The Executive Committee of the School of Human Ecology will conduct periodic post-tenure reviews of each Professor and Associate Professor in accord with UW-Madison FP&P 7.17. The Committee will adopt the criteria and procedures laid out in that document and any later revisions. Where that document refers to “department” and “executive committee,” those terms will apply to the School and its Executive Committee.

The School of Human Ecology will implement the university procedures in the following way:

I. Review Committee Appointment and Timeline

A. The SoHE Dean’s Office will maintain a record of due dates for faculty post-tenure reviews (PTR) and will inform the Executive Faculty at their meeting at the end of each academic year, no later than May 31, about those faculty who are due for PTR in the next academic year. Any identified need to extend a post tenure review must be submitted to the Provost’s office for approval.

B. Each faculty member who is due for review will submit to his or her department chair a statement of accomplishments since the last review, an up to date curriculum vitae, and a statement of future goals to the Dean’s office, no later than October 1st in the fall semester. The Dean’s office will complete the dossier with five years of P-FAR faculty reviews and also provide the review committee with access to original P-FAR reports.

C. The Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, in their role as Executive Faculty Chair, in consultation with the department chair, will appoint and convene a PTR committee composed of two executive faculty members of the faculty member’s department and one executive faculty member from another SoHE department or from another UW-Madison unit with relevant input. The review committee for faculty with administrative appointments will be facilitated by the Dean’s office in collaboration with that faculty member and his/her department chair.

D. If upon faculty notification of the PTR committee by the Dean’s office, the faculty member under review formally objects to a reviewer, the Chair, in consultation with the Associate Dean, shall identify other appropriate reviewers. Objection to the review committee must be received by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs no later than October 15th. Such formal objections will be kept confidential per FP&P 7.17 C1.

E. The review will be conducted in the fall semester no later than the first week of November.

II. Review Committee Responsibilities

A. The review committee will consider the faculty member’s statement of accomplishments and goals, his or her curriculum vitae, and the descriptive and numeric results of each annual review (P-FAR) since the last post-tenure or promotional review.

B. Prior to writing their report the committee shall meet with the faculty member to review (and clarify when necessary) the review materials submitted.

C. The review committee will prepare a brief evaluative report which includes, at a minimum, a conclusion as to whether the faculty member is meeting his/her obligations to the University with one of the following conclusions: 1. exceeds expectations, 2. expected level of accomplishment, 3. does not meet expectations.

D. That report will be addressed to the Dean, with copies to the department chair and the faculty member under review. If s/he chooses, the faculty member can prepare a written response to the summary within 30 days.
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E. If, on the other hand, the committee finds exceptional achievement, it may recommend special recognition, such as nomination for a School, University, or national award or a named professorship; promotion to full professor; a merit or equity-based salary increase; or flexible funds.

F. Per the FP&P 7.17 C4, all documents that play a substantial role in the review will be preserved by the Deans office in the faculty member’s personnel file.

III. Administrative Review

G. Upon receipt of the PTR report, the Dean will conduct a “sufficiency review” within 14 days per FP&P 7.17 C6. A letter in regard to that review will be sent to the faculty member and the PTR committee. If the committee concludes that the faculty member is not meeting his or her obligations, the report should include proposals designed to remedy the shortcomings. The proposals must be sent to the Provost’s office per FP&P 7.17 C7.

IV. Criteria

**Research / Scholarship.** Excellence in scholarship requires documentation of substantial and innovative post-tenure accomplishments as well as the promise of continued significant contribution to one’s field of expertise. Substantial and innovative accomplishments might be shown in many ways, including the following examples: through publication of books summarizing one’s field or program of scholarship, invited exhibitions of one’s work in regional and national venues (e.g. major museum galleries), reviews of one’s creative work in major venues (e.g. in reviews of major art exhibits of the previous year), invitations to author key publications summarizing one’s field of study (e.g. decade-in-review articles), filing of new patents, or copyrights, national awards from professional societies for one’s scholarly contributions, career development awards, significant funding and management of a major program of research, or through evidence of significant influence of one’s work on the work of other scholars (e.g. citation of one’s work as the origin of subsequent work by others, the use of one’s datasets by other researchers, etc.).

Excellence in research might also be documented by national or international recognition for a new (since tenure) area of programmatic scholarship. This can be shown by documenting the work itself, its contribution to knowledge, and its importance to the field or society (e.g. by its frequency of citation, by quoting from reviews of the work, by the testimony of external reviewers, by the importance of the topic itself, etc.). Achievement might also be recognized for taking one’s continuing scholarship to a new level, for example moving from basic research or need assessment research into the testing of societal interventions, taking one’s demonstration projects to scale across a
region or nation, moving one’s local or national scholarship into international contexts, or by establishing a recognized new subfield of scholarship.

**Teaching.** Excellence in teaching may include leadership for improvements in resident instruction or outreach teaching. Such leadership could take many forms, including any of the following examples: creating new (or substantially redesigning existing) courses, educational outreach programs, major or option or certificate programs, implementing substantially improved methods of instruction, excellence in the mentoring of others (students, lecturers, post-docs, academic staff, and other faculty), or substantially expanding the population reached by instruction.

Leadership in teaching could also be shown with evidence of significant impacts of one’s teaching upon individuals or society, for example evidence of lives improved or societal institutions formed as a result of one’s outreach teaching, evidence that one’s students have attained noteworthy success after graduation, evidence that one’s contributions to teaching are having impacts on instructional methods and topics beyond our own institution, for example through widespread use of one’s textbook or other teaching materials, the establishment of one’s instructional topic as a course in other universities, or leadership in establishing cross-university programs of study.

**Service.** Excellence in service can be demonstrated in many ways, including the following examples: through leadership in societal institutions related to one’s field of scholarship (for example, leadership of non-profit boards, government panels, or business organizations that apply one’s scholarly knowledge to societal issues), or leadership for one’s field of scholarship (for example, leadership of a national professional society, a major national conference, a national arts or science review board, editorship of a major journal, or service on some combination of editorial boards and professional societies). Documentation of the impacts of one’s leadership is especially noteworthy. Leadership of an academic department or a professional society can be an achievement in its own right, but the promotion report should focus attention on the impacts of that leadership, i.e., what was achieved through the service.