

5. Faculty-specific Policies and Procedures

5.1. Probationary Faculty Members: Procedures for Guidance, Annual Evaluation, and Recommendation for Tenure

These procedures represent the minimum level of guidance and support that a probationary faculty member (assistant professor) can expect from the Department's Executive Committee. Probationary faculty members are entitled to constructive guidance and fair and objective performance evaluation. The Department's Executive Committee hopes all probationary faculty members will reach their full potential.

Note from 2017: Expectations will not change as a result of the department restructuring for assistant professors in the department who were in probationary status when the department was established.

At the time of the probationary faculty member's appointment, the Department's Chair will give the probationary faculty member a copy of this document, along with the Faculty Division criteria that will be used in evaluating annual performance and in granting tenure. The Department's criteria for evaluating annual performance and for recommending tenure are consistent with the general criteria in Chapter 7 of the University's Faculty Policies and Procedures (FPP) and with the more specific criteria approved by the Executive Committee of the appropriate Faculty Division and UW Extension. Each year of the probationary period, the Chair will provide the probationary faculty member, his/her guidance committee, and his/her oversight committee with copies of any newly amended College and University guidelines on promotion and tenure. The Department's Executive Committee shall also ensure that the probationary faculty member is kept informed of any changes in Departmental goals or of other circumstances that might alter the opportunity for his/her promotion with tenure.

5.1.1. Mentoring and Guidance

5.1.1.1: Mentor

The Mentor is a member of the Department Executive Committee whose role is to offer support, guidance, and advice on navigating the probationary period, including the expectations and procedures of the department, college, and divisional committee.

A mentor is appointed for each probationary faculty member by the Department Chair at the beginning of each academic year. Although it is desirable to maintain a single mentor throughout the probationary period, the Department Chair, in consultation with the probationary faculty member, has the option of replacing the mentor at any point. The probationary faculty member may also request a change in his/her mentor at any time for any reason. All changes are made without prejudice to the probationary faculty member. The Department Chair should not serve as the Mentor, and the Mentor may not be part of the probationary faculty member's oversight committee.

The mentor will advise the probationary faculty member on the preparation of the annual review materials and may offer help on grant proposals, book prospectuses, manuscripts, teaching, and other professional activities, as appropriate. As needed, the mentor also may aid in communication between the probationary faculty member, his/her Guidance Committee, the Oversight Committee, the Department Chair, and the Department Executive Committee. The mentor should be available for advice on the informal as well as the formal aspects of department, college, and university culture, policies, and procedures. Beyond the relationship with a mentor, all probationary faculty members are encouraged to seek advice from all department faculty and others both inside and outside of the department.

5.1.1.2: Guidance Committee

A Guidance Committee includes the Mentor and at least one other member who could be a member of the Executive Committee, or when appropriate (such as in cases of special expertise and/or joint appointments), a representative from outside of the department. The role of the committee is to provide guidance for the probationary faculty member in accordance with Section 7.05(B), FPP. Guidance includes assisting the probationary faculty member in the preparation and assembly of materials required for the annual performance review. The Guidance Committee should meet with the probationary faculty member at least once each semester.

5.1.1.3: Oversight Committee

The Oversight Committee assists the Department's Executive Committee with the annual performance review and evaluation of progress toward tenure and promotion. The evaluation results in an annual performance review report to the Executive Committee, which is discussed and voted on at an Executive Committee meeting.

At the beginning of each academic year, the Chair appoints a two-member (minimum) Oversight Committee from the Executive Committee for each probationary faculty member. When there are multiple probationary appointments in the department, it is acceptable to appoint a single Oversight Committee for all probationary appointments. The Department Chair designates one member as the Oversight Committee Chair. The composition of the committee is expected to change from year to year. The Guidance Committee may assist the Oversight Committee, but the Mentor may not be a member of the committee. For joint appointments where the tenure home is the Department, one or more additional committee members may be appointed to the committee from the governing committee of the corresponding unit. For joint appointments with joint tenure homes, the two departments will decide whether to have one joint or two separate review committees.

The Oversight Committee ensures that probationary faculty provide all materials necessary for the annual review. The Oversight Committee Chair ensures that a teaching observation is performed and documented at least once each semester the probationary faculty member teaches a campus course (see additional details below). All committee members evaluate the progress of the probationary faculty member, based on the materials provided, and summarize their findings in a written annual review report to the Department's Executive Committee. A report must be reviewed by the Department's Executive Committee each year of the probationary appointment. In the final year of an appointment, the Oversight Committee responsibilities are assumed by the Tenure Review Committee (see part 5.1.3 below).

5.1.2. Annual Performance Review

Probationary faculty are reviewed each year beginning in the first year of their appointment. The first year is meant mostly to familiarize the Executive Committee with the work and progress of the probationary faculty member and to provide the probationary faculty member with guidance and support. For appointments that require annual renewal as of the second or third year of probationary service, each year a recommendation must be made by the Executive Committee to the Dean as to whether to extend the contract by one year, to promote, or to not renew the contract. Extension of the annual contract beginning in the second or third year requires that the faculty member be making progress toward tenure in research, teaching, and service in a manner appropriate to his or her stage in the probationary process. The reviews become increasingly more comprehensive as of the third year.

The Chair informs probationary faculty members of the date that their annual review will occur. Notification must be given no less than 20 days before the review, except with the agreement of the

probationary faculty member. The meeting of the Executive Committee at which the annual review will be evaluated is closed, except when the probationary faculty member requests that the meeting be open. In an open annual evaluation meeting, others may attend but do not have the right to participate in the discussion.

Approximately eight to ten weeks prior to the review by the Executive Committee, the probationary faculty member meets with the Oversight Committee Chair and Guidance Committee to discuss the materials the probationary faculty member needs to prepare for the review. The probationary faculty member prepares materials related to research, teaching, and service. The Oversight Committee decides whether the review should include cumulative materials or materials from just the previous year.

The probationary faculty member is responsible for providing the Oversight Committee Chair with requested materials one month prior to each scheduled review. The Committee Chair should make sure that all necessary information is present in the review file so that it is accessible to the Oversight Committee and the Department's Executive Committee.

The contents of the Annual Review File will include all of the following:

1. An updated CV (following guidelines for the appropriate Divisional Committee);
2. An updated statement (4-6 pages) from the probationary faculty member to his or her Oversight Committee outlining the year's progress, and relevant information pertaining to current and future research, teaching, and service (a cumulative statement may be requested);
3. Peer evaluation of teaching. Faculty Divisional Committees require at least one peer review of teaching by a tenured member of the faculty for each year of probationary service; peer reviews should cover the breadth of courses and levels of instruction reflective of the probationary faculty member's teaching expectations. The Oversight Committee Chair will ensure that a member of the Executive Committee will serve as a peer evaluator and observe the probationary faculty member's teaching at least once each year that the faculty member is teaching and preferably once each semester the faculty member is teaching. The evaluator should contact the probationary faculty member well in advance to arrange a mutually agreeable class period. Before the visit, the evaluator should communicate with the probationary faculty member to discuss the goals or learning objectives of the class meeting and how it fits into the rest of the course (e.g., what was covered last week, what is covered next, how it builds upon previous classes). The evaluator shall write a brief report on the class observation highlighting both strengths and recommendations for improvement. The evaluator should provide the draft report to the probationary faculty member and meet with him/her to discuss the evaluation. The evaluator will finalize the written report and submit it to the Oversight Committee Chair for inclusion in the annual review and in the personnel file;
4. Statistical summary sheets of student evaluations and student comment summaries [note: student evaluations of classroom teaching are secured at the end of each semester for each class. This evaluation includes both quantitative assessments collected for all instructors and open-ended comments from students. Quantitative assessments are summarized in order to make comparison between similar courses and among all courses in the Department. These evaluations are collected and retained by the Department and are public documents accessible to probationary faculty for use in annual reviews and tenure dossiers];
5. Syllabi for all courses;
6. Publications; and similar evidence of scholarship and/or works of art that contribute to knowledge and culture;
7. Additional materials: probationary faculty members have the option of providing any additional material that attests to their progress toward tenure in research, teaching, and service (e.g., letters, grant proposals, book contracts, manuscripts, pedagogical materials, newspaper articles related to work, etc.).

For faculty with an Extension appointment, several additional items should be included in the materials submitted for annual review. These include the following:

1. A statement of the probationary faculty member's overall Extension role (a personal statement of research and teaching programs and plans).
2. Extension multi-year work plan.
3. Annual work plan.
4. A list of expected products for the coming year.
5. Indirect evidence of impact such as plans, programs, or policies developed by agents or other clients such as local governments as a result of research/training by the specialist.
6. Description of Extension teaching activities.
7. Formal evaluations, if any, of Extension activities.
8. Information about important process/networking aspects of Extension work such as committees served on, groups worked with regularly.
9. Any other materials that the candidate thinks will shed light on her or his performance as an integrated Extension specialist.

The Oversight Committee will examine the materials with the probationary faculty and subsequently provide the Department's Executive Committee with an annual written assessment of progress toward tenure. The Department's Executive Committee will have access to review the assessment report and the annual review materials prior to the annual performance review meeting. **At each annual review, the Executive Committee will adopt, reject, or offer revisions to the Oversight Committee's report.** A final approved report will be provided to the probationary faculty member by the Department Chair within five working days of the annual evaluation meeting.

When the annual performance review requires a formal renewal or non-renewal recommendation to the Dean, the Executive Committee votes on whether or not to recommend to the Dean of the College an extension of the contract. These decisions are based upon progress toward criteria for promotion as outlined in guidance from the probationary faculty member's Divisional Committee. The Executive Committee can vote for non-renewal without soliciting outside evaluative letters. The Chair is responsible for notifying the Dean of the recommendation for extension or nonrenewal. When such action is taken, the probationary faculty member shall be notified in writing of the decision of the executive committee within five working days. When the decision is for non-renewal, the notification must further state that the faculty member will be given, upon request, the specific reason(s) for the decision in writing and an opportunity for reconsideration of the decision. Following discussion of the evaluation by the executive committee, a written evaluation approved by the executive committee shall be given to the probationary faculty member. Upon written request by the probationary faculty member, within fifteen days of the receipt of the written notice of the decision, the Chair shall provide within thirty days a written statement, which has been approved by the Executive Committee, indicating its reasons for the decision. See FPP Chapter 7 for procedures for appealing a decision for non-renewal.

5.1.3. Review and Recommendation for Promotion and Tenure

5.1.3.1: General Information

The decision on the timing of a promotion and tenure recommendation is jointly made by the probationary faculty member, the Mentor, and the Executive Committee. No later than the sixth year of the probationary faculty member's appointment, however, the Department Chair shall appoint a Tenure Review Committee that will assemble materials for the tenure review, undertake the review, and make a recommendation on tenure to the Department's Executive Committee. The Tenure Review Committee may include those who served on the Guidance Committees, including the Mentor. If a candidate has a joint faculty appointment with another academic department, this review committee may include

members of both departments. For candidates with Extension appointments, the Tenure Review Committee will also seek an evaluation of the candidate's performance from Extension by requesting a letter from the Associate Dean or Institute Director most familiar with the faculty member's activities.

Extensions to the maximum probationary period are permitted under University policy. A request for an adjustment of up to one year based on the birth or adoption of a child should be sent by the faculty member to the provost (with informational copies to the Department Chair and Dean) within one year of the birth or adoption. Approval of such requests is presumed. Requests based on other factors (e.g., disability, chronic illness, or significant responsibilities with respect to elder care or dependent care) should be sent by the faculty member to the Department Chair; these should be submitted within a year of when they occur and generally should not be made during the sixth probationary year. Approval of requests based on factors other than childbirth or adoption must be approved by the Executive Committee, the Dean, and the University Committee before a formal action is initiated by the Provost.

At the time of the tenure decision, supporting evidence for the tenure review shall be collected and assembled in consultation with the probationary faculty member (as outlined below in 5.1.3.3). The Tenure Review Committee will prepare a written report on the candidate's tenure case and will provide access to supporting materials on teaching, research, and service. Materials identified in 5.1.3.3 must be complete and made available to the Executive Committee one week before the meeting at which the tenure case will be presented and discussed.

The tenure decision will involve two meetings of the Department's Executive Committee that will take place one to two weeks apart. Formal notice of the two meetings must be provided to the probationary faculty meeting at least 20 days before the first meeting as specified in FPP Chapter 7. At the first meeting, the Tenure Review Committee will present the case for Executive Committee deliberation. Speakers from outside of the department with special insight on the case (e.g., from a department in which the probationary faculty member has a joint appointment) will be allowed to present to the Executive Committee and answer questions about the case; any such speakers must be identified in the formal notice provided to the probationary faculty member at least 20 days before the meeting. The Tenure Review Committee will consult with the probationary faculty member and mentor to identify appropriate speakers.

The second meeting, which must be held 7-14 days after the first meeting, will include additional discussion and a formal vote, conducted by signed written ballot. All members of the Department's Executive Committee are eligible to vote. A quorum for each meeting will be two-thirds of the Executive Committee members in residence. Executive Committee members on sabbatical or leave are not considered to be in residence but are counted toward quorum if they attend. Members of the Executive Committee may attend the meetings in person, by video conference (e.g., Skype connection), or by speakerphone/audio connection. The tenure vote will be decided by a simple majority (more than 50 percent) of the members of the Department's Executive Committee in attendance who are voting on the issue. Consistent with common practice, an abstention is not a vote.

If the Department's Executive Committee votes to recommend tenure, the Tenure Review Committee will assemble the candidate's tenure dossier for review by the appropriate Dean and by the Executive Committee of the appropriate Faculty Division. The Tenure Review Committee, in consultation with the probationary faculty member, will ensure that the tenure dossier is accurate and complete. The format of both the Chair's cover letter and the tenure dossier will conform with the Tenure Guidelines of the appropriate Faculty Division.

5.1.3.2: Substantive Guidelines

Decisions regarding tenure in the Department are governed by the “Statement of Criteria and Evidence for Recommendations Regarding Tenure” by one of the Divisional Committees of the UW-Madison. The Department must make an affirmative decision to recommend a candidate for tenure. That recommendation is made to the Dean of the College in which the appointment is aligned and to the relevant Divisional Committee.

These Departmental tenure guidelines provide a supplement to the Divisional Committee “Statement of Criteria and Evidence,” in an effort to be explicit about Departmental expectations concerning tenure. In addition, these guidelines specify the procedures to be used in deciding whether a faculty member will be recommended to the Dean and the Divisional Committee for tenure.

As noted in the Divisional Committee “Statement of Criteria and Evidence for Recommendations Regarding Tenure”:

The granting of tenure is a long-term commitment of university and state resources which requires the proof of excellence in past performance and 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.

In principle, the Department weighs the three functions of teaching, research, and service equally and expects probationary faculty to make contributions in all three areas. In practice, however, the Department will review each candidate for tenure in light of her or his expected role in the Department. For example, probationary faculty with partial or full Extension appointments will be expected to focus more on applied research and the extension of that research, through a variety of media, to the residents of Wisconsin and beyond. Among individual faculty members the balance between teaching, research, and service may differ, as may the nature of these activities themselves.

i Research

When evaluating the portfolio and interpreting divisional guidance, the department defines excellence in research as a coherent body of work, focused on a well-defined area or topic that is methodologically and/or theoretically rigorous and moves significantly beyond the candidate's Ph.D. dissertation. Such work must have been reviewed in refereed venues (e.g., published academic journals, other scholarly publications, artistic performances, artistic or literary works) that reflect the high standards of rigor, research, theory, and methods appropriate to the candidate's field. In exercising its judgment, the Executive Committee looks for evidence of originality, impact, independence, standing in the profession beyond the University (State-wide, nationally, and even internationally), and the likelihood of continued outstanding performance and growth. In addition, there should be evidence of a significant future project or projects in at least preliminary stages of development. Evaluation of research activities should include, but are not necessarily limited to, evaluation of specific publications by outside scholars in the field, evaluation of the quality of the journals or other publication outlets, evaluation of sources of research support, and evidence of use of materials by other scholars or by professionals in the relevant field.

The criteria of the Divisional Committees related to research address the kinds of research that faculty engage in and the various forms of evidence of research activity. These criteria also indicate that candidates with Extension responsibilities must have “significantly contributed to the translation and dissemination of the results of scholarly inquiry for the benefit of society, and that this work has extended the knowledge base of the university to the citizens of the state.”

The kind of publications and scholarly production submitted as evidence of performance will vary depending on the kind of appointment held by the probationary faculty member. Those with Campus appointments are expected to publish in academic outlets such as scholarly journals or books, while those with Extension and/or outreach appointments are likely to have more applied reports. This distinction,

however, is not a hard and fast one. Academics in an applied profession should be rewarded for work in both scholarly and applied areas.

In general, publications such as articles, books, reports, exhibits, or other artistic works that have been formally refereed or reviewed by academic peers are considered to be stronger evidence of scholarly quality than are non-refereed works and publications. Such refereed work has undergone the scrutiny of other scholars and has been judged to be a significant contribution to an academic discipline, knowledge, or culture.

ii Teaching

Excellence in teaching is demonstrated through such evidence as a well-articulated teaching philosophy, strong peer and student evaluations, thoughtful course and curriculum development and syllabi, and other pedagogical materials that demonstrate unique contributions to the teaching mission of the Department, University, or profession. All materials should demonstrate a commitment to acceptance of and respect for diversity, creating a classroom that is a safe space for expressing opinions, teaching in interactive ways, effectively utilizing technology to enhance the student learning process, insuring one's availability to students, assigning course materials that are current or seminal works, using measures that assess student work in a fair manner, and provision of feedback that is timely and constructive and challenges students to think more deeply and critically.

The Department engages in a wide variety of teaching activities. Courses offered on campus span large undergraduate courses, large and small studio and lab courses, smaller graduate lecture courses, and more intimate seminars. Individual work with students in independent studies and thesis and dissertation work also falls in the realm of teaching. Extension and/or outreach teaching includes short courses, workshops, applied training, or other methods as appropriate to serve the broader public. Extension teaching can also include less formal meetings with officials or members of the public in which information is shared. Individual contact, collaboration, and/or consultation with Extension agents, professionals, and the general public can also be a form of teaching.

Given this wide range of kinds of teaching situations, the Divisional Committee Criteria indicate that "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 guidelines suggest a variety of kinds of evidence which can be used to assess teaching performance:

- Surveys of student opinion;
- Assessment by colleagues based on direct observation;
- Course outlines and other written teaching materials such as exams, exercises, or assignments;
- Assessments by TAs or trainees;
- Client and peer evaluations of Extension programs;
- The record of student advising, consultation, and research supervision.

Depending on the nature of the teaching involved, other forms of evidence might be equally relevant. Development of new or innovative courses, teaching materials, or methods might be considered, for example. It is important to anticipate the need to have evaluations of teaching and to solicit such information throughout the candidate's probationary period. This is a particular challenge if the teaching is of a "non-traditional" nature. The final evaluation of teaching performance should rely on more than one of these various forms of evidence.

iii. Service

The probationary faculty member is expected to engage in the service life of the Department, University, and profession. Excellence in service is demonstrated through providing service at various levels (i.e., department, campus, community, state, national, and international). Examples contributing to demonstration of excellence in service include: choosing service that capitalizes on the assistant professor's area of expertise, selecting committees that advance the Department and University mission, championing projects consistent with this mission, being a team player, effectively organizing to address social issues, and demonstrating commitment and skills for positive long-term effect. For those being considered for tenure based on excellence in service, leadership in service will need to be demonstrated beyond participation in service. The expected balance between these kinds of service may differ considerably. Faculty may focus on University and professional service, although, as with applied research, public service in an applied discipline should be rewarded.

iv. Considerations for Faculty with Extension Appointments

The tenure criteria and processes for faculty with substantial Extension appointments: (1) are somewhat different from those for faculty not holding Extension appointments; (2) involve an equally high standard of accomplishment with an emphasis on program context and impacts; and (3) are recognized in the documents of all Divisional Committees at UW-Madison. Language in the tenure guidelines of the various Divisional Committees indicates that the focus of evaluation must be on programs. Extension programs are expected to respond to statewide or sometimes to national needs or problems, to set goals and objectives for dealing with those needs or problems, and to have an impact on the State.

Faculty with Extension appointments are engaged in a variety of activities, including: applied research; technical assistance; teaching/training; public policy education; analytical capacity development; strategic planning for programming/unit development; partnership/network development; professional development.

These tasks and activities need to be carefully documented. The Extension plans of work, annual plans, impact reports, and other vehicles can supply measures of these activities. The Department needs to make sure, however, that Extension faculty are pursuing "the forest, not the trees," and that accomplishments and activities are presented and evaluated in the larger context of programs and impacts on societal problems.

For probationary faculty members with integrated Extension appointments the Executive Committee would like to see a record of applied research and publication that is integrated with the candidate's teaching and service. This expectation includes traditional social science oriented research published in peer-reviewed journals as well as other publication material appearing in a wider variety of venues and formats appropriate to key audiences identified for extension programs. Excellence in the level and quality of integration among research, teaching and service is the operative standard. This includes recognized statewide leadership and program impact. The expectations for probationary faculty members with Extension appointments are further described in the following documents: "Defining Excellence among Integrated Cooperative Extension Specialists in Wisconsin" and "Commitment to The Wisconsin Idea: A Guide to Documenting and Evaluating Excellence in Outreach Scholarship."

5.1.3.3: Procedural Guidelines: Preparation for Promotion Review

In determining whether to solicit external reviews, the Executive Committee conducts an initial review of the work of the probationary faculty member (CV, publications, teaching evaluations, previous annual review reports, etc.) based on the substantive guidelines above. If the record warrants additional external review, the Tenure Review Committee moves forward with the procedures below.

i. Letter Requirements. The department will follow the requirements of the probationary faculty members' divisional committee in effect at the time when soliciting letters of evaluation of the candidate's abilities and accomplishments. Letters are expected to be from nationally or internationally recognized experts in the candidate's field outside this institution. The Executive Committee ensures that the external letters are from people who are at arm's length from the candidate, and the department must note any relationship between the candidate and the letter writers. If the minimum number of letters required by the divisional committee have not been returned by the time of the meeting at which the tenure vote will occur, the meeting will be rescheduled for a later date

ii. Selection of Outside Letter Writers. The Tenure Review Committee will consult with the probationary faculty member to solicit names of possible outside reviewers and to allow the probationary faculty member to identify potential reviewers who would not be appropriate due to various types of conflict of interest. The Tenure Review Committee also will solicit names of potential reviewers from the Executive Committee. The Tenure Review Committee will then provide the Executive Committee with a list of 7-10 names and addresses (including email) of recognized experts in the candidate's field. These experts will typically be full professors at peer institutions, but occasionally could include a top expert in a field who holds a different title and is at a program/institution that is not a peer institution. After the Executive Committee votes to approve 7-10 external reviewers, the Chair of the Tenure Review Committee will write to potential reviewers to identify at least 5 reviewers who will agree to evaluate the candidate's dossier. If there are not five reviewers from this list who agree to review, the Tenure Review Committee will return to the Executive Committee to solicit additional names. The identities and letters of outside reviewers are not made available to the probationary faculty member.

iii. Candidate's Statement. The candidate should provide the Chair of the Tenure Review Committee a statement of his or her research, teaching and service. In preparing these statements, the candidate should consult with his/her Tenure Review Committee, and his/her mentor if the mentor is not a member of his/her Tenure Review Committee, and members of his/her Guidance Committee who are not members of his/her Tenure Review Committee. For those with Extension appointments, descriptions of Extension programs and activities should be incorporated into research, teaching, and/or service statements.

iv. Material Sent to Reviewers. The candidate's current curriculum vitae, a representative sample of the candidate's teaching and research materials (chosen by the candidate and the Tenure Review Committee in consultation with the Executive Committee), and the candidate's statement of research, teaching, and service will be sent to external reviewers.

v. Additional Letters. Within two weeks of distributing materials for outside review, the Tenure Review Committee will also solicit additional reviews from individuals who could inform a decision about promotion and provide additional evidence of excellence in research, teaching, and/or service. These individuals might include former students, partners for Extension programming, and others who may provide a perspective on the applied nature or impact of the candidates work. As with Outside Reviewers, the Tenure Review Committee will consult with the probationary faculty member and mentor to solicit names of possible individuals and to allow the probationary faculty member to identify potential reviewers who would not be appropriate. The Tenure Review Committee also will solicit names of individuals from the Executive Committee. The Tenure Review Committee will then provide the Executive Committee with a list of names and up to twelve others who may comment on the impact of work. For probationary faculty members with integrated Extension appointments, the list shall include the Associate Dean or Institute Director most familiar with the faculty member's activities. The Executive Committee will approve the final list for the Tenure Review Committee to contact.

vi. Access to Outside Letters. Copies of confidential letters will be kept by the Chair of the Tenure Review Committee. Electronic copies will be made available online in a secure manner and made

available to members of the Executive Committee. The candidate does not have access to the outside letters. In the case of dispute, the Tenure Review Committee Chair has the option of summarizing the letters in such a way that the identity of the letter writers is not evident.

vii. Tenure Dossier Process - Overview. After external letters have been secured and preliminary dossier materials assembled, the Executive Committee follows the process outlined previously to determine whether or not to recommend the probationary faculty member for promotion with tenure. As outlined above, FPP Chapter 7 describes procedures for appeal.

If the vote is in favor of promotion, the Department Chair and Tenure Review Committee, in consultation with the Executive Committee, completes final preparation of the tenure dossier according to the Divisional Committee Guidelines and forwards the completed dossier to the Dean of the College. The Dean reviews the packet and forwards it to the Divisional Committee. The Divisional Committee reviews the case, votes, and makes its recommendation on promotion or non-renewal to the Dean. The Dean makes a recommendation on promotion or non-renewal to the Provost, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor. The Chancellor's recommendation goes to the Board of Regents for final approval. The promotion becomes effective on a specified date following approval by the Board of Regents.

5.2. Tenured Faculty: Annual Evaluation, Post-Tenure Review, and Promotion to Full

5.2.1 Annual Performance Evaluations for Tenured faculty

All faculty shall participate in annual reporting. Assistant professors shall follow the procedures in Section 5.1 of this document. Faculty with tenure shall report based on an academic year cycle and submit an updated CV between April 1 and June 15th of each year to the Department Administrator. Additionally, tenured faculty are encouraged to submit a summary Annual Activities Report (AAR) to the Department Administrator no later than June 15 each year using the standard department form. Tenured faculty who do not submit an AAR by June 15 will not be eligible for any merit exercise for the following academic year.

5.2.2. Post-tenure review

In accordance with Faculty Policies & Procedures (FP&P) 7.17, the Department of Planning and Landscape Architecture has established the following departmental policy and procedures for the post-tenure review of faculty.

5.2.2.1 Purpose

FP&P 7.17.A describes three purposes served by the five-year post-tenure review of faculty:

- “to recognize outstanding achievement”
- “to provide opportunities for mentoring and professional development”
- “to help identify and remedy, from a developmental point of view, any deficiencies in teaching, service, outreach/extension, and research/scholarly productivity”

FP&P 7.17.A also clarifies what post-tenure review is not:

- “Post-tenure review is not a reevaluation of tenure and is not undertaken for the purposes of discipline or dismissal.”

- “Departments, schools, and colleges may not use post-tenure reviews as the basis for budgetary decisions or for decisions regarding program discontinuance, curtailment, modification, or redirection.”

5.2.2.2. Criteria

FP&P 7.17.B notes the basic criteria for the post-tenure review:

- “The basic standard for review shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member’s position.” Additionally, our department recognizes that the expectations for each individual will vary reflective of the terms of their position as developed cooperatively by the individual and the Executive Committee.
- “Special care should be taken to ensure that the scholarly productivity of jointly appointed and interdisciplinary faculty is appropriately evaluated.”

Review categories. In the Department of Planning and Landscape Architecture, faculty are reviewed in each of the following three categories, similar to those used for annual merit or promotion review:

(1) Research and Scholarly Productivity. Includes, but is not limited to:

- Peer-reviewed articles, chapters, and conference papers
- Monographs, textbooks, and edited volumes
- Open-source databases, online tools, multimedia productions, and other networked, digital resources related to scholarship
- Competitive research grants and awards received
- Invited scholarly presentations
- Other creative scholarly activity

(2) Teaching and Mentoring. Includes, but is not limited to:

- Undergraduate courses taught, noting especially high-impact courses, general education requirement courses, and large-scale courses
- Graduate courses taught
- Teaching innovation, noting especially new modes of delivery, attention to grade gaps, improved assessment of student learning, or revised curricula
- Contribution to pedagogy through scholarly publication or university participation
- Competitive teaching grants and awards received
- Independent study instruction
- Advising—including projects, theses, and dissertations

(3) Outreach, Extension, Service and Governance. Includes, but is not limited to:

- Support for the Wisconsin Idea in bringing scholarship and educational expertise to the city, county, state, and region
- Popular presentations and publications for a broad non-specialist audience
- Service to academic/professional associations (state, national, and international), service as a peer reviewer for grants or publications, or external review of promotion and tenure cases from other institutions.
- Governance participation within UW-Madison at the department, college, and campus level
- Service to the profession in the form of consulting, advisory appointments, or professional review

- Media appearances, quotations, or other media recognition

Review scale. Faculty scheduled for review will be rated in each of the three categories above according to the following scale (as noted in FP&P 7.17.B.5):

- Exceeds expectations: “Exceptionally good” performance.
- Meets expectations: “Discharging conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member’s position”.
- Does not meet expectations: “Substantial deficiencies” in performance.

In determining the appropriate rating, the committee will take into account the performance ratings documented in annual reviews, the body of supporting evidence provided by the faculty member, and the unique terms of the individual’s position (as noted previously under Criteria). Consistent with FPP 7.17B, rating determinations for post-tenure review shall reflect the terms of the individual appointment with special care regarding needs of jointly appointed and interdisciplinary faculty.

5.2.2.3. Procedures

1. **Department chair assembles the year’s review schedule.** At the beginning of each academic year, the department chair verifies the list of reviews scheduled to be completed during that year. *[by the end of the first week of classes]*
 - Each tenured faculty member should be scheduled for review once every five years.
 - For any faculty members who are tenured in more than one unit, the department chair should coordinate with the leadership in the other unit to verify timing of the review.
2. **Department chair communicates the review schedule to each faculty member scheduled for a post tenure review.** The department chair notifies each faculty member in writing of their upcoming review.
 - According to FP&P 7.17, “The review may be deferred, by approval of the provost, for unusual circumstances such as when it may coincide with an approved leave, significant life event, promotion review, or other appointment, and the provost may then determine a new review schedule.”
3. **Departmental Faculty Evaluation and Awards Committee proposes a two-person Review Committee for each faculty member.** Each review committee must be chaired by a member of the Faculty Evaluation and Awards Committee. *[by September 30]*
 - If sufficient tenured faculty are not available to perform reviews within the department, outside tenured faculty members may be solicited to review a faculty member.
 - Faculty members with tenure appointments in more than one unit should be jointly reviewed by all units, having one reviewer drawn from each unit. Committees may include more than two members.
4. **Department chair communicates the proposed Review Committee to each faculty Member.** The department chair informs each faculty member under review of their proposed Review Committee and deals with any objections that arise.
 - Faculty members have one week to formally object to any proposed reviewer in writing to the department chair. If there are any objections, the department chair, in confidential consultation with the relevant dean, shall identify another appropriate reviewer.
 - Once the committee is final, the faculty member should meet with the Chair of the Faculty Evaluation and Awards Committee to clarify expectations regarding required materials.

5. **Faculty member submits supporting evidence.** Once the Review Committee has been accepted by the faculty member, the faculty member must supply supporting evidence to the Review Committee, including:
- a full and up-to-date curriculum vitae;
 - a statement providing a brief summary description of your role as a UW-Madison faculty member followed by a self assessment of your teaching, research, Extension (if applicable), and public service contributions for the last five years;
 - a brief statement of plans for the next three-to-five years.
 - access to copies of all scholarship published since the last post-tenure review;
 - access to representative syllabi (and those showing substantial change in course design) and summaries of student evaluations (as available) from all courses taught since the last post-tenure review (to be compiled by department administration);
 - access to all annual activity reports submitted since the last post-tenure review;
 - any other materials providing evidence of the faculty member's accomplishments and contributions that the department or the faculty member feel are relevant to the review.

NB: Letters from outside the university may be submitted but are not required as part of the review process.

The department will preserve in the faculty member's personnel file all submitted documents (other than documents such as publications that are readily accessible elsewhere).

6. **Review Committee conducts interviews.** The Review Committee may meet in person with the faculty member to discuss the supporting evidence if either the reviewers or the faculty member so desire.
- The Review Committee may also choose to consult with individuals who have knowledge of the faculty member's work. The names and affiliations of any individuals proposed to be consulted about the faculty member's work must be approved by the faculty member in advance.
7. **Review Committee writes up draft report for Executive Committee.** The Review Committee writes up a draft of the review report (generally five to ten pages long) and submits a copy to the Executive Committee for discussion.
- The draft review report should clearly state whether the faculty member "Exceeds expectations," "Meets expectations," or "Does not meet expectations" in each of the three categories of (1) Research and Scholarly Productivity, (2) Teaching and Mentoring, and (3) Outreach, Extension, Service and Governance.
8. **Executive Committee discusses draft report and votes to accept.** The Executive Committee meets to discuss and vote on acceptance of the draft review report for each faculty member. Any voted changes are incorporated into the final copy of the review report.
- A review report is not considered complete until the Executive Committee has voted to accept it. For example, the Executive Committee may direct the Review Committee to gather more evidence before accepting the report.
9. **Within 10 days, department chair transmits final review report to faculty member (who may respond).** The department chair provides the faculty member with the final review report as accepted by the Executive Committee. The faculty member shall have the right to prepare a written response to the report within 30 days after receipt.

10. Department chair files final review report and response (if any) with the Dean no later than March 1. A copy of the review report and any written response to it, shall be placed in the departmental personnel file of the faculty member and provided to the Dean for sufficiency review.

5.2.3 Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor

Associate Professors who are eligible for promotion to Full Professor and who intend to pursue a promotion request should discuss their interest with the Department Chair and the Chair of the Faculty Evaluation and Awards Committee (FEAC). Promotion requests are considered by a sub-group of the Executive Committee consisting of all Full Professors in the department (hereafter the Council of Full Professors). The request will be considered at a closed session of the Executive Committee. As a procedural matter, a faculty member seeking promotion to full professor should attend the Executive Committee meeting at which the request is considered.

A post-tenure review must be completed before the Executive Committee considers the request for promotion to full professor. If occurring in the same year, materials prepared for a post-tenure review may also serve as documentation for the promotion request, consistent with guidelines of the College of Letters and Science.

Guidance from the College of Letters and Science indicates that recommendations for promotion should be based on meritorious performance in rank, not merely length of service. The departmental review and supporting documents should be similar in intent, though not necessarily in length, to those submitted for recommendation for promotion with tenure. Documentation for promotions to full professor submitted to the Dean of the College of Letters and Science should include:

- a cover letter from the Department Chair with department recommendation;
- a complete, updated vita (prepared by the associate professor);
- documentation of contributions to research, scholarship, outreach/extension, and service since promotion to tenure, including a narrative analysis of the candidate's contributions in each of these areas, including evidence of significant integration of efforts across them. This reporting must be understandable to readers not in the candidate's specialty (prepared by the FEAC based on a dossier prepared by the associate professor);
- documentation of teaching performance, and other contributions to instructional effort including advising, the development of curricular material, and integration with research and outreach/extension (provided by the associate professor);
- documentation of service contributions at the departmental, campus, and national levels (prepared by the associate professor).

Outside letters of reference are not required by the College of Letters and Science.

Materials must be submitted to the Dean of the College of Letters and Science no later than March 20th of each academic year. Thus, the candidate must have met with the departmental and committee chairs prior to the second Wednesday of October of the prior fall semester, by which date the committee expects to learn if any associate professors are planning to apply for promotion. The deadline to supply completed materials to the FEAC is by the third Wednesday of November that academic year. The FEAC will establish other deadlines in order to supply the Council of Full Professors the candidate's dossier and the FEAC evaluation in a timely fashion.

In preparation for promotion to Full Professor, all tenured associate professors' research or creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach work are to be discussed **each year** with the Department Chair.

Department chairs should initiate a discussion about the appropriate timing for promotion to full professor no later than at the associate professor's first post-tenure review (performed in the associate professor's fifth year). An associate professor can also ask the chair to be considered for promotion to full professor at any time. The request for consideration for promotion should be followed by a conversation between the chair and the associate professor about the criteria for promotion, the associate professor's record of achievement since promotion to associate professor, and the relative strengths of the case in the context of the department's criteria for promotion.

The criteria for promotion to Full Professor are reflective of the individual terms of appointment for each faculty member and include proportionate expectations of strong performance in the various areas of research/creative activity, teaching, outreach/extension, and service. Those with integrated Extension faculty appointments are expected to demonstrate support from the relevant leadership within Cooperative Extension.

When a decision is made to pursue promotion to Full Professor, the associate professor will prepare a dossier of work, including all publications, grant proposals, and other scholarship; evaluations of teaching from students and peers; and evidence of service (both at UW-Madison and to the profession more broadly), outreach, governance, and administrative work. The dossier should include all materials that are required in a normal post-tenure review and identify work completed in rank as associate professor. The dossier should also contain a brief reflective statement of major accomplishments and outcomes, when possible striving to discuss important interrelationships across them, while serving as an associate professor. Finally, the dossier should contain a brief (1-page) statement of plans and goals for the next 5 years. The chair will request department staff to assist the associate professor by providing access to necessary information.

When completed, the associate professor will submit the completed dossier to the Chair of the FEAC with a formal request for promotion. The small subcommittee will prepare a written evaluation of the associate professor's work and submit it for consideration to the Council of Full Professors so that the report and related materials can be read before a vote is taken. Similar to the post-tenure review process, in determining whether to recommend an associate professor for promotion, the committee will take into account the unique terms of the individual's position, the performance ratings documented in annual reviews, and the body of supporting evidence provided by the faculty member.

Faculty promoted to full professor must be contributing mature and exemplary teaching, scholarship, leadership to their profession, college, and/or broader community, and evidence of integrating aspects of all of them in their work that relates to community engagement, outreach, and extension, consistent with their appointments.

Work reflecting this level of contribution will follow from the Letter of Appointment and include:

- A clear established trajectory from national to international recognition for one's scholarly and academic contributions, which include research, teaching, outreach, extension, and service.
- Evidence of ongoing scholarship productivity depending on the character of each individual's academic appointment. Examples might include: an average of two or more peer reviewed publications/year, or acclaimed books/textbooks, publications in high impact journals, substantial citations of previous work demonstrating ongoing relevance and intellectual leadership—particularly in the case of an individual whose combined responsibilities emphasize this type of academic performance; high-profile jurying appointments, peer reviewed project grant awards, exhibitions, web resources, sites, productions and publications, public media coverage of scholarship, teaching, outreach, projects and productions in many formats. Evidence of significant leadership in academics or the profession. Some examples: chairing professional inter/national organizations, hosting inter/national conferences, editing inter/national journals and

publication series, directing cross-college and community engagement programs or initiatives, chairing a department or major university committee, receiving prestigious academic recognition through awards, fellowships, public coverage.

- Exemplary teaching and/or teaching and learning scholarship and/or innovation. Examples might include: impactful outreach/extension learning, either transformative for the community, or in how teaching is done through community engagement; ongoing advising and successful matriculation of graduate students; continued leadership and service to undergraduate and graduate students through, for example, involvement with career fairs and capstone presentations.
- Service as a role model for colleagues, students, and staff through, for example: senior-level mentoring of junior faculty; leadership on campus that may involve representing the department or college in governance, innovations, or controversial issues; representing students and colleagues in the community and professional organizations such as CELA, APA, etc.; nominating others for awards and professional development opportunities.
- For faculty with formal Extension appointments as Integrated Specialists, activities as appropriate to the current structure of appointment.
- Progress in addressing any “does not meet” expectations and no evidence of repeated “needs improvement” evaluations.

The Council of Full Professors will, after reading the report of the Faculty Evaluation and Awards Committee and evaluating the associate professor’s work, vote on whether or not to promote. A successful vote to promote requires a simple majority of full professors in the department (excluding faculty on sabbatical leave, whose participation is welcome but optional).

Once the vote has been taken, the Department Chair will report the results of the vote to the associate professor, and – if the vote is positive – write a letter recommending promotion to the Dean of the College of Letters and Science. Promotions from associate professor to full professor are reviewed by the Dean and academic associate deans of the college.

Consistent with college policy, the Department Chairs are encouraged to consult with the appropriate Associate Dean about possible promotions before the formal documentation is submitted, especially in cases where a candidate has fewer than five years in rank as an associate professor, or in cases where additional documentation may be deemed appropriate by the college. In the event of a negative vote, the chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss how to create a stronger case for promotion at a later date.

5.3. Faculty Leave

The department strongly encourage professional development and research activities of faculty, recognizing that pursuing these translates into time away from teaching.

5.3.1. Criteria used by the department in considering leaves, including sabbatical requests

- A critical mass of faculty must be available to offer the instructional curriculum and to sustain our core courses and critical concentration offerings; in meeting this “critical mass” requirement, careful consideration should be given to equitably balancing the leave opportunities and departmental workload among faculty.
- The proposed leave of absence or other release from teaching responsibilities must relate to the mission of the Planning & Landscape Architecture Department, e.g., professional development, student training and research opportunities, publications, etc. (consideration will be given to both

the mission and the desires of the individual and the department as a whole).

- The department may differentiate between leaves of absence which take the faculty person away from the campus (and thus make the faculty person unavailable for departmental advising, committee work, and other sustenance functions), in contrast to research grants or fellowships which can be pursued while the faculty person is in residence and is supporting the overall mission of the department via non-teaching activities.

5.3.2. Conditions Attached to Leaves of Absence or Other Absences from Teaching

- The faculty member who wishes to take a leave must provide a statement of rationale for the leave to colleagues, as a basis for departmental action regarding the leave.
- A viable instructional replacement strategy must accompany any requests for leave and be worked out in advance of leave approval, with the authorization of the Executive Committee.
- Upon their return, the faculty person may be obligated to teach somewhat different courses than at the time of departure; this would be in response to the department's own adjustments in offering a balanced course mix during the faculty member's absence.
- Conditions will be attached to the duration of a leave of absence and the conditions for any possible extension of a leave of absence.

5.3.3. Departmental Process/Procedures for Managing Leaves of Absence and Other Absences from Teaching

- The Executive Committee must approve leaves of absence and other absences from teaching if the leave or aggregate absence from teaching will exceed 2 weeks in a single semester.
- The Executive Committee must receive advance notification of intended leave. For taking a leave of absence from teaching in the fall semester, requests must be distributed to the Executive Committee no later than January 15 of the preceding spring, and similarly for a spring semester, October 1 of the preceding semester.
- The Chair is authorized to approve leaves for faculty of no more than 2 weeks within a single semester.
- Sabbatical requests must follow expectations provided by UW-Madison at: <https://www.ohr.wisc.edu/grants/sabbatical.aspx>
- A leave request to the Executive Committee must include the following:
 - Name
 - Research support: source, title, & period requested (list separately as many possibilities as applicable)
 - Leave of absence for professional development: source of funding & period requested
 - % of your academic year salary requested in Sem I
 - % of your academic year salary requested in Sem II
 - Date submitted or to be submitted
 - Estimated date when you will know
 - Estimated probability of funding
 - PLA curriculum impacts (what courses that you teach would not be taught?)