

The purpose of this document is to help unit chairs, Executive Committees and candidates for tenure 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 (See especially section 3.08) and in UWGB Faculty Document on Tenure, (Faculty Handbook, pp.81-84; Revised and Approved 9 October 1985). 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.

I. Preparation for the Review at the Unit Level

A. Materials Prepared by the 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.

B. Materials Prepared by the Unit

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.

Chapter 3, 3.08.4.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.

II. Preparation of a Recommendation Memorandum

A. Statement of Criteria

1. 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.

2. 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.

B. Judgment of the Executive Committee

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.

There should be a record of the vote of the Executive Committee.

C. Explicit Statement of Reasons for the Recommendation

1. 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?

2. Discussion of the Executive Committee's judgment

a. 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? (FDT, p.63, A.1. and A.2.)

ii. Course development and pedagogy

How well has the candidate approached the challenge of improving teaching? (FDT, p.63, 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? (FDT, p.63, A.4)

b. 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 FDT, p.64, B 1-7.)

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.

c. Service

The executive committee is expected to make distinct judgments regarding the candidate's contributions to institutional development and community outreach. (FDT, p.65, E.)

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 FDT, p.64, C. 1 and 2.

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 FDT, p.64, 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.

d. 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. (FDT, p.65, E.)

-prepared by Ken Fleurant 2005