The Department of Medical Sciences, School of Veterinary Medicine, promotion criteria and procedures that govern tenure review follow the "Guidelines for Recommendations for Promotion or Appointment to Tenure Rank, Faculty Division of the Biological Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison" last updated March 26, 2012. The following guidelines complement those formulated by the Biological Sciences Division and do not pre-empt them.

As specified in the Division of Biological Sciences Guidelines, every probationary tenure track faculty member is provided a copy of these Guidelines when newly appointed; additionally as part of the mentoring process, and the Faculty Annual Activity Summary, they are continually kept apprised of changes and updates to requirements until they receive or are denied tenure.

Mentor Committee

Mentoring in the Department of Medical Sciences follows the UW-SVM procedures and guidelines in the “Best Practices for Mentoring Early-Career Faculty” document created by the taskforce on faculty mentoring December 2014.

In summary, the Mentor Committee is selected within 3 months of appointment based on discussion between the probationary faculty, other colleagues and the Department Chair. Typically 3-5 faculty members are invited by the Department Chair to serve on the committee, and one member will be selected to serve as mentoring committee chair. The composition of the committee may change upon approval by the Chair subsequently. The first meeting of the committee should be attended by the Department Chair, timed within 3 months of arrival and a second meeting should follow at 6 months; at which time a teaching committee should be selected. Thereafter 1-2 meetings per year are recommended, organized by the probationary faculty member and the Mentor Committee Coordinator, with each meeting summarized in a standardized report to the Department Chair and the Mentor Committee Coordinator.

A promotional document template should be created before the end of year 2 and provided to the mentoring committee. Each year thereafter, the faculty member can be edited, refined and continually updated.

Annual Review

The Departmental Executive Committee will annually review the progress of all probationary faculty through the provision of a Faculty Annual Activity Summary in mid-January each year. The Department Chair will assign a primary and secondary reviewer for each candidate from the Executive Committee. The reviewers will grade the candidate one of 4 grades: Excellent,
Good, Satisfactory and Needs Improvement and submit their combined Faculty Assessment Report for review and approval by the entire Executive Committee, who determine the final grade. Reviewers will be asked to provide a written statement regarding the overall trajectory of the faculty member, with suggestions for improvement and recommendations for assistance where needed. The Department Chair will review the candidate’s documentation and the reviewers’ evaluation and suggestions and complete the Faculty Assessment Report. If progress is unsatisfactory, remedial measures will be made in writing by the Executive Committee review team in collaboration with the Chair, and discussed with the probationary faculty member at a meeting with the Chair organized by the DMS Office. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to respond to annual reviews and to seek clarification or correct perceived misconceptions on the part of the Departmental Executive Committee at the meeting. The response to the review should be in written format and should be submitted to the Chair within one month of the meeting to discuss the annual review. Based on consideration of this response, the annual review may, at the discretion of the Departmental Executive Committee, be modified. The Chair ensures that the annual review in its original form, response from the faculty member, and any revision of the annual review or correspondence between the Departmental Executive Committee and the faculty member will be retained for subsequent review at the time of consideration for renewal of probationary appointment or promotion to tenure. All other materials relevant to the annual review, including teaching evaluations and publications, will also be kept on file.

At the end of the faculty member’s initial contract, usually the third year (based on the initial contract terms), a decision will be made by the Departmental Executive Committee in consultation with the Mentor Committee regarding an annual reappointment. The vote of the Departmental Executive Committee on action for reappointment must be a majority of all voting Committee members.

Criteria for Promotion to Tenure

For most candidates, promotion to tenure would be considered after a minimum of 5-6 years of employment in the position, with the process starting at least 18 months prior to the employment end date. The Departmental Executive Committee would indicate by affirmative vote of the majority that a tenure document should be developed by the Chair in consultation with the candidate.

To be recommended for promotion or appointment to tenure rank, faculty must have clearly demonstrated excellence in one chosen area and significant accomplishment in another, according to the guidelines of the Divisional Committee. The area of evaluation to be considered for excellence in performance shall be identified at the time of hiring to ensure that the programmatic needs of the Department are met and that time (effort) is appropriately allocated and adequate means of continued evaluation of performance are instituted. Switching the areas of evaluation to be considered for excellence is discouraged and will not generally be allowed except by approval of the Departmental Executive Committee.
If "research" is to serve as one of the performance areas for consideration for promotion or appointment to tenure, the focus of the research should be clearly identified and a general plan for the development of the research program should be formulated within the first year of the probationary appointment. This plan should be developed through consultation with the Mentor Committee and the Departmental Executive Committee and be outlined and updated in the Mentor Committee reports. For faculty performance to be considered excellent in research, the work must be broadly recognized for its originality and significance among the candidate's peers.

If "outreach" is to serve as one of the performance areas for consideration for promotion or appointment to tenure, the impact of the candidate’s contributions to outreach must extend beyond the campus and be documented by recognized leaders in outreach outside the department and UW-Madison. A key component for excellence in outreach is the dissemination of information derived from scholarly enquiry for the benefit of the targeted population. The outreach plan should be developed through consultation with the Mentor Committee and the Departmental Executive Committee so that monitors are set up early in the faculty’s appointment, to measure this impact over time.

If "teaching" is to serve as one of the performance areas for consideration for recommendation for promotion or appointment to tenure, the quality of teaching effort must be evaluated at the campus, state, national and international levels. Activities which will provide the opportunity to substantiate the quality of performance in teaching will be discussed with the Mentor Committee, and a coherent approach to the development of the teaching program will be formulated in consultation with the Departmental Executive Committee and Mentor Committee. A peer teaching review committee to evaluate on-campus teaching will be established within the first year of the probationary appointment. Members of this committee should annually attend lectures, laboratories, and student rounds in the Teaching Hospital. This committee should report back annually through the Mentor Committee report to the Departmental Executive Committee summarizing their evaluation of the faculty member. Alternatively, each member of the committee may provide an individual evaluation. Student evaluations should also be obtained on a regular basis and evaluated. When faculty present educational programs at state, national or international meetings, they are encouraged to obtain evaluations from the organizers of the event and participants. The quality and impact of teaching materials that contribute to teaching (class notes, proceedings, published papers, monographs, texts, etc.) authored by the candidate will be evaluated annually by the Mentor Committee and by the Departmental Executive Committee.

The performance of the candidate in areas of service (university and professional) will be evaluated and can support the quality of performance. Service in this context does not include clinical practice. However, faculty are not expected to assume major service obligations during the probationary appointment, and an outstanding performance in service does not decrease expectations of performance in clinical practice, research, teaching outreach.

Preparation and Approval of the Promotion Document
The draft tenure document will be prepared according to the Divisional Committee guidelines and made available for review by the Mentor Committee and the Departmental Executive Committee. Sufficient arms-length reviewers will be identified in collaboration with the candidate, and upon approval by the Executive Committee, the letters will be solicited. Once the final tenure document has been prepared and all letters received, the Executive Committee will meet to vote on submission of the document. The vote to submit the tenure document to the Divisional Committee via the Dean will be a majority vote of all members of the Departmental Executive Committee and written ballots will be used.
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