

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:

Timeline and Procedures for the SOFAS, Tenure Candidate, Unit Chair, Program Chair, Personnel Council Chair, Dean, Provost, and Chancellor

Legend (the person responsible for the action(s) required in each bullet point below is color coded as follows):

SOFAS

Program Chair

Unit Chair

Tenure Candidate

Dean of the College

Personnel Council Chair

Provost

Chancellor

April 30

- **SOFAS** sends a letter to the Deans (cc: Unit Chairs and Program Chairs) listing Assistant Professors who will be entering their sixth year as a probationary faculty member and must go up for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. [This step is currently muddled due to Administration's decision to allow Assistant Professors to delay their tenure decision by up to two years due to COVID].

May 10

- **Unit Chair** informs those probationary Assistant Professors who are completing their fifth year of service at UWGB that they must be reviewed the following academic year for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. [This step is currently muddled due to Administration's decision to allow Assistant Professors to delay their tenure decision by up to two years due to COVID].
- **Tenure Candidate (if seeking an early tenure decision)** requests, in writing, of his/her Unit Chair consideration for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure (cc: SOFAS and respective Dean). An Assistant Professor may make this request once in any of the first six years of his/her appointment; this request is to be honored.

Summer

- **Tenure Candidates** create their tenure document which consists of the following components:
 - a) Current Curriculum Vitae
 - b) Most Recent PAR
 - c) Personal Statement (part of the Professional Narrative) – an effective personal statement includes an overview for each area to be evaluated (teaching, scholarship, service); see more suggestions under “**Materials Prepared by the Tenure Candidate**” found in the “Preparing a Case for Tenure at the Unit Level” appended to the back of this document (p. 6 of this document).
 - d) Professional Narrative – see specifics in the Faculty Handbook under the section entitled “UWGB Document on Tenure” (located under “Faculty Policies: Personnel Policies,” <https://www.uwgb.edu/UWGCMS/media/sofas/rules/facultyhandbook.pdf>); Suggestion for the **Tenure Candidate** – ask a member from your Unit who has recently received tenure if you may examine his/her narrative.
 - e) External Review Letters – In accordance with the Faculty Handbook’s revised “UWGB Faculty Document on Tenure,” passed by the Faculty Senate on January 26, 2022, the Personnel Council requests a minimum of one and not more than five external letter(s) from (an) expert(s) in the tenure candidate’s field which evaluates the candidate’s scholarship and/or creative activity. **NOTICE TO TENURE CANDIDATE AND UNIT CHAIR:** it is the responsibility of each respective Unit to decide: (a) how the external letter or letters are solicited (does the Tenure Candidate solicit the letters or does the Unit Chair solicit the letters based on names provided by the Tenure Candidate?), and (b) the Unit’s policy regarding the candidate’s relationship to the letter writer (can the external reviewer be someone with whom the Tenure Candidate has collaborated or is the external reviewer someone with whom the Tenure Candidate has never collaborated?). The PC recommends that each Unit provides clear written guidelines regarding these two requirements. Letters solicited from external reviewers shall be placed into the **Tenure Candidate’s** evidentiary file.
 - f) Evidentiary File – materials from the **Tenure Candidate’s** time as a probationary faculty member at UWGB that support their case for tenure; divide these materials into four categories: teaching, scholarly activity, service (institutional development and community outreach), and external review letters.
- **SOFAS** will create a separate Teams Channel for every Tenure Candidate. All of the tenure candidate’s documents (a-f above), in electronic form, will be added to the Teams Channel. The Program’s Executive Committee (if applicable), Unit’s Executive Committee, the candidate’s Dean, the members of the Personnel Council, the Provost, and the Chancellor will be granted access to the candidate’s Teams Channel.

September/October

- **Program Chair** (if the Tenure Candidate is part of Program) sends the notice of Program review to the Tenure Candidate setting the date of the review (cc: SOFAS) [a template

letter is available from SOFAS]. A minimum of 20-day notice prior to the review is required.

- If a 20-day notice is not given, the **Tenure Candidate** must formally waive their right to a 20-day notice via an email to the Program Chair (cc: SOFAS).
- **Program Chair** asks the Academic Department Associate (ADA) to send a request to SOFAS making sure the Program's Executive Committee has access to the Tenure Candidate's Teams Channel two weeks prior to the scheduled Program Review.

September/October

- **Tenure Candidate** transmits electronic copies of the following items to the SOFAS Office:
 - Tenure document (Professional Narrative and Personal Statement) (cc: the ADA of the Unit)
 - Most up-to-date Curriculum Vitae (CV) (cc: the ADA of the Unit)
 - Most up-to-date Professional Activities Report (PAR) (cc: the ADA of the Unit)
 - Evidentiary File (cc: the ADA of the Unit)
 - NOTE: After the Tenure Candidate's review by his/her Program Executive Committee and/or Unit Executive Committee, the candidate may revise their Professional Narrative, Personal Statement, CV, and PAR up to the point when the Dean of the College requests a recommendation from the Personnel Council (cc: SOFAS – if any of these documents were revised). The Dean requests a recommendation from the Personnel Council one week after the Unit review.
- Following the Program tenure review, the **Program Chair** submits a letter to the Unit Chair summarizing the comments of the Program's Executive Committee regarding the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service record, and external review letters, and expressing the Program's recommendation on promotion to Associate Professor with tenure (see page 7 of this document) (cc: SOFAS and the respective Dean)
- **Unit Chair** sends the notice of Unit review to the Tenure Candidate setting the date of the review (cc: SOFAS) [Template Letter is available from SOFAS]; a minimum of 20-day notice prior to the review is required
- If a 20-day notice is not given, the **Tenure Candidate** must formally waive their right to a 20-day notice via an email to the Unit Chair (cc: SOFAS)
- If the tenure candidate does not have a Program home, the **Unit Chair** asks the Academic Department Associate (ADA) to send a request to SOFAS making sure the Unit's Executive Committee has access to the Tenure Candidate's Teams Channel two weeks prior to the scheduled Program Review.

Early November (Deadline 3 November 2023)

- **Unit Chair** submits a letter to the Dean summarizing the comments of the Unit's Executive Committee regarding the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service record, and external review letters, and expressing the Unit's recommendation on promotion to Associate Professor with tenure (see page 7 of this document) (cc: SOFAS)

Mid-November (Deadline 17 November 2023)

- **Dean of the College** sends a letter to the Personnel Council Chair (cc: SOFAS) asking the Council for their recommendation on the Assistant Professor candidate seeking promotion to Associate Professor with tenure [Template Letter is available from SOFAS]
- NOTE: Once the Dean of the College requests a recommendation on tenure from the Personnel Council, the Tenure Candidate may no longer make any changes to his/her Tenure Document

Late November or Early December

- **Personnel Council Chair** sends the Notice of Tenure Review letter to the Tenure Candidate setting the date for the tenure review (cc: SOFAS) [Template Letter is available from SOFAS]; a minimum of 20-day notice prior to the review is required
- If a 20-day notice is not given, the **Tenure Candidate** must formally waive their right to a 20-day notice via an email to the Personnel Council Chair (cc: SOFAS)
- **SOFAS Office** will ensure all members of Personnel Council have access to the Tenure Candidate's materials stored on their Teams Channel

Late January (Deadline 19 January 2024)

- **Personnel Council Chair** submits a letter to the Dean (cc: SOFAS) summarizing the comments of the Personnel Council regarding the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service record, and external review letters, and expressing the Council's recommendation on promotion to Associate Professor with tenure [Template Letter is available from SOFAS]
- **SOFAS Office** will ensure the Dean has access to the Tenure Candidate's materials stored on their Teams Channel

Late February (28 February 2024)

- **Dean of the College** submits his/her tenure recommendation to the Provost (cc: SOFAS) [Template Letter is available from SOFAS]
- **SOFAS Office** will ensure the Provost has access to the Tenure Candidate's materials stored on their Teams Channel

Late April (Due 28 April 2024)

- The **Chancellor** in consultation with the **Provost** submits his/her tenure recommendation to the Board of Regents (cc: SOFAS and the tenure candidate)

Early June

- **Board of Regents** approve tenure, which becomes effective in August of the new academic year when faculty are back under contract

List of Tenure Documents to be Submitted to SOFAS (and Who is Responsible for their Submission):

- Most Current Professional Activities Report [PAR] (**Tenure Candidate**)
- Professional Narrative, original (**Tenure Candidate**)
- Professional Narrative, if revised after Unit Review (**Tenure Candidate**)
- Curriculum Vitae (**Tenure Candidate**)
- Notice of Program Review (20-Day Notice Required) (**Program Chair**)
- Waiver of 20-Day Notice of Program Review, if applicable (**Tenure Candidate**)
- Recommendation from the Program Review to the Unit Chair (**Program Chair**)
- Notice of Unit Review (20-Day Notice Required) (**Unit Chair**)
- Waiver of 20-Day Notice of Unit Review, if applicable (**Tenure Candidate**)
- Recommendation from the Unit Review to the Dean (**Unit Chair**)
- Dean's Letter requesting a Recommendation from the Personnel Council (**Dean**)
- Notice of Personnel Council Review (20-Day Notice Required) (**Personnel Council Chair**)
- Waiver of 20-Day Notice of Personnel Council Review, if applicable (**Tenure Candidate**)
- Recommendation from the Personnel Council Review to the Dean (**Personnel Council Chair**)
- Dean's Recommendation to the Provost (**Dean**)
- Provost's Recommendation to the Chancellor (**Provost**)
- Chancellor's Recommendation to the Board of Regents (**Chancellor**)

Preparing a Case for Tenure at the Unit Level

(Prepared by Dr. Ken Fleurant, SOFAS, 2003-2006)

The purpose of this document is to help **Unit Chairs**, **Executive Committees**, and **Tenure Candidates** prepare a case for review that is effective, efficient, and meets the standards set forth in UW-Green Bay personnel policy.

This document is intended to elaborate on matters specified in UWGB Chapter 3, Faculty Personnel Policy Procedures (Faculty Handbook sections 3.08 and 3.10) and in UWGB Faculty Document on Tenure, (2021 Faculty Handbook, pp. 94-96). It does not supplant or replace any portion of either document, both of which remain controlling in personnel reviews. Other terms and conditions of employment relevant to tenure may be specified in the Letter of Appointment.

This document specifically addresses the preparation of cases for tenure review, and is set within the context of tenure policy and procedure. While it may provide advice that is also useful for reappointment or promotion reviews, it does not specifically address those personnel processes.

While the criteria for tenure are common across units within the university, articulation of the standards that are used to determine whether the criteria have been met are the responsibility of the budgetary unit. Standards establish and specify the level of quality or performance necessary for the work of the candidate to be considered of high quality. It is the responsibility of recommending bodies beyond the Executive Committee to assess whether the standards have been appropriately applied in the candidate's case and whether the evidence in the file supports the claim that the criteria for tenure have been met.

Materials Prepared by the **Tenure Candidate**

1. *Curriculum Vitae*

Materials in the CV should be easy to locate. It is particularly important that the scholarship section clearly distinguish work that is already published from works that are accepted for publication and works that are in progress. Articles and abstracts should also be clearly distinguished from one another. Presentations at conferences should not be intermixed with publications.

2. *Personal Statement*

Experience suggests that an effective personal statement includes an overview for each area to be evaluated (teaching, scholarship, service) which both anticipates the details to follow and places them in a context explaining the faculty member's goals, assumptions and sense of accomplishment regarding them. This is the candidate's opportunity to provide a synthesizing statement of the interconnections among the parts of his or her academic career. It can help the reader understand how teaching, scholarship, institutional and community service come together for the person. There is no need to reproduce lists of courses, publications or committee assignments in the personal statement. These are generally available elsewhere in the file.

Materials Prepared by the **Unit Chair**

In general, it is most helpful if the case put forward by the unit explains the processes by which evidence was gathered and evaluated. For example, it is useful to know how letters of recommendation were solicited and how decisions to include or exclude materials from the file were made.

1. *Evaluations from all Units in which the candidate teaches.*

In the 2020 Faculty Handbook, 3.10(4.a) requires that this information be considered in the recommendation of the unit. It is the responsibility of the Executive Committee of the reviewing unit to assemble all of the relevant evaluations and to make reference to them in conjunction with its own assessment of the candidate.

2. *Letters of evaluation*

It is important for the reader of the file to know how letters of evaluation were solicited and used. This might be most easily addressed by having a statement in the file concerning the solicitation of letters.

- a. Teaching: Were the letters solicited by the candidate or the unit? If the unit, what method was used to identify names of students?
- b. Scholarship: By what process were external reviewers selected? What are the reviewer's qualifications to provide an assessment of the candidate's work? What relationship, if any, does the reviewer have to the candidate?
- c. Service: What is the source of the reviewer's knowledge of the quality of the candidate's work? Committee chair? Co-participant? Service Beneficiary?, etc.

Preparation of a Recommendation Memorandum by the **Program Chair and the **Unit Chair** with the Assistance of the respective unit's Executive Committee**

1. *Statement of Criteria*

- a. The criteria for high quality in the categories of teaching, scholarship and university and community service are elaborated in each interdisciplinary unit's personnel policies. Those criteria should be referenced and applied in the recommendation on tenure.
- b. The Faculty Document on Tenure specifies that "[t]he evaluation of a probationary faculty member for purposes of retention or promotion should take careful and specific account of the candidate's contribution to the unit's goals and the related institutional missions as specified in the unit's current planning and review documents." These considerations should also be referenced and applied in the recommendation on tenure.

2. *Judgment of the Executive Committee*

- a. The memorandum of recommendation should contain an explicit statement that the Executive Committee found (or did not find) that the candidate met all of the criteria for tenure - in accordance with its standards.
- b. There should be a record of the vote of the Executive Committee.

3. *Explicit Statement of Reasons for the Recommendation*

- a. Review of reappointment history – The recommendation should summarize advice that has been given to the candidate in reappointment letters. Did the candidate respond to the advice?
- b. Discussion of the Executive Committee’s judgment

1. *Teaching*

- i. Contribution to program(s) curriculum – How well does the candidate’s array of courses contribute to program curricula and its student learning outcomes? (2022 Faculty Handbook, p. 93, A.1 and A.2)
- ii. Course development and pedagogy – How well has the candidate approached the challenge of improving teaching? (2020 Faculty Handbook, p. 94, A.3)
- iii. Effectiveness at facilitating the teaching/learning process – What evidence is available to support the Executive Committee’s judgment that the candidate is an effective teacher who can help students learn? (2022 Faculty Handbook, p. 93, A.4)

2. *Scholarship*

High quality work in the area of scholarship is work that:

- i) contributes to knowledge bases in the candidate’s areas of research or creative expression,
- ii) is acknowledged by peers,
- iii) is judged by peers to be of high quality, and
- iv) shows evidence of the likelihood of continuing productivity. (Sources of evidence are listed in 2022 Faculty Handbook, p. 94, B.1-B.8)

For evaluation of scholarly contribution, it is especially important that scholars with expertise in the candidate’s areas of expertise judge the quality of the candidate’s work. This can be accomplished in a number of ways. Selection of the methods of documentation should be clearly established within the unit. In many fields this is done through acceptance of publications in refereed journals. This form of peer review also takes place in other contexts, including selection of a candidate’s work for conference presentations, events, shows, performances, and so on. In each case, it is the responsibility of the unit to evaluate the quality of the venues of the candidate’s scholarship and to assess the significance of the peer judgment.

Peer review can also be accomplished by letters from external reviewers who have been selected by the Executive Committee (rather than the candidate). The role of these reviewers is not to make a judgment of tenurability, that is the proper role of the executive committee and other campus review bodies. The reviewer's role is to make a judgment about the work in relation to criteria i) - iv) above.

It is relatively common for candidates to submit as part of a tenure dossier work that has been produced collaboratively. It is the responsibility of the executive committee to satisfy itself that it understands the candidate's contribution to the work and is able to evaluate the candidate on criteria i) -iv) on the basis of that understanding.

3. *Service*

- i) The executive committee is expected to make distinct judgments regarding the candidate's contributions to institutional development and community outreach. (2020 Faculty Handbook, pp. 94-95, C and D)
- ii) All faculty members are expected to participate in the shared governance of the university both within their units and within the broader committee structure. It is the quality of service, not only the quantity, that is under review. Quality is typically demonstrated in a review of the work products and in an assessment of the impact of service contributions. Quantity of service may, of course, demonstrate a record of commitment to the institution over time. Appropriate forms of evidence are noted in Faculty Handbook, p. 94, C.1 and C.2.
- iii) Service to external constituencies, the communities to which the university is related, should be grounded in the candidate's expertise as a professional in one or more fields of study and as a faculty member. Appropriate sources of evidence of the quality of community service are outlined in 2022 Faculty Handbook, p. 94, C.3.

Service that supports the mission of the university and that is integrated with the candidate's teaching and scholarship should be particularly valued.

4. *Institutional need*

Program needs and institutional priorities provide the context for assessment of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarly or creative activity, institutional development and community outreach. The executive committee is responsible for assessing the "programmatic significance" of the candidate's qualifications. This is most easily accomplished by reference to campus and program mission statements, the existing curricula to which the candidate contributes, and to program development plans of the various programs to which the candidate contributes.

It is the responsibility of the Office of Academic Affairs, and (by delegation) of the Deans, to identify programmatic or institutional concerns that could negatively affect the retention or tenuring of a probationary faculty. (Faculty Handbook, p. 95, D.)