

**University of Wisconsin-Madison
Faculty Division of Social Sciences**

Statement of Criteria and Evidence for Recommendations Regarding Tenure

Effective May 2024

The Executive Committee's criteria for appointment to tenure are intended to preserve and enhance the university's excellence and its function in developing the human intellect. Tenure contributes to this objective by giving a strong measure of security and protection to faculty members; it frees them 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. The granting of tenure is a long-term commitment of university and state resources that requires proof of excellence and a forecast for sustained high-quality performance. There is no entitlement to tenure based upon a record that is merely competent and satisfactory.

The university, in considering a candidate's future contributions to the educational function, should accord major significance to all evidence of scholarly excellence and productivity. Scholarly excellence and productivity are measured by the quality of (1) research and scholarly work; (2) teaching and the development of teaching materials; and (3) service to the public, the university, and the profession. Research, teaching, and service collectively encompass the diversity of activities essential for all faculty, including those with extension/outreach responsibilities in integrated departments and professional schools, and others with specialized missions. The standards to be applied in judging research, teaching, and service, and the role of faculty with budgeted extension/ outreach responsibilities, are elaborated immediately below, and specific requirements for the dossier and supplemental materials are described later in this document.

I. RESEARCH

The candidate should have a record of scholarly inquiry that makes a contribution to knowledge. These accomplishments and productive scholarship may be demonstrated in one or more of the following ways: (1) conducting research with appropriate methods and rigor; (2) conceptualizing and theorizing in an original way; (3) synthesizing, critically analyzing, and clarifying extant knowledge and research; (4) developing innovative methods for conducting scholarly inquiry; and (5) conducting research related to the solution of practical problems of individuals, groups, organizations, or societies. Where appropriate to the role of the faculty member, innovative and scholarly translation and dissemination of the results of scholarly inquiry in their discipline for the benefit of society will also demonstrate research ability.

Evidence of research performance and of a candidate's standing in a discipline includes (1) scholarly books, monographs, chapters, bulletins, media, videos, computer programs, technical reports, web sites, etc.; (2) articles published or accepted for publication in scholarly or professional journals; (3) scholarly activities that enhance the Wisconsin Idea exemplary materials that demonstrate community-engaged scholarship and/or scholarly activities that promote diversity, equity, and inclusion; (4) reviews and other evaluations of the candidate's publications and manuscripts; (5) citation of the work, along with norms for the field or subfield; (6) research awards, grants, and proposals; (7) evaluations by authorities, especially those from other major universities, in the candidate's field of specialization; (8) 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 (9) patents or evidence of intellectual property. The case must be made both as to the quality and level of contribution of the candidate's present work and also to the potential of the candidate's future work to contribute to disciplinary scholarship (and interdisciplinary scholarship, as appropriate) and to the missions of the department and the university.

II. TEACHING

The candidate should have demonstrated effective teaching. The following should be evident in the record: commitment to teaching, success in communication of material, and stimulation of learner interest. Because continual improvement of courses is part of good instruction, evidence of these achievements should be furnished. Some candidates may have made significant, innovative developments in instructional techniques and materials which affect academic programs in their department or discipline. Procedures adopted or admired by colleagues within and outside the candidate's department should be documented. Other noteworthy contributions include teaching beyond regular duties, collaborative efforts, and interdisciplinary instructional activities.

Evaluation of teaching ability and performance must take into account the wide range of approaches to teaching within the university. Besides the variations attributable to individual personality and style, there are distinctions among types of teaching situations both on and off campus. No candidate is expected to be equally proficient in all teaching situations; proficiency must be demonstrated in those teaching situations most appropriate to the candidate's teaching mission and responsibilities.

These include lectures, discussion sections, seminars, institutes, workshops, media presentations, laboratory instruction, clinical teaching, in-service training, media courses, distance-learning courses, individual tutorials, supervising undergraduate research, advising and consulting, and consultative exchanges with client groups.

Evidence must be presented that the candidate has engaged in a teaching program of substantial quality and quantity. The following kinds of information are appropriate: (1) a statement by the candidate of teaching philosophy; (2) a statement by the department of the candidate's contribution to the teaching mission; (3) systematic surveys of student opinion; (4) evaluation by teaching assistants, teaching specialists, workshop participants, clients, or trainees; (5) evaluation by peers based on direct observation of teaching or extension/outreach program presentations and examination of teaching or program materials; (6) documentation of student advising, consultations, and research and clinical supervision; (7) examples of teaching or program materials; and (8) evidence of scholarly achievements related to the candidate's teaching program, such as publications, honors, or awards. Each type of evidence provides an incomplete picture; a balanced judgment of teaching ability must rely on several kinds of evidence.

III. SERVICE

Service activities fall into three general categories: public, university, and professional. All service activities must be adequately documented. If exceptional service is claimed as part of the case for tenure, the quality or significance of the service should be documented. Candidates may submit a statement on the nature and impact of their service (no more than two pages) and are strongly encouraged to do so in cases where service is one of the proposed areas of excellence.

Public. Faculty members participate in various ways in carrying out the university's obligation to serve the state and the public. Public service may include 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.

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. Participation in activities in one's capacity as a citizen outside the university is not ordinarily considered.

The Executive Committee recognizes that public service is a major, and for many a primary, duty for faculty with extension/outreach responsibilities. The documentation in such cases must clearly demonstrate either how the candidate is meeting the extension/outreach program needs of the public through the teaching, coordination and evaluation of extension/outreach programs or how the candidate's work may have aided in shaping public policy. Evidence should be presented showing that a candidate with extension/outreach responsibilities has been able to identify program needs, develop and teach programs to address those needs, use new and existing information in program development, skillfully deliver programs to the public, and evaluate those programs. The Executive Committee requires specific, reliable evidence of productivity, quality, creativity, and impact.

University. The effective operation of the university requires a high degree of faculty participation and, at times, intensive activity in faculty government, departmental and university committees, administrative roles, advisory functions, and similar tasks. All faculty must share in this task, but the Executive Committee recognizes that a heavier burden may and should fall on the shoulders of more senior (and already tenured) faculty members.

Professional. Service to one's profession or academic discipline may occur at local, state, national or international levels. Appropriate activities include service as an officer, member of a board, committee, or task force of a professional group, on-site visits, reviewing research proposals or manuscripts, and organizing and participating in professional and technical meetings such as training institutes, workshops, conferences, and continuing professional education.

IV. WEIGHING THE EVIDENCE

A recommendation for promotion or appointment with tenure should clearly present evidence that the candidate has made and will continue to make significant contributions. The recommendation should identify the candidate's relative balance of responsibilities and accomplishments in research, teaching, and service. The relative number, quality and ranking of refereed journals in which the candidate has published; a review of publication citation rates; numerical ratings of teaching effectiveness; and letters, for example, should be used to document the case, but are not the case in and of themselves.

Types of cases

In weighing the evidence for each of the types of cases outlined below, the divisional committee will consider the candidate's corpus of scholarly work, the trajectory of its production, its influence, importance, and the likelihood that the candidate will continue to make significant contributions in the future.

1. Demonstrated excellence in research and one other domain

Demonstrated excellence in two of the three areas, one of which must be research, is normally required. The candidate's performance must be at least adequate in the third. The appropriate balance among research, teaching and service is generally determined by the candidate's letter of appointment and the expectations of the department. **In the chair's letter, the sponsoring department should state clearly which area beyond research shows demonstrated excellence.**

2. Demonstrated exceptional merit in one area with adequate performance in other domains

In unusual cases, a department may recommend tenure for a candidate whose efforts and abilities do not appear appropriately balanced among research, teaching and service. In such cases, the department must demonstrate that the candidate is clearly exceptional in either teaching or research, adequate in the other, as well as in service; that the candidate has performed in accord with the department's expectations; and that the overall balance within the candidate's department will not be adversely affected. Where a recommendation is made primarily on an exceptional record in either research or teaching, the evidence must show clearly that the candidate is one of the very best in their field, and that the candidate's special competence or talents will bring added distinction and visibility or otherwise be of special value to the department. Where a recommendation is based primarily on exceptional teaching, the impact of the candidate's contributions should extend beyond the university; there should be evidence that the candidate has contributed creatively to teaching in the field. Unusual rapport with students is important, but not by itself sufficient to support a case for tenure based primarily on teaching. Significant public service contributions may strengthen a case for tenure but, except in the case of faculty with budgeted extension/outreach responsibilities, cannot be the primary basis for a tenure recommendation. The Executive Committee recognizes that particular activities may make contributions to more than one area. A candidate's activities and accomplishments in promoting diversity in research, teaching, and service may also be valued in the consideration for tenure.

3. Outreach/Extension

A tenure recommendation may be made on the basis of significant extension/outreach activities for a candidate with primarily extension/outreach responsibilities. In such cases the evidence must show that the candidate is recognized both within and outside the university in their field, and has made significant contributions to extension/outreach through an appropriate balance of teaching, research and public service. The Executive Committee recognizes that translation and dissemination of research results through teaching and service are the most important responsibilities of a faculty member with primarily extension/outreach responsibilities.

4. Demonstrated excellence through integration of all three domains

For some departments, it may be preferable to appoint faculty to tenure track positions for which the expectation is that the faculty member will integrate research, teaching, and service. Cases of this type allow demonstration of excellence in instances where the three areas of achievement may be so closely integrated that it is not possible to unambiguously document and assign accomplishments to specific areas. Further, the integrated case is an avenue whereby a candidate can demonstrate generation of new knowledge, scholarly creativity and substantial impact where the activities that create this impact are distributed over more than one interrelated activity. Excellence is expected and it is incumbent upon the department and candidate to demonstrate, with appropriate metrics and supporting documentation, how one activity synergizes with another in a way that creates novel tools, treatments, ideas or knowledge to generate an impact.

Evaluation of an integrated case should take into account the overall impact on a field or the target community and document that the synergy among the various areas of achievement demonstrates excellence and meets the above criteria, as stated in Standards and Criteria of the Executive Committee of the Social Sciences Division, for achieving tenure.

In an integrated case the relative contributions of the three areas may vary but evidence within each area must be present. The types of impacts that a faculty candidate may have demonstrated to highlight excellence in an integrated case could, for example, include a number of the following:

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

See [committee's standing procedures](#) for information on voting and reconsideration procedures.

FORMAT OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO A TENURED POSITION

Tenure appointments are governed by [Chapter 4](#), “The Faculty Divisions” (particularly [4.20](#)) and [Chapter 7](#), “Faculty Appointments” (particularly [7.14](#) and [7.15](#)) of the *Faculty Policies and Procedures*; the procedures of the relevant school or college; and the above “Statement of Criteria and Evidence for Recommendations regarding Tenure, Division of the Social Sciences.”

If the candidate’s proposed tenure appointment is to be divided among several departments, each department’s executive committee must make an affirmative recommendation (see [Ch. 7.02](#) of *Faculty Policies and Procedures*). In such circumstances, the chair of the department that is principal sponsor of the recommendation is responsible for preparation of the dossier and supporting materials described below.

In the case of faculty whose scholarly interests are interdisciplinary (including those arising from cluster hires), in addition to the letter provided by the chair of the principal sponsoring department, we recommend that letters assessing the candidate and indicating their contribution be provided by all additional departments and/or programs with which a candidate is affiliated. We encourage provision of such supplementary material even if those departments and/or programs have no formal role in the tenure recommendation.

Each recommendation for appointment or promotion to a tenured position consists of a tenure packet that includes a Dossier and Supporting Materials.

For an alternative streamlined process for senior hires, see the end of this memo.

(Note: The dossier is Part One and the supporting materials are Part Two.)

Part One: The Dossier

The dossier should be presented in 150 pages or less, excluding departmental tenure guidelines (III.) and copies of the candidate’s publications (section X.E).

- I. A letter, memo or statement of transmittal from the appropriate dean requesting the advice of the Divisional Committee.
- II. Letter(s) of appointment. Please redact salary and startup package information.
- III. A copy of the departmental tenure guidelines
- IV. The sponsoring department chair’s letter should include (with exceptions as noted in section V.):
 - A. A statement indicating the nature of the proposed appointment including the percent of time devoted to extension/outreach activities, if applicable. If past and/or proposed appointments are divided among several departments, indicate the nature of the arrangement and the fraction of appointment in each department.
 - B. The number of eligible voters in the departmental executive committee during the semester of

the tenure decision and the exact vote, including absences and/or abstentions. (If appropriate, explanation of absences and/or abstentions should be given.) If a minority of the faculty voting negatively feels strongly enough to prepare a minority report, that report should be included with the formal departmental proposal.

In the case of divided appointments, the Divisional Committee requires a letter from the chair of each department providing the information about the vote for that executive committee.

- C. The number of years of probationary service the candidate will have completed at the end of the current academic year. The chair's letter should note if the candidate's probationary period ("tenure clock") was extended and what is the end of the tenure clock. However, the letter should not describe the specific circumstances for those extensions unless they were for relevant professional reasons rather than for personal reasons, e.g. parental leave or sick leave. For junior faculty, the evaluation should focus on the work accrued during the probationary period. For junior faculty, the evaluation period includes years credited from prior service.
- D. A departmental evaluation of the candidate's teaching, research, and service, which should include factual and judgmental statements about each area. **The letter should state clearly in which other area besides research the candidate is deemed to have achieved excellence or area of exceptional merit.** The evaluation should address the candidate's blend of teaching, research, and service. It should review the factors entering into the department's judgment in relation to the Divisional Committee's "Statement of Criteria." The use of superlatives without analysis of the work is not helpful.

An assessment of the candidate's anticipated contributions to the development of the department is to be provided. Include the candidate's contributions to the department's mission and strategic goals.

Department letters should motivate the candidate's work within the larger field within which the candidate works, keeping in mind that Divisional Committee members come from a wide range of theoretical and methodological perspectives across the fields that constitute the Social Sciences. This is especially important where the candidate's work cuts across disciplines. Where appropriate, letters should provide some explanation of the transdisciplinary or interdisciplinary fields to which a candidate's work contributes, indicating how the candidate's work fits into this area or these areas.

In the case of divided appointments, provide a summary of the contribution of the candidate to the other relevant departments.

- E. A summary of the standards of research excellence for the candidate's department/unit and disciplinary or interdisciplinary norms of research excellence.
- F. A statement in the Chair's letter describing how excellence in teaching or service is defined, promoted, and assessed in the candidate's department.

V. Considerations for divided and interdisciplinary appointments or integrated cases.

For an integrated case, the chair's letter must provide a clear description of the integrated nature of the activities and their impact. If the faculty member was not initially appointed with this intent or if the description of the appointment was adjusted during the probationary period, the chair's letter should provide a narrative describing and justifying the underlying rationale for the changes.

Note: If the recommendation is to be made on the basis as an "exceptional" case (in one area only: teaching, service or research) extensive documentation and justification are expected.

- A. In cases where a candidate has a divided appointment, letters from all departments whose executive committee makes a tenure recommendation should be provided. The content of letters should follow IV above.
- B. In cases where, in addition to a single tenure home appointment, a candidate is integrally involved with additional departments or programs, we recommend letters from each of these departments and/or programs be provided. Such letters should speak to the teaching and service the candidate has contributed to these departments and/or programs. In addition, where appropriate, we recommend discussion of the inter- or multi-disciplinary character of the candidate's research.
- C. For integrated cases only, the candidate must provide a summary statement (no longer than five pages) regarding the overall nature of the integration of activities and how their integration fulfills the criteria for tenure. **This statement replaces separate statements on research, teaching, and service considered in standard cases.** Descriptions of the candidate's approach to specific activity areas (teaching, service, and future research) and how they are integrated within the whole should be provided in this statement.

VI. *Curriculum vitae* with entries corresponding to the list below:

- Name
- Formal Education
- Title of Thesis
- Positions Held (list chronologically with no time period unaccounted for)
- Special Honors and Awards
- Research and Publications
 - Proper bibliographical form should be followed, **listing the names of coauthors in sequence as published**, and paging. Names of journals should be given in full.
 - Publication citation rates may be provided
 - These groupings may be useful: books and monographs; research and other scholarly papers; other publications (including conference proceedings, working papers); book reviews; and extension/outreach publications
 - **Those that are peer reviewed should be indicated by an asterisk**
 - Identify all publications based on work performed prior to the tenure-track appointment at UW-Madison
 - Number each publication in the vita in reverse chronological order, with the most recent first, and identify each publication submitted with that number

- Research and Publications in Progress
- Research Support (source, dates, and amount)
- List of Presentations (invited and conference)
- Teaching (principal areas and experience)
- Service (public, university, and professional)

VII. At least five letters must be provided from distinguished scholars in the candidate's field. In most cases, more than eight letters is excessive.

The departmental executive committee must ensure that at least five of these individuals (a) are not currently UW-Madison faculty and were not on the faculty when or after the candidate was recruited, (b) did not mentor the candidate (i.e. dissertation committee member or faculty mentor as a graduate student or post doc), (c) have not collaborated with the candidate (i.e. submitted research proposals or conducted research as co-investigators, published as a co-author, or other work relationship that may introduce bias in the candidate's review), (d) have not been colleagues or peers in the same department at any point during the candidate's career or training, and (e) have no personal interest in the candidate's success or attainment of tenure. Files of extension/outreach candidates must include letters from recognized experts in the candidate's field. The chair's letter should address any potential conflicts that letter writers will raise about why the relationship is arm's length.

The divisional committee prefers evaluation letters from experts at the rank of full professor from peer institutions or departments (but letters from other scholars can be considered with a thorough justification). If letters from associate professors or emeriti are solicited or if letters from full professors from non-peer institutions are solicited, please give an explanation. For an integrated case, requests for letters could specifically request an evaluation of the faculty member's integration of activities. Please also add information about the ranking of the letter writers' institution and home department.

The departmental executive committee should solicit no more than three letters that do not meet the above criteria. The departmental executive committee must provide rationale for soliciting such letters.

A summary document for this section must: (a) indicate by whom the outside evaluators were nominated; (b) include a list of the materials sent to the reviewers; (c) account for everyone asked for a review, including those who declined or did not respond (the reason should be stated, if known, preferably in the form of a brief letter from the evaluator who declined), and include informal as well as formal information; (d) state the nature of the relationship between the candidate and each evaluator (and specify why the letter is considered arm's length and/or address any ambiguities about the arm's length relationship of letter writers); (e) include a brief statement on the qualifications of each expert who was solicited for 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 field, and should explain why those not at leading research institutions were selected; and (f) acknowledge that all letters received have been included in the dossier. This information may be presented in tabular form.

The department should provide a sample copy of the letter requesting an evaluation. The letter should include a request for an evaluation of the candidate's contributions. It should not include a

department's assessment of a candidate or report on any votes that have been taken.

The letter should also include a request to explain whether and how the evaluator knows the candidate. Template letters are available at the end of this document.

In the rare case where a department executive committee has decided a tenure case is ready to proceed and collected arm's length letters only to pause the process, the department can choose to solicit a second batch of letters in a future academic year, if the candidate has at least one year left on their tenure clock. All the letters returned in response to the initial and secondary solicitation must be included in the tenure dossier.

VIII. Documentation of Teaching. The Divisional Committee requires:

A. A chronology of the candidate's teaching experience at the University of Wisconsin- Madison, and other teaching to the extent possible. Teaching at other institutions must be chronicled and documented with whatever evaluative evidence is available (e.g., student evaluations, peer review, sample syllabi and teaching materials). For classroom teaching, list each course by course number and title, and indicate its enrollment and whether undergraduate or graduate. For other teaching situations, off campus or nontraditional, be specific about the type of situation, duration, level, and audience or participants. This chronology should include a list of graduate students supervised. The department should summarize any contextual factors it has found important, such as size of class, required versus elective course, difficulty of material, preparation of students. This information may be in tabular form.

Departments should focus their documentation of teaching on the most recent six years of experience for senior candidates. If the senior candidate for full professor has not taught extensively during the most recent period, evidence of earlier teaching quality should also be presented.

B. For other than integrated cases, a reflective statement by the candidate describing personal teaching philosophy, strategies, and objectives. (2 pages maximum)

C. Teaching materials: the dossier should include a representative syllabus from at least one course, with syllabi from a selected semester for all other courses included in the supporting materials. If the syllabus does not indicate the schedule of topics covered, readings and other assignments over the course of the semester, please provide this information in a separate document. The dossier should also contain descriptions of any innovative instructional materials prepared by the candidate. These may include textbooks, workbooks, applications of instructional technology and innovative uses of information technology. Special consideration should be given to documentation of the candidate's completion of teaching workshops or courses, attempts at new or improved teaching methods and materials, and to evaluation of their effectiveness. Other teaching materials can be included as supporting materials.

D. Organized summary of student feedback, and comparative evaluation of teaching (relative to comparable classes in the department and improvement over time). State how feedback was acquired. Provide a sample copy of each evaluation instrument that shows the questions asked. In addition, the originals of all student evaluations should be provided to the committee as part of the supporting materials (not within the dossier) for review of student comments. Feedback

from other institutions should be presented as well if available, with the understanding that this information may not be comparable to that obtained at UW-Madison. Although the committee requires student feedback, it is aware of limitations and bias in surveys of student opinion. Programs are encouraged to introduce multiple forms of student feedback, such as discussions with focus groups, retrospective evaluations, letter from former students, or indicators of effective learning based on student outcomes. The chair's letter should provide additional context on why evaluations in a given class may be lower than average.

- E. Peer reviews. The dossier should include annual written peer reviews beginning in the first year the candidate is teaching. Each evaluation by peers in the context of tenure review should be based on both direct observation and examination of course syllabi, exams, and other teaching materials. Such evaluations may consist of statements from colleagues who have observed in the classroom or other instructional setting as members of a teaching team or as independent observers and should clearly detail strengths and weaknesses of teaching activities and materials as appropriate.
- F. Record of student advising, consultations, and research supervision. Information on effectiveness as a faculty adviser from present or former students. Some candidates for promotion to tenure, and most candidates for appointment to tenure, will have a record of such service as major professor to graduate students. Evaluation by these students may be included in the documentation. The subsequent performance of these students and advisees may provide useful evidence of the capabilities of a candidate.
- G. Honors or other recognition from colleagues such as a distinguished teaching award, publications related to teaching, grants awarded for teaching enhancement, or election to a committee on teaching should be included.
- H. As appropriate, other kinds of evidence may be included, such as evidence of student learning, assessment by workshop participants, clients, trainees, teaching assistants, or others. Such evidence should summarize systematically, rather than simply quoting a few laudatory comments.
- I. 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, government, or not-for profit organizations 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 express complex ideas; the candidate's ability to respond to inquiries about content matter; or the quality of the candidate's presentations at conferences, symposia, or continuing education presentations. 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.

IX. Documentation of Service.

To be relevant in tenure decisions, service activities must clearly involve a high level of skill in communicating and applying the knowledge of one's professional competence. Documentation of service should evaluate the quality of such service, as well as highlight individual efforts that are especially significant. The discussion should identify the nature of the tasks performed and the particular responsibilities of the candidate. When service is a major aspect of a candidate's responsibilities, letters should be solicited from authorities in the field evaluating the quality and impact of the service and its importance to the university.

Evidence of public service may include:

- A. Consultations to the community and significant advisory work with government, business, or industry.
- B. Extension/outreach program planning and development.
- C. Membership on committees and boards.
- D. Public lectures and presentations.
- E. Participation in radio and television programs.
- F. Service in official positions of public organizations or agencies.
- G. Publications for nonprofessionals.
- H. Testifying at public hearings.
- I. Preparation of reports.
- J. On site visits.
- K. The development of exemplary materials.

Evidence of university service may include:

- A. Major committee assignments in the department or the university.
- B. Chair or associate chair of a department or dean or associate dean of a school or college.
- C. Coordinator of statewide extension/outreach programs.
- D. Special administrative assignments in a department, college, or university.

Evidence of professional service may include:

- A. Membership on state, regional, or national review panels, study sections, councils, etc.
- B. Membership on editorial boards of professional journals or other reviewing or editing activities.
- C. Office of national or international scientific, professional, and educational organizations.
- D. Leadership in the development of continuing professional education for personnel in the field.

X. Documentation of Research Output. The Divisional Committee requires the following documentation for all candidates. For appointments at the full professor level, documentation may be limited to the most recent six-year period, with attention also given to earlier seminal work.

- A. Other than an integrated case, a succinct statement by the candidate describing the candidate's research program, major accomplishments to date, and goals for the future. (2 pages maximum).
- B. For coauthored publications give the full reference including the names of all coauthors and

describe the relationship of each to the candidate (e.g. mentor, peer, student). Describe the nature and extent of the candidate's contribution and those of directly supervised students and postdocs, distinct from their coauthors. Estimate the candidate's contributions to any jointly authored publication including: (a) contribution to conceptualization; (b) contribution to methodology and data analysis and (c) contribution to writing. In situations where coauthored work with peers or senior colleagues is central to establishing research excellence, departments may wish to solicit statements from coauthors that address their relative contributions. The department chair's letter should explain how authorship is organized in the candidate's discipline and in cases where a substantial number of papers are coauthored, the chair's letter should also describe the nature of the relationships between the candidate and co-authors. The candidate's independent contributions should be made explicit.

- C. Distinguish peer-reviewed articles from non-peer-reviewed pieces on the candidate's curriculum vitae. For publications that are peer reviewed, the department chair should provide an evaluation of the quality and standing of the publication outlet. Journal Citation Reports available through the Memorial Library provide one source of data, as well as the acceptance rate of various journals, which is often provided in official reports by the journal or can be obtained from editorial offices. The committee's concern is to document that there truly is a competitive selection process for a given journal. For nonrefereed publications, evaluation of the work's research and scholarly merit should be solicited from recognized authorities in the field. For extension/outreach publications, indicate any specialized nonacademic audiences for which it is designed and its influence on public policy and welfare or specific client groups.
- D. Evidence of acceptance for publications "in press" or "accepted for publication."
- E. The chair of the department should select two research publications (e.g., usually articles or book chapters) that are considered most representative of the candidate's work, append them to the dossier and give a rationale why they were chosen. For candidates with significant extension/outreach responsibilities, one of these documents should be illustrative of typical documents meant for use by client groups.

XI. For extension/outreach candidates, describe of up to three significant programs in which the candidate made a major contribution. Use the following format:

- A. Identify the problem, the clientele, and the needs assessment procedure.
- B. Outline the objectives.
- C. Provide details on the method of instruction and delivery, and on innovative teaching methods, materials, aids or approaches.
- D. Document the significance of the program and its relevance to the social problems in the state and nation, and its potential or demonstrated impact on public policy and welfare.
- E. Include relevant peer and client evaluations.

XII. Scholarly Activity that Enhances the *Wisconsin Idea*

Pursuant to the *Wisconsin Idea*, engaged scholarship seeks to extend scholarly traditions of research, instruction, and outreach through community engagement. Faculty contributions to the *Wisconsin Idea* should be recognized and valued.

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.

The criteria for high-quality engaged scholarship can include the candidate's demonstration of:

- A. Clear academic and community goals.
- B. Adequate preparation in relevant knowledge domains and disciplines.
- C. Grounding in community needs and the interests of partners, recognizing strengths and assets of both community and institution.
- D. Appropriate scholarly methods, community engagement techniques, and socially and ethically responsible conduct.
- E. Documented community impact, evaluated from academic and community perspectives.
- F. Significant results disseminated to scholarly domains.
- G. Significant results discussed with communities and disseminated through appropriate media.
- H. Reflective critique: lessons learned to improve scholarship and community engagement.

Scholarly activities to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion can take many forms. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement, including research, teaching, and service, that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition and should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. This engagement may reflect the active promotion of practices and policies that support under-represented or disadvantaged groups as defined by race, culture, gender, socioeconomic status, mental or physical disability, and any other dimension of exclusion. Below are some examples of the kinds of activities that might be documented in a tenure dossier:

- A. Conducting scholarly work related to the solution of practical problems of individuals, groups, organizations, or communities.
- B. Research in a scholar's area of expertise that addresses and contextualizes historical and current inequalities.

- C. Evidence of efforts to advance equitable access to education.
- D. Active mentoring and advising minority students or new faculty members and academic staff.
- E. Creating an inclusive and respectful classroom.
- F. Public or campus service that addresses the needs of under-served communities
- G. Student recruitment and faculty/staff hiring practices oriented to opening opportunities for under-represented groups.
- H. Leading initiatives and activities focused on increasing awareness and knowledge of equity, diversity and inclusion among the campus community.

XIII. COVID-19 pandemic considerations for promotion at UW-Madison

1. Divisional Committees should continue to review dossiers holistically, not based on journal metrics or constrained by an arbitrary number of years. Reviews should continue to focus on accomplishments, trajectory and the candidate's total body of work during the probationary period. If a tenure candidate who has been granted an extension elects not to use the extension, Divisional Committees should review the dossier with this same holistic approach.
2. To avoid bias, requests for extensions should be made to the vice chancellor for academic affairs and provost (with informational copies to the faculty member's department chair and dean), consistent with the policy for tenure clock extensions described in Faculty Policies and Procedures Chapter 7.04, and not by the Divisional Committees. The reason(s) for extension should not be disclosed or discussed to the Divisional Committees. Divisional Committees should treat COVID-19 extensions like any other extension. Appeals of denial of an extension requests should follow the procedures outlined in Faculty Policies and Procedures Chapter 7.04 and 8.15.
3. The candidate and Department Chair have the option of providing a brief statement of impact, that would specifically focus on how the candidate's accomplishments in their areas of excellence and/or significant accomplishment were affected by the pandemic. For example, a major grant or source of funding was lost due to work interruption or research restrictions. The absence of such a statement will not be viewed negatively.
4. Mentor Committees and Department Chairs should anticipate COVID-19 related issues that may affect a candidate's promotion and encourage candidates to submit request for an extension as early possible.
5. The Provost's office should prepare for several years of COVID-19 related extension requests, since the impact of pandemic is not clear and may affect several years of productivity for some candidates.
6. To avoid repetitive/persistent extension without promotion, broader or alternative ways to assess productivity may be needed.

Sample COVID-19 language for external review letters

The COVID-19 pandemic has affected the productivity and pace at which probationary faculty progress towards promotion. The UW-Madison is sensitive to the extenuating circumstances and disruptions created by the pandemic including limited access to campus research spaces and resources, transitioning to remote learning, restricted travel, among other major changes. We also are sensitive to biases that reviewers may experience when evaluating a promotion dossier. Because pandemic mitigation efforts may lead to variation in probationary periods within and between disciplines, we encourage reviewers to evaluate dossiers holistically, not based on journal metrics or constrained by an arbitrary number of years on faculty or since a terminal academic degree. Though tenure clocks may be extended, tenure standards have not been relaxed. Reviewers should continue to consider the quality of the candidate's work, the impact they have had on their academic field, and their professional trajectory. They should de-emphasize quantity, rate, and timeliness of the accomplishments given the COVID-19 pandemic effects.

Part Two: Supporting Materials

- A. The Ph.D. dissertation or equivalent; this is not required for candidates at the full professor level.
- B. All the candidate's significant professional publications and manuscripts of works accepted for publication (for full professors, the most recent six-year period). Optionally include copies of unpublished manuscripts, grant proposals, or other evidence of work in process.
- C. The originals of all student feedback on teaching.
- D. Syllabi for all courses taught. (Include only the most recent syllabus for each course unless you wish to document significant changes in a course syllabus overtime.)
- E. Any other lengthy supporting materials relevant to documenting research, teaching, service or extension/outreach, depending on their nature.

Presentation of the Case

The divisional committee requires a bookmarked PDF of the tenure dossier, plus supporting materials in electronic or hard copy. See [Checklist of Materials for Tenure Recommendation](#) for instructions. Departments are strongly encouraged to submit tenure packets early in the year and early in the semester. Upon receipt, the tenure packet will be reviewed for completeness. If documentation is incomplete, delays in committee review may ensue. If more cases are submitted than can be accommodated at a particular meeting, the divisional committee chair will consider factors such as reviewer availability and the urgency of the decision when determining which cases to postpone for review at a future meeting.

Materials must be submitted by noon by the [deadline posted on the web site](#). A calendar of Social Sciences Divisional Committee meetings and other documents can be found at to the *Faculty Divisions* section of the Office of the Secretary's website: www.secfac.wisc.edu. Direct questions to the divisional committees coordinator (divisional@secfac.wisc.edu or 263-5741).

Alternative Streamlined Process for Senior Hires

The Divisional Committee notes that many full professors in the division are eminently qualified for tenure at UW–Madison. Preparation of the same type of packet as an assistant professor being considered for tenure burdens departments and, sometimes, hinders the hiring process. Moreover, past tenure cases for these senior hires have often been incomplete given the difficulty of obtaining certain evaluations, especially regarding teaching. Thus, a streamlined tenure process for senior hires is enacted, with the following provisions:

1. A senior hire is defined as an individual who has fully passed the tenure process and been granted tenure in another academic institution, most typically a peer institution. In this context, a senior hire must be a full professor or, if not currently a faculty member, the equivalent of full professor in their respective field.
2. If the senior hire is being recruited for an administrative position at UW–Madison, a tenure-worthy record is still required. In evaluating recent (post-tenure) accomplishments in research, teaching, and service, the Divisional Committee will take into account both the length of time that the senior hire has devoted to administration elsewhere and the administrative position that is being assumed at UW–Madison. For example, persons hired to be department chairs should have ongoing scholarly accomplishments whereas persons hired for full-time higher administrative positions might not have significant recent scholarly accomplishments (for instance, if the person was serving as a Dean or Provost elsewhere or if the person has held a position in government).
3. Departments must opt into the streamlined case procedure. For various reasons, departments might want to submit a traditional case, which remains the default for all cases.
4. Department chairs are required to consult with the Divisional Committee chair before submitting a streamlined case.
5. The Divisional Committee reserves its option to request more information, including outside, arms-length letters, from the department on any streamlined case.
6. Minimum components of a streamlined tenure case for a senior hire:
 - a. A full, long-form C.V., format unspecified
 - b. Materials from the job search, including a description of the applicant pool that yielded the senior hire, all letters of recommendation, including at least 3 arm's length evaluative letters that review the candidate's research record, and other material submitted by the senior hire. These other materials must include the candidate's own statements of research interests and teaching/mentoring approach/accomplishments (maximum of 2 pages each). A syllabus for one course should be appended to the teaching statement. If teaching is not the second area of excellence for the candidate, then a statement about that area (e.g., service or outreach) should be substituted for the teaching statement.
 - c. A record of the Executive Committee vote on the hire and the recommendation for an appointment with tenure, with an explanation of reasons for any split votes.
 - d. A letter from the department chair justifying a positive tenure decision and making the case for excellence as appropriate for the type of case. The format and content of this letter may be adapted to the specific context.
 - e. Three (3) papers representing the candidate's best recent scholarship.
 - f. If the candidate has significant Outreach/Extension responsibilities, a description of one program that the candidate has been involved in should be provided.

SUGGESTED 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 their publications, conference addresses, [extension/outreach publications,] and research funding along with representative publications.

[For an integrated case] At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, tenure can be granted based on excellence demonstrated through the overall impact of a faculty member's work for which the expectation is that the faculty member will integrate research, teaching, and service. We are considering Professor (Dr.)_____ for promotion based on such an integrated case. In addition to assessments of the individual areas of Professor (Dr.)_____ 's work as described below, please evaluate how one activity synergizes the other in a way that creates novel tools, treatments, ideas or knowledge to generate an impact.

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 you provide specific evaluations of the content, quality, and impact of the candidate's most important contributions, including the representative publications provided. 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 Social Sciences for a further review of the candidacy. The Executive Committee is an elected committee of senior faculty throughout the Social 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 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, rigor, 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.
- To the extent that you are able, comment on the candidate's effectiveness in communication, special accomplishments in the mentoring of graduate students, and/or evidence of pedagogical skills that indicate that the candidate would be effective in the mentoring of graduate students and formal classroom teaching.

- [For extension/outreach candidates: Evidence that the candidate has developed and implemented a high quality extension/outreach program that has had a significant impact.]
- Please include any additional information that you feel is particularly relevant with respect to [promotion or appointment] to a tenured position.

In your letter, please indicate whether or not you are personally acquainted with the candidate. If you are personally acquainted, we would appreciate knowing the length of time you have known the candidate and the nature of the association. The UW-Madison Division of Social Sciences considers arm's length reviewers to be those individuals who (a) are not currently UW-Madison faculty and were not on the faculty when or after the candidate was recruited, (b) have not mentored the candidate (i.e. dissertation committee member or faculty mentor as a graduate student or post doc), (c) have not collaborated with the candidate (i.e. submitted research proposals or conducted research as co-investigators, published as a co-author, or other work relationship that may introduce bias in the candidate's review), (d) have not been colleagues or peers in the same department at any point during the candidate's career or training, and (e) have no personal interest in the candidate's success or attainment of tenure.

The COVID-19 pandemic has affected the productivity and pace at which probationary faculty progress towards promotion. The UW-Madison is sensitive to the extenuating circumstances and disruptions created by the pandemic including limited access to campus research spaces and resources, transitioning to remote learning, restricted travel, among other major changes. We also are sensitive to biases that reviewers may experience when evaluating a promotion dossier. Because pandemic mitigation efforts may lead to variation in probationary periods within and between disciplines, we encourage you to evaluate dossiers holistically, not based on journal metrics or constrained by an arbitrary number of years on faculty or since a terminal academic degree. Though tenure clocks may be extended, tenure standards have not been relaxed. You should continue to consider the quality of the candidate's work, the impact they have had on their academic field, and their professional trajectory. You should de-emphasize quantity, rate, and timeliness of the accomplishments given the COVID-19 pandemic effects.

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.

SUGGESTED 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 their 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 you provide specific evaluations of the content, quality, and impact of the candidate's most important contributions, including the representative publications provided. 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 Social Sciences for a further review of the candidacy. The Executive Committee is an elected committee of senior faculty throughout the Social 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 critical review of the candidate; as such, your addressing, as you are able, the following specific points will be particularly helpful:

- [For extension/outreach candidates: Evidence that the candidate has developed and implemented a high quality extension/outreach program that has had a significant impact.]
- Please include any additional information that you feel is particularly relevant with respect to promotion [appointment] to a tenured position.

In your letter, please indicate whether or not you are personally acquainted with the candidate. If you are personally acquainted, we would appreciate knowing the length of time you have known the candidate and the nature of the association. The UW-Madison Division of Social Sciences considers arm's length reviewers to be those individuals who (a) are not currently UW-Madison faculty, (b) have not mentored the candidate (i.e. dissertation committee member or faculty mentor as a graduate student or post doc), (c) have not collaborated with the candidate (i.e. submitted research proposals or conducted research as co-investigators, published as a co-author, or other work relationship that may introduce bias in the candidate's review), (d) have not been colleagues or peers in the same department at any point during the candidate's career or training, and (e) have no personal interest in the candidate's success or attainment of tenure.

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.