

Chapter 2
Retention,
Renewal and
Promotion

Mentoring Program

The relationships between the faculty mentors and probationary faculty are most effective when they are informal and fully collegial. The degree to which mentors are needed by incoming faculty varies, but the success of probationary faculty members frequently depends on the degree to which they are able to work with colleagues who can familiarize them with the University and with whom they can share their research and teaching plans.

Procedure

- Each department will identify faculty members who can serve as mentors for new faculty members in the department.
- Mentors will work with new faculty members for at least one year.
- Each candidate will be assigned a mentor from his or her own department and a mentor from a related department or discipline in the College.
 - Department mentors will be assigned by the chair, who will inform the Dean's Office of the selection. If the department does not have enough qualified people to serve as mentors, the chair will work with the Dean's Office to identify a possible alternate.
 - The Dean's Office will designate an external mentor.

Mentors' Responsibilities

Department Mentors will work closely with probationary faculty members, familiarizing them with the unit's administrative processes, assisting them as necessary in developing syllabi and strengthening their teaching skills, helping them obtain peer evaluations and interpret Student Opinion Surveys, encouraging them in their research activity, and providing advice and guidance for requesting Faculty Development and external grant proposals, developing renewal and promotion documents, and proposing curricular changes.

External mentors have the same *general* responsibilities, but they provide information, guidance and assistance in the broader context of the College and University. They serve an important role in introducing probationary faculty members to the larger academic community and in encouraging interdisciplinary and cooperative approaches to instruction and research. External mentors are encouraged to take their mentees to lunch twice in the first year, to assist in encouraging a strong and continuing relationship; the cost of these lunches will be reimbursed by the Dean.

College Faculty Committee, May 30, 1986

Policy on Reappointment and Tenure
Also see *UWO Chapter 4 Faculty Handbook*

Introduction

This document establishes the general policy for reappointment and tenure for the College of Letters and Science. It will serve as a guide for the development of policy specific to the particular discipline(s) by each academic department or unit. The activities in the areas of evaluation enumerated below are intended to preserve and enhance the excellence of the College of Letters and Science by encouraging faculty members to develop their full potential as teachers and scholars.

Relationship to University Mission and Tenure & Reappointment Policies

Its select mission calls for the University "to acquire, preserve and disseminate knowledge" to intellectually "challenge students," and "to expect scholarly activity, including research, scholarship and creative endeavor." The University guidelines that candidates for tenure demonstrate (1) "quality performance teaching," (2) "scholarly achievement and institutional and extra institutional related professional services and activities at a level sufficient to assure continued professional and intellectual growth," and (3) "a significant contribution to the growth and development of the institution."

Areas of Evaluation

Teaching

Effective teaching requires mastery of the subject coupled with the organizational and communication skills necessary to share this knowledge with students in a manner that encourages them to learn. Effective teaching requires continual upgrading of course subject matter and instructional techniques. Effective teaching may require diverse pedagogical approaches and may take place in many settings, some removed from the classroom. Effective teaching may require collective as well as individual efforts in developing or revising a curriculum or carrying out cooperative instructional activities.

Professional and scholarly activity

Professional and scholarly activity involves active engagement with one's discipline or field. It includes the search for new knowledge, the expression of creative talent, and the application of existing knowledge to issues and problems within our society.

Professional and scholarly activity enables faculty members to acquire and maintain expertise within their disciplines and, where appropriate, across disciplines. It enhances their abilities to engage students both in gaining knowledge of their disciplines and in developing the skills by which knowledge is acquired.

Professional and scholarly activity takes diverse forms depending on the individual faculty member and discipline. For the purpose of reappointment and tenure, the common criterion for all faculty members is that professional and scholarly activity must be demonstrated in such a manner that it can be observed and evaluated by appropriate peers.

Service

Service activities fall into three general categories: University, public, and professional. University service is directed toward the department, College, University and UW-System. Faculty members have an obligation to accept their share of responsibility for the governance of the institution. Public service relates to the non-academic community, especially those publics needing one's professional expertise. Service to the profession includes activities such as serving as an officer for a professional organization, as a peer reviewer for a journal, conducting on-site evaluations of academic programs or reviewing grant applications.

Relative Importance of the areas

Teaching effectiveness and professional and scholarly activity are the most important elements in reappointment and tenure decisions.

Progress Toward Tenure

Each year probationary faculty members should show satisfactory progress in developing a record of teaching and scholarly and professional activity which will result in the granting of tenure. It is expected that probationary faculty members will concentrate on effective teaching and on establishing a record of scholarly and professional activity in their first years on the faculty. By the time of the tenure decision, a clear record of accomplishment in both areas should be established. Although tenured faculty members bear a major burden in institutional governance, probationary faculty members are expected to participate in general departmental responsibilities, most particularly in the last half of their probationary period.

Relationship to Department Policies

This document serves as the framework for individual policies framed by each department in the College. Department policies define more precisely what activities constitute satisfactory professional and scholarly growth for their faculty members and what levels of performance are necessary for reappointment and tenure. Department policies will also take into account the various contexts and methods of instruction appropriate to specific disciplines in defining what constitutes effective teaching. Department policies also define appropriate levels of service. Finally, department policies describe the nature and amount of evidence that must be presented for evaluation in teaching, scholarship and service.

Approved by L&S Faculty February 22, 1991

Outside Letters for Tenure & Promotion Decisions

The College of Letters and Science's policy on the topic of outside letters evaluating tenure and promotion candidate is:

**NO OUTSIDE LETTERS OF ANY SORT ARE REQUIRED FOR
TENURE OR FOR PROMOTION DECISIONS**

Some candidates might opt to have such letters included in their files:
they are free to do so.

Candidates who **do** elect to include such letters may solicit their own letters, ask the chair to solicit letters on their behalf, ask the Dean to solicit letters or choose some other option. If the Dean is asked to solicit letters, the following conditions will apply:

- The candidate must initiate the process. The Dean will not solicit letters for a candidate who does not request assistance
- Each candidate who wishes to have letters solicited will be asked to sign a release permitting the insertion of those letters in his or her promotion or tenure file.
- The candidate, and his or her chair, will create a list of possible outside reviewers. This list includes their telephone number(s), addresses and a brief description of their qualifications.
- The reviewers may not have close professional or personal relationships with the candidate.
- After the list is presented to the Dean's Office, contact will be made with the outside reviewers. Evaluators will be asked to review the scholarly work of the candidate (the Dean's Office will pay to send copies of scholarly works to the reviewers). A **qualitative** assessment will be requested.
- The letters of all evaluators will be kept confidential and the evaluators will be assured of that confidentiality.
- Letters from evaluators will be shared with department committees and all other higher levels of review, but not with the candidate. However, on request of the candidate, the Dean will provide an anonymous summary of all letters received.

Based on a memorandum from the Dean dated September 16, 1994

Distribution of Tenure and Renewal Guidelines

It is vitally important that newly hired faculty be knowledgeable about their department's tenure and renewal guidelines. Along with Chapter IV. B & C of the *Faculty Handbook*, departmental guidelines provide new faculty with a sound basis for planning. Good information and the ability to plan: (1) encourage faculty to see professional development and self-evaluation as an *ongoing* process, not just an episodic one; and (2) materially increase the prospects of successful renewal.

Each new faculty member should receive a copy of the unit's tenure and renewal guidelines no later than within the first month of service. It is suggested that the chair not only distribute a copy of the guidelines but that he or she review the document with the probationary faculty member and answer any questions the faculty member has after having had a chance to read the material.

The new faculty member should provide a short memo acknowledging receipt of the guidelines and this should be kept in the department file.

Based on a request from the Dean, 1996

Inclusion of Teaching Evaluations with Tenure/Renewal & Promotion Files

The Vice Chancellor's Office has requested that candidates' renewal, tenure and promotion files forwarded by the initial level of review should contain only summaries regarding teaching, professional development and service.

All information relevant to teaching should remain in candidates' files when they are forwarded to the Dean's Office. It is extremely valuable to the College Committee and Dean to have access to the peer evaluations of teaching and the student opinion printouts for individual classes **including student comments**. Teaching is one of the most important functions that faculty members perform, and College-level reviewers value the opportunity to read the complete teaching credential file.

Based on a memo from the Dean, October 12, 1995

Policy on the Minimum Size of Departmental Promotion Committees

Rationale:

There are College or University procedures for dealing with small departmental Tenure and Renewal Committees and for departments with empty Promotion Committees, but there are not procedures for small departmental Promotion Committees. The proposed policy for the College of Letters and Science is to use the same procedure in either case.

- A . If there are no faculty in the department at the appropriate rank, the College of Letters and Science Promotion Committee shall be the functional equivalent if the initial level of review.
- B .
- ① If there is only one appropriate faculty member in the department deliberating and voting, he or she shall be joined by the College of Letters and Science Promotion Committee for the purpose of acting as the initial level of review, subject to the following considerations: (1) the member of the department is entitled to one vote; and (2) the members of the College Committee shall, in total, have two votes, with the vote of each individual member weighed to equal a proportionate share based on the number of college committee members participating (e.g., if there are seven members of the college committee, each participating individual shall be entitled to $2/7^{\text{th}}$ vote).
 - ② If there are two appropriate faculty members in the department deliberating and voting, they shall be joined by the College of Letters and Science Promotion Committee for the purpose of acting as the initial level of review, subject to the following considerations: (1) each member of the department is entitled to one vote; and (2) the members of the college committee shall, in total, have one vote, with the vote of each individual member weighted to equal a proportionate share based on the number of college committee members participating (e.g., if there are seven members of the college committee, each participating individual shall be entitled to a $1/7^{\text{th}}$ vote).
- C . If the college of Letters and Science Promotion Committee participates in the initial level of review, it does not subsequently act as the second level of review. The chair of the College of Letters and Science Promotion Committee shall serve as the chair of this ad hoc committee.

Approved by Faculty Committee, Minutes of 23 February 2000
Also approved in a College-wide referendum 7 April 2011

In the College of Letters and Science Promotion Committee, only those committee members who are full professors are eligible to participate in the discussion regarding promotion to full professor. – College-wide referendum passed 8 May 2003

Materials to be Included in Promotion Documentation

Policy:

In the College of Letters and Science, candidates for promotion must provide peer evaluations as part of their documentation of Teaching Effectiveness.

Rationale:

The procedures for promotion should be consistent with other personnel procedures in the College of Letters and Science. In University guidelines peer evaluation is already one of the permissible types of evidence that may be used to demonstrate teaching effectiveness.

Approved by Faculty Committee, Minutes of 28 February, 2002
Also approved in a College-wide referendum 8 May 2003

Policy:

Candidates for promotion shall submit comments and votes by all levels of review from the most recent promotion consideration to the same rank if such a consideration took place in the previous five years.

Rationale:

The Promotion Committee should be provided with the same documentation that is submitted to the Tenure and Renewal Committee. Reviewing previous comments and votes will help clarify for the Committee whether the candidate has addressed any concerns expressed previously by all levels of Review.

Policy Approved by the Faculty Committee, Minutes of 06 March 2002
Also approved in a College-wide referendum 8 May 2003

College of Letters and Sciences Post Tenure Review

I. Preamble

Post-tenure review is required by the University of Wisconsin System's Board of Regents (see Appendix I). The principles and procedures outlined below pertain to the College of Letters and Science at the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh and require all departments and department equivalents to have an approved post-tenure review policy in accordance with the policies and procedures outlined below.

II. General Principles

A. Post-tenure reviews are designed to ensure the maintenance of a quality faculty necessary to fulfill the mission of the College of Letters and Sciences at the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh. All levels of review should adhere to the following guidelines (advocated by the American Association of University Professors):

1. respect and protect academic freedom;
2. involve faculty peers and faculty adjudicating or governance bodies and procedures;
3. be kept confidential, barring a request for an open meeting or hearing (see III. G.);
4. permit and respect challenges;
5. be seen as a method, developed and agreed upon by all parties, of improving faculty performance for the goals of the College and University.

B. Post-tenure review should recognize and accommodate diverse faculty talents and career paths.

III. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

A. Coordination with other Personnel Decisions: Promotion to the rank of Professor or a professorial productivity award will be considered a favorable post-tenure review and this event will reset the review clock.

B. Frequency: A review of each faculty member with tenure will normally occur once every four years and will consist of an examination of teaching; scholarly, professional, and creative activity (scholarship, hereafter); and service. A faculty member is defined by faculty status in accordance with Faculty Handbook. PTR is intended to coordinate with merit review. Therefore if PTR is to occur outside of the merit cycle then the faculty member's PTR will be delayed one year to bring PTR and merit back onto the same cycle.

C. Levels of Review

1. The initial level of review will be the department or equivalent unless this is impossible (e.g. the only tenured member of a department is up for review or the department does not have an approved post-tenure review policy).
2. A second level of review will be conducted by the COLS Promotion Committee (PC).
3. In cases where the two levels disagree about whether a faculty member meets expectations in any of the three areas of judgment, the COLS Dean will decide which

position prevails, examining both the record of the faculty member and the statements written by the department and PC.

4. In cases where the only level of review has been the COLS Promotion Committee, the Dean will conduct a review; a negative outcome may be appealed to the Provost.
 5. In all cases, the written decisions of reviewers will be forwarded to the Dean and Provost, on the approved form.
- D. Departmental Policy and Procedure: Each department or equivalent shall describe its post-tenure review process in its bylaws or a separate PTR policy. Only tenured members of a department may serve on a review committee. No individual undergoing review may participate in his/her own review. The initial level of review determines if the faculty member meets minimum expectations or does not meet minimum expectations in each of three areas: teaching, scholarly activity, and service. A standard form that indicates whether or not the faculty member meets expectations in each of the three areas must be sent forward. In cases where the faculty member under review does not meet expectations, an explanation must be made about how and why expectations are not met, written by the departmental designee and submitted to the COLS Promotion Committee, along with the documentation submitted by the faculty member being reviewed.
- E. Promotions Committee Procedure: After review of the submitted evidence by the Promotion Committee and a vote of committee members, the committee chair or designee will indicate on the standard form whether the faculty member meets expectations in each of the three areas under review. The committee will provide a brief written statement summarizing the committee's decision, explaining the reason behind any adverse decision and the reversal of any departmental determination.
- F. Appeal Process: In cases where a level of review determines that someone does not meet expectations in one or more areas, the person being reviewed may write a one page Letter of Appeal to the next level of review. This letter should address the concerns expressed in the review. The faculty member appealing may also submit any documentation which may mitigate the concerns expressed in the statement written by the previous level of review.
- G. Post-tenure review is a personnel action, and it is one in which confidential performance evaluation data is considered. Therefore, consideration of materials and of the individuals will generally be done in closed session under the auspices of Section 19.85 of Wisconsin's state statutes. Under this same statute any one up for post-tenure review may ask that their assessment be held in an open meeting or request that there be a separate, open evidentiary hearing.

If there is a disagreement between the determination of the department and the Promotion Committee or if the Promotion Committee has served as the only level of review, the Dean of COLS will determine if the faculty member meets expectations. In these two cases the Dean's office will consider the written statements from the two levels of review and all evidence provided by the faculty member under review, and any other formal documentation. In these cases the Dean will indicate on the standard form whether the faculty member meets

expectations in each of the three areas under review. The Dean will provide a brief written statement explaining the reason behind any adverse decision and the reversal of any prior determination. The Dean will forward this decision to the Provost.

IV. Submission Requirements

A. Departmental or unit post-tenure review policies must:

1. Indicate standards for meeting expectations in all three areas and clearly indicate documentation deemed necessary for determination. It is suggested that these match merit standards and documentation.
2. Specify the procedure to produce and the expectations to be met in a Professional Improvement Plan (PIP).
3. COLS requires that every faculty member undergoing post-tenure review submit student opinion surveys from at least 50% of courses/sections/labs taught in the previous four years. Opinion surveys representing the breadth of different courses taught by the submitter is highly desirable. Departments may use University or departmental approved forms. Departments are encouraged to require peer reviews of faculty teaching during the post-tenure period.
4. Submission packets from those being reviewed should be concise and compact; any statements required from the person being reviewed should not exceed those required for merit determination. A maximum of one single-spaced page statement for each area under review is recommended.

B. Professional Improvement Plan

1. A Professional Improvement Plan (PIP) is required of all individuals determined not to have met expectations in one or more of the three areas. These are required in cases where the first two levels of review have agreed on a deficiency, and in cases where the Dean has agreed with one of the first two levels about a deficiency.
2. A PIP is to be submitted by the faculty member in a timely manner to both the home unit and the Dean. Department policy should present guidelines for developing specific plans for remediation of the deficiency determined by the levels of review, emphasizing achievable objectives with specifiable results. If the deficiency is in the area of teaching, the plan should include peer reviews of teaching as a means of generating suggestions for improvement.
3. If a PIP is not submitted, the faculty member will undergo post-tenure review in the year immediately following the initial review and determination of deficiency.
4. Individuals who submit a PIP will undergo another post-tenure review the second year after an initial determination of deficiency, which covers only the area(s) in which he or she was determined to not meet minimum expectations. The faculty member under review is expected to specifically address how successful he/she was in remedying the deficiency(s) determined in the previous review and supply appropriate documentation to help the committee determine the success of the remediation. All levels of review

are expected to revisit the deficiency and determine whether it has been remedied, particularly addressing this matter in its written report. A full review, covering all three areas, will be conducted four years after the initial determination of deficiency.

V. Timeline

The review will be conducted in spring semester, though the administrative unit head and the faculty must be notified in the fall semester preceding the post-tenure review.

Names of faculty up for post-tenure review to department chair	End of October
The faculty member(s) formally notified of the Upcoming post-tenure review (procedure specified in dept. policy)	Second Week of November
Faculty completed portfolio for initial level of review (submission procedure specified in dept. policy)	First week of February
Department review forwarded to COLS committee	End of February
COLS committee review forwarded to dean of COLS	End of March
COLS Dean review forwarded to provost	Third week of April
Notification to faculty member and department chair	First week of May

VIII. Results

Post-tenure reviews are designed to ensure the maintenance of a quality faculty necessary to the mission of the College of Letters and Sciences at the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh. It is intended to be a faculty-led assessment of faculty performance, with the primary goal of improving clear deficiencies in teaching, scholarship, and service performed by tenured faculty in COLS. The post-tenure review process itself does not carry the possibility of negative sanctions beyond the determination of not meeting expectations, the possible requirement of a Professional Improvement Plan, and the additional reporting the plan requires. The COLS Dean may make use of post-tenure determinations to carry out his/her statutorily defined and campus specific prerogatives, including overseeing plans for remediation of deficiencies and sanctioning individuals who fail to meet expectations for an extended period, provided that he/she does so in accordance with all state and federal statutes, all relevant UW system policies, and the Faculty and Academic Staff handbook.