

University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Faculty Division of Biological Sciences

**Guidelines for Recommendations for Promotion or Appointment to Tenure Rank**

Effective May 2023 2022

**Procedures Prior to Tenure Consideration:**

Newly appointed probationary tenure track faculty will be provided with a copy of these guidelines and University of Wisconsin-Madison *Faculty Policies and Procedures* by the Secretary of the Faculty. If there are questions concerning the guidelines, persons may consult the chair of the Executive Committee of the Biological Sciences Division or the Coordinator of the Divisional Committee. **Departments will create an internal review committee (i.e. oversight committee) for each probationary appointee at the time of initial appointment.** We recommend that each assistant professor's committee include at least one associate professor who has successfully navigated the promotion and tenure process in the same division at UW-Madison recently. That committee should monitor the progress of the tenure track faculty member throughout the probationary period in accordance with Faculty Policies and Procedures 5.21, make suggestions for improvement, and provide peer review when the departmental executive committee considers promotion. ~~For extension faculty with program responsibilities that are largely interdepartmental, one or more program area peers should be added to the internal review committee.~~ To ensure that the tenure track faculty member receives accurate advice, it is critical that all members of this internal review, promotional oversight committee remain familiar with the most current version of these Guidelines throughout the mentoring and review process. The candidate and committee chair are encouraged to participate in Biological Sciences Divisional Committee tenure workshops at least once every two years from the start of the probationary period. If a candidate's work is so broadly interdisciplinary that it would benefit from cross-divisional input, the department chair should alert the Divisional Committee as early as possible in the candidate's probationary period.

Proposals for promotion should be submitted when the departmental executive committee and dean consider that the candidate's contributions make the best case for promotion with tenure based on their accomplishments during the probationary period. A decision on promotion with tenure must be made before the end of the sixth year of the tenure clock. Cases submitted earlier must meet the same criteria required for cases brought in the sixth probationary year.

The probationary period can include time spent in a tenure-track faculty position elsewhere or in another type of independent position **in which the faculty member's independence is clear** (e.g. research professor appointment, Clinical Health Sciences track, industry research program leader) at UW-Madison or elsewhere. If the letter of offer does not state how that prior position will be included in the probationary period, department chairs should contact the Divisional Committee co-chairs to inform them that the probationary period will include a specified period of time in the prior position (not to exceed six years total for the probationary period). This decision should occur as early in the probationary period as possible. **Notably, the candidate's dossier must still demonstrate a sufficient record of accomplishment, impact, and trajectory for future success during their probationary period in the position at UW-Madison for which tenure is being considered.** In their letters accompanying the final submitted dossier, and when soliciting arm's length reviews, department chairs should ensure that the inclusive dates of the probationary period under consideration are explicitly stated.

Candidates are not penalized for tenure-clock extensions, which stop the tenure clock for a specified period of time. Candidates should feel comfortable requesting tenure clock extensions under the campus-approved guidelines. The Biological Sciences Divisional Committee looks for the same level of accomplishment by the end of a candidate's probationary period, regardless of the number of tenure clock extensions. The chair's cover letter for the dossier should identify both the original tenure clock end date and the amended tenure clock end date, with

the revised mandatory review date reflecting any extensions. However, the letter must not describe the specific circumstances or reasons for extensions. If a candidate chooses not to use the approved tenure clock extensions, they will be considered for tenure without prejudice.

A candidate's dossier and recommendation for promotion with tenure must be submitted early enough in the last year of the probationary period **to enable for** review and consideration by the Divisional Committee ("see also Presentation of the Tenure Document"). Departments are encouraged to review Chapter 7 of the UW-Madison *Faculty Policies and Procedures* regarding faculty appointments and especially 7.07, which provides procedures for action on probationary appointments and contains information on notification of candidates and their appearance at evaluation meetings.

It is the responsibility of the candidate, during the probationary period, to develop the record of accomplishment required for a promotion to tenure. Regardless of the areas of scholarly activity on which a candidate's case is based, there must be evidence that all academic activity required of the candidate (teaching, research, and service as well as outreach/extension, if appropriate) has been performed at a satisfactory level. A candidate should demonstrate excellence in at least one area of activity **(research, teaching, outreach/extension; cannot be service)**. Excellence can be documented in clearly defined areas or through integrated, synergistic combination of research, teaching, and outreach or service. It is expected that all candidates will provide service to the University and their profession. Efforts to promote a diverse population of researchers, teachers and students and to encourage the participation of groups underrepresented in the candidate's field are valued in the consideration for tenure. Departments must ensure that probationary faculty, particularly those of under-represented groups, are not required to take on more committee service and advising responsibilities than their peers, potentially compromising their ability to develop a strong record of scholarly accomplishments.

Please note that there is **a streamlined process** of dossier preparation (see Appendix 1) for senior hires who earned tenure **or its equivalent** at a peer institution more than five years previously and are to be appointed to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor with tenure upon their appointment at UW-Madison. This streamlined process may also be used for individuals who previously obtained tenure at UW-Madison and are returning to take a new position. **Department chairs who seek to follow this streamlined process for senior hires should contact the Divisional Committees Coordinator to notify them of their intention as early as possible in the process.**

Queries relevant to crafting of tenure documents should be directed to the Divisional Committees Coordinator in the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty.

## **Tenure Criteria**

### **General**

The criteria for the granting of tenure are governed by policies from the UW Board of Regents and rules of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Relevant passages may be found in the UW System mission statement and the UW-Madison *Faculty Policies and Procedures*. The statement from *Faculty Policies and Procedures* follows:

#### 7.14. (paragraphs B, C, and D) CRITERIA FOR THE GRANTING OF TENURE

In applying its professional judgment to the decision to recommend or not to recommend tenure, the departmental executive committee or ad hoc committee under 7.10.C has the obligation to exercise its discretion in the interest of improving the academic and professional quality of the department; departmental executive committees or ad hoc committees may not decline to recommend tenure for any reasons which are legally impermissible or which violate principles of academic freedom.

Each divisional executive committee shall establish written criteria and standards it will employ in recommending the granting of tenure. These criteria and standards shall assure that the granting of tenure is based on evidence of: (1) teaching excellence; (2) a record of professional creativity, such as research or other accomplishments appropriate to the discipline; and (3) service to the University, to the faculty member's profession, or professional service to the public.

For more information on the committee's voting and reconsideration procedures, please see their Standing Procedures.

Each departmental executive committee shall establish written criteria and standards it will employ in recommending the granting of tenure. These criteria and standards shall be consistent with 7.14.C of these rules. A copy of these criteria and standards shall be furnished to probationary faculty member(s) (see 7.05.A of these rules) and shall be filed with the appropriate dean(s) and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost. A copy of the departmental criteria along with a statement showing how they were applied to the candidate shall be forwarded with a departmental recommendation for tenure.

#### **Standards and Criteria of the Executive Committee of the Biological Sciences Division**

The Executive Committee's criteria for granting tenure are intended to preserve and enhance the quality of this university's programs. Promotion with tenure requires proof of excellence during the probationary period, and convincing evidence that a high level of performance will continue. To achieve tenure, a candidate must demonstrate an ability to: (1) generate new knowledge or develop new approaches to problem solving and/or teaching that indicates creativity (innovation) and has substantial impact on the intended audience; (2) effectively communicate scholarly information orally and in written form to students, colleagues and the public; and (3) enhance the scholarly environment of the University community.

Recommendations for *Appointment* to tenure will be handled in the same manner as recommendations for *Promotion* to tenure. The committee recognizes that faculty make a wide variety of academic contributions. Thus, it is not possible to provide precise criteria for all potential tenure cases. It is the intent of the committee to evaluate all candidates in the fairest manner with the intent of enhancing University excellence.

~~Scholarly activity, engagement with diversity and inclusion, and community involvement.~~ Efforts to promote inclusion of diverse populations at the University of Wisconsin-Madison through inclusive teaching practices, scholarly activities, community engagement and partnerships with marginalized communities, or in the promotion of diversity, equity and inclusion in the candidate's field are valued in tenure considerations. This statement is intended to explicitly recognize the contributions of faculty members who choose to put effort into these activities, but ~~is are~~ not meant to imply that these are mandatory components of tenure and promotion documents. Please [see here for further guidance](#).

## Types of Tenure Cases:

### 1. Excellence in one area with significant accomplishment in a second area

To qualify for tenure in this case, the candidate must demonstrate excellence in at least one of the areas of research, teaching, or outreach, and significant accomplishment in one of the remaining two areas or in service. Note that service cannot be chosen as an area of excellence but can be an area of significant accomplishment. **Under exceptional circumstances for senior hires or track transfers at the rank of Professor, substantial leadership and service over the preceding six years may serve as the area of excellence for granting of tenure.** The area selected for excellence and the area selected for significant accomplishment must be specified in the chair's letter. By **excellence** and **significant accomplishment**, the committee is referring to quality of the candidate's performance during the probationary period and their impact on their discipline. The committee's recommendation for promotion is based on a holistic evaluation of the candidate's total body of academic accomplishments and their professional trajectory, not on time allocation or amount of time that has elapsed. The importance of a candidate to a program of the department or school may not replace excellence in teaching, research, or outreach (or their integration) as a basis for promotion or appointment to tenure. The committee recognizes that the needs of departments and the position responsibilities of candidates may differ.

### 2. Integrated cases

In some cases, the best way to evaluate a candidate's activities is by assessing the impact of their accomplishments via integration of several areas of activity. An integrated case allows a candidate to demonstrate generation of new knowledge, scholarly creativity (innovation) and substantial impact through synergistic activities distributed over more than one area. Cases of this type allow demonstration of excellence in instances where the three areas of achievement may be so closely integrated that it is not possible to unambiguously document and assign accomplishments to specific areas. In this case, the chair must indicate in their cover letter that an integrated case is being submitted and justify why this is appropriate. Evaluation of an integrated case will consider the overall impact on a field or the target community. The synergy among the various areas of achievement must demonstrate excellence. It is incumbent on the department to document how synergistic interaction of areas achieves this excellence.

### 3. Extraordinary cases based on only one area

When the overall program of the candidate's department can be shown to benefit from a candidate's strong emphasis on a single area, recommendation for tenure may be based solely on excellence in teaching, research or outreach. However, the department must justify each extraordinary case by documenting truly exceptional performance. The usual documentation is required with the following amplifications.

For recommendations based solely on **research**, the evidence must show that the candidate is one of the very best in their field and that the candidate is exceptionally creative, productive, and recognized nationally and internationally as a leader in an area of the biological sciences.

For recommendations based solely on **teaching**, the evidence must clearly indicate that the candidate is a truly outstanding teacher, has made novel and innovative contributions to the art and practice of teaching in the field, and has achieved national and/or international recognition. **The impact of the candidate's contributions to teaching must extend beyond the campus** and be documented, for example by scholarly publications in the area of teaching. To be successful, the case requires evaluations furnished by recognized educators **outside in** the candidate's ~~field outside the candidate's~~ own department and outside the UW-Madison.

For recommendations based solely on **outreach** the evidence must demonstrate that the candidate's performance is outstanding and has achieved national and/or international recognition. Evidence must be presented to show that the candidate has demonstrated outstanding leadership in initiating innovative techniques, designing and

implementing new or creative approaches to transferring novel science and technology developed in research programs. Evaluation of quality should include evidence and outcomes that document the intellectual contribution of the outreach. **The impact of the candidate's contributions to outreach must extend beyond the campus.** The impact of these activities must be documented by recognized leaders in outreach outside the candidate's own department and outside the UW-Madison.

## Criteria for Excellence or Significant Accomplishment in Specific Areas

### 1. Excellence or significant accomplishment in research

The candidate must have developed an original, high-quality research program that is making a substantial and continuing contribution to science. It is important that the candidate has developed one or more, original, independent, coherent, and impactful lines of research. Significant accomplishment in research is similar to the case for excellence, but the body of work or the size of the research enterprise may be less extensive. **Incorporation of activities within the research program that promote diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) is valued but not required in the tenure process.**

### 2. Excellence or significant accomplishment in teaching

Excellence in teaching requires more than just evidence of high quantity or good quality teaching on campus. It also requires evidence of a national or international reputation as an expert in teaching and learning, demonstrated by impactful scholarly work in the advancement and development of teaching as an academic pursuit. **Demonstration that the teaching activities have significant impact is required.** Significant accomplishment in teaching implies a substantial contribution to the educational mission of the university through teaching, and often includes major innovations in curricula. It can be demonstrated in the classroom, clinic, or in other venues (see "Summary of teaching activities," below). **Programs and efforts focused on diversifying the UW-Madison student body, such as inclusion of DEI content in curriculum and implementation of practices to promote inclusive learning spaces, are highly valued but not required for promotion.**

Teaching through high-quality and effective mentoring of trainees is expected, valued and may strengthen a case, but it cannot serve as the primary basis for accomplishment in teaching. Likewise, guest lecturing in courses, however well received, cannot serve as the primary basis for excellence or significant accomplishment in teaching in cases in which the candidate has had a minor role in defining the curriculum or **course structure and content or** in assessing student learning.

Meaningful evaluation of teaching performance requires credible evidence obtained by peer review as well as student feedback. The committee has established the following system of peer review for teaching.

- A. To demonstrate excellence or significant accomplishment in teaching the department is required to provide **both student feedback and** evaluation from peer review of the candidate's teaching activities **and student feedback** covering the probationary period. Peer reviewers should be accomplished teachers from within or outside the candidate's department. The exact format of the peer-review process is at the discretion of the department. Peer review of teaching should occur at least annually, beginning in the second year. There should be substantial, documented, **longitudinal** observation of the candidate's **teaching.**

- B. When teaching is the primary area of excellence, the department must provide additional credible evidence for excellence in teaching beyond student feedback and peer review. In such cases, an ad hoc peer-review committee composed of two or more members from outside the department should be appointed by the departmental executive committee.

It is essential that the committee be credible in its own right and include faculty who are recognized as excellent teachers. The ad hoc committee should begin its work as early as possible in the probationary period. It should ascertain the candidate's role in and contribution to the departmental teaching mission and should provide repeated direct observation of all of the candidate's teaching activities. This committee should submit a written report to the departmental executive committee regarding the merits of the candidate's teaching but should not make a recommendation for or against promotion. The department should include the entire ad hoc committee report in the tenure document.

3. Excellence or significant accomplishment in outreach

Excellence in outreach may serve as a basis for tenure for Extension-funded faculty in those with formal appointments at UW-Madison academic departments or other individuals Extension program or with a significant proportion of their appointment focused on outreach activities. A key component for excellence in outreach is the dissemination of information derived from scholarly inquiry for the benefit of society. Successful outreach will involve innovative practices, development of impactful programs and applications that have made continuing and substantial contributions at the local, regional, national or international level. It may also lead to transformative practices derived from clinical programs or community engagement for the benefit of society. Community engagement activities targeting marginalized and/or underserved populations and communities are valued but not required for promotion. A demonstrated ability to develop and sustain an independent, proactive, cohesive, and impactful outreach program is essential. Dossiers must document the outcomes of outreach and its impacts and, in addition, include evaluations by recognized outreach specialists in the candidate's field outside UW-Madison. Significant accomplishment in outreach is similar to the case for excellence but the magnitude of the outreach enterprise may be less.

4. Significant accomplishment in service

**Service cannot be the "area of excellence"** for the granting of tenure, but it may serve as an area of significant accomplishment. In exceptional circumstances, for senior hires or for track transfers within UW-Madison at the rank of Professor, for those previously holding substantial leadership obligations, service and leadership may be an area of excellence. In order to qualify for significant accomplishment in service, the candidate must engage in substantial service activities that demonstrate innovation and creativity and advance the mission of the University to support the generation and dissemination of knowledge, and to serve the broader public good. Service activities meeting the criteria for significant accomplishment may include leadership in major campus, government, or non-governmental organization initiatives, or development, leadership and management of innovative educational programs or creation of clinical programs in the health or veterinary sciences. Context of leadership activities should be provided such as the size of organization, whether the position was volunteer or selected, and overall role within the organization. Service activities that promote diversity equity and inclusion at UW-Madison and in the community are valued but not required in the promotion process. Medical or veterinary clinical practice, per se, cannot be used as the basis for significant accomplishment in service. For example, a health care or veterinary professional fulfilling their clinical obligations cannot use that work as a basis for significant accomplishment in service, however, innovative clinical or educational programs they develop, such as the ones that address novel clinical problems or that provide novel clinical solutions, could be considered. Also, service activities that are disconnected from the University's academic mission, such as voluntary activities for charitable or religious organizations, will not be considered.



Documentation of service and standards for evaluation of significant accomplishment are described at the end of Section 11 of this document (under the heading **Presentation of the Tenure Document**).

## 5. Integrated case

Tenure can be granted based on the overall impact of a faculty member's work in a field where the three main areas of achievement (research, teaching, and either outreach or service) are so closely integrated that it is not possible to clearly separate one area of "excellence" from another with "significant accomplishment". In an integrated case, it is expected that the faculty activities in teaching, research and service or outreach are integrated such that their impact upon the field of study, when viewed as a whole, is demonstrably enhanced through the synergies created among the areas of activity (i.e., have a multiplier effect). The threshold for an integrated case is established through the integration of select activities such that excellence is achieved. The candidate must demonstrate how one activity synergizes with another in a way that creates novel tools, treatments, ideas or knowledge to generate an impact on a field and/or the general public. Excellence is expected and it is incumbent on the department to document how the synergistic interaction of areas, with appropriate metrics and supporting documentation, achieves excellence. In an integrated case the relative contributions of the three areas of achievement may vary but evidence of significant and sustained impact within each area must be present. An integrated case should not be considered as a "backup plan" for candidates who do not demonstrate outstanding performance. The types of impacts that a faculty candidate may have demonstrated to highlight excellence in an integrated case could, for example, include a number of the following:

- A. The candidate's activities, due to their integrated and synergistic nature, have had a **significant impact upon the field of study** that would not otherwise be present in the absence of such integration.
- B. Integration of the candidate's activities has contributed to the generation of new knowledge or development of new approaches to problem solving and/or teaching that indicates creativity (innovation) and substantial impact on the intended audience.
- C. Integration of the candidate's activities has enhanced teaching and mentoring excellence.
- D. Integration of the candidate's activities has enhanced, community outreach and engagement, service to the university, and/or the faculty candidate's profession.
- E. Integration of the candidate's activities has enhanced the effective communication of scholarly information to students, colleagues and the public.
- F. Integration of the candidate's activities has enhanced the scholarly environment of the University community.

## COVID-19 Pandemic Considerations

The Biological Sciences Divisional Committee will continue to review dossiers holistically, not based on journal metrics or constrained by an arbitrary number of years. Reviews should continue to focus on accomplishments, impact, and the candidate's total body of work during the probationary period. Please see information for Chair's letter, candidate's statement, and external reviewer letters, below.

- A. The reason(s) for any extension(s) should not be disclosed to the Biological Sciences Divisional Committee in the tenure dossier.
- B. The Divisional Committee should treat COVID-19 extensions like any other clock extension and will accept claims of COVID-19 impact at face value.
- C. Review of tenure dossiers should not be prejudiced by number or length of extensions and will not assume any norm for the length of a review period.

## Presentation of the Tenure Document

In accordance with the procedures of the particular college or school, the dossier must contain either a letter of transmittal from the appropriate dean (including the vote of college or school promotion committees if they are involved) or a statement from the department chair that the dean has been consulted and is requesting the advice of the Executive Committee of the Biological Sciences.

In developing documentation for promotion or appointment to tenure rank, the sequence and scope of the pertinent sections shown in the section "Mandatory Format", below, are to be followed carefully. Permissible modifications for streamlined cases for appointment with tenure are outlined in Appendix 1.

The Biological Sciences Divisional Committee requires that tenure dossiers be submitted electronically.

Please contact the Divisional Committees Coordinator ([divisional@secfac.wisc.edu](mailto: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.

Submit two bookmarked PDF documents in Box by noon on the [deadline day](#):

1. The dossier, described in the "Mandatory Format" section below.
2. The candidate's peer-reviewed publications appearing in the probationary period ~~six years prior to~~ under consideration for promotion with tenure, or the preceeding six years prior to consideration of appointment with tenure. Present the publications as a bookmarked, text-searchable PDF, with a bookmark for each publication.

Templates of the dossier and publications are available if departments wish to insert documents. However, departments may find it easier to first create the document and insert bookmarks later.



## Mandatory Format

Present the dossier as a bookmarked, text-searchable PDF, with a bookmark for each number and letter on the [checklist](#). The divisional committee does not require departments to include a table of contents and insert page numbers.

1. Letter from the dean requesting the advice of the Executive Committee of the Biological Sciences Division.
2. Cover letter from **the** department chair. The chair's cover letter is critical for presenting the case for tenure. It should describe what a successful tenured faculty member in their discipline or department is expected to have accomplished and how the candidate meets those expectations. It should provide context for the candidate's accomplishments and explain the Department's evaluation criteria and process. It should highlight the candidate's independent, scholarly contributions to their discipline and their professional impact, and provide evidence for their rationale describing why the candidate will continue to make strong contributions in their areas of excellence and significant accomplishment, **or across their integrated program is appropriate**. It should educate the committee about discipline-specific practices, unusual career paths, and directly address potential limitations or weaknesses in the dossier. In some circumstances, a joint letter from the department chair and mentoring committee may be acceptable.

In addition, the letter must include:

- A. The number of eligible voters on the department executive committee at the time of the tenure decision and the exact vote, including absences or abstentions. Indicate the percentage of votes required for acceptance by the department.
- B. The total number of years counted on the candidate's tenure clock at UW-Madison and elsewhere at the time of the department vote and, if different, at the time of submission of the dossier. Total years must agree with the official "Faculty Probation Record" maintained by the Office of Budget, Planning & Analysis for the Secretary of the Faculty.
- C. Define and document the responsibilities of the candidate. If the candidate's relationship to, or role in, the department has the potential of not being clear to a reviewer from outside the department, provide adequate documentation. Time commitments (% effort) are not required and will not be considered in the review, **but may be helpful in providing context of the candidate's role in the department**.
- D. The areas of excellence and of significant accomplishment must be stated clearly. If a candidate is being presented as an integrated or extraordinary case based on one area, the cover letter must state this explicitly and provide justification. If a candidate is presented as a usual case, the area of excellence and of significant accomplishment must be clearly stated.
- E. For an integrated case, the chair's letter must provide a clear description of the integrated nature of the candidate's activities and their impact as described under the Integrated Case sections above. If the faculty member was not initially appointed with this intent or if the description of the appointment was adjusted during the probationary period, the chair's letter should describe and justify the underlying rationale for the changes.
- F. In the case of an appointment to two (or more) departments, the chair of the primary tenure home department should solicit supporting information about the candidate's contributions and responsibilities to other programs or departments from the relevant program directors or department chairs.

- G. The Chair's letter should indicate how the candidate's productivity was affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and explain how the Department considered its impact in their evaluation of the candidate's readiness for promotion. The Chair must ensure that their comments are consistent with the candidate's COVID-19 impact statement.
3. A copy of the departmental tenure guidelines.
  4. Letter of appointment with redacted salary information.
  5. Summary statement from departmental internal review, mentoring or executive committee (2-page maximum; required only for promotions).
  6. Background information on the candidate. Include:
    - A. Name
    - B. Formal education: include thesis titles and major professors for graduate work, and names and titles of post-doctoral mentors
    - C. Positions held: list chronologically and indicate length of service in each position, accounting for all years.
    - D. Honors and awards
    - E. Society memberships
  7. Summary Statement on Integration of Activities (1-page maximum). For integrated cases only, the candidate must provide a one-page summary statement regarding the overall nature of the integration of activities and how their integration achieves **fulfills** the criteria for tenure. Descriptions of how specific activity areas (research, teaching, outreach, service) are integrated within the whole should be provided in the Candidate Statements for those sections.

**Please note that candidates who are seeking promotion and tenure based on excellence in teaching or outreach may choose to reorder the research, teaching, and outreach sections of their dossiers to match the expectations of their faculty positions (e.g., section on excellence in teaching or outreach first, and section on significant accomplishment in research second). The order described below corresponds to the most common type of case, which is excellence in research and significant accomplishment in teaching.**

8. For candidates with Research Performance as their area of excellence or significant accomplishment, or who choose an **integrated** approach, documentation must be presented to indicate that the candidate has developed a high quality, independent, and impactful research program during the probationary period. Independence is usually documented by the published research record achieved after the candidate's period of formal pre- and postdoctoral training. There is no set number of publications that qualifies research performance for an evaluation of excellence or significant accomplishment. Quality is more important than quantity. However, the dossier must provide evidence of a **consistent** and **continuing** publication record in peer-reviewed journals appropriate to the candidate's field. Well-defined goals must be evident in one or more coherent and significant lines of research.

The Biological Sciences Division strongly supports the value of team science, cross-disciplinary collaborations, and the merits of pursuing innovative **interdisciplinary** research **at the edges of disciplinary boundaries**. An Assistant Professor whose research depends on a collaborative team can demonstrate

scientific excellence by identifying their unique contribution to the team and/or leadership role in a particular aspect of the team research. The faculty member's role must be critical to the research such that if the faculty member were removed from the project, the project would not have existed or would fail without an additional expert being added to the team.

The promotion dossier must ensure that the individual research accomplishments of the tenure candidate are evident and distinguishable from those of their collaborators and former mentors. The applicant should use their research statement to document their unique contributions to their research team in the formation, design, analysis, methodology and/or dissemination of the research program. If research funding is obtained collaboratively, the candidate's role in obtaining funding and the funds that are intended for the candidate's independent research program should be clear. Their unique contributions should be described in the chair's letter and in a non-arm's length letter from a collaborator and/or former mentor who can describe and attest to the candidate's unique contribution in the team research effort. General letters of support are not helpful. Also, the annotated publications list in the candidate's bibliography should be accompanied by annotations that clearly indicate and explain their unique scientific contribution to each manuscript.

A. Statement by candidate (2 pages maximum)

A description of the candidate's research program, major accomplishments to date, and goals for the future. For an integrated case, a specific description of the integration of research within the overall body of work should also be provided.

B. List of publications

Publications during the probationary period should be clearly distinguished from publications prior to the start of the probationary period. For each publication with multiple authors, the role(s) played by the candidate, their mentees/trainees, and any previous mentors must be indicated clearly. It is especially helpful if A one- or two-sentence narrative should be added after each publication paper listed indicating the contributions of the candidate's research team. Indicate whether the candidate was senior/corresponding author and identify all authors who were directly supervised by the candidate (e.g., students, post-docs, technicians, scientists). Indicate the responsibility (%) of the candidate's research team for:

Key: (a) = concept development and design  
(b) = data acquisition  
(c) = analysis  
(d) = writing

For each paper, each percentage (a-d) should include the sum of both the effort of the candidate and any trainees or staff that were directly supervised by the candidate.

An example:

Example: "Co-author, Candidate, Co-author. Title of publication. *Journal Name*. Year; volume (issue): page-page. (a) 70%, (b) 90%, (c) 80%, (d) 90%. I was primary author and provided the intellectual framework of the project." (or, "I was senior author and mentor to the first author.")

The candidate should insert asterisks (\*) before the five publications from the probationary period that represent their most noteworthy scholarly contributions to their discipline.

Candidates can update their publication list at any point up to the date of the committee meeting by e-mailing the information to the Divisional Committees Coordinator. Papers submitted or accepted for

publication should be indicated. Manuscripts in preparation but not yet submitted should not be included. Subdivide the material as follows:

- (1) Original research papers published in or accepted by peer-reviewed journals (list inclusive page numbers of each publication) **and provide DOI or PMCID numbers if applicable.**
- (2) Review papers, case reports, and other research papers published in or accepted by peer-reviewed journals (list inclusive page numbers of each publication).
- (3) Papers submitted to peer-reviewed journals but not yet accepted for publication. Specify the journals and the dates submitted.
- (4) Papers published in or accepted by journals that are not peer-reviewed.
- (5) Invited papers, conference proceedings, and scientific abstracts published in conference proceedings. Indicate contributions if co-authored.
- (6) Monographs or books published. Indicate contributions if co-authored.
- (7) Chapters in books, videos or other appropriate media.
- (8) Invited editorials, technical reports, and other publications.
- (9) Patents

#### C. List of presentations

Chronologies of oral and poster, electronic, or similar research presentations during the probationary period should be provided, including dates, title, location, and event/conference. Separate chronologies of (1) research presentations at scientific conferences (“abstract” presentations or “paper” readings), and (2) invited lectures (“podium talks” at scientific conferences or academic institutions) should be provided with subsections for UW, regional, national, and international presentations. Only invited and/or competitive oral presentations delivered by the candidate **or their trainees** should be included. **If a presentation was not delivered by the candidate it should be clearly stated that the presentation was “delivered by my trainee”.**

#### D. Research support

Competing successfully for peer-reviewed grants and other funds (e.g. industry or commodity group support) is evidence of the stature and research capabilities of the candidate. A chronology of research support during the probationary period should be provided, including dates, level of funding, renewals, joint support, and pending proposals. Grant applications and awards during the probationary period should be clearly distinguished from those that occurred prior to it. The candidate’s role in preparing the grant proposal and performing the grant aims should be explained in a one- or two-sentence narrative after each grant. For all grants, indicate the amount of funding designated for the candidate’s program. Candidates should include recent peer reviews of funded grants, reviews of grants that were close to the funding line, or others that they would like considered as part of their tenure package. Peer reviews must be included in their entirety. Grant support can be updated at any time up to when the committee meets by sending an email to the Divisional Committees Coordinator.

Narrative examples:

“I served as PI of the grant proposal. I developed the overall concept. All preliminary data were generated by my laboratory and all grant funds were designated for my research group.”

“I served as co-investigator of this grant. I provided some preliminary data for the proposal. I and a graduate student from my lab completed all of the experiments for one of the three aims of the grant. 25% of total funding went to my lab.”

“I served as a PI on a multi-PI proposal. I was responsible for concept development and execution of the aim X, related to topic Y, and was the administrative contact for the proposal. 50% of the funding went to my lab.”

9. For candidates with teaching performance as their area of excellence or significant accomplishment, or who choose an Integrated approach, evaluation of teaching performance requires the presentation of credible evidence obtained by peer reviews (see section 9.C.) as well as student feedback. Substantial documentation of innovation and scholarship in teaching; teaching activities, and evidence of ongoing reflection on teaching practices, for example in the form of a teaching portfolio, is an expectation for those candidates selecting teaching as their area of excellence.

Teaching documentation to be provided:

A. Statement by candidate (2-page maximum)

The candidate should describe and reflect on the goals, methods, and philosophy of their teaching program. For an integrated case, a specific description of the integration of teaching within the other areas of work should also be provided.

B. Summary of teaching activities

This should include a list of all courses taught, presented in tabular form, with numbers of credits, numbers of students in each course, number of contact hours, and grade distribution for each course. Courses for which the candidate served as course director should be clearly indicated. Also relevant is any role the candidate has played in curriculum innovation and development. Teaching activity should may be summarized in tabular form as shown in the examples. An example is given below.

Template Tenure Teaching Summary (*sample data in italics*)

**Classroom Teaching (graduate & undergraduate)**

<b>Classroom Teaching (graduate &amp; undergraduate)</b>						
Years	Course Title	Credits	Students	Grade Distribution	Contact Hours	Format
2018	<i>Bio152 Intro to Biology</i>	5	653		3h/wk x 5 wks	lecture
<b>Guest Lectures (graduate &amp; undergraduate)</b>						
2016, 2018	<i>Micro 370</i>	3	20-22		1 x 75 min	lecture
2019	“ “	2	21		1 X 75 min	lecture

Medical School Teaching						
Years	Course Title	Credits	Students		Contact Hours	Format
2017, 18	Anatomy 400	2	80-95		3 x 75 min/yr	lecture

### Clinical Teaching

Clinical Teaching (postgraduate trainees/clinical trainees, including fellows and residents)			
Trainee name and year(s) of training		Face-to-Face Contact Hours	Teaching Context*
2018-19	Jane Doe	120 hours	clinic

\*e.g., clinic, operating room, procedures suite, simulation center

Continuing Medical Education Courses				
Years	Course Title	Students	Hours	Sponsor-Venue
2017, 18, 19	IBD Update	~50	3h/year	Mayo Clinic

### Mentor Teaching

Postdoctoral Mentees		
Years	Name	Current Position
2016-18	Xia Huang	Assistant Professor of Biology, U. Iowa

Graduate Student Mentees			
Years	Name	Degree Program	Current Position or expected defense date
2016 -	Nico Nueva	Ph.D. (CMB)	In progress, defense anticipated Spring 2023
2016-2022	Sami Smart	Ph.D. (CMBS)	Post doc, Stanford University

Undergraduate Student Mentees (direct mentor teaching)				
Years	Name	Program(s)	Credits	Degree earned / Awards received / Subsequent position(s) (if known)
2018-2013	Jazz Jacobs	Bio-152, Ophth 699 Capstone	5	BS 2020/UW-Madison SVM Class of 2025



It is useful to distinguish three kinds of teaching:

- (1) **Classroom teaching** may include lectures, seminars, laboratories, discussion sections, and workshops. Evidence must be presented that the candidate has developed and conducted a high quality teaching or training program, **with course responsibility that extends** beyond giving many lectures. Special consideration will be given to new and innovative teaching methods and their effectiveness.
- (2) **Clinical teaching** may involve lecture, demonstration, one-on-one teaching in a clinical setting, and postgraduate and continuing education. The general criteria and evidence for high quality are the same for clinical teaching as for classroom teaching and equivalent data as outlined above should be provided and go beyond having many trainees present in clinical encounters. Because excellent patient care is essential to and an integral part of clinical teaching, the clinical teacher **must** demonstrate excellence and innovation in their clinical area. Therefore, the candidate's statement and the summary of teaching activities should include a description of the area(s) of clinical expertise and activities. This section should document how the candidate's clinical activities/expertise have been integrated into the candidate's clinical teaching. **For Because much clinical teaching of residents and fellows in is in** a one-on-one or small-group clinical setting, **all available trainee student** feedback comments should be included.

Clinical teaching contributions should be documented in the areas appropriate to the candidate:

- Professional degree training. Include the evaluation of lectures or courses given by the candidate and the evaluation of mandatory and elective clinical (clerkship) courses.
  - Postgraduate training. Documentation of the quality of the candidate's teaching should be provided by fellows, residents, and other clinical trainees. Special consideration will be given to evaluation by graduates of training programs, taking into account adequacy of preparation for practice and continued professional learning. Document encouragement given by the candidate to house staff to engage in scholarly activity (manuscripts, abstracts, etc., produced by house staff). The candidate's special contributions to teaching or to the teaching program should be identified.
  - Postgraduate and continuing education courses for practitioners. Documentation should be provided to show the quality of teaching and its impact on practitioners in the field **including evaluations of presentations and courses if available.**
- (3) **Mentor teaching** includes training of one's own graduate students and postdoctoral fellows and may include journal clubs, lab meetings, as well as one-on-one mentorship. Provide information on **all** the learners trained, **(including those who have left or not yet completed the program)**, the role of the trainees under the candidate's mentorship in tabular form.,~~and~~ The accomplishments of the learners (e.g., awards received for mentored projects and presentations) may be provided in list form. **Reasons for students failing to complete their program of study should also be documented.**

**Completion of formal mentor training should be documented.** Documentation of achievements in increasing and encouraging diversity, equity, and inclusion in clinical, classroom, and mentored teaching is encouraged.

### C. Peer reviews of teaching

The mentoring committee should ensure that formal, evaluative peer review of the candidate's teaching is performed and documented annually beginning in the second year. For cases based on teaching excellence, include the entire ad hoc committee report (see section on Excellence and Significant Accomplishment in Teaching for general information on peer review of teaching) and all departmental peer evaluations, which will provide multiple years of observations that critically evaluate the candidate's teaching and trajectory in instruction. For cases of significant accomplishment in teaching (section 9.B.), it is not necessary to include all peer reviews in the dossier. Submit **at least** two peer evaluations and assure that at least one critically evaluates the trajectory of the candidate's performance in instruction over multiple years (**each evaluation limited to** 2 page maximum).

Describe the department's peer-review process used in evaluating the candidate. For example, including the number of times the candidate was reviewed, the names of the reviewers, and the criteria used in the review. Departments may find the [template peer review format useful](#).

### D. Student feedback

**A** formal **process to solicit** student feedback is an important means of evaluating teaching. Summaries of quantitative student evaluations, should be presented for the entire probationary period beginning in the second year. Provide all compiled individual student comments from only the two most recent courses taught. Include all comments, not selected comments. The committee is aware of limitations and bias in quantitative student evaluations. As such, in addition to traditional student evaluations, programs are encouraged to develop and include other forms of student feedback for the candidate, such as discussions with focus groups, retrospective evaluations, or indicators of effective learning based on student outcomes.

### E. Supporting documentation:

- (1) Published materials. Publications related to teaching should be presented in the same format as outlined under Section 8B in Research Performance. Examples include published journal articles on teaching, textbooks, web-based or other electronic forms of delivery, etc. A brief statement should be added for each publication indicating the relationship of the publication to the teaching program.
- (2) Invited presentations. This list should focus on invited presentations that refer specifically to teaching. They may include continuing education or other workshops, individual lectures on teaching approaches, philosophy, or technique, or other presentations that relate to teaching activities. Presentations of research other than research into pedagogy should be included under Research Performance **in section 8 above**.
- (3) Grants and awards. These can include teaching awards at the local, regional, national, or international level; grants awarded to support teaching improvement; laboratory or other teaching facilities improvement; etc.
- (4) Other. Include any other documentation of teaching accomplishment. This should be organized clearly and concisely and should include a limited selection of such information as course outlines, handouts, grading techniques, examinations that demonstrate the quality of the candidate's teaching. This section should be summarized by briefly justifying each item included.

## 10. Outreach Performance

See: [\*Commitment to the Wisconsin Idea: A Guide to Documenting and Evaluating Excellence in Outreach Scholarship\*](#)

The case for excellence in outreach must be based on clear evidence that the candidate, in their area of expertise, has engaged in independent scholarly endeavors that demonstrate conclusively: (1) leadership, organizational and communicative skills that are truly outstanding; (2) productivity and innovation that are meritorious; and (3) program impact that is highly effective. In addition to the traditional activities of outreach faculty, it is also expected that candidates holding significant appointments in outreach or extension will have accomplishments in this area that are superior in quality and significant in quantity. Distribution and dissemination of their scientific products are critical. The following format is suggested for presentation of accomplishments; however, a modified format may be necessary in unusual cases.

### A. Statement by candidate (2 pages maximum)

A description by the candidate of their outreach program, major accomplishments to date, and goals for the future should be presented, emphasizing those in the probationary period. Include: (a) problems and objectives, (b) clientele served or engaged, (c) uptake of subject matter and value for end users, (d) major accomplishments, giving special attention to scholarly content and leadership role, and (e) evaluation of impact. When appropriate for an integrated case, a specific description of the integration of outreach within the body of work should also be provided.

### B. Documentation of activities

- (1) Publications. All outreach-related publications, with the exception of those in preparation and articles on original research, should be listed here. Publications should be grouped in two categories: (1) single print publications (those not intended to be revised and reissued periodically) and (2) series publications (those intended to be updated and reissued periodically). Publications submitted but not yet accepted, and those accepted but not yet in print, should be identified. It will be of great help to the committee if a short statement is made after each publication indicating the level of scholarly input (e.g., a revision of a periodical, or an extensive review and summation of data and concepts from multiple sources, or an in-depth review and interpretation of complex data and concepts from numerous sources) and additionally for multiple-author publications, the role played by the candidate (See Section 8B). Candidates may update their publication list at any point up to the date of the committee meeting by e-mailing the information to the Divisional Committees Coordinator.
- (2) Computer software or application development
- (3) Extension media development (websites and other social media, radio-TV programming, newspaper, etc.)
- (4) Continuing education programs
- (5) Outreach presentations, including lectures, workshops, seminars, short courses and individualized instruction
- (6) Collaboration, planning and development of outreach activities
- (7) Special activities in the candidate's area of expertise
- (8) Documenting outreach efforts to **marginalized** groups that have not historically benefited from university-sponsored outreach is encouraged.

## 11. Service Performance

### A. Statement by candidate (2 pages maximum)

The candidate should provide a statement regarding their service performance. When appropriate for an integrated case, a specific description of the integration of service within the body of work should also be provided.

### B. University service

- (1) Present and past administrative assignments in the department, school, college, or University. If administrative service is considered the basis of a strong service contribution, there must be supporting evidence of outstanding quality and importance of this activity to the University.
- (2) Major committee assignments.

### C. Professional service (the order of presentation of these categories may be modified according the candidate's overall responsibilities)

- (1) Service on state, regional, national, and international review panels, study sections, committees, and other public service groups insofar as these services provide evidence of accomplishment in an area of the biological sciences.
- (2) Appointments or election to editorial boards of scientific journals and to office in national and international scientific and educational societies.
- (3) Clinical service. In addition to generation and dissemination of knowledge, clinical departments have a responsibility to provide care of the highest quality to patients as a necessary basis for education of professional, graduate and postgraduate students. This service **alone** is not applicable for demonstration of "significant accomplishment" in research, teaching, or service, but it can be included as evidence of a contribution to university, state, or national service. **However, the development and implementation of highly innovative new programs or models for the delivery of clinical care may constitute significant accomplishment or excellence in research. This section #** should include a synopsis of clinical responsibilities, documentation of patient care by publication or dissemination of case studies and **by documentation of the development and translation of new approaches to clinical care and its delivery,** and evaluation of clinical performance by peers in the candidate's own and related professional specialties.
- (4) Outreach service. Land grant colleges have a tradition of helping agricultural clientele solve problems. In certain instances, these outreach activities would not necessarily involve creation of innovative practices or program developments with impacts at the local, regional, national or international level and would best be categorized as a service activity. Evidence of outreach service should include a synopsis of outreach responsibilities, documentation of such activities (e.g., outreach presentations such as lectures, workshops, or individualized advising; publication of bulletins or research related to outreach), and evaluation of outreach performance by peers. It must be noted that service/outreach may not serve as an area of significant accomplishment for those whose declared primary area of performance is in outreach/extension.
- (5) Efforts to promote inclusion of diverse populations at the University of Wisconsin-Madison or in the candidate's field are **highly** valued **but not required** in the consideration for tenure.

For those candidates whose area of significant accomplishment is anticipated to be service/outreach, departments must institute methods for documenting the level of performance over a major portion of the probationary period. These may include, but are not limited to, published outputs such as committee reports or white papers, and invited evaluative letters describing the nature and impact of the candidate's service. Where possible, letters evaluating significant accomplishment in service should come from persons outside of UW-Madison or if the significant service is at the University, from persons who are not closely associated with the candidate.

## 12. COVID-19 Pandemic Impact Statement

The candidate should provide a one paragraph "COVID-19 Impact Statement" that describes whether achievements in their areas of excellence and/or significant accomplishment were affected by the pandemic and the duration of this impact, and whether impact is ongoing. For example, a major grant or source of funding was lost due to work interruption or research restrictions; there was a negative impact on trainee recruitment and retention; they were unable to recruit participants into research studies which delayed their conduct, or their in-person teaching responsibilities could not be performed or had to be dramatically altered. Candidates may choose to share that they experienced an increase in family or childcare responsibilities that impacted their scholarly productivity. It also is acceptable for the candidate to state that COVID-19 did not substantively affect, or had a positive effect on their achievements.

## 13. Letters of Evaluation

- A. The selection of letter writers is the responsibility of the department (acting through its executive committee, the candidate's internal review committee, or the chair), not the candidate. The candidate may provide a list of names of potential letter writers to inform, not dictate the selection process. To obtain an objective evaluation, the final list of evaluators must include names other than those suggested by the candidate. Include a thorough description of the process used to develop the list of people solicited for a letter of evaluation. Provide a list of all persons solicited for letters of evaluation. In addition, provide the number of individuals (not the identity of the letter writers) on the final list of letter writers who were invited at the suggestion of the candidate, the number suggested by the mentoring or executive committee, and the number of individuals common to both lists.
- B. At least five (5) but no more than eight (8) letters must be "arm's length" and come from established nationally recognized authorities who are knowledgeable about the candidate's scientific discipline. They should come from persons outside of UW-Madison who are not closely associated with the candidate. "Arm's length" evaluations refer to those from individuals that have no vested interest in the candidate's success or attainment of tenure. The candidate's former mentors, collaborators and recipients of joint funding cannot be considered arm's length. Co-authorship on multi-author papers or textbooks in the absence of direct collaboration (e.g., as members of large consortia, clinical trials or co-authors of major consensus papers in the field) does not necessarily exclude individuals from providing "arm's length" evaluations but the nature of their relationship to the candidate should be clearly articulated in the chair's letter. Avoid soliciting letters from people unlikely to be knowledgeable about the candidate's area of expertise or from junior faculty. If under unusual circumstances more than 8 letters are received, all of them must be included. The most useful letters provide a thoughtful evaluation of the significance and impact of the candidate's contributions to their discipline.
- C. "Non-arm's length" individuals include any UW-Madison employee, the candidate's major professor, postdoctoral supervisors, research mentors, collaborators, recipients of joint funding, individuals with personal friendships outside of normal professional working relationships, or individuals with other vested interests in the candidate. Non-arm's length letters are only useful for clarifying a candidate's independence, the role of the candidate on multi-investigator research projects, or other unique circumstances or attributes that may not be covered by arm's length letters (e.g., individuals involved in

team science or in clarifying how prior periods of employment in non-tenure granting institutions in streamlined cases for senior hires are equivalent to tenure at UW-Madison). These non-arm's length letters should not be viewed as letters of evaluation or recommendation, but rather, should focus on documenting and clarifying the role of the candidate as an independent investigator or in joint or team projects. No more than three (3) "non-arm's length" letters are allowed, except under exceptional circumstances. The candidate's specific role(s) and independence in collaborative projects should also be summarized in the Chair's letter (Section 2).

- D. For an integrated case, requests for letters should specifically evaluate the impact of the faculty member's integrated activities upon the field or the target community.
- E. The chair must certify in the cover letter of the tenure dossier that all letters of evaluation received are included in the document. Also, the names and addresses of those who were invited to submit letters of evaluation, but did not do so, must be provided. The reason for the lack of response or reason for not providing a letter of evaluation should be stated if known, preferably in the form of a brief letter or copy of and email received from the evaluator who declined.
- F. Respondents should be nationally or internationally recognized authorities – or, in the case of outreach/extension, regionally recognized authorities – in the candidate's field, familiar with the candidate's contributions, and able to provide an objective assessment of the candidate's work and its significance for the broader discipline.

Provide brief statements on:

- (1) The qualifications of each expert from whom a letter was solicited. The department must document that the outside evaluators are recognized experts in the candidate's research or outreach/extension area or a closely related area.
  - (2) The relationship (past or present) between the expert and the candidate. It is essential that the referees be able to give objective evaluations of the candidate's work.
  - (3) Which letter writers (the number of names, not their identity) on the final list were chosen at the suggestion of the candidate, which were only suggested by the mentoring or executive committee, and which were common to both lists should be included.
- G. Provide a copy of the letter requesting evaluations.

The letter from the department soliciting outside letters of evaluation should be neutral in tone; that is, it should invite an objective assessment rather than simply an endorsement of the department's opinion. This letter should follow closely the wording indicated in the appended template letter, should explicitly state the time period to be evaluated, and must be free of any leading statements. If the letter requesting evaluations includes any phrases indicating perceived biases of the chair or other executive committee members (e.g., "We are planning to recommend \_\_\_\_\_ for tenure."), the Biological Sciences Divisional Committee may request that the department obtain additional letters from evaluators whose opinions have not been potentially biased by a soliciting letter. In this case, consideration of the candidate by the committee may be delayed until the new, unbiased letters are received.

Outside letters of evaluation are of particular value to the committee in determining a candidate's national and international stature. However, outside letters that merely summarize the candidate's accomplishments are not useful. Letter writers should be asked if the candidate is producing significant and important contributions in their area of expertise, focusing on the candidate's accomplishments since the beginning of the designated probationary time period. Letter writers should evaluate the quality and



productivity of a candidate's program with emphasis on the areas in which the case for promotion is being made (e.g., research, teaching, outreach). Letters should assess the candidate's accomplishments and reputation relative to others in the discipline at the same career stage. Comments providing information on the specific nature of the contributions are preferred to general statements.

The template letter should be used for both arm's length and non-arm's length letters, but if other approaches are used to obtain non-arm's length letters, they need to be documented in the dossier and include the following statement:

"The letters of evaluation will only be read by tenured faculty in the candidate's department, members of the university committees to whom the issue of tenure is presented, and the university administrators who are involved in the tenure process. The university will not release the identity of the letter writer, or the contents of letter unless obligated to do so by law or court order."

14. The candidate should include two representative publications from the probationary period that represent their most noteworthy scholarly contributions to the discipline.

### **Template Letter for Soliciting Arm's Length Letters of Evaluation**

Dear Dr./Professor \_\_\_\_\_:

Assistant Professor \_\_\_\_\_ is under consideration for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. UW-Madison has four divisional executive committees which establish criteria for granting tenure in the social, biological, or physical sciences and in arts and humanities. Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_ will be reviewed by the Biological Sciences Divisional Committee. The guidelines for tenure from this Committee indicate that "criteria for granting tenure are intended to preserve and enhance the quality of this university's programs" and that "Tenure requires proof of excellence during the probationary period and convincing evidence that a high level of performance will continue. To achieve tenure, a candidate must demonstrate that they are an independent investigator with an ability to: (1) generate new knowledge or develop new approaches to problem solving and/or teaching that indicate creativity (innovation) and have had a substantial impact on the intended audience; (2) effectively communicate scholarly information orally and in written form to students, colleagues and the public; and (3) enhance the scholarly environment of the University community." We ask you to consider Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_'s accomplishments **during the period beginning {date}** in light of these requirements *[include the paragraph that fits with the type of tenure case for the candidate]*.

#### **[For excellence in a primary area and significant accomplishment in a secondary area]**

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, tenure is granted based on demonstrated excellence in a primary area (research, teaching or outreach) and significant accomplishment in a secondary area (research, teaching, outreach, or service). We are considering Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_ for promotion based on excellence in \_\_\_\_\_ and significant accomplishment in \_\_\_\_\_.

#### **[For an integrated case]**

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, tenure can be granted based on excellence demonstrated through the overall impact of a faculty member's work on a field where the three areas of achievement (research, teaching, and outreach or service) may be so closely integrated that it is not possible to clearly identify one area of excellence and one area of significant accomplishment. We are considering Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_ for promotion based on an integrated case. In addition to assessments of the individual areas of Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_'s work as described below, please include in your evaluation an assessment of how the integration of these areas provides synergy to increase impact in the field and to the larger scientific and public community as appropriate.

**[For cases based on only one area]**

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, tenure can be granted based on excellence in a single area. We are considering Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_ for promotion based on excellence in \_\_\_\_\_.

**[For all cases]**

As a part of the tenure process at this university, the credentials of candidates for tenure are reviewed by a campus-wide elected committee of the faculty. Letters of critical appraisal from outside referees are of the utmost importance in documenting the quality of performance of candidates for tenure at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. We therefore ask that you provide a substantive evaluation of Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_'s \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ programs, focusing on the period during **beginning {date}** which Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_ was a tenure track faculty member. Also, please indicate the nature of your association with Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_.

Please provide a specific, objective evaluation of the quality and productivity of Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_'s research/teaching/outreach/service. Outside letters of evaluation help the committee determine a candidate's national and international stature. However, outside letters that merely summarize the candidate's accomplishments as presented in the dossier are not useful. We request your perspective on whether the candidate is producing significant and important contributions in their chosen area of expertise, focusing on their accomplishments since the beginning of their probationary time period (date). In particular, please evaluate the originality, impact, and significance of the candidate's program. Assessment of the candidate's accomplishments and reputation relative to others in the discipline at the same career stage is especially useful. If you believe the candidate would be promoted at your institution, please identify the specific accomplishments that made you draw this conclusion. Please avoid referring to citation metrics like impact factor and h-index.

If appropriate, also please provide an objective evaluation of Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_'s outreach or service. What impact have their outreach accomplishments had on students, clients, patients, professional colleagues or on the discipline in general?

The COVID-19 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 recommend that you evaluate the candidate based on the review period {date probationary period started – present} with no prejudice or predetermination of a norm or set number of years a candidate should need to merit promotion. Though tenure clocks may have been extended, tenure standards have not been relaxed. Reviewers should continue to focus on the candidate's accomplishments, the impact they have had on their academic field, and their total body of work during their probationary period.

To aid you in your evaluation I have enclosed Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_'s Vitae, a description of their scholarly productivity and their most significant publications. If you are unable to write a letter, please indicate the reason.

Your letter will be read only by tenured faculty in our department, members of the university committees who are involved in the tenure process and university administrators who are involved in the process. The University of Wisconsin will not release your identity or the contents of your letter unless obligated to do so by law or court order.

On behalf of the faculty, I sincerely thank you for your important contribution to this review process.

Sincerely yours,

## Template Letter for Soliciting Non-Arm's Length Letters of Evaluation

Dear Dr./Professor \_\_\_\_\_:

Assistant Professor \_\_\_\_\_ is under consideration for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. UW-Madison has four divisional executive committees which establish criteria for granting tenure in the social, biological, or physical sciences and in arts and humanities. Professor (Dr.) \_\_\_\_\_ will be reviewed by the Biological Sciences Divisional Committee. The guidelines for tenure from this Committee indicate that "criteria for granting tenure are intended to preserve and enhance the quality of this university's programs" and that "Tenure requires proof of excellence during the probationary period and convincing evidence that a high level of performance will continue. To achieve tenure, a candidate must demonstrate that they are an independent investigator with an ability to: (1) generate new knowledge or develop new approaches to problem solving and/or teaching that indicates creativity (innovation) and has substantial impact on the intended audience; (2) effectively communicate scholarly information orally and in written form to students, colleagues and the public; and (3) enhance the scholarly environment of the University community."

We ask that you do not contribute a letter evaluating the case for tenure. Rather, please provide a letter specifically addressing the candidate's independence, and/or explaining the candidate's role in and contribution to a particular project or activity on which you are listed as a contributor. In addition, even though you may have a personal connection to the candidate, it might be appropriate to comment on other aspects of the case for promotion that you may have knowledge about but that may not be apparent to the committee.

Thank you,

## APPENDIX 1

### STREAMLINED TENURE PROCESS FOR SENIOR HIRES

Many senior hires have long since achieved the qualifications for tenure at UW-Madison. Preparation of the same type of dossier that an assistant professor submits for promotion burdens candidates and departments, and can hinder the hiring process. Moreover, the difficulty of obtaining student or peer teaching evaluations and other historical teaching data from other institutions also leads to dossiers that cannot be completed with the same level of 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 was granted tenure in another academic institution at least 5 years previously. In this context, a senior hire should currently be full Professor or advanced Associate Professor in another academic institution **or should hold equivalent senior status**. Returning faculty who received tenure at UW-Madison may use this streamlined option at any time.
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 **or its equivalent**) 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 **or teaching** accomplishments (e.g., 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 tenure process. They can do so by consulting with the Divisional Committee co-chairs and **for** coordinator before submitting a streamlined case. For various reasons, departments might want to submit a traditional case for appointment to Associate or full Professor.
4. The Divisional Committee reserves the option to request more information from the department, including letters from additional external evaluators, on any streamlined case.

With those provisions in mind, the compilation of a dossier for a senior hire can follow the simplified format below rather than the standard format described in the Divisional Committee tenure guidelines. Each streamlined dossier should include:

- A. Letter of transmittal from the Dean
- B. A letter from the department chair that includes:
  1. a description of the hiring process and general information about the applicant pool
  2. a record of the Executive Committee vote on tenure, with explanation of any negative vote
  3. a justification for a positive tenure decision based on department tenure guidelines and evaluation of the senior hire's accomplishments in research, teaching, service, and outreach
  4. a statement supporting the "tenure equivalency" of the candidate's prior employment history.
- C. Letter of appointment with redacted salary information
- D. A copy of the departmental tenure guidelines
- E. The candidate's full, current curriculum vitae in a format of their choice. **Departments are encouraged to request modifications to the CV format as needed to facilitate evaluation.**

- ~~F. A letter from the department chair that includes:~~
- ~~1. a description of the hiring process and general information about the applicant pool~~
  - ~~2. a record of the Executive Committee vote on tenure, with explanation of any negative votes~~
  - ~~3. a justification for a positive tenure decision based on department tenure guidelines and evaluation of the senior hire's accomplishments in research, teaching, service, and outreach~~
- F. All materials from the job search including:
1. the position vacancy listing (PVL)
  2. the candidate's application cover letter
  3. all letters of recommendation **obtained during the hiring process** (at least 3)
  4. a research statement (maximum 2 pages)
  5. a teaching **and/or service and/or outreach** statement(s) (maximum 2 pages **each**)
  6. any other materials submitted as part of the application process. **Documentation that supports the "tenure equivalency" of the candidate's prior employment history.**
  7. **a minimum of two arm's-length letters** from established experts in the senior hire's field (if not among the letters of recommendation provided with the application).
- G. Two representative publications that highlight the candidate's most noteworthy scholarly contributions to the discipline.
- H. Evidence of teaching effectiveness for the most recent period of teaching (no more than 2 years), which could include:
1. student evaluations with written comments
  2. syllabi for course(s) taught
  3. peer evaluations
- I. If the senior hire has had and/or will have significant service, outreach, or extension responsibilities, a 2-page statement summarizing the impact and trajectory of those activities should be provided.