These procedures describe the manner in which the Department of Psychiatry is to pursue its guidance and evaluation of Assistant Professors (Tenure, CHS, and CT Tracks) with primary appointments in the Department during the period leading up to promotion to Associate Professor. Departmental practices conform to both the general guidelines and the specific rules of the University and the School of Medicine and Public Health (SMPH). Tenure-track faculty members are strongly urged to become familiar with the University’s official Faculty Policies and Procedures, especially chapter 7 on "Faculty Appointments" (http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/FPP/Table_of_Contents.htm), as well as the tenure guidelines of the Division of the Biological Sciences (http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/divcomm/biological/TenureGuidelinesClean.pdf). CHS-track and CT-track faculty members are strongly urged to become familiar with the SMPH documents detailing the School’s guidelines for promotion specific to each track (http://intranet.med.wisc.edu/hr/appointments-reappointments-promotions/30857).

1. Guidance

The Department Chair has overall responsibility for the professional development of each Assistant Professor. The Chair may delegate specific responsibilities, described below, to the Vice-Chair for Faculty Development.

The guidance of Assistant Professors begins at the time of appointment. The Department Chair will, in consultation with the Assistant Professor, select a Mentoring Committee and, within that committee, a Chair. The Committee will be comprised of at least two (and typically three) Department members at the Associate Professor or Professor level; for Tenure-track Assistant Professors, these mentors must be tenured members of the Department Executive Committee. If the Department Chair and the Mentoring Committee judge that no member of the Department has expertise sufficiently close to that of the Assistant Professor, one or more additional members from outside the Department may be included. However, the majority of the Mentoring Committee and the Committee Chair must be from the Department. It is desirable that the faculty members who serve on the Mentoring Committee remain the same over time, but there may be extenuating circumstances; the Assistant Professor may also request a change.

The Mentoring Committee is responsible for the professional guidance of the Assistant Professor and will provide advice and assistance toward achieving promotion to Associate Professor. The Committee will meet at least annually, typically in the spring of each year. Starting in the first year of the appointment, the Committee will discuss with and advise the Assistant Professor on the selection of a primary and secondary area of activity (research, education, service, clinical, leadership) that are appropriate to their faculty track (Tenure, CHS, or CT) and will be the basis of later promotion, and advise the faculty member of Department, SMPH, and University needs and opportunities in those two areas. In preparation for each annual meeting, the Chair of the Committee will request from the Assistant Professor a current CV and summary statement of
progress during the past year and plans for the coming year. The CV should be formatted as specified in the guidelines for promotion for each track (see links above in the introduction to this document). After the meeting, the Committee Chair will send those materials, together with a letter summarizing the meeting and the Committee’s evaluation of the Assistant Professor’s progress and plans, to the Department Chair. The Department shall maintain a file, available to the Mentoring Committee and Assistant Professor, of these materials as well as the letter of annual evaluation from the Executive Committee (if applicable; see below).

2. Annual Evaluation

Beginning in the second year of appointment, all Assistant Professors will receive an annual evaluation by the Department Executive Committee. If the Executive Committee has delegated authority regarding academic staff personnel issues to the Department Chair, the following procedures of annual evaluation pertain only to Tenure-track Assistant Professors.

Annual evaluations are conducted as a two-step process, including an initial review by an Oversight Committee preceding the Executive Committee meeting to discuss and vote on the progress of each Assistant Professor. The Department Chair will select an Oversight Committee comprised of three tenured members of the Executive Committee. Typically, the Vice Chair for Faculty Development is the Chair of the Oversight Committee. The responsibility of the Oversight Committee is to review the materials submitted by the Mentoring Committees, and to meet with each Assistant Professor to discuss expectations of the Department and the Divisional and/or SMPH Committees regarding promotion, and the Assistant Professor’s progress in that regard. If there are any significant concerns regarding performance or progress toward promotion, the Oversight Committee may also request to meet with the Chair of the Mentoring Committee.

A summary of the Oversight Committee’s review of each Assistant Professor will be presented by the Chair of the Oversight Committee to the Executive Committee for discussion and vote. A simple majority of tenured Executive Committee members must be present; and an affirmative vote requires a simple majority of the tenured members who are present. If the evaluation occurs at the time of contract renewal (one year prior to the end of the current appointment), the Department Chair may call for a vote on a decision to proceed with reappointment or to not renew. The discussion will close with a summary by the Department Chair of the strengths and weaknesses related to the Assistant Professor’s past and (if reappointed) expectations for future performance. Following the discussion, a written evaluation from the Department Chair approved by the Executive Committee will be given to the Assistant Professor. The Assistant Professor may respond to the evaluation in writing or may, upon request, address the Executive Committee regarding the evaluation.

3. Promotion to Associate Professor

The Executive Committee will meet annually to consider Assistant Professors for promotion in a two-phase process (see below) as requested by the Oversight and Mentoring Committees. Procedures and criteria for promotion generally follow those established by the Faculty Guidelines of the University and SMPH.
In general, criteria for promotion for Tenure and CHS Tracks include having strong achievements in two areas (research, teaching, service, clinical activity, leadership) that are appropriate to the Assistant Professor’s track, demonstrating excellence in one and significant accomplishment in another. Emphasis for CT Track promotion will be placed on documented excellence in clinical practice; CT Track candidates strengthen their application by providing evidence of significant accomplishment in a secondary area (medical education, medical community service, or other service). In most cases, excellence in the primary area will be reflected by a strong record of activity in that area and by the written evaluations of leaders working in the same field as the Assistant Professor. Additional information on the criteria for promotion in each faculty track can be found on the links provided above in the introduction to this document.

In addition, specifically for Tenure-track Assistant Professors whose area of excellence is research, the Executive Committee would expect to see proof of excellence in past research performance and convincing evidence that a high level of performance will continue. Specifically, there must be clear evidence that:

- The faculty candidate has established an original research program of high quality which is making a continuing and substantial contribution to science.
- An independent and productive research program has been established while a member of the UW-Madison faculty. Independent research refers to published work achieved after any pre- and postdoctoral training and independent of previous advisors/mentors. Collaborative efforts with Department or other UW faculty are important and encouraged; the extent of the candidate’s contributions and degree of originality are the critical factors in evaluating co-authored publications resulting from such collaborations.
- There is a consistent and continuing publication record in what are generally considered to be excellent peer-reviewed publications appropriate to the candidate’s field.
- The faculty candidate’s individual research accomplishments demonstrate the ability to attract sustained outside research support as Principal Investigator adequate to support her/his research program.

Although there are no fixed rules regarding the above criteria, it would be expected that Tenure-track Assistant Professors will have 10 to (ideally) 12 peer-reviewed independent publications as first or senior (i.e., last) author during the tenure-clock period prior to evaluation for promotion, with several in top-tier journals appropriate to their field.

Initial review: At the beginning of the faculty member’s year of service in which promotion review will occur, the Assistant Professor compiles an up-to-date, comprehensive CV and supporting materials for their areas of excellence and significant accomplishment (e.g., teaching evaluations), formatted as specified in the guidelines for promotion for each track (see links above in the introduction to this document). The Assistant Professor will also give a seminar to the Executive Committee, highlighting the work especially in the area of excellence. The Executive Committee will review these materials and the seminar, as well as Mentoring Committee reports and Executive Committee annual evaluations, and discuss and vote on whether the case for promotion is strong enough to warrant obtaining letters from external
reviewers. A simple majority of tenured members of the Executive Committee must be present; and an affirmative vote requires a simple majority of those tenured members who are present. A negative vote represents the Executive Committee’s evaluation that the Assistant Professor has not met the criteria for promotion; as such, Tenure-track Assistant Professors can appeal a negative vote following the University procedures specified in FPP Chapter 7.

**Full dossier review:** If the result of the initial review is a positive vote, a full promotion dossier is put together by the Chair of the Oversight Committee with input from the Assistant Professor and Mentoring Committee. In addition to updated materials compiled for the initial review, the full dossier includes letters from recognized experts in the Assistant Professor’s field to assess the candidate’s work. The Department Chair, with input from the Mentoring Committee Chair and the Assistant Professor, requests such letters. For the Executive Committee meeting, the candidate’s full dossier will be distributed for review, and a summary of the dossier will be presented by the Chair of the Oversight Committee for discussion and vote. A simple majority of tenured members of the Executive Committee must be present; and an affirmative vote requires a simple majority of those tenured members who are present. In the case of an affirmative vote, the Department’s recommendation is forwarded to the Dean’s Office. If the vote is not to grant promotion, the Assistant Professor may request to meet with the Executive Committee to discuss the recommendation. For Tenure-track Assistant Professors, a negative vote can be appealed following the University procedures specified in FPP Chapter 7.