

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FACULTY DIVISION OF THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES**

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POSITIONS INVOLVING TENURE

Effective May 2020

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 are urged to send tenure recommendations to the Arts and Humanities Divisional Committee as early in the academic year as possible.

See committee's standing procedures for information on voting and reconsideration procedures.

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

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

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.

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES THAT ENHANCE THE WISCONSIN IDEA

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

Scholarly achievement that promotes diversity, equity, and inclusion can be grounded in the creation of formal theoretical frameworks and methodologies. It may also manifest in other critical ways that advance the academic mission of the institution by fostering a teaching and learning environment that is more diverse, equitable, and inclusive. This engagement may reflect the active promotion of practices and policies that support under-represented or disadvantaged groups as affected by race, culture, gender, socioeconomic status, mental or physical disability, and any other form of exclusion.

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

To document this work across research, teaching, and/or service, candidates are invited to submit a statement on Engaging with Diverse Communities in Section F of the tenure dossier described below. For more guidance on how these achievements can be recognized through the preparation of the dossier as a whole, [please see here](#).

MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES

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

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

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

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 cannot be submitted for the April or May meetings.

1. Publications

The committee requires each of the candidate's publications, monographs, articles accepted for publication, and book manuscripts electronically in PDF format. Some reviewers prefer hard copies of already published books, so please provide those as well, if possible. Documentary evidence of acceptance for publication, and referees' reports on book manuscripts, if available, should accompany accepted materials not yet published. This evidence should be included in the supporting materials.

Uncompleted works and works not yet accepted for publication are considered by the committee to be works in progress. Evidence of work in progress, for example manuscript copies and referees' reports, may be submitted 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.

3. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Programs will provide evidence of teaching effectiveness to the divisional committee. The originals of all student course evaluations are to be provided to the divisional committee. We highly encourage additional forms of documenting teaching effectiveness, such as discussions with focus groups, retrospective evaluations, or evidence of student learning outcomes. The Chair's letter should explain how this data was collected and evaluated.

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. The chair's letter should note the number and duration of any extensions to the probationary period ("tenure clock") that were granted to the candidate, *however, to maintain confidentiality, the dossier should not contain any information about the reasons for the extensions, regardless of the reason.*
3. **An assessment of the candidate's special contributions** to the development of the department(s) and, in the event that the candidate is a member of an interdisciplinary cluster, to the development and advancement of the cluster. The committee must be convinced that this candidate serves the needs of the department(s) (and cluster) well and has established a pattern of scholarly or artistic productivity and teaching excellence in traditional academic, outreach/extension, or creative arts settings. The chair's evaluation should balance commitments and responsibilities required or appropriate in one area against those in another. This is especially important where the candidate's accomplishments depart from conventional academic patterns or work across traditional disciplinary boundaries. Include a statement of what the department sees as the role (scholarly, professional) of the candidate. Comment on the original letter of appointment (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](#).

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

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. A strong chair's letter will also be sure to contextualize the selection of external letter writers and explain why these were the best evaluators to select (especially if there could be the appearance of a lack of arm's length relationship).

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(S)

1. 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.
2. If applicable, candidates conducting community-engaged scholarship and/or scholarly activity that promotes diversity, equity, and inclusion are invited to submit an additional statement on "Engaging with Diverse Communities" to detail these contributions.

G. 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.

Briefly state the peer review process for each peer-reviewed publication and performance/exhibition, in addition to explaining their quality and 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. For artists and scholarship based in performance, reviews of one representative theatrical, musical, or literary performance; of exhibitions and individual works of art; and of essays and works of drama, fiction, and poetry should be submitted. For research scholars, reviews of published work should be included in the supporting materials.

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

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 had substantial involvement or participation in the work evaluated must 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, but when the professional cohort size is small an advanced associate professor may be a better option provided that the chair's letter contextualizes that choice. 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.

Three recommenders should be selected from a list of scrupulously independent people prepared by the department without the candidate's involvement, and two should be selected from a list prepared by the candidate. Other than providing the department with a list of potential letter writers, the department should not involve the candidate in any deliberations about the process of finding letter writers. These two must still not be closely associated with the candidate. Again, please remember that if there are any judgment calls being made on issues of arm's length relationships with the candidate, be sure that the chair's letter carefully contextualizes why the department went ahead and selected that evaluator anyway.

All communication related to obtaining letters of recommendation, including communication with those who decline to write letters, must be in writing (letter or email). Copies of all communication must be submitted to the divisional committee as part of the dossier. The divisional committee will not consider letters solicited independently by the candidate.

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

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 any historical or current problems or weaknesses with teaching exist, they should be addressed in the chair's letter and in the narrative of teaching. Some candidates may deserve credit for significant, innovative development of instructional techniques and materials which affect academic programs in their department or discipline. Mention evidence of any special commitment to the instructional life of the institution, such as a readiness to reshape and strengthen a program. Procedures adopted or admired by colleagues within or outside the candidate's department should be documented. 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. The dossier should not rely exclusively on any one measure of teaching effectiveness. We encourage programs to include multiple forms of student feedback, such as discussions with focus groups, retrospective evaluations, or evidence of student learning outcomes. 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. If alternative methods of evaluation are being used by the department instead of the above, they must be carefully explained and contextualized.

The originals of all forms of student feedback should be provided to the committee, separately from the dossier. If submitted as hard copy, these will be returned to the department.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness from other institutions should be solicited and presented in full, with the understanding that there is no presumption that such evidence is 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.

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/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/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.

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

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

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

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/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/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, please include the length of time you have known the candidate and the nature of the association. If your association with the candidate has been substantial

and/or sustained, please make us aware of this upon receiving this request so that we can appropriately evaluate any outstanding arm's-length issues before proceeding with your letter.

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

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