

**STATEMENT OF CRITERIA AND EVIDENCE
FOR RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING TENURE**

**FACULTY DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON**

OCTOBER 1998

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 which requires the proof of excellence in past performance and a forecast that an individual faculty member's intellectual vitality and future performance will continue to be of high quality for many years to come. 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 publications; (2) teaching and the development of teaching materials; and (3) service to the university, the public, and the profession. Research, teaching, and service collectively encompass the diversity of activities essential for all faculty, including those with extension 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 responsibilities, are elaborated below.

I. RESEARCH

The candidate should have **demonstrated** the ability to conduct research that reflects original scholarship and makes a contribution to knowledge and the likelihood of continued quality performance. This ability and future promise may be demonstrated by the ability in one or more of the following categories: (1) to conduct research with appropriate methods and rigor; (2) to conceptualize and theorize in an original way, with logical and mathematical formulation as appropriate; (3) to synthesize, criticize, and clarify extant knowledge and research; (4) to innovate in the collection or analysis of empirical data; or (5) to relate research to the solution of practical problems of individuals, groups, organizations, or societies. In evaluating the record of candidates with extension responsibilities, the evidence must show that the candidate's work has significantly contributed to the translation and dissemination of the results of scholarly inquiry in his or her discipline for the benefit of society, and that this work has extended the knowledge base of the university to the citizens of the state.

Evidence of research performance and of a candidate's standing in a discipline includes (1) scholarly books, monographs, chapters, bulletins, etc.; (2) articles published or accepted for publication in scholarly or professional journals; (3) extension publications and exemplary materials; (4) reviews and other evaluations of the candidate's publications and manuscripts; (5) citation of the work, if particularly frequent or laudatory; (6) research awards, grants, and proposals; (7) evaluations by authorities, especially those from other major universities, in the candidate's field of specialization; and (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.

II. TEACHING

The candidate should have demonstrated effective teaching abilities. 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. These include lectures, discussion sections, seminars, institutes, workshops, media presentations, laboratory instruction, clinical teaching, in-service training, media courses, correspondence and distance-learning courses, individual tutorials, advising and consulting, and consultative exchanges with client groups. Specifics about how learners benefitted from teaching should be addressed. 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.

Evidence must be presented that the candidate has engaged in a teaching program of substantial quality and quantity. The following kinds of information may be presented if appropriate and available: (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, workshop participants, clients, or trainees; (5) evaluation by peers based on direct observation of teaching or extension 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.

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. Participation in activities in one's capacity as a citizen outside the university is not ordinarily considered. Public service activity shall be evaluated according to the level of skill and success in communicating and applying the knowledge of one's field of professional competence.

The Executive Committee recognizes that public service is a major, and for many a primary, duty for faculty with extension responsibilities. The documentation in such cases must clearly demonstrate either how the candidate is meeting the extension program needs of the public through the teaching, coordination and evaluation of 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 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, and creativity in public service and outreach activities. Such evidence includes a description of the activities, the nature of the problems and the public served, the objectives sought, the methods employed, and the results achieved.

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 identify the candidate's relative balance of responsibilities and accomplishments in research, teaching, and service. Demonstrated excellence in at least two of these areas is normally required. Occasionally a tenure recommendation may be generated for a candidate, other than one who has primarily extension responsibilities, whose efforts and abilities are not well balanced among research, teaching and service. Such recommendations are welcomed where the candidate is clearly exceptional in either teaching or research, not inadequate in the other, and where 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 his or her 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 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.

A tenure recommendation may be made on the basis of significant 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 his or her field, and has made significant contributions to 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 responsibilities.

If a tenure recommendation is based on administrative service as the major activity of the candidate at the present time, or where tenure is sought for an administrative appointment from the outside, evidence of excellence in either teaching or research (with adequacy in the other) must also be presented to demonstrate the candidate's ability to fill a teaching and/or research function when his or her administrative activities come to an end.

FORMAT OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO A TENURED POSITION

Tenure appointments are governed by Chapter 4, "The Faculty Divisions," and Chapter 7, "Faculty Appointments," of the *Faculty Policies and Procedures*; the procedures of the relevant school or college; and the attached "Statement of Criteria and Evidence for Recommendations regarding Tenure, Division of the Social Studies."

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 supporting material described below.

Each recommendation for appointment or promotion to a tenured position must include:

- I. A letter of transmittal from the appropriate dean or a statement indicating that the dean has given approval for requesting the advice of the Divisional Committee.
- II. Letter(s) of appointment, and documentation of any changes in appointment status.
- III. A covering letter from the chair of the sponsoring department. The letter should include:
 - A. A statement indicating the nature of the proposed appointment including the percent of time devoted to extension 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 or abstentions. (If appropriate, explanation of absences or abstentions should be given.) In the case of divided appointments, the Divisional Committee requires a letter from the chair of each department providing the information 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.
 - D. A departmental evaluation of the candidate's research, teaching, and service, which should include factual and judgmental statements about each area. The evaluation should address the candidate's blend of research, teaching, service attainments, and anticipated contributions to the future development of the department, as well as the tenure standards applied in comparable departments elsewhere. 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.

In the case of divided appointments, provide a summary of the contribution of the candidate to the relevant other departments. If the recommendation is to be made on the basis of an exceptional case, extensive documentation and justification are expected.

- IV. *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. These groupings may be useful: books and monographs; research and other scholarly papers; minor publications and book reviews. Those that are peer reviewed should be indicated by an asterisk. Publications not based on work performed as an assistant professor at UW-Madison should be identified. Extension publications should also be separately identified. Number each publication in the vita and identify each publication submitted with that number. (Use small self-stick tags for marking each publication with its number.)
- Research and Publications in Progress;
- Research Support (source, dates, and amount);
- Teaching (principal areas and experience);
- Service (public, university, and professional).

V. Documentation of Research Output. The Divisional Committee requires:

- A. Two copies of each of the candidate's significant professional publications. (These will be returned to the department.)

The chair of the department should also select two research publications (e.g., usually an article or book chapter) that are considered most representative of the candidate's work and forward **14 copies** of each to **134 Bascom Hall** for distribution to the entire Divisional Committee. For extension candidates, one of these documents should be illustrative of typical extension documents meant for use by the unit's clients.

- B. For coauthored publications give the full reference including the names of all coauthors and an indication of what role the candidate has played in the research and writing. Each candidate is to be asked to estimate his or her contributions in percentage terms to any jointly authored publication including the following data: (a) percent contribution to conceptualization; (b) percent contribution to methodology and data analysis and (c) percent contribution to writing.
- C. For publications that are peer reviewed, the department chair should provide an evaluation of the quality and standing of the publication outlet. For nonrefereed publications, evaluation of the work's research and scholarly merit should be solicited from recognized authorities in the field. Please also distinguish peer-reviewed articles from non-peer-reviewed pieces clearly on the candidate's curriculum vitae. When possible please include the acceptance rate of the various journals. This information may be available from the Memorial Library reference department if you do not have ready access to it. For extension publications, also indicate for each publication outlet, any specialized nonacademic audiences for which it is designed and its influence on public policy and welfare.
- D. Evidence of acceptance for publications "in press" or "accepted for publication."
- E. As evidence of the candidate's stature in the field, letters of evaluation from distinguished scholars in the candidate's field should be solicited by the departmental executive committee. At least five letters of evaluation should be provided, at least four of which should be from outside the University of Wisconsin-Madison. In most cases, more than eight letters is excessive. Provide a sample copy of the letter. It should include a request for general comments about 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 how the evaluator knows the candidate. The department should make every effort to insure that these letters are not from individuals who have a close relationship to the candidate (major professor, previous colleagues, collaborators, etc). Letters from people not closely associated with the candidate are given more weight by the committee. A list of all persons asked for letters should be provided, indicating their affiliation and their stature in the field. A statement should also be included acknowledging that **all** letters received have been submitted. If some individuals from whom letters were requested were unable to respond, the reasons for their inability should be given. Files for extension candidates should also include letters from recognized extension leaders and experts in the candidate's field. Peer and client evaluations are also to be included for extension cases.
- F. Each candidate is to prepare a succinct statement on his or her future research plans, say, over the next five years. This should not be more than three pages.
- G. Ph.D. dissertation or equivalent.

VI. 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 course evaluations provided. 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.

- B. Evidence of the candidate's general abilities as a teacher. Assessment of teaching performance requires several kinds of evidence. The type of evidence included depends on the type of instructional activity. The quality, not quantity, of evidence will be considered. We expect evidence of teaching performance from the following categories:
1. A reflective statement by the candidate describing personal teaching philosophy, strategies, and objectives (2-3 pages).
 2. A statement by the department highlighting the contribution of the candidate to the teaching mission of the department or school. Contextual factors the department has found important (size of class, required versus elective course, difficulties of material, preparation of students, etc.) should be noted.
 3. Systematic surveys of student opinion. Such surveys are most useful if they have been prepared by departments for general and anonymous administration, using carefully selected questions that have proven useful in the particular teaching situation. Data that provide information about overall teaching effectiveness are useful. In addition to reporting these data, a department must analyze this information by making comparisons (using response distributions, means and/or medians, and standard deviations) to other faculty and similar courses (perhaps considering factors such as class size and purpose), and tracking changes in the candidate's performance over time. Information should be reported in an original scale metric rather than as standardized scores. In addition, the originals of all student evaluations should be provided to the committee for review of student comments. Teaching evaluations from other institutions should be presented as well, with the understanding that these evaluations may not be comparable to those collected at UW-Madison.
 4. Peer review, if available. Evaluation by peers in the context of tenure review should be based on 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.
 5. 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 should be included in the documentation. The subsequent performance of these students and advisees may provide useful evidence of the capabilities of a candidate.
 6. Course outlines, syllabi, bibliographies, scripts, and other teaching materials. Selected examples should be accompanied by an evaluation by colleagues or other experts. Special consideration should be given to documentation of attempts at new or improved teaching methods and materials, and to evaluation of their effectiveness.
 7. 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.
 8. 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.

- C. For extension candidates, description of up to three significant extension programs in which the candidate made a major contribution. Use the following format:
1. Identify the problem, the clientele, and the needs assessment procedure.
 2. Outline the objectives.
 3. Provide details on the method of instruction and delivery, innovative teaching methods, materials, aids or approaches, and client evaluation of the program's effectiveness.
 4. 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.

VII. 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 must 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. Outreach program planning and development.
- C. Membership on committees and boards.
- D. Public lectures and presentations.
- E. Participation in radio, television, and ETN 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 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.

VIII. Presentation of the Case.

No useful purpose is served by the receipt of complex and expensively packaged tenure materials. The following specific suggestions are to be followed in assembling tenure proposals.

- A. Number all pages of the document in consecutive order. The case should be presented in 150 or fewer pages, excluding copies of the candidate's publications. Copy documents on both sides of sheets, for ease of handling.
- B. Include a table of contents.
- C. A simple metal clamp may be used to contain the document.
- D. Plastic dividers with tabs are unnecessary. A sheet of paper with a heading identifying each section is sufficient.
- E. Do **not** use "Accopress" or 3-ring binders or any other bulky cover.
- F. Do not use expandable "accordion" files except when necessary to contain publications.
- G. When publications or other materials (such as manuals, tapes, or irreplaceable items) are sent in limited number for reviewers, please list these items on a separate sheet for special handling.
- H. Prepare **14 copies** of the tenure document (including 2 selected publications).
- I. Copies must be submitted at least **three weeks before** the divisional committee meeting.
- J. Questions about tenure documentation should be directed to the divisional committee office.
- K. If documentation is incomplete, delays in committee review may ensue.

DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES OFFICE
134 BASCOM HALL / 263-5740