
**Proposed Change to *Faculty Policies and Procedures*: the Addition of a New Section, 7.18,
Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor**

The promotion of a faculty member from associate professor to full professor is a significant milestone in one's academic career, and is a sign that the person who holds this status is recognized by their peers as having achieved national and international recognition for excellence in the scholar's field. Unlike promotion from assistant professor to associate professor with tenure, the process for promotion to full varies – sometimes widely – from school to school, and from department to department. While some variation is entirely understandable, the lack of clear and consistent processes across the university – or even within schools and colleges – causes confusion among associate professors, and raises questions as to the “standard” for achieving the rank of full professor.

On October 17, 2016, Michael Bernard-Donals, Vice Provost for Faculty and Staff, and Steve Smith, Secretary of the Faculty, issued a memo providing guidance to deans and chairs on promotion to full program. In July 2019, an Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion to Full Professor was created and charged by the University Committee to recommend changes to *Faculty Policies and Procedures* addressing promotion to full professor that address both faculty and administration (dean) concerns and needs. The committee consisted of Michael Bernard-Donals; Paul Campagnola, Professor, Department of Biomedical Engineering; Jane Collins, Professor, Department of Community and Environmental Sociology, and Steve Smith. The committee recommends adding a new section in Chapter 7 of FPP titled “Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor.”

On March 2, 2020, an earlier draft of this document was presented for a first reading at the Faculty Senate. The current version incorporates suggestions received by the University Committee.

New Section:**7.18. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF FULL PROFESSOR****A. GUIDANCE**

Promotion from the rank of associate professor to that of full professor should be guided by a clear, written policy on the criteria and process for promotion within each college. While the policy should not establish absolute metrics of scholarship, it should define types of scholarly work (research, teaching, and service/outreach) that are expected for promotion. Copies of these policies should be sent to the appropriate dean's office, the Office of the Provost, and the secretary of the faculty

All departmental Executive Committees shall establish procedures for promotion to full professor (see 7.18.B. below). The articulated standards in each department should be consistent with the criteria for excellence held by peer institutions and with disciplinary conventions. In general, promotion should be based on the record of scholarly work, and should not be taken for

reasons of salary, status, retention, or perceived inequity. Promotion is not acquired solely because of the number of years of service.

B. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

1. Promotion to the rank of full professor is granted following an affirmative recommendation of a subset of the departmental Executive Committee, consisting of the full professors on the Executive Committee (hereafter referred to as the “Council of Full Professors”), to that effect. In lieu of a Council of Full Professors, departments may instead use or create a smaller subset of the Executive Committee to vote on promotion cases, so long as that sub-committee is comprised of tenured full professors.

A minimum of three full professors is required for a Council of Full Professors in any department. Any department that does not have at least three full professors must appoint, by a vote of its Executive Committee, a full professor (or full professors) to bring the complement of full professors on the Council to three. The appointed full professor (or professors) will serve until there are enough full professors in the department to bring the number in the Council to three or more.

2. In applying its professional judgment to the decision of whether to recommend promotion, the Council of Full Professors has the obligation to exercise its discretion in the interest of improving the academic and professional quality of the department; departmental executive committees may not decline to recommend promotion for any reasons which are legally impermissible or which violate principles of academic freedom. The basic standard for review shall be whether the faculty member under review has met criteria consistent with the rank of full professor as established in its guidelines (see B.3 below). Special care should be taken to ensure that the scholarly productivity of jointly appointed and interdisciplinary faculty is appropriately evaluated.

3. Each departmental executive committee shall establish written criteria and standards it will employ in recommending promotion. These criteria and standards shall assure that promotion is based on evidence of (1) teaching excellence; (2) a record of professional creativity, such as research or other accomplishments appropriate to the discipline; and (3) service to the university, to the faculty member’s profession, or professional service to the public appropriate to the rank of full professor. These criteria and standards shall be consistent with, and indeed may be a subset of, those established under section [7.17.B.](#) of these policies (“Post-Tenure Review: Criteria”).

4. A copy of the criteria and standards described in the preceding paragraph shall be furnished to all persons hired into the rank of associate professor and to all newly tenured faculty members, in accordance with FPP 5.21.D.1, and shall be filed with the appropriate dean(s), the vice chancellor for academic affairs and provost, and the secretary of the faculty. A copy of the departmental criteria along with a statement showing how they were applied to the candidate shall be forwarded with a departmental recommendation for promotion.

5. Notwithstanding the responsibility of departmental Executive Committees to provide for the guidance and mentoring of all faculty members, it is the faculty member's responsibility to meet the criteria for promotion as determined by the department.

6. These criteria and standards shall be periodically reviewed by the executive committee of each department and the relevant school or college APC(s).

C. PROCEDURES

1. Each year, all tenured faculty will be evaluated by their Executive Committees (or a subcommittee thereof) in order to be considered for merit pay, equity, awards, mentoring, and to be considered for promotion in rank.

2. If an associate professor being considered for promotion has a joint appointment, the department designated as the primary sponsor of tenure will take the primary role in the evaluation process. The other department(s) should vote to approve following the action of the lead department or otherwise follow the process outlined in the faculty member's appointment letter.

3. Department chairs should ensure that the Executive Committee discuss the timing of consideration for promotion to full professor for each associate professor no later than the occasion of their first post-tenure review (performed in the fifth year) under section 7.17. of these rules. Once the chair has determined, with the advice of the Executive Committee, that an associate professor should be considered for promotion, the chair should notify them that this is the case and provide them with the guidance they need to prepare their dossiers; the contents of the dossier should be established by the departmental Executive Committee.

4. An associate professor can ask to be considered for promotion to full professor at any time. The request for consideration for promotion should be followed by a conversation between the chair and the associate professor about the criteria for promotion, the associate professor's record of achievement since promotion to associate professor, and the relative strengths of the case in the context of the department's criteria for promotion. Should there be a disagreement between the chair and the associate professor about the appropriateness of undergoing a promotion review, the Executive Committee should make the ultimate decision.

Should the chair or the Executive Committee decide that the associate professor should not move forward to be promoted, and the associate professor disagrees because they believe they have been treated unfairly or because their due process rights have been violated, the associate professor may file a complaint with the University Committee under FPP 8.15.

5. Once the chair, in consultation with the Executive Committee, decides that it is appropriate to move forward with consideration for promotion, the chair will appoint a small subcommittee of

full professors – ideally from a scholarly area in or adjacent to the associate professor’s – to solicit outside letters, evaluate the research or creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach work, and to make a recommendation to the council of full professors. (In the event that the faculty member is working across disciplinary areas, or in hybrid fields, it may be worth considering the inclusion of a faculty member from outside the department in the subcommittee.)

6. The associate professor will provide this subcommittee with a dossier of their work, including all publications, grant proposals, and other scholarship; evaluations of teaching from students and peers; and evidence of service (both at UW-Madison and to the profession more broadly), outreach, governance, and administrative work.

7. At least three outside letters of evaluation are required as part of the process of evaluating the scholarly work (in research or creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach) of associate professors being considered for promotion. The Executive Committee should determine whether and if so, how many letters beyond three will be required for the promotion of full professors, whether the letters will be confidential, and how the referees will be selected. In doing so, the Executive Committee should balance departmental culture, disciplinary norms, best practice, and peer institutions’ practices. Solicited letters should be written by faculty members within or adjacent to the scholarly area of the person being considered for promotion. In the event that the faculty member being considered for promotion is working across disciplinary areas, or in hybrid fields, letters may be solicited from faculty member from disciplines or departments other than the one in which the promotion candidate resides.

Faculty members who were promoted to associate professor with tenure between 1 July 2016 and {insert date this chapter goes into effect}, and whose departments did not previously require outside letters prior to the adoption of this chapter, may opt to prepare their cases without outside letters. All other associate professors must include outside letters in their promotion dossiers.

8. The subcommittee will prepare a written evaluation of the associate professor’s work across all areas of scholarship (research and creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach), and submit it for consideration to the Council of Full Professors so that the report – along with a selection of the work, the outside letters of evaluation, and the record of teaching and service/outreach – can be read before a vote is taken.

9. The Council of Full Professors will meet to discuss and vote on the advancement of associate professors to the rank of full professor. After reading the report of the subcommittee and evaluating the associate professor’s work and the outside letters, the Council of Full Professors will vote on whether or not to promote. The vote should then be based on the record of scholarly work, and should not be taken for reasons of salary, status, or perceived inequity. The department’s policy should specify whether a 2/3 or simple majority is required for a positive vote, and should specify whether it is a majority of all full professors or of those full professors present.

10. Once the vote has been taken, the faculty member shall be notified of the decision by the department chair in writing within five business days of the decision. If the decision is negative, this notification shall include the reasons for that decision.

11. If the vote is positive, the chair shall write a letter recommending promotion to the dean of the appropriate college or school. The dean will then follow the process for approval or denial of promotion recommendations as outlined by school/college policies and procedures.

12. In the event of a negative vote that the faculty member chooses not to appeal (see section D), the chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss how to create a stronger case for promotion at some later date.

D. DUE PROCESS, RECONSIDERATIONS AND APPEALS

1. If the faculty member disagrees with a negative decision, they have ten business days from the date of the written decision to request a reconsideration of the decision in writing to the department chair. The department's Council of Full Professors has twenty days from the date of the faculty member's request to re-consider its decision.

2. Once the vote on reconsideration has been taken, the faculty member shall be notified by the chair in writing of the reconsideration decision within five days of the decision. If the decision is negative, the faculty member may appeal to the office of the dean. The dean's office will have fifteen days, from the date of the appeal, to consider the faculty member's appeal and render a decision. In cases of a negative decision that is upheld by the dean, that decision may be appealed to CFRR (see 4 below).

3. Should a departmental decision on promotion be positive, and that decision is reversed by the office of the dean, the faculty member will be notified in writing of the dean's decision within five days of that decision, and the reasons for that decision. The faculty member may appeal the dean's decision (see 4 below).

4. In the event of a negative decision at the departmental level or by the office of the dean, the faculty member will have twenty days from the date of the dean's decision to appeal that decision to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (CFRR). The CFRR will decide on the validity of the appeal of the faculty member – basing its assessment on whether or not the decision on promotion was based on impermissible factors (see UWS 3.08[1][a], [b], and [c]) -- and will make its report to the faculty member, the department chair and the department's Council of Full Professors, the appropriate dean, and the provost.

If CFRR finds that a decision in 7.18.D.2 or 7.18.D.3 (that is, at the departmental or decanal level) was based on impermissible factors, it will ask the provost, in consultation with the DCRC (see FPP 7.17.C.7) to make the final decision on promotion. That decision will be rendered within 30 days of the date of the CFRR report. The provost's decision will be final.

5. A negative decision on promotion does not preclude consideration in subsequent years.

This redline version shows the changes that were made from the version presented at the March Senate meeting on March 2, 2020 and the current version, which will be presented at the April Senate meeting on April 20, 2020. The entire section 7.18 Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor is proposed as an addition to Faculty Policies and Procedures.

7.18. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF FULL PROFESSOR

A. GUIDANCE

Promotion from the rank of associate professor to that of full professor should be guided by a clear, written policy on the criteria and process for promotion within each college. While the policy should not establish absolute metrics of scholarship, it should define types of scholarly work (research, teaching, and service/outreach) that are expected for promotion. Each dean’s office should decide if these policies will be created solely at the departmental level ~~or if there will be a school/college policy that covers all departments. Copies of these policies should be sent to the appropriate dean’s office, the Office of the Provost, and the secretary of the faculty~~

All departmental Executive Committees shall establish procedures for promotion to full professor (see 7.18.B. below). The articulated standards in each department should be consistent with the guidance provided by the dean and the College. They should also be consistent with the criteria for ~~excellence held by peer institutions and with disciplinary conventions. In general, promotion~~ should be based on the record of scholarly work, and should not be taken for reasons of salary, status, retention, or perceived inequity. Promotion is not acquired solely because of the number of years of service.

B. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

1. Promotion to the rank of full professor is granted only following an affirmative recommendation of a subset of the departmental Executive Committee, consisting of the full professors on the Executive Committee (hereafter referred to as the “Council of Full Professors”), to that effect. In lieu of a Council of Full Professors, departments may instead use or create a smaller subset of the Executive Committee to vote on promotion cases, so long as that sub-committee is comprised of tenured full professors. Promotion is not acquired solely because of the number of years of service.

A minimum of three full professors is required for a Council of Full Professors in any department. Any department that does not have at least three full professors must appoint, by a vote of its Executive Committee, a full professor (or full professors) to bring the complement of full professors on the Council to three. The appointed full professor (or professors) will serve until there are enough full professors in the department to bring the number in the Council to three or more.

2. In applying its professional judgment to the decision of whether to recommend promotion, the Council of Full Professors has the obligation to exercise its discretion in the interest of improving the academic and professional quality of the department; departmental executive committees may not decline to recommend promotion for any reasons which are legally impermissible or which violate principles of academic freedom. The basic standard for review shall be whether the faculty member under review ~~discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated~~ has met criteria consistent with the faculty member's position rank of full professor as established in its guidelines (see B.3 below). Special care should be taken to ensure that the scholarly productivity of jointly appointed and interdisciplinary faculty is appropriately evaluated.

3. Each departmental executive committee shall establish written criteria and standards it will employ in recommending promotion. These criteria and standards shall assure that promotion is based on evidence of (1) teaching excellence; (2) a record of professional creativity, such as research or other accomplishments appropriate to the discipline; and (3) service to the university, to the faculty member's profession, or professional service to the public appropriate to the rank of full professor. These criteria and standards shall be consistent with, and indeed may be a subset of, those established under section [7.17.B.](#) of these policies ("Post-Tenure Review: Criteria").

4. A copy of the criteria and standards described in the preceding paragraph shall be furnished to all persons hired into the rank of associate professor and to all newly tenured faculty members, in accordance with FPP 5.21.D.1, and shall be filed with the appropriate dean(s), the vice chancellor for academic affairs and provost, and the secretary of the faculty. A copy of the departmental criteria along with a statement showing how they were applied to the candidate shall be forwarded with a departmental recommendation for promotion.

5. Notwithstanding the responsibility of departmental Executive Committees to provide for the guidance and mentoring of all faculty members, it is the faculty member's responsibility to meet the criteria for promotion as determined by the department.

6. These criteria and standards shall be periodically reviewed by the executive committee of each department and the relevant school or college APC(s).

C. PROCEDURES

~~1. Each year, the department chair, in consultation with the Council of Full Professors) should evaluate ALL tenured associate professors' research or creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach work. This purpose of this review is to consider, among other things, whether there are faculty members who should be nominated for awards, determine whether any faculty members need mentoring or guidance, and to decide which faculty members should be considered for promotion to full professor. Each year, all tenured faculty will be evaluated by their Executive Committees (or a subcommittee thereof) in order to be considered for merit pay, equity, awards, mentoring, and to be considered for promotion in rank. Each year, all tenured~~

faculty will be evaluated by their Executive Committees (or a subcommittee thereof) in order to be considered for merit pay, equity, awards, mentoring, and to be considered for promotion in rank.

2. If ~~an~~ the associate professor being considered for promotion has a joint appointment, the department designated as the primary sponsor of tenure will take the primary role in the evaluation process. The other department(s) should vote to approve following the action of the lead department or otherwise follow the process outlined in the faculty member's appointment letter.

3. Department chairs should ensure that the ~~Council of Full Professors~~ Executive Committee discuss the timing of consideration for promotion to full professor for each associate professor no later than the occasion of their first post-tenure review (performed in the fifth year) under section 7.17. of these rules. Once the ~~Council of Full Professors decides~~ chair has determined, with the advice of the Executive Committee, that an associate professor should be considered for promotion, the chair should notify them that this is the case and provide them with the guidance they need to prepare their dossiers; the contents of the dossier should be established by the departmental Executive Committee.

4. An associate professor can ask ~~their chair~~ to be considered for promotion to full professor at any time. The request for consideration for promotion should be followed by a conversation between the chair and the associate professor about the criteria for promotion, the associate professor's record of achievement since promotion to associate professor, and the relative strengths of the case in the context of the department's criteria for promotion. Should there be a disagreement between the chair and the associate professor about the appropriateness of undergoing a promotion review, the ~~Council of Full Professors~~ Executive Committee should make the ultimate decision.

Should the chair or the ~~Council of Full Professors~~ Executive Committee decide that the associate professor should not move forward to be promoted, and the associate professor disagrees, because they believe they have been treated unfairly or because their due process rights have been violated, the associate professor may file a complaint with the University Committee under FPP 8.15.

5. Once the ~~Council of Full Professors~~ chair, in consultation with the Executive Committee, decides that it is appropriate to move forward with consideration for promotion, the chair will appoint a small subcommittee of full professors – ideally from a scholarly area in or adjacent to the associate professor's – to solicit outside letters, evaluate the research or creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach work, and to make a recommendation to the council of full professors. (In the event that the faculty member is working across disciplinary areas, or in hybrid fields, it may be worth considering the inclusion of a faculty member from outside the department in the subcommittee.)

6. The associate professor will provide this subcommittee with a dossier of their work, including all publications, grant proposals, and other scholarship; evaluations of teaching from students and peers; and evidence of service (both at UW-Madison and to the profession more broadly), outreach, governance, and administrative work.

7. At least three ~~o~~Outside letters of evaluation are required as part of the process of evaluating the scholarly work (in research or creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach) of associate professors being considered for promotion. ~~The full professors~~ Executive Committee should determine whether and if so, how many letters beyond three will be required for the promotion of full professors, which letter will be confidential, and how the referees will be selected. In doing so, ~~the full professors~~ Executive Committee should balance departmental culture, disciplinary norms, best practice, and peer institutions' practices. Solicited~~The~~ letters should ~~ideally be solicited from department~~ be written by faculty members(s) within or adjacent to the scholarly area of the person being considered for promotion. In the event that the faculty member being considered for promotion is working across disciplinary areas, or in hybrid fields, ~~suggestions for~~ letters may be solicited from a faculty member from disciplines or departments other than the one in which the promotion candidate resides ~~outside the department.~~

Faculty members who were promoted to associate professor with tenure between 1 July 2016 and {insert date this chapter goes into effect}, and whose departments did not previously require outside letters prior to the adoption of this chapter, may opt to prepare their cases without outside letters. All other associate professors must include outside letters in their promotion dossiers.

8. The subcommittee will prepare a written evaluation of the associate professor's work across all areas of scholarship (research and creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach), and submit it for consideration to the Council of Full Professors so that the report – along with a selection of the work, the outside letters of evaluation, and the record of teaching and service/outreach – can be read before a vote is taken.

9. The Council of Full Professors will meet to discuss and vote on the advancement of associate professors to the rank of full professor. ~~After~~ reading the report of the subcommittee and evaluating the associate professor's work and the outside letters, the Council of Full Professors will vote on whether or not to promote. The vote should then be based on the record of scholarly work, and should not be taken for reasons of salary, status, or perceived inequity. The department's policy should specify whether a 2/3 or simple majority is required for a positive vote, and should specify whether it is a majority of all full professors or of those full professors present.

10. Once the vote has been taken, the faculty member shall be notified of the decision by the department chair in writing within five business days of the decision. If the decision is negative, this notification shall include the reasons for that decision.

11. If the vote is positive, the chair shall write a letter recommending promotion to the dean of the appropriate college or school. The dean will then follow the process for approval or denial of promotion recommendations as outlined by school/college policies and procedures.

12. In the event of a negative vote that the faculty member chooses not to appeal (see section D), the chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss how to create a stronger case for promotion at some later date.

D. DUE PROCESS, RECONSIDERATIONS AND APPEALS

1. If the faculty member disagrees with a negative decision, they have ten business days from the date of the written decision to request a reconsideration of the decision in writing to the department chair. The department's Council of Full Professors has twenty days from the date of the faculty member's request to re-consider its decision.

2. Once the vote on reconsideration has been taken, the faculty member shall be notified by the chair in writing of the reconsideration decision within five days of the decision. If the decision is negative, the faculty member may appeal to the office of the dean. The dean's office will have fifteen days, from the date of the appeal, to consider the faculty member's appeal and render a decision. In cases of a negative decision that is upheld by the dean, that decision may be appealed to CFRR (see 4 below).

3. Should a departmental decision on promotion be positive, and that decision is reversed by the office of the dean, the faculty member will be notified in writing of the dean's decision within five days of that decision, and the reasons for that decision. The faculty member may appeal the dean's decision (see 4 below).

4. In the event of a negative decision at the departmental level or by the office of the dean, the faculty member will have twenty days from the date of the dean's decision to appeal that decision to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (CFRR). The CFRR will decide on the validity of the appeal of the faculty member – basing its assessment on whether or not the decision on promotion was based on impermissible factors (see UWS 3.08[1][a], [b], and [c]) -- and will make its report to the faculty member, the department chair and the department's Council of Full Professors, the appropriate dean, and the provost.

If CFRR finds that a decision in 7.18.D.2 or 7.18.D.3 (that is, at the departmental or decanal level) was based on impermissible factors, it will ask the provost, in consultation with the DCRC (see FPP 7.17.C.7) to make the final decision on promotion. That decision will be rendered within 30 days of the date of the CFRR report. The provost's decision will be final.

5. A negative decision on promotion does not preclude consideration in subsequent years.