Proposed College of Engineering policy to include information from students in the assessment and review of faculty.

The College of Engineering at UW-Madison is committed to providing its faculty, staff and students with an environment that is conducive to and supportive of learning, scholarship, innovation and creativity. Such an environment must be welcoming and inclusive of all, and it must be free from any form of bias, harassment and bullying. Although we have made some progress, recent events in the college and the University indicate there remains much work still to be done. Central to our success are the tenured and tenure-track faculty as they set and exemplify the standards of expectation for the profession, department and the College. It is therefore imperative that we set the level of expectation high and hold ourselves accountable.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty are evaluated annually and on occasions of career milestones, e.g., end of probationary period for assistant professors, promotions and post-tenure review. These evaluations focus on scholarship, teaching and service. The processes are well tested and have served the college well. However, recent events have indicated a flaw in our methodology that needs to be addressed, namely there is no consideration of the climate and culture set by the faculty member in the classroom and in the research environment. The following proposal seeks, in part, to address this gap although it is recognized there are other sources that could provide information on the same topic.

Proposed Policy in the College of Engineering

It is proposed that beginning in AY 21, the materials submitted by the department to the College of Engineering regarding reviews of assistant professors at the end of their probationary period, supporting promotion from assistant to associate professor with tenure, supporting promotion from associate to full professor, and post-tenure review of faculty include an assessment of the climate and culture in the tenure-track and tenured faculty member’s research group. This summary should capture the cumulative information from annual reviews and, if any corrective measures were necessary during the review period, the outcome of those measures should be discussed.

Information the department should consider include but is not limited to the following:

- Written student comments in AEFIS teaching evaluations
- Written comments provided by the graduate research assistants in the GOAALS assessment tool
- Exit interviews with MS-research and doctoral students
- Movement of students into and out of the faculty member’s research group. An explanation for abnormally high student attrition rates must be provided.

It is recommended that the assessment of the climate and culture established by the faculty member be addressed in the letter from the department chair.

Failure to address this point in the submitted materials will result in the dossier being returned to the department.

If this CoE policy is adopted, the College will develop the mechanism to gather and disseminate the information to the departments in time for annual reviews of faculty.