

Department of Biostatistics and Medical Informatics (BMI)
Policy on Review of Tenured Faculty
Finalized and Approved by BMI EC 2 February 2018

In accordance with [Faculty Policies & Procedures 5.21.D](#) and [7.17 \(approved by the Faculty Senate, 6 March, 2017\)](#), and with Unclassified Policies and Procedures found [here](#), the Department of Biostatistics and Medical Informatics has established the following policy on the review of tenured faculty.

1. Purpose

From FP&P 7.17:

The purposes of the review of tenured faculty are:

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

The process of post-tenure review is the periodic assessment of each faculty member's activities and performance, in accordance with the mission of the department, college, and institution, and the responsibilities of the faculty as described in [FPP 8.02](#). The review is to be appropriately linked to the merit process, and should not involve the creation of unnecessary additional bureaucracy. Review of tenured faculty builds on and complements other aspects of the tenure process in order to develop faculty capacity and strengthen and promote the public benefits of tenure.

The most important attribute of the post-tenure review process is that it is to be constructive, so that genuine communication can occur between the Review Committee and the individual under review, to the benefit of the Department of Biostatistics and Medical Informatics (BMI) and of the individual. We describe below a step-by-step process to ensure that proper procedures are followed and that the review is fair and constructive.

In addition, we note that, in the review process, where appropriate, strong performance should be duly noted, and discussion of deficiencies should focus on constructive suggestions for improvement. For faculty with joint appointments, the goals and conduct of the review will be coordinated with the department(s) comprising the other part of the faculty member's appointment, wherever possible. Because of the complexity of merit negotiations in a department with a substantial fraction of joint appointees in different departments, the regular merit review of all tenured and untenured faculty members has traditionally been delegated to the Department Chair, and can be supported by the post-tenure review process.

2. Criteria

The normal duties of a faculty member in the School of Medicine and Public Health (SMPH) include teaching, collaborative and methodological research, service (or outreach), and in some cases academic leadership or program development. Those faculty with joint appointments in other departments may have regular duties such as providing statistical consulting services, taking part in collaborative research projects, or participating in mentorship for students or fellows not in the faculty member's area of expertise

In general, our faculty are expected to be committed, conscientious, and effective teachers at both the graduate and, if applicable, undergraduate levels, and to continue throughout their careers to be productive and innovative

scholars. Furthermore, it is expected that all members will share the burdens of administration, advising, and other committee and service tasks. Our faculty are generally expected to engage in extramural professional service.

Areas of performance that shall be considered in the review include the following. (See **Appendix 1** for suggested evidence in each area.)

Teaching: Didactic teaching, graduate and undergraduate supervision, new course development, development of teaching materials.

Research: Research funding activities, research products including manuscripts, conference proceedings, and/or software/tool development, talks and lectures on research, with a broad focus on overall impact and productivity. BMI faculty are expected to engage in both collaborative and methodological research, although the balance of the two, and nature of each area, may vary widely.

Service (including Academic Leadership or Program Development): Service to the Department, School, University and/or the Profession. Development or leadership of new programmatic directions or initiatives.

Review criteria for each faculty member shall conform with the SMPH criteria set out in the UW SMPH document titled: "Guidelines for Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty to Professor," whatever the most current version (7/19/2017 as of this writing). The document is available on the SMPH appointments, reappointments, and promotions [webpage](#).

3. Procedures

Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed no less frequently than every five years unless delayed because the faculty member is on leave. A faculty member may request review of him/herself at any time, but not more frequently than every year. When appropriate, reviews will be combined with promotion or other reviews including but not limited to nominations for major teaching awards, chaired professorships, and national honors and awards. In the case of combined reviews (for joint appointments), supplementary documentation may be required.

Faculty newly promoted to the rank of Associate Professor shall receive an interim post-tenure review during or before his/her fourth year post-promotion to assess career progression to Professor.

3.1 Review Committee and Oversight

The Department Chair or his/her delegate shall have the responsibility for selection of Review Committees, determining dates and time deadlines for the various stages of the review, and general oversight over the review process. For appointments that are 100% tenure in BMI, each Review Committee is to be made up of three members of the Department EC. In the case of joint tenure appointments, the Review Committee will comprise up to five members of which at least two and not more than three should be members of the BMI Department EC. Every effort should be made to jointly follow policies and procedures of all appointing departments.

For all situations at any point in the review process where University or School policy requires involvement of the Department Executive Committee, that responsibility will be delegated to the Department Committee of Professors.

3.2 Protocol (See **Appendix 2** for annual calendar for post-tenure review table.)

1. The Department Chair will select a tentative Review Committee and Review Committee Chair for each faculty member who is to be reviewed.
 - a. The Review Committee will collectively include members knowledgeable about the reviewee's research, teaching, and service.
 - b. For full Professors, the Committee will consist of full Professors only.
 - c. For Associate Professors, there must be at least one full Professor on the Review Committee.
2. The Department Chair will present the names of the tentative Review Committee, including a Review Committee Chair, and the faculty member's rights and responsibilities to the faculty member under review. **DEADLINE:** August 31. These rights include:
 - a. The right to object to one or more members of the Review Committee.
 - b. The right to suggest knowledgeable people who could serve on the Review Committee.
 - c. The right to be informed of a reasonable deadline (two weeks from the date of receipt of notification of the review by the Department Chair or delegate) for responding to items (a) and (b) above. The deadline can be extended if the faculty member requests an extension and the Department Chair feels the situation warrants an extension.
3. The faculty member under review has **two weeks** from the receipt of the notice to voice objections about the proposed Review Committee members. **DEADLINE:** September 14.
 - a. If the faculty member objects to any members of the proposed Review Committee, those members will be replaced without question.
 - b. In this case, the Department Chair will present the name(s) of alternate member(s) to the faculty member under review.
 - c. The reviewee may again object, but at this stage, it is the Department Chair's decision whether to replace members any further or not.
 - d. Communication shall continue between the Department Chair and the faculty member until an acceptable Review Committee is formed.
 - e. The deadline for determination of the final composition of the Review Committee is six weeks from the receipt of the notice unless there are extenuating circumstances as accepted by the Department Chair. **DEADLINE:** October 12.
4. The Department Chair or his/her delegate (who may be the Review Committee Chair and/or an administrative team member) will request materials needed for the review from the individual under review unless such materials have already been requested for the purpose of some other review. **DEADLINE:** August 31.

The materials requested include (see also **Appendix 1** for suggested materials):

Current vitae, including teaching and mentoring activities (see **2. Criteria** above).

- a. Annual activity reports filed since obtaining tenure or since the last review (not to exceed 5 years).
 - b. Teaching evaluations or summaries of such.
 - c. A statement of areas of research interest and a summary of career plans for the future.
 - d. An optional activity report covering the entire period under review to bring out progress toward long-term goals, or other materials providing evidence of accomplishments, and/or any other materials the individual under review thinks would be relevant.
5. Each individual under review will be given eight weeks to submit the requested materials. The deadline can be extended if the faculty member requests an extension and the Review Committee feels the situation warrants an extension. **DEADLINE:** October 26.

6. The Department Chair or his/her delegate will forward the individual's materials to the Review Committee Chair and will notify the Review Committee that proper procedure has been followed so that the Review Committee can proceed with the review. **DEADLINE:** October 31.
7. The Review Committee will evaluate the submitted materials. If desired by either the Review Committee or the individual under review, they may meet to discuss the reviewee's performance and contributions. The individual under review may be asked to submit additional materials. The Review Committee will produce an evaluation in the form of a draft written report, which will include a discussion of the submitted materials. The spirit of the review procedure is to be constructive and should follow the **Purpose** and **Criteria** outlined in **1** and **2** above.
 - a. The draft report will include a broad rating of the individual under review according to the definitions in **3.4** below as required in [FP&P 7.17](#).

If appropriate, the report will also offer tangible recognition to those faculty identified as "exceptionally good", including but not limited to, suggested nomination for university, national, and international awards.

If the individual under review is Associate Professor in at least his/her fourth year of service at that rank, the report should include a discussion of progress toward promotion to the rank of Professor.
 - b. The Review Committee will forward its draft report to the Department Chair. **DEADLINE:** November 30.
 - c. The draft report will be accompanied by **one** of the following:
 - i. (If the reviewee is Associate Professor), a referral to the Committee of Professors (CoP) with a recommendation to pursue promotion to Full Professor as soon as possible.
 - ii. A referral to the Committee of Professors for discussion of the report and a request for amendments and/or acceptance of the report by the CoP.
 - iii. A statement that the Committee does not feel the report needs to be discussed by the CoP (a recommendation which the Department Chair may override).
 - d. If the reviewee is Associate Professor in at least his/her fourth year of service at that rank, the Committee must choose **Option i** or **ii**.
8. After review by the Department Chair and, if instigated, the CoP, the Review Committee Chair and the Department Chair will finalize the report. The Department Chair will meet with the reviewed individual with the report at hand: (a) to summarize the strong points of the reviewee's performance and contributions, (b) to delineate the weaker points, (c) to outline a plan for addressing the weaker points in the coming years, and (d) to identify how the Department can help the reviewee improve his/her scholarship. **DEADLINE:** January 17.
9. The reviewed individual will have the 30 days from receipt of the written report to respond in writing to the review committee. **DEADLINE:** February 14.
10. The Department Chair and the individual being reviewed will have 2 weeks to meet again to discuss areas of disagreement and to negotiate any amendments or planned actions moving forward.

11. A copy of the final written report, any response to it, and any agreed-upon amendments shall be placed in the personnel file of the individual being reviewed and filed with the SMPH Dean for sufficiency review. **DEADLINE:** February 28.
12. The remainder and conclusion of the review process will follow procedures stated in [FP&P 7.17.C](#), paragraphs 4, 6-10.

3.3. Review of Department Chair

In the case where the Department Chair is the one being reviewed, a faculty member selected by the Department EC (without participation by the Department Chair) will play the role of the Department Chair (not the Review Committee Chair) in the foregoing procedure.

3.4 Definitions

Ratings will be interpreted as follows, based on [Regent Policy Document \(RPD\) 20-9, sec. 9.b.](#)

- Exceptionally good performance = rating of “exceeds expectations”
- Substantial deficiencies in performance = rating of “does not meet expectations”
- All other review results = “meets expectations”

See also [FPP 7.17.B.5](#) for further details.

4. Accountability

Copies of this policy shall be filed with the Dean of the School of Medicine and Public Health. A record of reviews completed shall be maintained, including the names of all the reviewers. A report listing those faculty reviewed and a summary of the outcome of the reviews shall be sent to the Dean of the School of Medicine and Public Health by March 1.

This policy can be modified by a simple majority of the EC subject to approval by the Dean of the School of Medicine and Public Health. The periodic review of the Department of Biostatistics and Medical Informatics shall include a review of this policy.

See also [FPP 7.17.D](#).

5. Adjustments to Five-Year Review Schedule

The Department may defer reviews, with the approval of the Dean and the Provost, for unusual circumstances. Examples of unusual circumstances include when reviews coincide with approved leave, or when the faculty member experiences significant life event, is under promotion review, or holds other appointment. The Provost may then determine the new review schedule.

Director of Operations or Assistant to the Chair will add approved adjustments to the five-year review schedule to a spreadsheet titled “GOC Committee Summary List”, which is located in Q/faculty/committees.

6. Policy Review

This policy shall be reviewed every five years by the Department Chair and Director of Operations, with any proposed changes subject to approval by the departmental Executive Committee. Next review due January 2023.

7. References with Full Text URLs

Faculty Policies and Procedures 5.21.D – Departmental Executive Committees: Functions
https://secfac.wisc.edu/governance/faculty-legislation/fpp_ch_5/#5.21.

Faculty Policies and Procedures 7.17 – Review of Tenured Faculty
https://secfac.wisc.edu/governance/faculty-legislation/fpp_ch_7/#7.17.

Faculty Policies and Procedures 8.02 – Faculty Duties and Responsibilities
https://secfac.wisc.edu/governance/faculty-legislation/fpp_ch_8/#8.02.

University Personnel Policies and Procedures 8.01 – Faculty Performance Reviews
<https://www.ohr.wisc.edu/polproced/UPPP/0801.htm>

Regent Policy Document 20-9 – Period Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development
<https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/policies/periodic-post-tenure-review-in-support-of-tenured-faculty-development/>

SMPH Guidelines for Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty to Professor, revised 7/19/2017.

PDF available at the bottom of the following webpage:

<https://intranet.med.wisc.edu/human-resources/appointments-reappointments-and-promotions/>

Appendix 1: Suggested evidence / materials to include in each area of performance (all materials are not required).

Teaching: Courses taught, student evaluations of courses; number of graduate students supervised, number of Ph.D. theses completed; teaching / supervising of undergraduate students; time spent advising students; new course development; participation on preliminary and final Ph.D. examinations; books, laboratory or solutions manuals and other teaching aids written; applications for instructional grants; awards recognizing teaching contributions and excellence; teaching in workshops or other short courses.

Research: Areas of current and future research interest; applications for grants; grants awarded for research support; papers published, papers in press, manuscripts submitted; awards recognizing research contributions; invited and contributed talks and lectures on research; research plans.

Service (including Academic Leadership or Program Development): Departmental, School, and campus committees and/or leadership positions; planning of national or international meetings or symposia; reviews of manuscripts for refereed journals and of research proposals for funding agencies; editorships; participation and offices in professional societies; professional services to government and industry; and contributions to the scholarly activities of the department.

Appendix 2: Annual Calendar for Post-Tenure Review

Note: For individuals likely to be considered for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, as much of this process as possible should be completed by the beginning of Fall Semester.

Deadline	Time Limit from Previous Step	Action
May 31		Submit list of faculty to be reviewed in upcoming fiscal year to SMPH Deans Office
August 31		Assign a Post-Tenure Review Committee for each faculty under review and send to faculty member for comment with rights and responsibilities/PTR policy.
August 31		Department Chair/Delegate requests review materials from faculty member under review
September 14	14 days from receipt of comments	Comment period for faculty member under review to request changes to review committee
October 12	6 weeks from August 31	Finalize review committee
October 26	8 weeks from receipt of request for materials	Faculty member under review provides requested review materials to Department Chair/Delegate
October 31	5 days from receipt of review materials	Department Chair/Delegate forwards review materials to review committee chair.
November 30		Review committee forward draft report to Department Chair.
January 17		Department Chair meets with individual under review and provides a copy of the review to that person.
February 14	30 days from receipt of report	Faculty member under review may submit a written response to the review committee
February 28	14 days from receipt of written response from faculty member under review.	Final written report submitted to SMPH Deans Office for sufficiency review and filed in personnel record.