

UNIVERSITY RANK, SALARY, AND TENURE (URST) PROCEDURES
2014-2015 (for calendar year 2014)

Introduction

Current URST policies and procedures at UW-Platteville are based on the following principles:

1. Periodic review consisting of: student and peer evaluation and departmental, college, and university review.
2. Annual meetings between faculty and department chairs, program coordinators, or other individuals to whom they report to set goals and objectives for the faculty members and, later, to review progress toward meeting the goals.
3. An open and cumulative file assembled and maintained by the faculty member.
4. Open review with the faculty fully informed at every step in the review process of what goes into their respective files plus provision for reconsideration at every level.
5. Individual salary recommendations made by the colleges under guidelines formulated by the Chancellor in consultation with the deans of the colleges and the URSTPC (University Rank, Salary and Tenure Policy Commission).
6. The URSTPC as a policy formulating and monitoring body serving to guide the college rank, salary and tenure committees in their work.
7. Affirmative action for equal employment opportunity as the responsibility of all reviewing agencies from the departmental to the university level.
8. Inclusion of the extension function as part of the performance evaluation for faculty with collaborative appointments between UW-Extension and UW-Platteville.
9. The responsibility of the individual faculty member for compiling a file that conforms to the guidelines set forth in this document.

Section 1 General Functions of RST Bodies

School Review Body (SRB) and Departmental Review Body (DRB) are equivalent throughout this document.

a. Departmental Review Body (DRB)

The primary function of the DRB is to make retention, promotion, and salary recommendations based on pertinent data in accordance with a department and college approved plan. It is the responsibility of tenured members of a department to make tenure recommendations.

b. College Rank, Salary, and Tenure Committee (CRSTC)

The primary function of the CRSTC is to review and evaluate DRB recommendations for retention, promotion, tenure and salary in accordance with a university approved plan.

c. University Rank, Salary, and Tenure Policy Commission (URSTPC)

The primary function of the URSTPC is to set policies; and monitor procedures.

d. All of the ABOVE BODIES will act in direct accordance with AFFIRMATIVE ACTION and EQUAL OPPORTUNITY LAWS AND REGULATIONS. The University Affirmative Action Officer will direct the attention of the various review bodies to affirmative action problems and needs.

Section 2 The File

a. Each faculty member is to assemble and maintain a file or portfolio for retention, promotion, tenure, and salary purposes. DRB chairs shall assemble a file for faculty who are unable to construct their own.

Faculty members not seeking retention, promotion, or tenure are required to build a file that will minimally include a Vita Update, and Form 1 for the previous calendar year. The CRSTC is not required to review documents other than updated Vita and Form 1, unless the faculty member requests reconsideration of salary recommendation.

b. Format for RST File (required of anyone requesting retention, promotion or tenure.)

Three-ring notebook not to exceed approximately one inch thick (clearly labeled/flagged as to which action -- retention, promotion, tenure -- is being requested by the individual involved).

Notebook divided into sections including the following:

Section I Updated Vita by faculty member.

Section II Peer Evaluation and Students' Evaluations as completed by the DRB on URSTPC Form 1.

Peer Evaluation will include evaluation in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly and Professional Activity, University Service, and Community Service for at least the last three years listed as outstanding (5), above normal (4), normal (3), below normal (2), or low (1). Student evaluations will include, at a minimum, a summary of evaluations for all courses taught for one semester in each of the last three years listed as outstanding (5), above normal (4), normal (3), below normal (2), or low (1). (Supporting student evaluation of teaching data must be available for review by the CRSTC upon request.)

Section III Narrative Statement or List of Activities completed by faculty member for current year including Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly and Professional Activity, University Service, and Community Service. Numerical summaries of student evaluations should not be included in this section.

Section IV Accumulation of past Narrative Statements or Lists of Activities assembled by faculty member. In the case of promotions, Statements or Lists must be provided for every year since acquiring current rank. In the case of retention or tenure, Statements or Lists must be provided for every year at UW-P. In cases of promotion and tenure, supporting documentation of performance at previous institutions should be included whenever possible.

Section V Additional materials added to the file by others at any level. This includes the annual statement from tenured faculty regarding a probationary faculty member's prospects for tenure. Any material added to the file must be dated and signed and a copy must be sent to the faculty member.

Section VI New materials added to the file after a negative decision and before an appeal. These materials will only be considered if the information relates to or clarifies information in the file.

Section VII Ancillary Supporting Materials provided by the faculty member. Any documentation of performance, e.g., syllabi, letters, or scholarly papers, should be placed here.

c. Faculty members should submit their files to the DRB. The DRB must add to the file a summary of current peer and current student evaluations (URSTPC Form 1). Since the peer evaluations must be independent of student evaluations, peer evaluations must be completed first.

- d. There will be no single scheme for the solicitation of student and peer evaluations, but every department must follow a plan that has been approved by its CRSTC. The CRSTC will review and approve departmental plans annually. The URSTPC will review and approve college plans annually. If the DRB and the CRSTC cannot reach agreement on the department plan, the final review and approval will be made by the URSTPC.
- e. For nontenured faculty and all faculty seeking promotion, the full student and peer evaluation processes must be at least **annual**. Student evaluations must be conducted each semester for faculty during their first three years of service. Those seeking promotion must submit peer evaluations for the three consecutive years immediately preceding the date of application. They also must submit a summary of student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught in at least one semester in each of the three consecutive years immediately preceding the date of application. (A summary means, at a minimum, a check on Form 1. Supporting student evaluation of teaching data must be made available to the CRSTC upon request.) When a faculty member submits student evaluations, they must be for all courses taught in that semester, including any UWP courses offered through an alternative delivery system.

For tenured faculty not seeking promotion, the DRB may make its recommendations without requiring current student and peer evaluations. In such cases, the full review is required once every three years. However, no department or DRB may deny a faculty member's request for a full review.

- f. Should a faculty member no longer be employed by UW-Platteville, every effort should be made to give the file to the faculty member. If this is not possible, the college or department must keep the file for seven years before disposition.

Section 3 The Review Process

- a. All departmental recommendations on retention, promotion, tenure and salary increases, shall be based on a review of student and peer evaluation data, the vita, and other materials in the faculty member's file. These recommendations are reported on the "Teaching Faculty Evaluation Report 2014 (Form 1)." The DRB is only required to place a checkmark in the appropriate box under Peer and Student evaluation. Numerical ratings will not be forwarded to the CRSTC. The peer evaluations must be independent of formal student evaluations.
- b. All DRB recommendations with respect to promotion may be ranked or alphabetized at the discretion of the CRSTC.
- c. The faculty member must be notified of the DRB recommendation and allowed to add further comments to the file and/or request reconsideration. The faculty member may not remove or change the review body's statements without its consent; however, he/she may add a counterstatement with respect to peer evaluation, student evaluation, DRB evaluation, the letter addressing progress towards tenure or the statement by the department chair.

- d. It is the responsibility of the department chair to make a summary of all recommendations, flag any file with a counterstatement, and forward the summary and the files to the CRSTC. A flag is intended to prevent any unusual case from going unnoticed and indicates to the next review body those files which may need extra attention.
- e. Any department chair serving on the DRB for his/her department shall serve as a nonvoting member.
- f. Each review body shall place a memorandum in each faculty file indicating the date that it was reviewed and the date(s) of every action taken.
- g. The CRSTC follows the Faculty Bylaws, Part III, Article IV, Section 3a, in carrying out its responsibility for reviewing recommendations of DRBs. (See Appendix)
- h. All CRSTC recommendations for retention, promotion, or tenure both positive and negative, must be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor. CRSTCs are encouraged to include a clear statement of the rationale for their recommendations.
- i. After the CRSTC has made its recommendations, the dean may add an independent statement if he/she so chooses.
- j. The CRSTC returns copies of any additions to the file to the faculty member and to the DRB. The faculty member may submit another statement. The CRSTC and Vice Chancellor will not accept any new "supporting evidence," regardless of the source, without the material being reviewed by the DRB.
- k. The department chair again collects any additional statements for the files and forwards them to the college dean who prepares a summary of the recommendations and flags files with counterstatements.
- l. The dean then forwards the files with a summary of recommendations for retention, promotion, and salaries to the Vice Chancellor.
- m. The Chancellor takes action on all recommendations.
- n. After this process is finished, the complete files are returned to the college deans and must be available to the faculty.
- o. Faculty members who choose not to prepare files will be considered as fairly as possible in light of whatever information is available to their department.
- p. Any department and/or college wishing to deviate from this procedure must have the approval of the CRSTC, the dean, and the URSTPC.

Section 4 Evaluation Criteria

- a. In the faculty evaluations, teaching effectiveness shall receive top priority, followed by scholarly and professional activities; service to the university and service to the community in the area of the faculty member's expertise shall also be considered. The CRSTC shall require of each department a set of guidelines stating how teaching effectiveness, scholarly and professional activity, service to the university and service to the community are evaluated and how each of the four categories in the evaluation is weighted.
- b. Teaching includes an array of activities that provide students opportunities for learning beyond the classroom (including but not limited to advising, coaching, supervision of independent work, career counseling, advising of student organizations, internships, student-faculty research projects, field trips, individual tutoring, and supervision of student laboratory work). This array, along with availability to students and colleagues, should be considered in evaluating teaching.
- c. Adherence to Federal, State, System and campus guidelines on discriminatory harassment or conduct based on race, sex, religion, color, creed, disability, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry or age shall also be considered in the evaluation process.

Section 5 Peer and Student Evaluations

Those seeking promotion must submit peer evaluations for the three consecutive years immediately preceding the date of application. They also must submit a summary of student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught in at least one semester in each of the three consecutive years immediately preceding the date of application. (A summary means, at a minimum, a check on Form 1. Supporting student evaluation of teaching data must be made available to the CRSTC upon request.)

- a. Student Evaluations. The policy has been to encourage a wide range of practices. The DRB shall make decisions about student evaluations, including what instrument will be used and how the data are to be interpreted. DRBs are urged to use resources available at the Teaching Excellence Center in developing an evaluation form.

The DRB should recognize that student evaluations are required for RST purposes and are also used for self-improvement. Student evaluations for RST purposes shall be separate from those for self-improvement.

The CRSTC shall review and approve the departmental procedures annually. When an agreement regarding procedures cannot be reached, the URSTPC will conduct the final review and grant approval. The departments and colleges should keep the process as simple and as fair as possible and should see that no questions are included that would destroy student anonymity. Recommendations for reappointment and the granting of tenure must be based on a cumulative annual record.

Student evaluations must be conducted each semester for probationary faculty during their first three years of service. Other probationary faculty must be evaluated by students in all classes they teach in one semester at least once a year. All other faculty must be evaluated by students in all classes they teach in one semester at least once every three years. Faculty members may add additional evaluations to their files. Faculty members have the right to respond to all summary statements of student evaluations prepared for retention, promotion, tenure, and salary purposes.

- b. Peer evaluations. Peer evaluation must be independent of formal student evaluation. Colleges and departments may use a variety of peer evaluation techniques, and one individual or several may conduct peer assessment. A designated individual, the department chair, DRB chair, the DRB, or an ad hoc committee may solicit and summarize evaluations in a given department. The specific procedure must be described in the written guidelines of the DRB and reviewed by the CRSTC.

When conducting peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness, the following methods and information may be considered:

1. Classroom, laboratory or workshop observations by the department chair or a DRB member followed by discussion with the faculty members of their strengths and weaknesses and a written summary report by the observer.
2. A complete list of classes taught specifying student credit hours and indicating whether graduate or undergraduate level.
3. Copies of all syllabi and samples of tests or, in classes without tests, samples of assignments.
4. Vita.
5. Unique educational experience(s).
6. A set of personal goals to enhance teaching effectiveness developed by each faculty member with evidence of progress toward meeting these goals.
7. Percent of time assigned to teaching.

Section 6

2014-2015 Retention, Tenure, Salary and Emeritus Status
Calendar and Checklist

<u>DEADLINES</u> <u>2014-2015</u>	<u>Item</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Department Level</u>
Sept 10, 2014	1	Department Chairs advise 2 nd year probationary faculty regarding DRB, CRSTC, and University review dates for reappointment. Faculty must be advised to update their files at least 20 days in advance of the DRB meeting.
Oct 06	2	2 nd year faculty files are due to the DRB.
Oct 17	3	DRB informs the 2 nd year faculty of their recommendation and sends files and retention recommendations for 2015-2016 for second year faculty to CRSTC.
Oct 22	4	A 2 nd year faculty member may request DRB reconsideration. This may include submission of a counter statement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the DRB.
Oct 31	5	DRB informs the 2 nd year faculty member and CRSTC of the results of reconsideration.
Nov 05	6	Department Chair sends notices to ALL faculty reminding them that up-to-date RST files are to be prepared before January 05, 2015. [Note: the DRB may set an earlier deadline but may not require portfolios to be submitted before <u>January 1, 2015</u> . If this option is chosen, the exact date and the procedures for notifying the department faculty of an earlier deadline must be included in the DRB plan.] All probationary faculty must be advised regarding DRB and CRSTC review dates for reappointment at least 20 days in advance of the DRB meeting.
Nov 10	7	Each DRB submits its 2015-2016 RST procedures to CRSTC for review.
Nov 28	8	Department members complete evaluation of the Department Chair's administrative performance. Evaluations will be coordinated by the Chair of the DRB. A summary will be given to each Chair to be placed in his or her RST file.
Jan 05, 2015	9	ALL faculty RST files given to the DRB. [Note: the DRB may set an earlier deadline but may not require portfolios to be submitted before <u>January 1, 2015</u> . If this option is chosen, the exact date and the procedures for notifying the department faculty of an earlier deadline must be included in the DRB plan.]
Jan 15	10	DRB notifies ALL faculty of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summaries of peer and student evaluations (URSTPC Form 1)• Recommendations on retention for 2016-2017 for probationary faculty other than 1st year faculty• Recommendations on retention for 2015-2016 for 1st year probationary

faculty

- Promotion recommendations
- Tenure recommendations
- Salary recommendations

Department chair sends a copy of the annual statement (beginning in the second year) from the tenured faculty in the discipline regarding the probationary faculty member's prospects for tenure to the faculty member under review and inserts a copy in the RST file.

If the department chair chooses to submit an independent evaluation, a copy of the letter must be sent to the faculty member under review and placed in the RST file.

Jan 20	11	A faculty member may request DRB reconsideration of any recommendations. This may include submission of a counter statement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the DRB.
Jan 27	12	DRB informs the faculty member of the reconsideration results.
Jan 29	13	Department Chair summarizes all recommendations for the department, flags files with counter statements, flags files for those with split appointments, and forwards the materials to the CRSTC.

After reconsideration procedures have been exhausted, a non-renewed probationary faculty member or a faculty member denied tenure at the completion of the maximum probationary period may initiate a formal appeal as outlined in Part II, Article VIII of the UWP Faculty Bylaws (see appendix).

<u>DEADLINES</u> <u>2014-2015</u>	<u>Item</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>College Level</u>
Nov 07, 2014	14	CRSTC notifies 2 nd year faculty of retention recommendations and forwards the files of all 2 nd year faculty receiving positive recommendations to the Vice Chancellor.
Nov 12	15	A 2 nd year faculty member may request reconsideration by the CRSTC. This may include submission of a counter statement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the CRSTC. The DRB Chair must be informed of any scheduled reconsideration meetings involving faculty from that department.
Nov 17	16	CRSTC distributes department chair evaluation forms to DRB Chairs who in turn coordinates a departmental evaluation of the Department Chair's administrative performance.
Nov 21	17	Each college electronically submits its 2014-2015 CRSTC procedures to the URSTPC Chair and the Vice Chancellor. Each CRSTC may schedule a meeting with the Vice Chancellor or the URSTPC to review URSTPC procedures in order to prevent misinterpretations.

- Nov 24 18 CRSTC informs the 2nd year faculty member, the DRB, the department chair, and the Vice Chancellor of their decision regarding reconsideration. The CRSTC sends files for 2nd year faculty not previously sent to the Vice Chancellor (see item #14).
- Nov 26 19 CRSTC chairs receive salary inequity study summary from the URSTPC chair and distribute summary to all faculty in their college.
- Feb 05, 2015 20 CRSTC notifies 1st year faculty, DRB, and Department Chair about CRSTC recommendation concerning retention of 1st year faculty for 2015-2016. CRSTC forwards the files of all 1st year faculty receiving positive recommendations to the Vice Chancellor.
- Feb 10 21 A 1st year faculty member may request CRSTC reconsideration of retention for 2015-2016. This may include submission of a counter statement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the CRSTC. The DRB Chair must be informed of any scheduled reconsideration meetings involving faculty from that department.
- Feb 13 22 CRSTC Chair notifies the 1st year faculty member, DRB, and Department Chair of reconsideration decision. The CRSTC sends files for 1st year faculty not previously sent to the Vice Chancellor (see item #20).
- Feb 13 23 CRSTC notifies the DRB, Department Chair, and faculty of the following:
- Recommendations on retention for 2016-2017 for probationary faculty other than 1st year faculty
 - Promotion recommendations
 - Tenure recommendations
 - Salary recommendations, including merit and inequity
- When the CRSTC's recommendation in regard to retention, promotion, or tenure is contrary to the DRB's recommendation, the CRST will meet with the DRB and explain the rationale for the recommendation.
- Feb 18 24 A faculty member may request reconsideration by the CRSTC. This may include submission of a counter statement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the CRSTC. The DRB Chair must be informed of any scheduled reconsideration meetings involving faculty from that department.
- Feb 25 25 CRSTC notifies the faculty member, DRB, and Department Chair of reconsideration decisions.

Feb 25 26 CRSTC chair summarizes CRSTC recommendations using URSTPC FORM 1 for promotions, flags files with counter statements, flags files for those with split appointments, and forwards to the Vice Chancellor the summary and all faculty files of those being considered for retention, promotion, and tenure.

After reconsideration procedures have been exhausted, a non-renewed probationary faculty member or a faculty member denied tenure at the completion of the maximum probationary period may initiate a formal appeal as outlined in Part II, Article VIII of the UWP Faculty Bylaws (see appendix).

DEADLINES 2014-2015	Item <u>No.</u>	<u>University Level</u>
Nov 17, 2014	27	URSTPC submits 2015-2016 procedures to the Faculty Senate. URSTPC chair contacts web development to update on-line evaluations of administrators (Vice Chancellor/Provost and Deans).
Nov 24, 2014	28	URSTPC chair distributes salary inequity study summary, provided by the University Affirmative Action Officer, to all faculty.
<u>Dec 15</u>	29	2 nd year faculty must be notified by the Chancellor of any non-renewal decisions.
Dec 08	30	URSTPC reviews CRSTC procedures for 2015-2016.
Jan 06, 2015	31	Chair of URSTPC notifies faculty and staff that the evaluation forms of administrators (Vice Chancellor/Provost and Deans) are available on-line.
Jan 29	32	Evaluation results for the Deans are forwarded to the Vice Chancellor who shares them with the Deans. Evaluations of the Vice Chancellor are forwarded to the Chancellor who shares them with the Vice Chancellor.
<u>Mar 1</u>	33	1 st year faculty must be notified by the Chancellor of any non-renewal decision.
Mar 11	34	The Vice Chancellor forwards RST recommendations and rationale to the Chancellor for action.
Mar 16	35	The Chancellor informs each faculty member, Department Chair, and Dean of final decisions in regard to retention, promotions, and tenure.
Mar 16	36	The Vice Chancellor returns all faculty files to the college Dean.
<u>Mar 31</u>	37	Departments submit post-tenure review reports to the Dean.
<u>April 15</u>	38	The college Dean sends a summary of post-tenure reviews to the Vice Chancellor.

Note: Non-renewal notices at all levels must cite specific portions of the Faculty Bylaws and/or Faculty Personnel Rules that relate to the appropriate reconsideration and appeal process.

Calendar for First-year Faculty
(Retention Only)

DEADLINES <u>2014-2015</u>	Item <u>No.</u>	<u>Department Level</u>
Nov 05, 2014	6	Department Chair sends notices to ALL faculty reminding them that up-to-date RST files are to be prepared before January 5, 2015. [Note: the DRB may set an earlier deadline but may not require portfolios to be submitted before <u>January 1, 2015</u> . If this option is chosen, the exact date and the procedures for notifying the department faculty of an earlier deadline must be included in the DRB plan.] All probationary faculty must be advised regarding DRB and CRSTC review dates for reappointment at least 20 days in advance of the DRB meeting.
Jan 05, 2015	9	ALL faculty RST files given to the DRB. [Note: the DRB may set an earlier deadline but may not require portfolios to be submitted before <u>January 1, 2015</u> . If this option is chosen, the exact date and the procedures for notifying the department faculty of an earlier deadline must be included in the DRB plan.]
Jan 15	10	<p>DRB notifies ALL faculty of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summaries of peer and student evaluations (URSTPC Form 1) • Recommendations on retention for 2016-2017 for probationary faculty other than 1st year faculty • Recommendations on retention for 2015-2016 for 1st year probationary faculty • Promotion recommendations • Tenure recommendations • Salary recommendations <p>If the department chair chooses to submit an independent evaluation, a copy of the letter must be sent to the faculty member under review and placed in the RST file.</p>
Jan 20	11	A faculty member may request DRB reconsideration of any recommendations. This may include submission of a counter statement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the DRB.
Jan 27	12	DRB informs the faculty member of the reconsideration results.

Feb 25 26 CRSTC chair summarizes CRSTC recommendations using URSTPC FORM 1 for promotions, flags files with counter statements, flags files for those with split appointments, and forwards to the Vice Chancellor the summary and all faculty files of those being considered for retention, promotion, and tenure.

After reconsideration procedures have been exhausted, a non-renewed probationary faculty member or a faculty member denied tenure at the completion of the maximum probationary period may initiate a formal appeal as outlined in Part II, Article VIII of the UWP Faculty Bylaws (see appendix).

DEADLINES	Item	
<u>2014-2015</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>University Level</u>
<u>Mar 1</u>	33	1 st year faculty must be notified by the Chancellor of any non-renewal decision.
Mar 16	35	The Chancellor informs each faculty member, Department Chair, and Dean of final decisions in regard to retention, promotions, and tenure.

NOTE: Non-renewal notices at all levels must cite specific portions of the Faculty Bylaws and/or Faculty Personnel Rules that relate to the appropriate reconsideration and appeal process.

Calendar for Second-year Faculty
(Retention Only)

DEADLINES <u>2014-2015</u>	Item <u>No.</u>	<u>Department Level</u>
Sept 10, 2014	1	Department Chairs advise 2 nd year probationary faculty regarding DRB, CRSTC, and University review dates for reappointment. Faculty must be advised to update their files at least 20 days in advance of the DRB meeting.
Oct 06	2	2 nd year faculty files are due to the DRB.
Oct 17	3	DRB informs the 2 nd year faculty of their recommendations and sends files and retention recommendations for 2015-2016 for second year faculty to CRSTC. If the department chair chooses to submit an independent evaluation, a copy of the letter must be sent to the faculty member under review and placed in the RST file
Oct 22	4	A 2 nd year faculty member may request DRB reconsideration. This may include submission of a counter statement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the DRB.
Oct 31	5	DRB informs the 2 nd year faculty member and CRSTC of the results of reconsideration.
Jan 17, 2015	10	Department chair sends a copy of the annual statement (beginning in the second year) from the tenured faculty in the discipline regarding the probationary faculty member's prospects for tenure to the faculty member under review and inserts a copy in the RST file. If the department chair chooses to update his/her independent evaluation for the second-year review, a copy of the letter must be sent to the faculty member under review and placed in the RST file.
Jan 29	13	Department Chair summarizes all recommendations for the department, flags files with counter statements, flags files for those with split appointments, and forwards the materials to the CRSTC. After reconsideration procedures have been exhausted, a non-renewed probationary faculty member or a faculty member denied tenure at the completion of the maximum probationary period may initiate a formal appeal as outlined in Part II, Article VIII of the UWP Faculty Bylaws (see appendix).

<u>DEADLINES</u> <u>2014-2015</u>	<u>Item</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>College Level</u>
Nov 07, 2014	14	CRSTC notifies 2 nd year faculty of retention recommendations and forwards the files of all 2 nd year faculty receiving positive recommendations to the Vice Chancellor.
Nov 12	15	A 2 nd year faculty member may request reconsideration by the CRSTC. This may include submission of a counter statement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the CRSTC. The DRB Chair must be informed of any scheduled reconsideration meetings involving faculty from that department.
Nov 24	18	CRSTC informs the 2 nd year faculty member, the DRB, the department chair, and the Vice Chancellor of their decision regarding reconsideration. The CRSTC sends files for 2 nd year faculty not previously sent to the Vice Chancellor (see item #14).

<u>DEADLINES</u> <u>2014-2015</u>	<u>Item</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>University Level</u>
<u>Dec. 14</u>	28	2 nd year faculty must be notified by the Chancellor of any non-renewal decisions.

Section 7 Reappointment of Nontenured Faculty

- a. The criteria used in reviewing nontenured faculty members for reappointment shall include the following in this order:
 - 1) teaching effectiveness
 - 2) scholarly and professional activities
 - 3) service to the university
 - 4) service to the community in the area of faculty member's expertise

- b. The DRB and the CRSTC must review first- and second-year faculty before other faculty since the recommendations concerning reappointments of first- and second-year faculty must reach the Vice Chancellor earlier than those for other faculty. See the due dates in section d below.

- c. A file, including the following items, will be submitted to the DRB, CRSTC and Vice Chancellor for each nontenured faculty being reviewed for reappointment
 - 1) up-to-date vita
 - 2) narrative progress report (optional)
 - 3) cumulative summaries of student and peer evaluations (current and previous years' Form 1, at a minimum. (Supporting student evaluation of teaching data must be available for review by the CRSTC upon request.)
 - 4) department chair statement (optional)
 - 5) a well-documented recommendation by the DRB concerning the renewal or nonrenewal of the faculty member
 - 6) a recommendation by the CRSTC which must include evaluation in terms of the criteria listed in "a" above
 - 7) a letter from the tenured faculty of the discipline reviewing the faculty's prospects for tenure (required beginning in the second year). If data are gathered for input to the letter for one probationary faculty member within a discipline (as defined for tenure votes), the same data must be gathered for all probationary faculty members in that discipline. A copy of this letter shall be given directly to the probationary faculty member. Email communication shall not be used to conduct discussions or propose changes to the content of this letter. However, non-substantive editorial changes to this letter may be communicated via email.
 - 8) In the rare case in which a faculty member is granted 2 or more years toward tenure when hired, the letter referred to in Sec. 7 c. 7) is required beginning in that faculty member's first year.

d. Calendar of due dates

2nd year faculty	CRSTC positive retention recommendations to the Vice Chancellor by November 7, 2014. CRSTC retention recommendations concerning other second-year faculty to the Vice Chancellor by November 24, 2014.
1st year faculty	CRSTC positive retention recommendations to the Vice Chancellor by February 6, 2014. CRSTC retention recommendations concerning other first-year faculty to the Vice Chancellor by February 13, 2015.
2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th year faculty	CRSTC recommendations to the Vice Chancellor by February 25, 2015.

Second-year faculty must be notified of nonrenewal for a third year by December 15th and first-year faculty must be notified of nonrenewal for a second year by March 1st.

Section 8 Post Tenure Review

- a. The professional performance of tenured faculty will be reviewed on a five year cycle. This review may be conducted simultaneously with the faculty annual merit review; it is not a re-tenuring process. It should be considered a supplement to the normal merit review. The purpose of the review is to encourage and support the growth and development of faculty that positively contributes to the mission and goals of the department, the college and the university.
- b. The five year cycle will run as follows:

2015: College of LAE
2016: No Review
2017: No Review
2018: College of BILSA
2019: College of EMS
Etc.

A department or other administrative unit may define an alternative cycle as part of its DRB guidelines as long as it ensures tenured faculty are reviewed on a regular basis.

- c. Post-tenure reviews must be completed at the department level by March 31 of the assigned year.
- d. The faculty member will complete Form 2, which includes a personal plan for continuing growth and development. Form 2 will be submitted to the department chair by March 1 of the specified year. The faculty member will then meet with the department chair. The meeting shall address development needs of the faculty member to make progress toward achieving the plan's goals and shall recommend ways of helping the faculty member to meet those goals.
- e. Results of the post-tenure faculty reviews will be transmitted by the department chair to the college dean. The post-tenure reviews shall become part of a personnel file of the faculty member concerned. The file will be retained in the college dean's office.
- f. If the faculty member's review reveals a need for significant improvement, the department chair will report such to the college dean. The dean and the chair will assist the faculty to find resources to fund appropriate future development plans of the faculty member.
- g. The dean will send a summary of the post-tenure reviews to the Vice Chancellor by April 15 of the assigned year.
- h. Monitoring the post-tenure review process is the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor in

conjunction with the URSTPC.

Section 9. Salary Recommendations

- a. The departments and colleges have the responsibility for making recommendations concerning salary increases according to guidelines formulated by the URSTPC and approved by the Faculty Senate and the Chancellor.
- b. Because all review bodies should reflect Regent policy and legislative intent in their recommendations, after System guidelines have been formulated, the URSTPC will develop and recommend for Faculty Senate approval more precise guidelines.

Section 10 Inequity Defined and a Statement of the High Priority to Be Given to Inequity Adjustments

- a. The URSTPC is committed to the principle of equal reward for equal service and wishes to emphasize the university's absolute commitment to the UW System Affirmative Action policy and guidelines, as stated elsewhere in this document.
- b. Correcting inequities without creating new ones is a high priority for the DRB and the CRSTC regarding salary. In determining an inequity, the DRB and the CRSTC should consider comparable faculty and not "select" a few individual cases to support a claim of inequity.
- c. Inequity decisions must be based on convincing documentation.
- d. Not only length of service but also quality of service to the university must be considered when deciding whether or not inequity exists. If other faculty with similar professional backgrounds and years of experience are receiving higher salaries, this does not automatically indicate an inequitable situation.
- e. The years and quality of service to this university should be considered before total years of experience.

Section 11 Promotions: Numbers and Minimum Criteria; Emeritus Status

- a. Academic rank must continue to have credibility. For this reason, the DRB and CRSTC should follow these minimum eligibility criteria when making recommendations for promotion.

Promotion to the Rank of Assistant Professor

The candidate must have demonstrated achievement in teaching effectiveness, scholarly and professional activities, and university service and must meet one of the following criteria:

- 1) an earned doctorate or equivalent in an appropriate discipline.
- 2) A master's degree in an appropriate discipline plus a minimum of three years of teaching or equivalent experience.

Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

The candidate must have demonstrated significant achievement in teaching effectiveness, scholarly and professional activities, and university service and also must meet one of the following criteria:

- 1) an earned doctorate or equivalent in an appropriate discipline, plus at least five years of documented effective teaching at the college level (including at least 3 years at UWP). *To be interpreted as five years (three years at UWP) at the time of receiving the promotion. Also to be interpreted as 4½ years (2½ years at UWP) at the time of applying for promotion.*
- 2) a master's degree in an appropriate discipline plus at least 10 years of documented effective teaching at the college level. (At least 7 years at UWP). *To be interpreted as 10 years (at least 7 at UWP) at the time of receiving the promotion. Also to be interpreted as 9½ years (6½ years at UWP) at the time of applying for the promotion.*

Promotion to the Rank of Professor

The candidate must have demonstrated significant achievement in teaching effectiveness, distinguished professional and scholarly activities, and university service. An individual is expected to be in the associate professor rank at least 5 years before being promoted to the professor rank. The candidate also must meet one of the following criteria:

- 1) an earned doctorate or equivalent in an appropriate discipline plus at least ten years of documented effective teaching at the college level including at least 3 years at UWP. *To be interpreted as ten years (three years at UWP) at the time of receiving the promotion. Also to be interpreted as 9½ years (2½ years at UWP) at the time of applying for promotion.*
 - 2) a master's degree in an appropriate discipline with significant academic preparation beyond the master's plus at least 18 years of documented effective teaching at the college level. (At least 15 years at UWP). *To be interpreted as 18 years (at least 15 at UWP) at the time of receiving the promotion. Also to be interpreted as 17½ years (14½ years at UWP) at the time of applying for the promotion.*
- b. Significant achievement in distinguished professional and scholarly activities includes recognized participation in research, scholarship, the arts, professional practice, and other specialized work associated with the academic expertise of the faculty member.
- c. All equivalents to the earned doctorate will be decided on a case by case basis.
- d. CRSTCs may rank all those recommended for promotion within each rank. The integrated promotion lists may be ranked in priority order. If the CRSTC chooses not to rank the candidates for promotion, candidates should be listed in alphabetical order.

Emeritus Status

The faculty member will be granted emeritus status at the rank held at the time of retirement. To be granted emeritus status, the faculty member must:

- 1) have at least 20 years of relevant experience in higher education at an accredited institution with at least the last 10 years at UWP, OR in education (any level) with at least the last 15 years at UWP.
- 2) be officially retired from the UW System.
- 3) have served the University in an exemplary manner.

Exceptions to these guidelines may be made if recommended by the department and approved by the Chancellor after consultation with the CRSTC.

- 4) Emeritus Recommendation Process:
 - a. Vice Chancellor's office must inform department chairs of impending retirements.
 - b. Department chairs will conduct a vote of tenured department members to determine departmental support for recommendation to emeritus status.
 - c. The department recommendation will be forwarded through the CRSTC for comment (concurrence with department or not).
 - d. The Chancellor will review the recommendations and take action.

Section 12 Policy on Tenure: Numbers and Criteria

- a. The university's policy is to continuously examine and evaluate the proportion of tenured to nontenured faculty especially in any department or college with a tenure density in excess of 70 percent. Tenure should be recommended only in cases where the candidate has received the appropriate terminal degree and is deemed to be an exceptional present and future asset to the department and the University. Exceptions to the above terminal degree requirement may be made in extraordinary cases where, prior to appointment, the department has made written justification which the dean and the Provost have approved.
- b. Tenure should be recommended only by a department that can demonstrate long-term programmatic need. Ordinarily tenure should not be recommended by any department characterized by a tenure density over 70 percent or by falling enrollments. Written justification to exceed these limits must accompany a recommendation from the department.
- c. Departments and colleges are urged to make nonrenewal decisions as early as possible in all impending tenure cases unless the probationary faculty member is an exceptional asset to the university. Departments and colleges must be candid about the prospects for tenure with probationary faculty.

d. Retention of women and protected minorities is educationally significant and must be considered.

e. Within each year's SRB/DRB plan, the school/department will:

Determine (in consultation with the Dean and the Chancellor) the disciplines that exist within the school/department; the school/department may recommend that previously separate categories could be merged with the decision to be made prior to November 1st of each year.

Determine which tenured and untenured faculty are in each discipline, for the purpose of granting tenure and tenure votes;

Define the school/departmental procedure on how the tenure vote will be conducted.

f. The tenure recommendation must be made no later than the end of the sixth year of the probationary period. This includes any years granted toward tenure at the time of the initial contract. More detail is provided in the appendix to this document.

g. If the tenure vote is done by a show of hands, the number of affirmative votes, negative votes, abstentions, and absences must be recorded. If any member of the voting body asks for a roll call vote, the name of each person and how that person voted must be recorded. If the vote is done by written ballot, rather than by a show of hands, each person must sign his/her ballot.

The vote is public record. The results of how each person voted, if a roll call or written ballot is used, is also public record and will be released upon request.

The person being considered for tenure must be notified of the time and place of the meeting and that he/she has a right to have the meeting conducted in open session. If the candidate has requested an open meeting, he/she has a right to be present throughout the entire process, including deliberations and voting.

A paper copy of the results of the tenure vote (including the roll call votes and written ballots, if used) must be recorded and forwarded to the CRSTC and the Provost. The Provost will archive all of these results.

Section 13 A Reaffirmation of Affirmative Action Goals

The university is deeply committed to ensuring equal opportunity for all individuals. It is university policy to correct underutilization of women and minorities at all levels of employment and in all academic programs, and to assure equal compensation for comparable work, equal opportunity for merited advancement, and equal opportunity for retention and tenure. Positive action to implement this policy must be continuous and aggressive. Therefore, each reviewing body must see that these goals are a part of its RST procedures. In retention, promotion, and tenure decisions each review body will be responsible for including affirmative action and equal employment opportunity considerations in their deliberations.

Section 14 Policy on Split Appointments

- a. If an individual holds a split appointment between two or more departments, programs, or units, that individual is to be evaluated and recommended by the group in which he or she holds the major fraction of appointment. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to obtain input from the other partial appointment area. In the case of a 50/50 appointment, the faculty member must designate the primary evaluating department, program or unit.
- b. The file of a faculty member to be evaluated and recommended by two or more such units will be flagged automatically so as to receive proper attention by the CRSTC and the Vice Chancellor. The purpose of this special procedure is to ensure fair consideration of a faculty member's work in more than one department, institute, or program.
- c. University personnel who have appointments split between teaching and administrative services will participate in the departmental, college, and university RST evaluation process. They will be evaluated and recommended by each group according to their percentage assignment, and their files will be flagged before the final recommendation goes to the Chancellor. The department or unit to which a majority of the staff member's time is assigned will have the primary responsibility for moving evaluation materials forward.
- d. It is this university's policy that faculty with split appointments, those on leaves of absence, sabbatical leaves, and especially those who have volunteered for retraining and reassignment will not be inadvertently penalized for their unusual assignments; instead DRBs and CRSTCs will be expected to reward unusual efforts made on behalf of the total university. All review bodies should review the files of all such faculty with care and consideration.

Section 15 Open Meeting Procedures for All Review Bodies

- a. Public notice will be given of all meetings at least 24 hours prior to each meeting unless for good cause such notice is not possible, in which case notice of at least two hours will be given.
- b. The review bodies will always convene in open session, but the meeting may be closed by majority vote for consideration of reappointment, promotion or salary. (State Statute 19.85)
- c. The review bodies will give advance notice of evidentiary hearings to each faculty member considered for the granting or denial of tenure. The person being reviewed has the right to demand that the evidentiary hearing or the meeting at which final action is taken be held in open session. Secret ballots may not be used in any tenure decision.

Section 16 Review of Department Chair

- a. Department chairs with teaching responsibilities will be evaluated on teaching effectiveness, scholarly and professional activities, and service in the same manner as other department members, according to their percentage appointment. Departments chairs' files should also contain:

1. Annual evaluations of their performance as a chair by their departments.
 2. The college dean's evaluation of their performance as chair.
- b. It is the responsibility of the department chairs to have these additional items in their files.

Section 17 Review of Academic Administrators, i.e., the Vice Chancellor and Deans

- a. Faculty members will have an opportunity to submit an evaluation of their academic administrator's performance using the evaluation form prepared by the URSTPC. This evaluation form will be posted online. Evaluation results for the Deans are forwarded to the administrator and to the Vice Chancellor, and the results of the Vice Chancellor evaluation will be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor and the Chancellor. A digital copy and a hard copy of the evaluations will be held in each supervisor's office.

Section 18

Form 1
 University of Wisconsin-Platteville
 Teaching Faculty Evaluation Report 2014
 (For activity between 1/13-12/13)

Name: _____ Rank: _____

Department (s) or Service Area (s): _____

Education: _____ Code: _____
 (Highest degree plus additional credits)

(Dean is to circle the following if different from latest printout)

Years of Experience: _____ Promotion History: _____

At UW-Platteville: _____

Other College or Relevant _____

Peer Evaluation (Date of last evaluation) _____

	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Outstanding
Teaching Effectiveness					
Scholarly and Professional Activity					
University Service *					
Community Service *					

* University and Community Service may be combined into one category at the option of the Department.

Student Evaluation (Date of last evaluation) _____

	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Outstanding
Teaching Effectiveness					

Affirmative Action Considerations Discussed, if Applicable: DRB CRSTC

Salary Recommendations: DRB Merit Inequity

Check as appropriate

	Across-the-Board	Merit	Inequity	Total
CRSTC (Assigned Points)				
Instructor				
Assistant Professor				
Associate Professor				
Professor				

If the CRSTC recommendation differs from that of the DRB, please give the reason:

Note: Only departments with approved DRB procedures specifying use of the method of review similar to that adopted by the Department of Biology may use this alternative form 1.

Alternate Form 1
 University of Wisconsin-Platteville
 Teaching Faculty Evaluation Report 2014
 (For activity between 1/13-12/13)

Name: _____ Rank: _____

Department (s) or Service Area (s): _____

Education: _____ Code: _____
 (Highest degree plus additional credits)

(Dean is to circle the following if different from latest printout)

Years of Experience: _____ Promotion History: _____

At UW-Platteville: _____

Other College or Relevant _____

Peer Evaluation (Date of last evaluation) _____

	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory
Teaching Effectiveness		
Scholarly and Professional Activity		
University Service *		
Community Service *		

* University and Community Service may be combined into one category at the option of the Department.

Student Evaluation (Date of last evaluation) _____

	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory
Teaching Effectiveness		

Affirmative Action Considerations Discussed, if Applicable: DRB CRSTC

Salary Recommendations: DRB Merit Inequity

Check as appropriate

	Across-the-Board	Merit	Inequity	Total
CRSTC (Assigned Points)				
Instructor				
Assistant Professor				
Associate Professor				
Professor				

If the CRSTC recommendation differs from that of the DRB, please give the reason:

Section 19

Form 2
University of Wisconsin-Platteville
Post-Tenure Review

Name: _____ Department: _____

Year that Tenure was granted: _____ Year of Previous Post-Tenure Review: _____

Summary of Evaluations since the time of Tenure or the previous Post-Tenure Review

Peer Evaluations

Teaching Effectiveness						Scholarly and Professional Activities					
Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing	Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing

University Service						Community Service (<i>if separate</i>)					
Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing	Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing

Student Evaluations

Teaching Effectiveness					
Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing

Brief Summary of major activities since the previous post-tenure review:

Personal Plan for Continuing Growth and Development until next review in year _____

Review by: (Signature of Chair indicates review is complete.)

Faculty Member _____ Date _____

Department Chair _____ Date _____

Dean _____ Date _____

This document will be retained in the faculty member's personnel file in the college dean's office.

Faculty/Staff Evaluation of College Dean

* Required

Name of College Dean *For activity between 1/13-12/13

Name Optional

1. Communication of college goals Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

2. Implementation of college goals Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

3. Communication of progress toward college goals Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

4. Fulfillment of college goals Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

5. Supports departmental issues in university relations Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

6. Supports individual issues/concerns Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

7. Acts upon issues and problems Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

8. Communicates results or action taken Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

9. Shows genuine concern about meeting the needs of the college employeesFar Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

10. Establishes contact with external individuals and groups; OutreachLeave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

11. Attends alumni activitiesLeave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

12. Is involved in community activitiesLeave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

13. Participates in ceremonial roles in college-related external activities.Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

14. Works with other deans toward common goalsLeave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

15. Works effectively with administration on college goals and requirementsLeave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

16. Maintains interaction with students in the collegeLeave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

17. Applies a broad variety of skills and knowledge in order to perform the job wellLeave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

18. Strives for excellence in educational program Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

19. Understands and strives to meet or exceed the university's definition of success for the job Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

20. Listens and observes attentively, allowing an exchange of information Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

21. Speaks and writes clearly and concisely with an appropriate awareness of the intended audience Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

22. Disseminates information appropriately Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

23. Performs responsibilities without having to receive prompting from others Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

24. Thinks ahead, develops and then implements ways to perform Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

25. Seeks out information as needed Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

26. Builds a sense of teamwork, purpose and group identity Leave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

27. Sets high performance standards for self, group, and othersLeave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

28. Serves as credible role model who displays and instills a positive attitudeLeave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

29. Shows trust and respect for all members of the collegeLeave blank if you cannot assess.

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfactory Far Exceeds Expectations

Comments

Overall Numerical Rating?

1 2 3 4 5

Lowest Highest

Times Per SemesterPlease Indicate your level of personal contact with the Dean

Please check OneOptional

- Faculty/Staff
- Department Chair
- Program Director

Powered by [Google Docs](#)[Report Abuse](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Additional Terms](#)

Section 21

**University of Wisconsin-Platteville
Administrative Review of Provost for Calendar Year 2014**

1. How many years have you been employed at UW-Platteville?

1-2 years	3-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16+ years
0	0	0	0	0

2. Which of the following best describes your status at the University?

Teaching Faculty	Teaching Academic Staff	Non-Teaching Faculty	Non-Teaching Academic Staff	Administrator (e.g., Asst. Dean)
0	0	0	0	0

3. Which of the following best describes the extent of your contact with the Provost during the past year?

Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Once per semester	No personal contact
0	0	0	0	0

To support the university's academic mission, the Provost

4. Encourages high academic standards.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

5. Demonstrates commitment to achievement of educational outcomes for students.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

6. Leads efforts to continuously improve academic programs.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

7. Encourages appropriate program accreditation.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

8. Demonstrates commitment to academic assessment.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

9. Provides resources for excellence in the quality of instruction.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

10. Effectively promotes use of high quality information technology.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

11. Strives to develop and maintain high quality distance education programs.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

12. Demonstrates expertise in developing strategic plans.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

13. Sets institutional goals and priorities.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

14. Directs development and implementation of appropriate policies.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

15. Promotes professional development of faculty and staff.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

The Provost...

16. Establishes positive relationships with faculty and academic staff.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

17. Works collaboratively with academic deans and other administrators.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

18. Works effectively with shared governance.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

19. Communicates effectively with various external constituencies.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

Judge

Disagree

Agree

20. Is accessible to students, faculty, and staff.

No Basis to 0
Judge

Strongly 0 0 0 0 0
Disagree

Strongly
Agree

21. Demonstrates commitment to recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty, staff, and student body.

No Basis to 0
Judge

Strongly 0 0 0 0 0
Disagree

Strongly
Agree

22. Demonstrates sound budgetary and fiscal management skills.

No Basis to 0
Judge

Strongly 0 0 0 0 0
Disagree

Strongly
Agree

23. Networks effectively with important support groups including alumni, foundation, and community partners.

No Basis to 0
Judge

Strongly 0 0 0 0 0
Disagree

Strongly
Agree

24. Exhibits effective presentation skills.

No Basis to 0
Judge

Strongly 0 0 0 0 0
Disagree

Strongly
Agree

Comments:

**University of Wisconsin-Platteville
Faculty/Staff Administrative Review of Chancellor for
Calendar Year 2014**

1. How many years have you been employed at UW-Platteville?

1-2 years	3-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16+ years
0	0	0	0	0

2. Which of the following best describes your status at the University?

Teaching Faculty	Teaching Academic Staff	Non-Teaching Faculty	Non-Teaching Academic Staff	Administrator (e.g., Asst. Dean)
0	0	0	0	0

3. Which of the following best describes the extent of your contact with the Chancellor during the past year?

Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Once per semester	No personal contact
0	0	0	0	0

Academic Excellence

The Chancellor effectively...

1. Demonstrates support for continuous improvement in the quality of instruction and educational outcomes for students

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

2. Fosters a collaborative student-centered campus community with respect for the open exchange of ideas

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

3. Demonstrates knowledge of current program needs, strengths, and growth opportunities

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

4. Fosters a welcoming, positive, inclusive university community

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

5. Demonstrates support for high quality distance education programs

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

6. Encourages international educational opportunities for students and faculty

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

Leadership & Vision

The Chancellor effectively...

7. Works with the shared governance process in planning and developing policies for the University of Wisconsin-Platteville.

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

8. Leads UW-Platteville in formulating and implementing strategic plans to accomplish its mission

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

9. Delegates work

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

10. Demonstrates commitment to recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty, staff, and student body

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

11. Fosters a campus climate that encourages teamwork

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

12. Fosters a campus climate that encourages innovation and the expression of new ideas

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

13. Markets the image of the University of Wisconsin-Platteville to the public

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

14. Advocates for UW-Platteville within the UW System

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

15. Advocates for UW-Platteville in the state and region

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

16. Responds to local community concerns affecting UW-Platteville

No Basis to 0 Strongly 0 0 0 0 0 Strongly
Judge Disagree Agree

17. Maintains accessibility to students, faculty, and staff

No Basis to 0 Strongly 0 0 0 0 0 Strongly
Judge Disagree Agree

18. Articulates and communicates the University’s vision

No Basis to 0 Strongly 0 0 0 0 0 Strongly
Judge Disagree Agree

Financial and Budgetary Management

The Chancellor effectively...

19. Seeks input from faculty and staff in setting budgetary priorities of UW-Platteville

No Basis to 0 Strongly 0 0 0 0 0 Strongly
Judge Disagree Agree

20. Leads fund-raising for UW-Platteville

No Basis to 0 Strongly 0 0 0 0 0 Strongly
Judge Disagree Agree

21. Supports those who seek external funding

No Basis to 0 Strongly 0 0 0 0 0 Strongly
Judge Disagree Agree

22. Secures sufficient resources, including positions, to achieve UW-Platteville’s mission

No Basis to 0 Strongly 0 0 0 0 0 Strongly
Judge Disagree Agree

23. Allocates resources, including positions, in an appropriate and equitable manner

No Basis to 0 Strongly 0 0 0 0 0 Strongly
Judge Disagree Agree

Communication

The Chancellor effectively...

24. Represents the administration at university events

No Basis to 0 Strongly 0 0 0 0 0 Strongly
Judge Disagree Agree

25. Sets expectations for the administrative leadership team

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

26. Considers the views of others on the administrative leadership team

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

27. Provides clear, understandable reasons for decisions

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

28. Explains reasons for decisions in a timely manner

No Basis to Judge	0	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

Comments:

Section 22

UW-Platteville

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REAPPOINTMENT OR TENURE
FROM THE DEAN TO THE VICE CHANCELLOR**

College: _____ Department: _____

Name: _____ Currently in 1 2 3 4 5 6 year of service at UW-P
(Circle one)

Criteria to be used in making decision (in this order): teaching effectiveness, scholarly and professional growth, service to the university, and community service in area of faculty member's expertise.

PEER EVALUATIONS

I. Teaching Effectiveness						II. Scholarly & Professional Activities					
Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing	Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing
1 st (20__)						1st					
2 nd F (20__)						2 nd F					
2 nd S (20__)						2 nd S					
3 rd (20__)						3rd					
4 th (20__)						4th					
5 th (20__)						5th					
6 th (20__)						6th					
III. University Service						IV. Community Service					
Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing	Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing
1st						1st					
2 nd F						2 nd F					
2 nd S						2 nd S					
3rd						3rd					
4th						4th					
5th						5th					
6th						6th					

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

V. Teaching Effectiveness					
Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing
1 st					
2 nd F					
2 nd S					
3 rd					
4 th					
5 th					
6 th					

For tenure recommendations only.

Years credited toward tenure when hired: _____

Number of current department teaching positions filled with:

Tenured Faculty: _____ Tenure Track Faculty: _____ Instructional Academic Staff: _____

- a) It is university policy that the proportion of tenured to nontenured faculty must be continuously examined and evaluated especially in any department or college with a tenure density in excess of 70 percent. Tenure should be recommended only in those cases where the candidate has received the appropriate terminal degree and is deemed to be an exceptional present and future asset to the department and university.
 - b) Tenure should be recommended only by a department that can demonstrate long-term programmatic need. Ordinarily tenure should not be recommended by a department characterized by a tenure density over 70 percent or by falling enrollments. Written justification to exceed these limits must accompany a recommendation from the department. (Attach justification should the 70 percent limit be exceeded.)
-

Was there a contractual agreement for the completion of a terminal degree or equivalent: Yes / No

If yes, has this contractual obligation been met? Yes / No

If no, please explain:

Signature of Dean

Date

Name: _____ Department: _____

Summary of Current Year's Recommendations for Appointment or Tenure (Tenure reviewed in 6th year at UWP)

	Yes	No	Comments
Department Chairperson			
DRB			
CRST			
Dean			

**UW-Platteville
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROMOTION
FROM THE DEAN TO THE VICE CHANCELLOR**

College: _____ Department: _____ Date: _____

Name: _____ Rank: _____

Recommended for Promotion to: Associate Professor or Professor

Highest Degree Earned: _____ and credits beyond: _____

Year hired at UWP: _____ Number of years teaching at UWP (including current year): _____

Number of years teaching at the college/University level elsewhere: _____

List other colleges/universities and years taught: _____

First academic year of current rank _____ Years in current rank at UWP _____

Criteria to be used in making decision (in this order): teaching effectiveness, scholarly and professional growth, service to the university, and community service in area of faculty member's expertise.

Peer Evaluations

I. Teaching Effectiveness						II. Scholarly & Professional Activities					
Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing	Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing

Student Evaluations

III. University Service						IV. Community Service					
Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing	Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing

V. Teaching Effectiveness					
Year	Low	Below Normal	Normal	Above Normal	Out-standing

Summary of Current Year's Recommendations for Promotion

	Yes	No	Comments
Department Chairperson			
DRB			
CRST			
Dean			

Was there a contractual agreement for the completion of a terminal degree or equivalent? Yes / No

If yes, has this contractual obligation been met? Yes / No

If no, please explain:

Signature of Dean

Date

Appendix

FACULTY BYLAWS, Part II, Article III, Section 6 Appeals Commission

For the purpose of this section, the Library faculty shall be considered a department.

a. Responsibilities

- i. Hears any faculty member's appeal of a decision not to renew a probationary member's appointment, or to deny tenure at the completion of the maximum probationary period, made by a department review body, the tenured members of a department or its functional equivalent, or a college RST committee, according to the appeal procedures set forth in the Faculty Bylaws, Part III, Article VII, Section 3, Formal Appeal Procedures.
- ii. Acts as an appeal body on the request of any faculty member against who the Chancellor has filed charges that may lead to dismissal. In such circumstances, the commission shall act as a hearing agent for the Board of Regents pursuant to Section 227.12 *Wis. Stat.*, and in accordance with all procedures set forth in UWS 4.
- iii. Acts as an appeal body on the request of any faculty laid off because of fiscal emergency, in accordance with all procedures set forth in UWS 5.

FACULTY BYLAWS, Part II, Article V, Section 3 College Rank, Salary, and Tenure Committees

a. Duties

- i. Review and act upon the appropriate DRB's evaluations and recommendations concerning each faculty member. It will require supporting information from the DRB and if the Department Chair's evaluation and/or recommendation differs from those of the DRB, it will consider both. In making its own judgments, the college RST committee will take into account the same criteria and standards incumbent upon the DRB (identified below in Article VI, Section 4, a).

If the college RST committee agrees with the DRB's recommendation having to do with rank it shall forward the recommendation to the Vice Chancellor. If the college RST disagrees with the DRB, it shall consult with the DRB with a view to reaching an accord, and if that effort fails, forward to the Vice Chancellor its own recommendation, the DRB's recommendation, and the department chair's separate recommendation.

Review and act upon tenure recommendations by the tenured members of the department or its functional equivalent. If the college RST agrees with the recommendation, it shall forward the recommendation to the Vice Chancellor. If the college RST disagrees with the recommendation of the tenured members, it shall forward to the Vice Chancellor its own recommendation, the tenured members' recommendation, and the department chair's separate recommendation.

If the college RST review concerns a DRB recommendation having to do with a merit award or inequity adjustment, the committee's judgment, made according to standards and guidelines set and monitored by the University RST Policy Commission, shall be final, subject only to the reconsideration procedures referred to in *v* below.

- ii. May initiate the consideration of any faculty member under its jurisdiction for a merit award or inequity adjustment, but the college committee may not make a merit award or inequity adjustment without the concurrence of the DRB.
- iii. Shall notify each faculty member in writing as soon as is practicable of all college RST committee judgments concerning that member and shall abide by the more detailed rules and procedures for notification in matters having to do with non-renewal, denial of tenure, and termination as set forth in Faculty Bylaws Part III, Article VIII, Section 2, Rights of Non-Renewed Probationary Faculty...
- iv. Shall notify the department review body when it (the college RST committee) makes a judgment and/or recommendation contrary to one made by the DRB.
- v. Shall reconsider any of its judgments and recommendations as is required if a faculty member invokes the privileges outlined in the Faculty Bylaws, Part III, Article VIII, Sections 1-3, Reconsideration Procedures.

FACULTY BYLAWS, Part II, Article VI, Section 4 Duties of Department Review Bodies

The department review bodies shall:

- a. Make periodic evaluation of all faculty under its jurisdiction, based on appropriate peer and student evaluation of professional performance. Such evaluations are to be elicited according to a plan adopted by the department;
 - in light of evaluation criteria established according to the provisions of section 1 of this article;
 - in light of Affirmative Action standards and other Equal Employment Opportunity policies;
 - in light of standards listed in the second paragraph of the Faculty Bylaws, Part III, Article VIII, Section 3, Formal Appeals Procedures; and
 - according to general procedures set by the University RST Policy Commission.
- b. Use the evaluations to make appropriate recommendations to the College RST Committee concerning individual rank, salary, merit award, inequity adjustment, or retention. The department review body shall also forward to the CRSTC the results of tenure votes made by the tenured members of the department or its functional equivalent as described in Part III, Article VI, Section 1. Individual numerical data and rankings for peer and student evaluations shall not be sent forward to the CRSTs.
- c. Make each recommendation known in writing to the faculty member evaluated prior to the time it is forwarded to the next higher review body and abide by the more detailed rules and procedures for notification in matters having to do with non-renewal, denial of tenure, and termination as set forth in the Faculty Bylaws, Part III, Article VIII, Section 2, Rights of Non-Renewed Probationary Faculty.
- d. Make the evaluation of each faculty member available to that member in such a way that he or she might be encouraged and helped to improve his or her professional performance.
- e. Reconsider any of its evaluations and recommendations as is required if a faculty member invokes the privileges outlined in the Faculty Bylaws, Part III, Article VIII, Sections 1-3, Reconsideration and Appeal Procedures.

FACULTY BYLAWS, Part III, Article IV, Section 2 Recommendations Concerning Renewal of Probationary Appointments

Department review bodies shall decide annually to renew or not renew the appointment of faculty members on probationary appointments. Beginning in the probationary faculty member's second year, if the faculty is recommended by the department review body for reappointment, the tenured faculty of the discipline shall review the file annually to discuss the person's prospects for tenure and prepare a written statement that will be placed in the individual's file. If the tenured faculty have any concerns regarding the probationary faculty member's prospects for tenure, they should be addressed in this written statement. A copy of this statement shall be given directly to the individual. In addition, in situations where the department's position allocation is reduced after the DRB has made an affirmative recommendation, the department shall have the opportunity to reconsider its earlier recommendation in light of the reduction. The decision to renew will be forwarded to the college RST committee for further consideration. The recommendation to renew a faculty member's probationary contract may contain a further recommendation that the renewal take the form of a terminal contract (provided that the contract period does not extend beyond the maximum probationary period). The decision not to renew will be made known to the affected faculty member in writing within twenty (20) days, and the faculty member shall be informed of the reconsideration and appeal procedures outlined in Faculty Bylaws, Part III, Article VIII.

FACULTY BYLAWS, Part III, Article VI, Section Recommendations Concerning the Granting of Tenure before Completion of the Maximum Period

- a. The granting of tenure before completion of the maximum probationary period (that is less than seven years, including any years granted toward tenure) may be recommended by a department only on the affirmative vote of at least four-fifths of the tenured members of the discipline as specified in Section 1. In disciplines with fewer than three tenured members, the granting of such tenure may be recommended only by a vote of at least four-fifths of the tenured members of the discipline and the tenured members of the department review body. In the event that there are fewer than three members in the probationary faculty member's discipline (as specified in Section 1) and the department review body, the granting of such tenure may be recommended only by a vote of at least four-fifths of the tenured members of the department.
- b. Abstention votes shall be counted in determining a quorum. Abstention votes and absences shall not be counted in determining a recommendation on tenure. All votes must be recorded.

FACULTY BYLAWS, Part III, Article VI, Section 3 Recommendations Concerning the Granting of Tenure at the Completion of the Maximum Period

- a. The granting of tenure to begin after the maximum probationary period may be recommended by a simple majority of the tenured members of the discipline as defined in Section 1. In disciplines with fewer than three tenured members, the granting of such tenure may be recommended by a simple majority of the tenured members of the discipline and the tenured members of the department review body. In the event that there are fewer than three tenured members in the probationary faculty member's discipline (as specified in Section 1) and the department review body, the granting of such tenure may be recommended by a simple majority of the tenured members of the department. Because of the notice periods required in UWS 3.09, all such recommendations must be made by the end of the sixth year of employment.

- b. Abstention votes shall be counted in determining a quorum. Abstention votes and absences shall not be counted in determining a recommendation on tenure. All votes must be recorded.

FACULTY BYLAWS, Part III, Article VIII, Section 1 Rights of Faculty Aggrieved by an Adverse Decision Concerning Rank, Salary, or Tenure before the Completion of the Maximum Probationary Period.

- a. A faculty member aggrieved by an adverse decision concerning rank or salary shall be entitled upon his or her request to a reconsideration by the review body (department review body, or college RST committee) making the initial adverse decision. The reconsideration shall be scheduled at the earliest practicable time. Such a faculty member shall also be entitled (a) to a postponement of any review action scheduled at a higher level until the reconsideration at the lower level has taken place, and (b) to prompt notice of the results of any reconsideration. If the reconsideration results in the review body reaffirming any adverse decision concerning salary, it shall abide by the provisions set forth in Part II, Article V, Section 3. If the reconsideration results in the review body reaffirming an adverse decision concerning rank, the faculty member may then plead only to the CRST Committee, where both the faculty member and the review body will be heard. He or she shall again be entitled to a prompt notice of the results of that plea and appropriate postponement of the next higher review.

A faculty member aggrieved by an adverse decision concerning rank or salary is not entitled to the formal appeals procedure of the Appeals Commission outlined in Section 3 of this article. The Chancellor is the court of last appeal.

- b. A faculty member aggrieved by an adverse decision concerning tenure before the completion of the maximum probationary period shall be entitled upon his or her request to a reconsideration by the review body (tenured members of the department or its functional equivalent, or college RST Committee) making the initial adverse decision. The reconsideration shall be scheduled at the earliest practicable time. Such a faculty member shall also be entitled (a) to a postponement of any review action scheduled at a higher level until the reconsideration at the lower level has taken place, and (b) to prompt notice of the results of any reconsideration. A faculty member aggrieved by an adverse decision concerning tenure before the completion of the maximum probationary period is not entitled to the formal appeals procedure of the Appeals Commission outlined in Section 3 of this article. The Chancellor is the court of last appeal.