

GUIDELINES FOR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROMOTION OR APPOINTMENT TO TENURE

FACULTY DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

October 2009

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 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 or the Coordinator of the Divisional Committees.

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. Promotion is typically considered in the sixth year on the candidate's tenure clock. A decision on tenure must be made before the end of the sixth 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.

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

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

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

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 7.14C of these rules. A copy of these criteria and standards shall be furnished to probationary faculty member(s) (see 7.05A 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 Division Executive 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.

In Part I, guidelines are presented concerning the kind of evidence required for evaluation by the Executive 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 Executive Committee is obligated 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.).

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 Executive 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 Task Force on Peer Review of Teaching for guidance in this matter. Some additional information regarding peer review of teaching techniques, objectives, and outcomes has been put together by a UW-Madison Peer Review of Teaching working group, and is available on the web at www.wisc.edu/MOO. 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.

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 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.)

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. 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. 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 his/her 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 FOR INFORMATION TO BE SUPPLIED

Departmental recommendations for promotion or appointment to tenure should be prepared *according to the following outline*. Fourteen copies should be sent to the divisional chair *at least three weeks* before the meeting of the Divisional Executive Committee during which the recommendations are to be considered. All dossiers should contain one publication. In addition three copies of the other two selected publications should be forwarded for the reviewers. Please *number all pages consecutively*, including all letters of recommendation and appendixes.

- 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 (including the vote of college or school promotion committees if they are involved) or a statement from the department chair that the dean has been consulted and is requesting the advice of the Executive Committee.
- B. Chair's letter of transmittal. 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. In the case of recommendations for promotion before the sixth year, the letter should state clearly why early promotion is proposed, including any exceptional circumstances, and the accompanying documentation must show unambiguously that the candidate's record is so strong that early promotion is justified. **Include a copy of the department tenure guidelines (*Faculty Policies and Procedures 7.14.D*) in the appendixes.** 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. Curriculum Vitae.
1. Name of candidate.
 2. Formal education and positions held (list chronologically, with gaps explained).
 3. Other special information deemed pertinent.
- D. 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 work conducted in centers, clusters or other group-based activities.
- E. 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 by candidate (maximum of two pages).
The candidate should describe his or her 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. 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. 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 (tle.wisc.edu/teaching-academy/peer/index).

A two-part review is strongly recommended. The committee recognizes that some modifications of these peer review guidelines may be appropriate (e.g., for 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 reviewer should document his/her evaluation of the candidate's teaching, in the form of a letter to the department chair. All letters should be included in the tenure dossier. 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.

4. Student evaluations of candidate's teaching
Student evaluations are an important means of evaluating teaching competence. These evaluations must be comprehensive and completed by a majority of the candidate's students. Student evaluations should 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. Do not include student comments. Include a copy of the evaluation form used. Specify the question or questions that are used for comparison. Ensure that the questions are directly relevant to the overall effectiveness of the candidate's teaching. Compare the candidate's mean score to the mean scores 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. 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 his or her potential to be a successful teacher.

F. Research

1. Statement by candidate (maximum of two pages). The candidate should give a capsule description of the most important elements of his or her research program at Wisconsin (or, in the case of appointments from outside, his or her 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 journal page numbers) of each publication, including names of all authors in the order appearing in the paper. The journals may be either print or electronic, but electronic journals must be refereed, archived and accessible for reference. For each publication indicate the nature and extent of the candidate's contribution and describe the roles of the candidate and the coauthors. For promotions, specify which publications were based on work performed while the candidate was an assistant professor at UW-Madison. Provide acceptance rates if available. Please list publications of different types separately in the following format:
 - a. Papers published in, or accepted by, refereed journals. Comment on the standards of the journals, and provide a list of the top (not more than 10) journals in the candidate's research areas, identifying both broad and specialty journals. Include acceptance rates and/or journal impact factors where available (be sure to specify the research areas), and provide in an appendix a copy of the letter of acceptance if not yet published.
 - b. Papers that have been submitted to refereed journals but not yet accepted (specify the journals and date of submission).
 - c. Monographs or jointly authored books (specify nature).
 - d. Books or conference proceedings edited (specify work involved).
 - e. Invited papers (not abstracts) published in conference proceedings (state if refereed), and invited chapters in books.
 - f. Invited abstracts at conferences published in whole, or by abstract (specify if refereed or not).
 - g. Contributed papers at conferences published in whole or by abstract (specify if refereed or not).
 - h. Nonrefereed publications not included above.

- i. Unpublished technical reports not included in section b.
3. Three publications that best demonstrate the candidate's qualities of creativity, imagination, and scholarly achievement should be identified. The most significant of these publications should be included in all dossiers (in the appendix). Three copies of each of the other two publications should be forwarded for the subcommittee. These should be identified by an asterisk in the list of research publications.
 4. Include a list of research students, both present and past, together with their thesis titles. If the advising responsibilities are shared, specify the coadvisers and the extent of their participation. Identify current employment for graduated research students.
 5. List of invited research presentations.
 6. Provide a summary of grants and contracts, including duration and amount of award, and 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.
 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 candidate's role in center, cluster or other group research activity, if any.
- G. Outreach/Extension
Discuss **any** outreach and/or extension activities.
- [See *Commitment to the Wisconsin Idea: A Guide to Documenting and Evaluating Excellence in Outreach Scholarship* at <http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/divcomm/outreach/WisconsinIdea.asp>]
1. Statement by candidate (maximum of two pages). The candidate should describe the goals and methods in his/her 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 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 included in all dossiers. Three copies of each of the other two publications should be forwarded for the reviewers.

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.
- H. Professional Service. Discuss the candidate's contributions to professional service as set forth in Part I.
- I. 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 the five leading institutions for research (and 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.

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. Indicate names that were suggested by the candidate, 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 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 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 research, teaching, and (when relevant) outreach-extension abilities and accomplishments from recognized experts in the candidate's field. (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.

For appointments from outside the university, letters that are used to evaluate an application can be included but should not replace letters solicited specifically for the tenure process.

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 by the committee.** This letter is available in hard copy from the Divisional Committee office or in electronic form at www.secfac.wisc.edu/divcomm/physical/index.htm, or found at the end of this document.

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.

5. Provide a sample copy of the solicitation letter.

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. is among the leading researchers at a similar career stage 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).

- J. 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 candidate fits into centers, cluster, etc. in which the candidate participates.
- K. Urgency. If it is urgent that the Executive Committee act at the earliest opportunity, please indicate this in the cover letter.

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).
5. Most significant publication
6. Three copies of 2 additional publications, for the subcommittee (see Part II.F.2).

Send 14 copies of all materials to: Divisional Committee Office, 134 Bascom Hall; telephone 263-5740.

Refer to *Faculty Divisions* at www.secfac.wisc.edu

revised October 7, 2009

SAMPLE LETTER TO REVIEWERS

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 [his/her] 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 teaching [and/or outreach/extension] efforts. It is particularly important that it give specific evaluations of the quality and impact of the candidate's most important contributions, and [his/her] standing in the field. Further, should the Department decide to recommend the promotion [appointment] of [title/name], all materials pertinent to that decision - of which your letter is an integral part - will be forwarded to the Executive Committee of the Division of 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 [his/her] 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. In particular, can you cite how the candidate's work compares with that of specific, nationally and internationally recognized scholars (and outreach/extension specialists) at a similar stage in their careers.
- The candidate's effectiveness and special accomplishments in formal classroom teaching, and the mentoring of graduate students, or evidence of outstanding communication and pedagogical skills that indicate that the candidate would be effective in those roles.
- [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.

Should you wish that your comments be held in confidence, please so state in your response. Both our department and the committee will then maintain confidentiality to the extent of the law.

In order to meet college 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.

Sincerely,