

TENURE REVIEW CHECKLIST
(for use by the Physical Sciences divisional subcommittee)

Candidate _____

Subcommittee members _____

Date of meeting with department or program _____

Meeting attendees _____

Note to subcommittee members: Mention the responsibility of the department to establish mentor committees for probationary faculty members and perform regular peer review of teaching.

A. Dean's letter

B. Cover letter

Who was on the departmental review committee and who prepared the package?

Quorum and voting rules. Are absentee ballots accepted?

What percentage is required to approve a promotion or tenured appointment? Possible reasons for dissenting votes or abstentions?

If this is an appointment to tenure, how was the candidate selected? Was a search conducted?

When did the tenure clock start? Is this an "early" promotion or appointment to tenure? If so, how is unusual maturity demonstrated?

C. Curriculum Vitae of candidate

D. Balance of responsibilities and accomplishments: teaching, research, service

E. Teaching

1. **Statement by candidate:** Does the candidate make a compelling case for past and future growth as a teacher/mentor?
2. **Teaching activities:** What has the teaching load been? Is the course load considered light? Heavy? Has the candidate taught undergraduate courses? If not, explain.
Is the grade distribution within the norm?
Have materials or new courses been developed?
3. How was the candidate mentored with respect to teaching? Are peer evaluations included?
Does department require regular peer evaluations?
4. Are student evaluations included for all programs/departments in which the candidate teaches? For all courses taught by the candidate?
Are comparative evaluations with the whole department or tenured faculty teaching similar courses included?
5. How does the candidate rank in teaching overall? Implicit bias can affect student teaching evaluations of candidates from certain groups; has this aspect been considered in the department's evaluation of the candidate's teaching (if applicable to the candidate)?
Is there evidence of bias in student evaluations?
6. Has the candidate encountered difficulties in teaching? How have the candidate and department responded to the candidate's difficulties in teaching? Is there evidence of teaching development over time?

F. Research.

How has the candidate been mentored by the department in research?

1. **Statement by candidate:** Is it written for an intelligent outsider? What are the major research themes? What are the key accomplishments that are deserving of awarding tenure?

2. **Publications**

Which publications contain the candidate's thesis research? Which contain work done before coming here?

What is a typical publication rate in the field?

Which publications are not refereed?

What contributions did the candidate make to each joint paper (by task)?

Who are the coauthors? Does the candidate have joint papers with students?

Is the order of authors significant? Is joint authorship common?

2a. **Journals:** How does the department rank-order the journals in the candidate's field?

Are there any unusually long review times?

2b. **Submitted papers:** What is the current status of submitted papers?

Are papers available on preprint servers that have not been submitted?

Explanation for any timing gaps?

2c. **Conference Proceedings:** Which papers are contributed? Invited?

What are the most prestigious conferences in the candidate's field?

What are the acceptance rates for the conferences (if significant)?

3. **Three representative publications:** How were they selected?

4. **Research students**

Does the candidate have a current pipeline of students? How many finished earlier? Their current jobs?

Do they pick up the M.S. on the way to the Ph.D.?

How are students supported?

5. **Invited research presentations**

What is the norm in the candidate's field?

6. **Grants**

What is the norm in the field?

What is the outlook for sustained funding in the future?

What is the role of the candidate in joint projects? Are there peer reviews or other objective evidence of candidate's individual role?

Are there pending grants?

G. Special features of extension/outreach activities

Programs developed?

Materials developed? Creativity?

How are the programs and materials evaluated?

What are the important outcomes?

H. Service

How do you rate the candidate's service to the department? University? Profession?

I. Letters of evaluation

How was the list developed?

What are the best universities in the overall field? In the candidate's specialty area?

How is the writer associated with the candidate?

Does the writer give specific examples of contributions? Impact of work done at Wisconsin?

Is the writer using one of these contributions?

Is there a comparison between the candidate and peers at other institutions?

How does the candidate rank relative to his or her peers?

Would the candidate be promoted at a leading department in the candidate's area?

Elaborate on negative comments or questions or interpretation.

J. Effect of this appointment on overall department balance and future plans.

K. Urgency

Is there any urgency or are there special circumstances?

Appendix:

1. Offers of positions elsewhere

2. Acceptance letters of publications not yet in print

3. Letters of preliminary approval for proposals not yet funded

4. Department guidelines for tenure (as specified in Faculty Policies and Procedures 7.14.D).

Areas addressed other than those referenced above:

Additional materials requested or received: