with the candidate, we would appreciate knowing the length of time you have known the candidate and the nature of the association.

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.

NEW: TEMPLATE LETTER TO REVIEWERS (Senior Hires)

Dear _____ :

The Department of ... is considering the 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 teaching [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 [his/her] publications, conference addresses, [extension/outreach publications,] and research funding along with representative publications.

It would be most useful to us if your appraisal could cover the various aspects of the candidate's research and teaching [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 [his/her] standing in the field. Further, should the department decide to recommend the appointment of [title/name], all materials pertinent to that decision - of which your letter is an integral part - will be forwarded to the Executive Committee of the Division of Arts & Humanities for a further review of the candidacy. The Executive Committee is an elected committee of senior faculty throughout the arts and humanities at UW-Madison; the committee is obligated to pass judgment on the candidacy, though its decision is advisory to the dean. Along with our department, the committee seeks a critical review of the candidate; as such, your addressing, as you are able, the following specific points will be particularly helpful:

The candidate's standing overall as a scholar both in the specialty area and in the broader field. Please include in your assessment information such as the impact of the candidate's research activities on the field, the candidate's productivity, and the candidate's contributions in any collaborative research. In particular, please cite how the candidate's work compares with that of specific, nationally and internationally recognized scholars (and outreach/extension specialists) at a similar stage in their careers.

[For extension/outreach candidates: Evidence that the candidate has developed and implemented a high quality extension/outreach program that has had a significant impact.]

Whether the candidate would merit 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 [appointment] to a tenured position.

If you are personally acquainted with the candidate, we would appreciate knowing the length of time you have known the candidate and the nature of the association.

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.