

**University of Wisconsin-Madison
Faculty Division of the Physical Sciences**

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

May 2024

Procedures Prior to Tenure Consideration

Newly appointed probationary tenure track faculty will be provided with a copy of these guidelines and UW-Madison *Faculty Policies and Procedures* by the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty. If there are questions concerning the guidelines, persons may consult the chair of the Executive Committee of the Physical Sciences Division (Physical Sciences Divisional Committee) or the divisional committees coordinator.

Departments, including department-like bodies or programs in which tenure may be granted, must monitor the progress of the tenure track faculty member throughout the probationary period in accordance with Faculty Policies and Procedures 5.21.D.(2). This will be accomplished in part by the departmental mentoring program for assistant professors as described in Faculty Policies and Procedures 7.05.

Proposals for promotion to tenure require a strong case and should be submitted when the departmental executive committee and dean consider that the candidate's contributions justify such action. The expected level of accomplishment for tenure is the same regardless of the timing of the application. Most candidates require the full tenure clock in order to meet this expectation. Promotion is typically considered in the sixth year on the candidate's tenure clock. The standard for tenure is the same regardless of the year of consideration, and of any extensions granted. A decision on tenure must be made before the start of the final year on the tenure clock.

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 of accomplishment in all academic activity required of the candidate (from among teaching, research, service, and extension). It is expected that all candidates will perform University and professional service. Assistant professors from underrepresented groups are often asked to assume a heavy service burden. Departments should ensure that these probationary faculty are not required to take on more committee, outreach and advising responsibilities than their peers. All assistant professors should be given an equal opportunity to develop a strong record of accomplishment.

For appointments at the Full Professor level, departments may opt for an expedited review process described in Part III of this document.

Tenure Criteria

The criteria for the granting of tenure are governed by state statute and the rules of the University of Wisconsin. 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. CRITERIA FOR THE GRANTING OF TENURE (paragraphs B, C, and D)

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.

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.

Favorable action by the Physical Sciences Divisional Committee on a departmental recommendation for promotion or appointment to tenure is based on evidence of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, research, outreach/extension (for departments in which outreach/extension is part of the departmental mission), and professional service. A candidate's achievements and the justification under these guidelines for awarding tenure must be documented. It is not sufficient without further justification that the candidate has performed satisfactorily all duties as an assistant professor, nor will a candidate with a developing record who shows future promise necessarily receive a positive recommendation. The strength of the case must be demonstrated unambiguously by the documents submitted.

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

The documents must demonstrate that the candidate has a record that merits tenure. In the case of a promotion, the documents should demonstrate the development of that record, and hence the candidate's development as a scholar. In the case of an appointment, the documents should present credentials that establish the candidate as a scholar. The standard for tenure is the same whether the case is a promotion or an appointment.

The Physical Sciences Divisional Committee recognizes that the COVID-19 pandemic has affected the productivity and pace at which probationary faculty progress towards promotion. The University of Wisconsin-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, and other major personal and professional disruptions. We note that these disruptions are not equitably experienced by all.

The Physical Sciences Divisional Committee will review dossiers holistically, not based solely on journal metrics or constrained by an arbitrary number of years. Reviews focus on accomplishments, trajectory and the candidate's total body of work during the probationary period. To avoid bias, requests for extensions of the probationary period should be reviewed at the Department and Dean's Office level and not by the Divisional Committees. The reason(s) for extension should not be disclosed and will not be discussed by the Divisional Committee, and COVID-19 extensions will be treated like any other extension. Mentor

Committees and Department Chairs should anticipate COVID-19 related issues that may affect a candidate's promotion and apply for extensions early.

In Part I, guidelines are presented concerning the kind of evidence required for evaluation by the divisional committee; the committee's weighing of the various factors depends on the individual case. Part II describes the precise format in which the evidence is to be presented. Other evidence that is appropriate to a particular case, for example, descriptions of cluster and center activities, may be submitted by the department chair to the divisional committee office. In its deliberation on a case, the divisional committee is obliged to interpret the department's vote of recommendation; as such it is critical that the committee be aware of any differences between the documented evidence forwarded by the department and the evidence that was available at the time of the department's vote (e.g., additional acceptances, late arriving letters of reference, etc.). Part III describes the expedited process available for appointments at the senior level where a streamlined dossier may be necessary and appropriate.

A subcommittee is charged with presenting the results of an in-depth review of the dossier, which includes a discussion with the department chair and/or other representatives of the department. The subcommittee may solicit other information not provided by the department in the original dossier. This additional information must be distributed to the divisional committee for its deliberations.

Part I: Guidelines

Teaching

The candidate should have a record of effective teaching, which should normally be at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The baseline requirement for teaching in a discipline is mastery of subject matter. Although such mastery is implied in the decision of the department to promote or appoint the candidate, confirming evidence of scholarly breadth and depth must accompany the documentation of the case. Effective teaching requires that the professor have the ability and willingness to communicate knowledge of the subject matter to students. The committee considers as primary evidence those classroom and research advising activities that relate directly to the candidate's recognized field of professional expertise. The candidate's success in communication, organization of material, interest in teaching and research advising, and stimulation of student learning should be apparent in the documentation. A summary of appropriate documentation is given in Part II.

A meaningful evaluation of the candidate's teaching requires the availability of credible evidence obtained by peer review and through student evaluations. In order to document significant accomplishment or excellence in teaching, the department is required to provide evaluation based on peer review of the candidate's teaching activities covering the probationary period. The exact format of the peer-review process is at the discretion of the department. However, some component of peer-review, such as classroom observation, is expected. The committee strongly encourages the department to consult the Teaching Academy [Peer Feedback on Teaching](#) pages for guidance in this matter. The peer review should begin in the first year and the assistant professor's teaching should be reviewed at least annually during the probationary period. Judgments on questions of course content, level of presentation, and organization of material should be made by colleagues, and should be discussed in the dossier supporting the promotion or appointment.

A summary of student evaluations should be included for all courses taught, in all departments or programs in which the candidate teaches. The committee will be particularly interested in evidence of continuing development in the candidate's teaching, and of systematic and significant improvement when the candidate's performance has been weak.

In addition to student evaluations and peer review of teaching, programs are strongly encouraged to provide evidence of instructor effectiveness that goes beyond the quantitative summary. It is known that various

biases can affect student evaluations and this should be taken into account when analyzing a candidate's teaching effectiveness.

Continual improvement and modernization of courses is a part of good classroom teaching. Evidence of these factors should be furnished. Significant achievements are those clearly successful, innovative developments in instructional techniques and materials that affect the department's academic programs. Procedures adopted or admired by colleagues within and outside the candidate's department should be mentioned. Participation in courses outside the candidate's department or beyond regular duties should be noted.

Advising and mentorship of students is a critical academic responsibility. The candidate's success as a mentor to undergraduate, graduate and outreach students is thus an important consideration for tenure. Evidence demonstrating a positive influence on the department's graduate program should also be given, such as quality of thesis topics, success of graduate students, and extensive interactions with graduate students from other research groups. (In some cases, thesis advising is intertwined with the professor's research program, in which case details should be given in the next section on research.)

Through long-standing tradition, articulated as the *Wisconsin Idea*, engaged scholarship seeks to extend scholarly traditions of research, instruction, and outreach through engagement with diverse communities. The University of Wisconsin-Madison supports the efforts of tenure candidates to promote equity, diversity, and inclusion among its students, staff, and faculty. These efforts typically involve community engaged scholarship (CES), scholarly activities in support of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), or both. Candidates involved in these efforts may include a statement describing their work in this direction.

Research

The case for research must be based on clear evidence that the candidate's creativity and productivity are excellent when compared to national or international peers. Evidence of research consists of an active research program that has yielded demonstrably significant results and promises continued achievement. Innovative and effective research is a vital university function that serves to differentiate major research universities from other institutions of higher learning. Published papers are tangible evidence of productivity in research, but the number of publications alone is not a good measure of quality of achievement. Moreover, publication rates and the extent of multiple, nonstudent authorship differ among disciplines. Conference proceedings and patents may also be evidence of scholarly activity, as appropriate for the research field of community. The committee's attention should be directed to particularly significant contributions and scholarly publications by the candidate.

The ability to sustain a research program normally requires external grant support adequate for students, staff, and facilities. The candidate's record of success with peer-reviewed grants can indicate (a) the outlook for the quality of the future research program and (b) the candidate's reputation as a researcher. The committee wishes to identify the candidate's individual accomplishments within the grant record.

In cases in which untenured faculty choose to conduct part of their research with other faculty or scientists, either as individuals or through the auspices of a center, cluster or similar group, the key elements in the case for tenure are the accomplishments of the candidate. When preparing the dossier, care must be taken to ensure that the individual research accomplishments of the tenure candidate are clearly evident and are distinguishable from those of the other collaborators. If research funding is acquired or handled jointly, the role of the candidate in raising and handling these funds must be described and documented clearly. Letters from co-investigators may assist in documenting the fund-raising and research accomplishments, but these points also must be addressed explicitly in external documentation, e.g. letters and peer review reports.

Overall, the candidate and the work should be held in high regard by outstanding researchers in the candidate's field. Testimony regarding the quality of the candidate's work at UW-Madison and the impact of the work on the field of interest must be provided. In the case of promotions, the impact of the work accomplished at Wisconsin must be addressed. Letters of evaluation from recognized experts in the candidate's field from outside this university are required. The documentation **must** provide convincing evidence that the outside evaluators are recognized researchers and leaders in the field. (In special cases, letters from colleagues within the candidate's department or from present or former students may supplement the comments from outside evaluators.)

Outreach/Extension

For candidates with major outreach/extension appointments, the principal criterion for promotion is that the candidate has developed and implemented programs of recognized national impact, demonstrating creativity, and sustained excellence. Letters of evaluation from nationally recognized experts (clients and peers) in the program area should be provided to assess the candidate's impact, creativity, and excellence. Evidence must be presented that the candidate is capable of using new and existing information in program development. Interpretation of research results and their implementation into the outreach program are important to consider. The candidate is expected to be active in professional organizations relevant to the implemented programs. The committee expects to receive complete documentation of the candidate's major contributions and activities in important programs.

In addition, the candidate should show competence and innovation in terms of developing teaching materials, visual aids, and other means of effectively communicating with the public. Significant educational programs should be outlined, and all outreach publications and semitechnical publications related to significant areas of program development should be listed. Student and peer evaluation of the effectiveness of the professor's major program contributions and communication and teaching abilities in an outreach/extension setting should be included.

Professional Service

Professional contributions include service on departmental and university committees as well as service to professional organizations, and professional consultation to the community, to agencies of government, or to industries. Contributions also include professional activities that enhance diversity and/or climate in the professional community, enhance public engagement in the physical sciences, and enhance K-12 outreach. Especially significant results of the candidate's individual efforts should be documented. Professional growth that results from service should be discussed. Reviewing of proposals for granting agencies or manuscripts for journal articles, and service as editor for a journal should also be documented.

Balance between Teaching, Research, Outreach/Extension, and Professional Service

Recommendations for promotion or appointment should identify the candidate's relative balance of responsibilities and accomplishments in teaching, research, extension, and professional service. Recommendations should be based on well-balanced accomplishments in two or more of the areas of teaching, research, and outreach/extension. Significant contributions in the form of professional service can strengthen but may not serve as the basis for the candidate's case.

Occasionally a recommendation for promotion or appointment may be given for a candidate whose efforts and abilities are not well balanced among research, teaching, and/or outreach/extension. In such a case the candidate must be exceptional and the overall balance within the candidate's department must not be

adversely affected. If the recommendation for promotion or appointment is based in primarily one area, this should be indicated in the chair's letter of transmittal.

- A. A recommendation may be based primarily on research. If so, the evidence must show that the candidate is one of the very best in the field in their peer group; that the candidate's work has had an important impact; that the candidate is exceptionally creative, unusually productive, and unequivocally recognized nationally and internationally as a leader in an important area of the physical sciences. The candidate's value to the programs of the department must be shown.
- B. A recommendation may be based primarily on scholarship in education. The evidence must show that the candidate is a truly outstanding educator and has contributed creatively to the content, techniques and/or art of classroom teaching, including a record of scholarly publications in the education literature. Through outstanding teaching, the university not only disseminates knowledge but contributes to better teaching elsewhere. Evidence must be presented to show that the candidate's work has had national impact. Unusual rapport with students in and out of the classroom is important but not sufficient. The impact of the candidate's contributions to teaching should extend beyond the University. The committee will emphasize evaluations furnished by colleagues outside of the candidate's own department and outside of the University, especially evidence provided by recognized educators in the candidate's field.
- C. A recommendation may be based primarily on work in outreach/extension. The evidence must show that the candidate is truly outstanding, being professionally recognized both within and outside the university as excelling in the field. The candidate's work must show the application of research results for the benefit of society, and the ways in which the candidate is meeting the continuing educational needs of the public through leadership of statewide, regional and/or national outreach programs.

Part II: Format

The Physical Sciences Divisional Committee requires electronic submission of tenure materials to the divisional committees office as two PDFs (one PDF of the dossier and one PDF of the selected publications) by the [deadline posted on the web site](#) for the meeting at which the tenure case is to be considered.

Where authors use generative artificial intelligence (AI) and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process, it should only be used to improve readability. Applying the technology should be done with human oversight and control, and authors should carefully review and edit the result to avoid AI-generated authoritative-sounding incorrect or biased output. Please note that authors are ultimately responsible and accountable for the contents of their work.

Note that the dean of the schools and colleges typically requires 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 at least four weeks prior to the committee's meeting. Check with your dean's office for the details of its requirements.

The dossier. Present the dossier as a bookmarked, text-searchable PDF, with a bookmark for each number and letter on the [checklist](#).

The candidate's three most significant publications from the probationary period. Present the publications as a bookmarked, text-searchable PDF, with a bookmark for each publication.

Departmental recommendations for promotion or appointment to tenure should be prepared *according to the following outline*. Please *number all pages consecutively*, including all letters of recommendation and appendices.

- A. In accordance with the procedures of the particular college or school, the dossier must contain either a letter of transmittal from the appropriate dean or a statement from the department chair that the dean has been consulted and is requesting the advice of the Physical Sciences Divisional Committee. College of school promotion committee consideration may be done concurrently.
- B. Chair's letter of transmittal. If the candidate has a split- or joint-appointment, the Chair's letter should be written from the perspective of both appointments. Either the Chair of each program should provide a letter, or a single Chair's letter coauthored by both chairs should be provided. The letter from the chair to the committee requesting consideration of the case should report the departmental vote as well as the total number eligible to vote and the voting rules relevant to tenure votes. (If a minority of the faculty voting negatively feels strongly enough to prepare a minority report, such a report should be included with the formal departmental proposal). The letter should also indicate the number of years counted on the candidate's tenure *clock* at the time of the departmental vote as well as the number of years remaining on the tenure clock. The letter should state clearly why promotion is proposed, including any exceptional circumstances, and the accompanying documentation must show unambiguously that the candidate's record meets the relevant departmental and divisional criteria for promotion. **Include a copy of the department tenure guidelines (*Faculty Policies and Procedures 7.14.D*) in the appendices.** Evidence of special recognition such as citations of the candidate's work in review articles, invitations to give lectures and participate on important advisory committees, offers of appointment elsewhere, and so on, may be presented in the cover letter.
- C. Candidate's Appointment Letter (please redact salary information). If there have been any changes about the nature of the candidate's appointment, please clarify these changes.
- D. Curriculum Vitae. Limit 2 pages. Publications and other extended material will be in later sections.
1. Name of candidate.
 2. Formal education and positions held (list chronologically, with gaps explained).
 3. Other special information deemed pertinent.
- E. State the relative balance of the candidate's responsibilities and accomplishments in teaching, research, extension, and professional and public service. Describe the candidate's role in centers, clusters or other group-based activities. If the candidate plays a key role in a center, institute or cluster, a supporting letter from a representative of that group should be included. In the case of an appointment with tenure, this statement should include the candidate's role at their prior institution.
- F. Teaching ability and experience.
Evidence must be presented that the candidate has developed and conducted a teaching or training program of high quality. It is normally expected that the candidate will have taught at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. If not, this must be explained. Special consideration should be given to new and innovative teaching methods and their effectiveness. As indicated in Part I, teaching includes both classroom and mentoring activities and accomplishments in both of these areas should be included here.
1. Statement on teaching by candidate (maximum of two pages)
The candidate should describe their teaching program with emphasis on past experience and future plans, including the approach taken to teaching, methods used, innovations, and long term objectives.
 2. Summary of teaching activities

This should include a list of all courses taught, including courses in external programs or departments with the numbers of credits, numbers of students in each course, and grade distribution for each course. Compare the candidate's mean grades to the mean grades of faculty teaching similar courses at similar levels, if available. Also relevant is any role the candidate has played in curriculum development.

3. Peer review of candidate's teaching

Departmental peer review of the candidate must be documented. Include brief information on the peer-review process used in evaluating the candidate – for example, number of times reviewed, number of reviewers, criteria used in the review, and procedure for providing feedback to the candidate.

For promotions, peer review should begin in the first year and should occur at least once per year. The courses reviewed should reflect the assigned teaching duties of the candidate (e.g., if the candidate has regularly taught core undergraduate classes, then at least some peer review of that class should be included). The department should consult the information on peer review provided by the Teaching Academy (<https://teachingacademy.wisc.edu/>) as well as the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty (<https://secfac.wisc.edu/tenure/information-for-assistant-professors/documenting-scholarship/>). A two-part review is strongly recommended. The committee recognizes that some modifications of these peer review guidelines may be appropriate (e.g., for candidates with extension appointments). First, the reviewer should examine the syllabus, reading materials, online course resources, exams, and project, report, or homework assignments. The reviewer should specifically note whether the course content is appropriate, the level of rigor is suitable, the organization of material is logical, and the methods of student assessment are clearly articulated. The reviewer should determine whether the instructional goals and objectives are clear and whether the course design and assessment tools are matched to the instructional goals. Second, the reviewer should observe the candidate in the classroom. Evaluation should be based on both content and delivery. The reviewer should make specific note of organization, pacing, clarity of presentation, voice, use of blackboards and visual aids, rapport with students, and use of innovative pedagogical methods, if any. The committee will be particularly interested in evidence of continuing development in teaching, and will expect to see clear evidence of a departmental response and systematic improvement if the candidate's performance has been weak.

In the case of an appointment with tenure, it is acceptable for the department to provide an evaluation stating its criteria for determining that the candidate is a successful teacher, such as the candidate's ability to communicate ideas orally; the candidate's sensitivity to others' beliefs and ideas; the candidate's ability to listen and respond orally to questions; the quality of the candidate's oral presentations at conferences, symposia, or continuing education presentations; and the candidate's mentoring of junior-level colleagues.

The reviewer should document their evaluation of the candidate's teaching, in the form of a letter to the department chair. This review should be guided by the checklists of short-answer forms provided in the resources above, but it should not just repeat the checklist or short-answer form. All letters should be included in the tenure dossier.

4. Student evaluations of candidate's teaching

The committee is aware of limitations and potential bias in quantitative student evaluations but requires this type of student feedback. Programs are encouraged to introduce additional forms of student feedback, such as discussions with focus groups, retrospective evaluations, or indicators of effective learning based on student outcomes. Student feedback (official course evaluations and any additional feedback the department chooses to submit) must be presented for the entire probationary period beginning in the first year, and for all courses (other than seminars) taught by the candidate, including those in external programs and departments. Specify whether the course

was taught entirely by the candidate or was co-taught with other faculty. Include a copy of the evaluation form used. Specify the question or questions that are used for comparison. Explain the evaluation process, ensuring that it is directly relevant to the overall effectiveness of the candidate's teaching. Provide this information in summary form as much as possible. Do not include raw course evaluations in the dossier. They may be attached as an appendix if desired. Specify the number of students that responded, as well as the number enrolled in the course. Compare the candidate's mean score and standard deviation to those of faculty teaching similar courses at similar levels. Provide an interpretation of the evaluation scale and describe the comparison group.

5. Submit any supplementary evidence such as awards or other special recognition received for teaching and especially authored or designed teaching materials.
6. Statement on mentoring by candidate (maximum one page)
The candidate should describe their mentoring philosophy, with emphasis on past experience and future plans. In addition to mentoring related to the candidate's research program, activities related to mentoring teaching assistants or supporting students from outside the candidate's direct mentoring responsibilities should be discussed.
7. Scholarly activity that enhances the *Wisconsin Idea* (optional, maximum one page)
The candidate may describe their efforts in community engaged scholarship (CES), activities in support of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), or both.

CES 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 experimental 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.

Scholarly DEI activities can take many forms. Some examples are: conducting scholarly work related to the solution of practical problems of individuals, groups, organizations, or communities; research in the candidate's area of expertise that addresses and contextualizes historical and current inequalities; evidence of efforts to advance equitable access to education; active mentoring and advising of minority students or new faculty members and academic staff; creating an inclusive and respectful classroom; public or campus service that addresses the needs of under-served communities; championing student recruitment and faculty/staff hiring practices oriented to opening opportunities for under-represented groups; leading or organizing events, workshops, or discussions that help students, staff, and faculty understand and overcome issues constraining diversity, equity, and inclusion.

8. There are circumstances in which a department may wish to recommend a tenured appointment for a person who has no teaching experience or for whom only limited information on teaching performance is available. Examples include tenure level hires from industry or government laboratories when the candidate is not engaged in teaching and hires from other universities when peer teaching reviews are not available or are incomplete. In such cases, it is necessary for the department to present evidence of the candidate's potential to be a successful teacher. Such evidence might include (but not be limited to) letters from colleagues and reviewers concerning the candidate's ability to communicate ideas orally; the candidate's sensitivity to others' beliefs and ideas; the candidate's ability to listen and respond orally to questions; the quality of the candidate's oral presentations at conferences, symposia, or continuing education presentations; and the candidate's mentoring of junior-level colleagues. The department should provide a statement in the tenure package about the specific courses or types of courses the candidate is expected to teach, and the department's assessment as to why the candidate is considered capable

of teaching these courses. In addition, the candidate should include a statement in the tenure package about their potential to be a successful teacher.

G. Research

1. Statement by candidate (maximum of two pages). The candidate should give a capsule description of the most important elements of their research program at Wisconsin (or, in the case of appointments from outside, their recent research activities). The emphasis should be on the most important elements of the program including the motivations, the principal results obtained, their significance for the broader research area, the future direction of the program, and training of graduate students. The statement should be written for scientists not familiar with the specialty area.
2. List of research publications. Give title and full reference (including page numbers) of each publication, including names of all authors in the order appearing in the paper. For promotions, specify which publications were based on work performed while the candidate was an assistant professor at UW-Madison, and which publications stemmed from work done elsewhere. For each publication, describe the nature and extent of the contribution of the candidate (including directly supervised students and postdocs) distinct from their coauthors. For publications that are collaborative, please include a description of who the collaborators are and how they contributed to the work.

Comment on the standards of the publication venues and provide a list of the top (not more than 10) publication venues in the candidate's research areas, identifying both broad and specialty venues. Include acceptance rates and/or impact factors where available (be sure to specify the research areas).

Please list publications of different types separately in the following format:

- a. Papers published in, or accepted by, refereed archival publication venues (e.g., journals and highly selective conferences with archival proceedings). Papers must be accessible for reference. Including DOI links is recommended. Provide in an appendix a copy of the letter of acceptance if not yet published. Citation counts and/or electronic download counts may be included to document impact.
- b. Papers that have been submitted to refereed archival publication venues but not yet accepted (specify the venue and date of submission).
- c. Monographs or jointly authored books (specify nature).
- d. Books or conference proceedings edited (specify work involved).
- e. Invited book chapters (state if refereed).
- f. Items at conferences. State whether published in whole or by abstract, whether refereed or not, and whether contributed or invited. If presented, describe presentation (e.g., keynote, talk, poster, demo).
- g. Patents
- h. Non-refereed publications not included above.
- i. Unpublished technical reports not included in section b.

- j. Publications by candidate's postdocs and students that do not include candidate as a co-author. Describe candidate's role.
3. Three publications from the probationary period that best demonstrate the candidate's qualities of creativity, imagination, and scholarly achievement should be identified. These should be identified by an asterisk in the list of research publications. Submit the publications as a separate PDF document. Include a brief description of the significance of each publication.
 4. Include a list of research trainees including undergraduate students, graduate students, and post-doctoral fellows, both present and past, together with their thesis titles, if appropriate. If the advising responsibilities are shared, specify the coadvisers and the extent of their participation. To the extent possible, identify current employment for research trainees who are no longer under the candidate's supervision.
 5. List of invited research presentations.
 6. Provide a summary of grants and contracts, including duration and amount of award, and the approximate amount supporting the candidate's research (if candidate is not the sole investigator). Thoroughly specify the role of the candidate if there is more than one principal investigator. Indicate the nature of review of the grant or contract proposal. List pending grant proposals, giving date submitted. Comment on the level of support available from granting agencies in the candidate's research area. Departments are encouraged to provide a graphical or tabular summary of the candidate's research funding broken down by year.
 7. Department's assessment of candidate's research. Explain the intrinsic significance of the research, and evaluations of its quality relative to the "state of the art" in the candidate's field, and of the department's evaluation of the candidate's abilities as a scholar and graduate student mentor as described in the previous section titled Research. Explain the importance of the candidate's work conducted in centers, clusters or other group research activity, if any.

H. Outreach/Extension

Discuss outreach and/or extension activities undertaken to fulfill expectations of the candidate's appointment, excluding activities described under section I. Service.

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

1. Statement by candidate (maximum of two pages). The candidate should describe the goals and methods in their outreach/extension programs.
2. Using the following format, describe up to three significant outreach/extension programs in which the candidate has made a major contribution:
 - a. Identify the problem and the clientele.
 - b. Outline the objectives.
 - c. Provide details on the method of instruction. Include development of visual aids, innovative instructional methods, and clientele evaluation of the effectiveness of the program.
 - d. List the implications of the program; its relevance to the problems of agriculture, industry, and other segments of society in the state and nation; and its potential or demonstrated impact on the public.

3. List contributions to specialized and interdisciplinary programs (exclude those covered in item 1 above).
 4. List outreach/extension and other relevant publications. Give title and full reference of each publication, including names of all authors. For each publication indicate nature of effort of the candidate and describe the role of the coauthors. Also specify which publications were based on work performed while the candidate was an assistant professor at UW-Madison.
 5. The three most important recent outreach/extension publications from the probationary period should be identified. These should be identified by an asterisk in the list of outreach/extension publications. The most significant of these publications should be identified. Submit the publications as a separate PDF document.
 6. List voluntary and invited public lectures and scientific presentations and summarize radio and television program participation.
 7. Provide an evaluation of the candidate's outreach/extension work by colleagues, with particular attention to the criteria listed in the section on Outreach/Extension in Part I.
 8. Include any supplementary evidence such as awards or other special recognition received for outreach/extension work, especially authored or designed outreach/extension materials.
- I. Professional Service. Discuss the candidate's contributions to professional service as set forth in Part I.
- J. Letters of Evaluation

1. Provide a brief description of the candidate's research area, putting it in the context of the broader field. Comment, for example, on whether the research area is a major area in the field, a narrower specialty area, or an emerging field, and on its importance for progress in the overall field.

Provide a list of ten or more leading institutions for research (or outreach/extension activities) in the candidate's discipline. The committee recognizes that the best work in the candidate's specialty may not be carried out at the top ranked institutions in the broader discipline. However, it will look for a balance of evaluations from referees at the leading institutions who can evaluate the research and its impact on the broader field, and from the leaders in the subfield if they are at different institutions.

2. Provide a list of **all** persons solicited for letters of evaluation and other forms of comment in connection with the promotion or appointment. A statement should be included acknowledging that **all** letters received have been submitted or, if they have not, the reasons should be specified. Reasons for declined solicitations should be documented wherever possible, through email or other correspondence.

Include a thorough description of the process used to develop the list of people solicited for letters of evaluation. The department should assume primary responsibility in identifying and soliciting qualified and independent evaluators. Evaluators are usually considered to be more independent if the candidate has had little or no involvement in selecting them. A candidate may identify non-preferred evaluators. Indicate any names that were suggested by the candidate for inclusion or exclusion, and describe the methods and criteria used to select the final list. Respondents should be nationally 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.

3. Provide brief statements on:
 - a. The qualifications of each expert who submitted a letter. The department must clearly document that the outside evaluators are recognized experts in the candidate's research or extension/outreach area or a closely related area and should explain why those not at leading research institutions were selected.
 - b. The professional 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.
4. Provide at least six letters for tenure evaluation of the candidate's stature in the field from recognized experts in the candidate's field. (For promotions, dossiers typically contain 8-10 letters.) At least five of the letters must come from persons who have not been closely associated with the candidate, and a greater fraction is desirable. Letters from individuals such as the candidate's major professor, close postdoctoral supervisors, frequent collaborators, recipients of joint funding, or others who may have a substantial interest in the work evaluated are generally given reduced weight by the committee. Avoid soliciting letters from people unlikely to be knowledgeable about the candidate's area of expertise, from junior faculty, and from within the UW system. In general, the candidate should not be consulted in the selection of letter writers.

In the case of an appointment with tenure, letters that are used to evaluate an application may be included, but the same standards apply (i.e., six letters must be submitted, at least five of which must come from persons who have not been closely associated with the candidate).

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. **Departments are strongly encouraged to use the text in the sample letter provided in the tenure guidelines.** Three template letters are available: a standard letter, a letter for senior hires, and a letter for scholarship in education.

Reviewers should be asked to evaluate thoroughly the quality and productivity of a candidate's program with emphasis on the area in which the case is to be made. The letters should address the question of whether the candidate is producing significant and important contributions in the chosen area of expertise. Comments providing information on the specific nature of the contributions are preferred to general statements. Outside letters of evaluation from recognized experts in the candidate's field are of particular value to the committee in determining a candidate's national and international stature. The solicitation letter **must** request an evaluation of the candidate's qualifications outlined in this document, including items listed in 5. a-f below.

For candidates whose research falls into new or inter-disciplinary sub-areas, the department may wish to solicit additional letters from reviewers whose expertise lies outside the candidate's sub-area, but who can provide a broader context for the candidate's research. These supplementary letters need not address the candidate's specific results and contributions but should address the significance and potential value of the new or inter-disciplinary research sub-area and its relevance to one or more broader research areas. The department may use a different solicitation letter when contacting these supplemental reviewers. Provide a copy of the alternate solicitation letter and clearly identify which reviewers received this alternate letter.

All letters solicited at any time during the probationary period pertaining to the faculty member's promotion must be included in the dossier.

5. Provide a sample copy of the solicitation letter, a copy of the outgoing email, and a list of materials submitted for evaluation. Reviewers should receive the candidate's current curriculum vitae, a representative sample of the candidate's work and the candidate's research statement.

The committee will examine the letters for all the points discussed in this document, as well as for evidence specifically addressed to whether the candidate:

- a. possesses a high degree of originality, imagination, and creativity;
 - b. possesses a strong technical competence, including industrial experience if appropriate;
 - c. has been producing significant and important contributions in the chosen area of expertise;
 - d. has achieved a national or international reputation as a leader in the field;
 - e. would be welcomed on the tenured faculty of other outstanding schools in that specialty; and
 - f. is committed to teaching, graduate research advising, and/or outreach/extension and has proven effective in teaching, research advising, and/or outreach/extension (for candidates with major outreach/extension appointments).
- K. Effect of this Appointment on Overall Department Balance and Future Plans. Explain how this candidate fits into the department with respect to the teaching and research programs and the future development of the department. Do not provide merely a statement such as “The candidate will increase the balance in the department.” Rather, explain why the candidate is needed, what new areas may be developed, whether the candidate will be most useful for research, classroom teaching, department service, or outreach/extension, and so on. If “in-breeding” is involved, thorough justification is required. Similarly, explain how this appointment affects the balance and future plans of centers, clusters, etc. in which the candidate participates.
- L. Urgency. If it is urgent that the committee act at the earliest opportunity, please indicate this in the cover letter.
- M. COVID-19 impact statement. The candidate and Department Chair have the option of providing a brief statement describing the impact of COVID-19 on the candidate’s progress toward tenure. Such statements should include specific examples of how the candidate’s accomplishments were affected by the pandemic.

Appendix. Documentation to be included here:

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).

Part III: Expedited Review for Full Professor Appointments

For appointments at the rank of Full Professor, the PSDC allows for expedited review at the discretion of the department, in consultation with the PSDC Chair. Streamlined dossiers should follow the same order as traditional dossiers. Materials for some sections may not be available at the full level described above for promotion dossiers; specific sections that are mandatory are described below. The standing subcommittee that reviews these cases may meet any time during the calendar year, subject to scheduling and availability. Cases that require review by the full divisional committee will only be reviewed during the academic year, when the full committee has regularly scheduled meetings.

The PSDC presumes that a tenure recommendation for such candidates will normally be based primarily on research excellence. The evidence must show that the candidate is one of the very best in their peer group; that the candidate's work has had an important impact; that the candidate is exceptionally creative, unusually productive, and unequivocally recognized as a leader in an important area of the physical sciences. The candidate's value to the programs of the department must be shown.

The candidate's dossier must include, at a minimum, the Chair's letter, the offer letter (whether draft or approved or accepted), the CV, the publication record, funding record, available teaching information, mentoring record, research, teaching, and mentoring statements (2 pages max. each), and a minimum of 5 external letters of evaluation from top scholars in the candidate's field (see the sample letter to reviewers at the end of this document), and the statement on impact on department balance and future plans. Other elements of the usual dossier can be included at the discretion of the department as available. The Chair's letter should include the usual elements, in particular making the case for exceptional accomplishment. The letters of evaluation shall be arm's length letters from prominent scholars selected by the department. Letter writers may include up to three referees from the application for the position, provided they are re-invited with a standard tenure letter request package.

Upon submission of an expedited review dossier, the PSDC Chair will inform the department chair of the time and place for review by the PSDC expedited review subcommittee. At the meeting, the department chair will be permitted to make a brief presentation of the case, followed by questions from the PSDC subcommittee members. The PSDC subcommittee will then convene for deliberation and voting. A unanimous positive vote is required of all voting members present for a positive PSDC tenure recommendation. Should a case fall short of unanimity, the department will be asked to prepare a standard PSDC dossier, and the case will be evaluated and voted upon according to usual PSDC procedures.

Template Letter to Reviewers (Standard)

Dear :

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

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

Because pandemic mitigation efforts may lead to variation in probationary periods within and between disciplines, we encourage you to evaluate this case holistically, and not based solely on journal metrics or constrained by an arbitrary number of years on faculty or since a terminal academic degree. We ask that you continue to consider the quality of the candidate's work, the impact they have had on their academic field, and their overall professional development. However, please de-emphasize factors such as quantity, rate, or timeliness of the accomplishments, that may have been adversely influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic effects.

It would be most useful to us if your appraisal could cover the various aspects of the candidate's research [and/or outreach/extension]. It is particularly important that it give specific evaluations of the quality and impact of the candidate's most important contributions, and their standing in the field. 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 Physical Sciences for a further review of the candidacy. The Executive Committee is an elected committee of senior faculty throughout the physical sciences 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 holistic understanding of the candidate and their fitness; 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 possible.
- The candidate's standing overall as a scholar both in the specialty area and in the broader field.
- The candidate's effectiveness in communication, special accomplishments in the mentoring of graduate students, and/or evidence of pedagogical skills that indicate that the candidate would be effective in the mentoring of graduate students. Comments on teaching are not required; if included they should be supported by examples of direct observations or first-hand knowledge of developed materials.
- [For outreach/extension candidates: Evidence that the candidate has developed and implemented a high quality outreach/extension program that has had a significant impact.]

- Whether the candidate would merit promotion [appointment] to a tenured position within your own department [if in academia] and in other, leading departments in the candidate's area.
- Please include any additional information that you feel is particularly relevant with respect to promotion [appointment] to a tenured position.

If you are personally acquainted with the candidate, we would appreciate knowing the length of time you have known the candidate and the nature of the association. It is important to recognize that the inclusion of words or phrases that reinforce stereotypes can inadvertently disadvantage some tenure candidates.

Your letter will be read only by tenured faculty in the [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 outreach /extension] activities to aid us in our deliberations. Appraisals are being solicited from leading authorities in the candidate's area of concentration and in related areas. We would appreciate your appraisal of this candidate.

For your information we are enclosing a resume for [candidate] which includes a listing of their publications, conference addresses, [outreach/extension 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 outreach/extension]. It is particularly important that it give specific evaluations of the quality and impact of the candidate's most important contributions, and their standing in the field. 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 Physical Sciences for a further review of the candidacy. The Executive Committee is an elected committee of senior faculty throughout the physical sciences 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 holistic understanding of the candidate and their fitness; 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.
- [For outreach/extension candidates: Evidence that the candidate has developed and implemented a high quality outreach/extension 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 appointment to a tenured position.

If you are personally acquainted with the candidate, we would appreciate knowing the length of time you have known the candidate and the nature of the association. It is important to recognize that the inclusion of words or phrases that reinforce stereotypes can inadvertently disadvantage some tenure candidates.

Your letter will be read only by tenured faculty in the [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 (Scholarship in Education)

Dear :

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

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

Because pandemic mitigation efforts may lead to variation in probationary periods within and between disciplines, we encourage you to evaluate this case holistically, and not based solely on journal metrics or constrained by an arbitrary number of years on faculty or since a terminal academic degree. Reviewers should continue to consider the quality of the candidate's work, the impact they have had on their academic field, and their overall professional development. However, reviewers should de-emphasize factors such as quantity, rate, or timeliness of the accomplishments, that may have been adversely influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic effects.

It would be most useful to us if your appraisal could cover the various aspects of the candidate's educational activities and outreach efforts. Please note that Dr. [name]'s current appointment does not include an expectation of research in the [discipline] discipline, and their tenure case is based primarily on scholarship in education. It is particularly important that your appraisal give specific evaluations of the creativity and quality of their contributions to the content, techniques and/or art of classroom teaching and its impact beyond UW-Madison.

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 Physical Sciences for a further review of the candidacy. The Executive Committee is an elected committee of senior faculty throughout the physical sciences 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 holistic understanding of the candidate and their fitness; 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 educational scholarship, and the impact of the candidate's activities on educational practices beyond UW-Madison. It is particularly useful to identify the candidate's most important innovations, and to comment on their significance not only for [discipline] education, but also for science literacy in general.
- 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 possible.
- The candidate's standing overall as an educator both in the specialty area and in the broader field.
- The candidate's effectiveness in communication, special accomplishments in the mentoring of graduate students, and/or evidence of pedagogical skills that indicate that the candidate would be effective in the mentoring of graduate students and formal classroom teaching.

- [For outreach/extension candidates: Evidence that the candidate has developed and implemented a high quality outreach/extension program that has had a significant impact.]
- Whether the candidate would merit promotion [appointment] to a tenured position within your own department [if in academia] and in other, leading departments in the candidate's area.
- Please include any additional information that you feel is particularly relevant with respect to promotion [appointment] to a tenured position.

If you are personally acquainted with the candidate, we would appreciate knowing the length of time you have known the candidate and the nature of the association. It is important to recognize that the inclusion of words or phrases that reinforce stereotypes can inadvertently disadvantage some tenure candidates.

Your letter will be read only by tenured faculty in the [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.