

University of Wisconsin-Platteville

Faculty Handbook

Chapter 6 Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures

Chapter Contents

6.1 Wisconsin State Policies	1
6.1.1 Wisconsin Administrative Code (UWS).....	1
6.1.2 Wisconsin Open Meetings Law.....	1
6.1.2.1 19.83 and 19.85 Wis. Stats.	1
6.1.2.2 General Information.....	2
6.1.2.3 Checklist—Protocol for Meeting in Closed Session.....	5
6.2 Definitions: Faculty and Academic Staff.....	7
6.2.1 Faculty and Academic Staff Definitions and Titles	7
6.2.2 Voting Privileges in Departmental Affairs	8
6.3 Faculty Personnel Rules.....	9
6.3.1 Recruitment and Initial Appointment.....	9
6.3.1.1 Eligibility to Participate in the Recruitment Process.....	9
6.3.1.2 Position Description and Vacancy Announcements	9
6.3.1.3 Department Search and Screen Committee	10
6.3.1.4 Guidelines for Conducting a Search	10
6.3.1.5 Reimbursement for Interview Expenses.....	10
6.3.1.6 Role of the Dean and Provost in the Recruitment Process.....	11
6.3.1.7 Offering an Initial Contract.....	11
6.3.1.8 Types of Appointment and Length of Probationary Period	12
6.3.2 Period of Employment and Related Policies.....	13
6.3.2.1 Period of Employment.....	13
6.3.2.2 Full-time Teaching Load	13
6.3.2.3 Policy on Split Appointments	13
6.3.2.4 Leaves of Absence.....	14
6.3.2.5 Suspension of Tenure Clock.....	14
6.3.2.6 Faculty Sabbatical Program	15
Section 1 Introduction.....	15
Section 2 Types of Sabbaticals	15
Section 3 Eligibility	15
Section 4 Policy Statements.....	16
6.3.3 Department Chairs	19
6.3.3.1 Selection of a Department Chair.....	19
6.3.3.2 Removal of a Department Chair	19
6.3.3.3 Designation of Department Chairs.....	19

6.3.4 Review Bodies.....	21
6.3.4.1 Introduction.....	21
6.3.4.2 General Functions of Review Bodies	21
6.3.4.3 Voting Procedures for Review Bodies	22
6.3.4.4 Department Salary and Promotion Committees (DSPC).....	23
Section 1 Establishment of Criteria for Evaluation	23
Section 2 Establishment of Department Salary and Promotion Committees.....	23
Section 3 Voting Eligibility	24
Section 4 General Duties of Department Salary and Promotion Committees	24
Section 5 Authority of Representative Department Salary and Promotion Committees	25
6.3.4.5 Renewal and Tenure Review Body (RTRB).....	25
Section 1 Establishment of Criteria for Evaluation	25
Section 2 Establishment of Renewal and Tenure Review Body	26
Section 3 Voting Eligibility	27
Section 4 General Duties of the Department Renewal and Tenure Review Body	27
6.3.4.6 College Compensation Committees (CCC).....	28
Section 1 Establishment of Criteria for Evaluation	28
Section 2 Membership and Chair of College Compensation Committees.....	28
Section 3 Voting Eligibility on College Compensation Committees	29
Section 4 General Duties of College Compensation Committees	29
6.3.4.7 University Promotion Committee (UPC).....	29
Section 1 Membership and Chair of the University Promotion Committee	29
Section 2 General Duties of the University Promotion Committee.....	30
6.3.4.8 University Rank, Salary, and Tenure Policy Commission (URSTPC).....	30
Section 1 Membership and Chair of University Rank, Salary, and Tenure Policy Commission.....	30
Section 2 General Duties of the University Rank, Salary, and Tenure Policy Commission	30
6.3.5 Review of Performance.....	32
6.3.5.1 Reaffirmation of Affirmative Action Goals.....	32
6.3.5.2 UW-System Policies.....	32
6.3.5.3 Periodic Review of Faculty [UWS 3.05]	32
Section 1 Probationary Faculty.....	32
Section 2 Tenured Faculty	32
Section 3 Department Chairs	33
6.3.5.4 Criteria for Review	33
Section 1 Evaluation Criteria	33
Section 2 Peer and Student Evaluations.....	34
6.3.5.5 Review Files	36
Section 1 General Guidelines.....	36
Section 2 Format for the RST Files.....	37
Section 3 Classification of Materials.....	40
6.3.5.6 Procedures for Review	44
Section 1 The Departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan and Procedures.....	44
Section 2 The Review Process	45
6.3.5.7 Responsibilities of Individuals and Review Bodies.....	46
Section 1 Faculty Members.....	46
Section 2 Department Salary and Promotion Committee Members and Chair	47
Section 3 Renewal and Tenure Review Body Members and Chair.....	49

Section 4 Department Chair	51
Section 5 College Compensation Committee Members and Chair	51
Section 6 University Promotion Committee Members and Chair	53
Section 7 University Rank, Salary, Tenure Policy Commission Members and Chair	54
Section 8 Deans.....	55
Section 9 Provost	55
Section 10 Chancellor	56
6.3.6 Renewal of Probationary and Other Appointments	57
6.3.6.1 General Information	57
Section 1 UWS 3.01, 3.04, 3.06, 3.07, 3.08, 3.09, and 3.10	57
Section 2 Renewal/Tenure Decisions (decision vs. recommendation).....	60
6.3.6.2 Composition of the Renewal and Tenure Review Body	61
6.3.6.3 Voting Eligibility	61
6.3.6.4 Criteria for Evaluation.....	61
6.3.6.5 Notification	62
6.3.6.6 Meeting for Discussion Prior to Vote.....	62
6.3.6.7 Voting Procedures.....	63
6.3.6.8 Counting of Votes	63
6.3.6.9 Reporting of Decision	63
6.3.6.10 Role and Authority of Chancellor	64
6.3.6.11 Recommendation Concerning Renewal of Department Chairs	64
6.3.6.12 Recommendations Concerning Renewal of Academic Administrators.....	64
6.3.6.13 Reconsideration and Appeals	64
6.3.7 Granting of Tenure	65
6.3.7.1 General Information	65
Section 1 UWS 3.01, 3.04, 3.06, 3.07, 3.08, 3.09, and 3.10	65
Section 2 Renewal/Tenure Decisions (decision vs. recommendation)	68
Section 3 Policy on Tenure Density.....	69
6.3.7.2 Composition of the Renewal and Tenure Review Body	70
6.3.7.3 Voting Eligibility	70
6.3.7.4 Criteria for Evaluation.....	70
6.3.7.5 Notification	71
6.3.7.6 Meeting for Discussion Prior to Vote.....	71
6.3.7.7 Voting Procedures.....	71
6.3.7.8 Counting of Votes	71
6.3.7.9 Reporting of Decision	72
6.3.7.10 Role and Authority of Chancellor	72
6.3.7.11 Tenure and Promotion in Rank	72
6.3.7.12 Early Tenure.....	73
6.3.7.13 Tenure upon Appointment	73
6.3.7.14 Circumstances That May Delay Tenure Decision.....	74
6.3.7.15 Tenure of Administrators	75
6.3.7.16 Reconsideration and Appeals.....	75
6.3.8 Promotion in Rank	76
6.3.8.1 General Information	76
6.3.8.2 Composition of the Department Salary and Promotion Committee and the University Promotion Committee	76
6.3.8.3 Voting Eligibility	76

6.3.8.4	Criteria for Evaluation/Minimum Degree and Experience Requirements.....	76
6.3.8.5	Notification	78
6.3.8.6	Review Process	78
6.3.8.7	Voting Procedures.....	79
6.3.8.8	Counting of Votes	80
6.3.8.9	Reporting of Recommendation	80
6.3.8.10	Role and Authority of Chancellor	81
6.3.8.11	Tenure and Promotion in Rank	81
6.3.8.12	Recommendations Concerning the Promotion of Department Chairs, Deans, and Other Administrative Faculty	81
6.3.8.13	Reconsideration of a Negative Recommendation	81
6.3.9	Recommendations Concerning Merit Awards and Inequity Adjustments	83
6.3.9.1	General Information	83
6.3.9.2	Composition of the Department Salary and Promotion Committee and the College Compensation Committee	83
6.3.9.3	Voting Eligibility	83
6.3.9.4	Criteria for Evaluation.....	83
6.3.9.5	Notification	83
6.3.9.6	Salary Recommendations.....	84
6.3.9.7	Voting Procedures.....	84
6.3.9.8	Counting of Votes	85
6.3.9.9	Reporting of Recommendation	85
6.3.9.10	Role and Authority of Chancellor	85
6.3.9.11	Salary Recommendations Concerning Department Chairs	85
6.3.9.12	Salary Reconsiderations	85
6.3.9.13	Inequity Defined and a Statement of the High Priority to Be Given to Inequity Adjustments	86
6.3.10	Post-tenure Review.....	88
6.3.10.1	Review Cycle	88
6.3.10.2	Review Process.....	88
6.3.11	Emeritus Status.....	89
6.3.11.1	Qualifications	89
6.3.11.2	Recommendation Process.....	89
6.3.11.3	Privileges Afforded to Emeriti Faculty.....	89
6.3.12	Nonrenewal of Probationary Appointments/ Denial of Tenure	90
6.3.12.1	General Information.....	90
	Section 1 UWS 3.07, 3.08, 3.09, and 3.10	90
	Section 2 Renewal/Tenure Decisions (decision vs. recommendation)	92
6.3.12.2	Reconsideration of Nonrenewals or Denials of Tenure.....	92
	Section 1 Overview of Process	92
	Section 2 Reconsideration Proceedings.....	93
6.3.12.3	Appeals of Nonrenewals or Denials of Tenure.....	95
	Section 1 Applicable Documents.....	95
	Section 2 Counsel	95
	Section 3 Burden of Proof and Scope of Appeals	95

Section 4 Time Limits	96
Section 5 Presence at Meetings	96
Section 6 Rules and Procedures.....	97
Section 7 Appeal Proceedings	100
6.3.13 Dismissals.....	107
6.3.14 Faculty Terminated Because of Fiscal Emergency	108
6.3.15 Retirements.....	109
6.3.16 Complaints and Grievances	110
6.3.16.1 General Information.....	110
6.3.16.2 Complaints	110
6.3.16.3 Grievances.....	110
6.3.16.4 Reporting Procedures.....	111
6.4 Calendars	
6.3.16.5 Current Academic Year Calendar	
6.3.16.6 Official Holidays	
6.3.16.7 RST Calendars	
6.5 Evaluation of Administrators	
6.6 Forms	

University of Wisconsin-Platteville

Faculty Handbook

Chapter 6 Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures

6.1 Wisconsin State Policies

6.1.1 Wisconsin Administrative Code (UWS)

The Wisconsin Administrative Code is a collection of state agency rules developed by the policy-making body of each State of Wisconsin agency under authority provided in the Wisconsin Statutes. The section of the Wisconsin Administrative Code pertaining to the University of Wisconsin System is officially entitled *Rules of Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System* (abbreviated UWS). The following chapters of UWS relate directly to faculty and academic staff:

UWS 1-6	<i>Personnel Rules for Faculty</i>
UWS 8	<i>Faculty/Academic Staff Code of Ethics</i>
UWS 9-13	<i>Academic Staff Rules</i>
UWS 19	<i>Sick Leave</i>

6.1.2 Wisconsin Open Meetings Law

6.1.2.1 19.83 and 19.85 Wis. Stats.

19.83 Wis. Stats.

19.83 Meetings of governmental bodies.

(1) *Every meeting of a governmental body shall be preceded by public notice as provided in s. 19.84, and shall be held in open session. At any meeting of a governmental body, all discussion shall be held and all action of any kind, formal or informal, shall be initiated, deliberated upon and acted upon only in open session except as provided in s. 19.85.*

(2) *During a period of public comment under s. 19.84 (2), a governmental body may discuss any matter raised by the public.*

19.85 Wis. Stats. (excerpts)

19.85 Exemptions.

(1) *Any meeting of a governmental body, upon motion duly made and carried, may be convened in closed session under one or more of the exemptions provided in this section. The motion shall be carried by a majority vote in such manner that the vote of each member is ascertained and recorded in the minutes. No motion to convene in closed session may be adopted unless the chief presiding officer announces to those present at the meeting at which such motion*

is made, the nature of the business to be considered at such closed session, and the specific exemption or exemptions under this subsection by which such closed session is claimed to be authorized. Such announcement shall become part of the record of the meeting. No business may be taken up at any closed session except that which relates to matters contained in the chief presiding officer's announcement of the closed session. A closed session may be held for any of the following purposes:

(a) Deliberating concerning a case which was the subject of any judicial or quasi-judicial trial or hearing before that governmental body.

(b) Considering dismissal, demotion, licensing or discipline of any public employee or person licensed by a board or commission or the investigation of charges against such person, or considering the grant or denial of tenure for a university faculty member, and the taking of formal action on any such matter; provided that the faculty member or other public employee or person licensed is given actual notice of any evidentiary hearing which may be held prior to final action being taken and of any meeting at which final action may be taken. The notice shall contain a statement that the person has the right to demand that the evidentiary hearing or meeting be held in open session. This paragraph and par. (f) do not apply to any such evidentiary hearing or meeting where the employee or person licensed requests that an open session be held.

(c) Considering employment, promotion, compensation or performance evaluation data of any public employee over which the governmental body has jurisdiction or exercises responsibility.

(f) Considering financial, medical, social or personal histories or disciplinary data of specific persons, preliminary consideration of specific personnel problems or the investigation of charges against specific persons except where par. (b) applies which, if discussed in public, would be likely to have a substantial adverse effect upon the reputation of any person referred to in such histories or data, or involved in such problems or investigations.

(2) No governmental body may commence a meeting, subsequently convene in closed session and thereafter reconvene again in open session within 12 hours after completion of the closed session, unless public notice of such subsequent open session was given at the same time and in the same manner as the public notice of the meeting convened prior to the closed session.

(See <http://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/19/V/81> for the full text of State Statute 19.81 et seq.)

6.1.2.2 General Information

As a public agency, the University of Wisconsin-Platteville is subject to the state's open meetings law (19.81 et seq., Wis. Stats.). This law requires advance notice of meetings of the governance organizations and certain university committees; the law also restricts and limits the circumstances under which these "governmental bodies" may meet in closed session. The law is based on the policy that the public right to attend and observe meetings must be respected, consistent with the conduct of governmental business. In order for a committee to lawfully meet in closed session, all of the following conditions must be satisfied:

- the committee must provide legally-sufficient public notice of the meeting;

- the meeting notice must identify the specific subject matter of the anticipated closed session;
- the meeting notice must also specifically identify the statutory basis that authorizes meeting in closed session;
- the meeting must start in open session and then properly reconvene in closed session; and
- the motion to meet in closed session (and the vote on that motion) must be recorded in the official minutes of the meeting.

A closed meeting, therefore, can be held only by specific action of the committee. Candidates for **tenure** do have the option of requesting that the committee conduct the evidentiary portion of its hearing and any meeting at which final action may be taken in open session. This means that for tenure-year decisions, a closed session may not be held over the objection of the faculty member whose credentials are under review at that meeting. To ensure compliance with the strict and nondiscretionary requirements of this law, the committee chair should make note of the following procedures:

- (a) Committee chairs must publish or post a public notice of meetings at least 24 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting.
- (b) Meeting notices should be published on campus and posted on appropriate bulletin boards. Academic departments (and subunits of departments) are exempt from the notification requirements, but the meeting notice must be "reasonably likely to apprise interested persons, and news media who have filed written requests for such notice." (19.84 Wis. Stats.)
- (c) Review bodies at UW-Platteville will always convene in open session, but the meeting may be closed by majority vote for consideration of renewal, tenure, promotion, or salary. The grounds for closing a meeting are limited, as set forth in 19.85 (1), 18 Wis. Stats. The statutes also establish a mandatory protocol for closing the meeting. When notices of meetings are posted announcing a meeting for actions on renewal, tenure, promotion, or salary, they should also include the statement that it is contemplated that the body will meet in closed session (this statement must also identify the subject matter and the statutory basis of this closed session). In the event a candidate for **tenure** has requested an **open** meeting for the portion of the meeting that constitutes an evidentiary hearing or final action on consideration of tenure for that individual, this should also be indicated in the notice of meeting.
- (d) In the event that a review body action involves a **tenure decision**, the chairperson of the committee must inform the candidate in writing of the time and location the meeting will take place. The notice shall include the statement that the individual has the right to request and receive an open meeting for the portion of the meeting that constitutes an evidentiary hearing or final action on consideration of tenure for that

individual. If the review body will be meeting to consider candidates for renewal (non-tenure-year) **and** candidates for tenure who have requested an open meeting, the agenda must include appropriate notice as to the open and closed sessions of the meeting, and it is recommended that the open session portion of the meeting be held before convening in closed session.

- (e) At the meeting, the committee chair should say, "I will now entertain a motion to reconvene in closed session to review credentials and to consider the formation of a recommendation on (renewal/tenure/promotion/salary)." When a chair entertains this motion to reconvene in closed session, the chair should specifically cite the appropriate sections of the *Wisconsin Statutes* that authorize this closed meeting (see section 19.85 Wis. Stats. above). The meeting minutes must record the motion as offered and seconded to convene in a closed session. Further, this motion "...shall be carried by majority vote in a manner that the vote of each member is ascertained and recorded in the minutes" (section 19.85 Wis. Stats.). In the event the motion fails, the meeting must be conducted in open session. If the motion passes, the meeting will then be closed, with only members of the committee or individuals invited by the committee being eligible to attend.
- (f) According to the procedures established on the UW-Platteville campus, **voting** must be done in open session if so requested by any faculty member under consideration for tenure. The vote may be conducted at a meeting held at least 24 hours after the meeting in closed session, or the committee may follow the procedures outlined in section "k" below. In all other cases, voting may be done in closed session, but the vote must be recorded and the results communicated to the faculty member under review.
- (g) **Secret ballots may not be cast.** At UW-Platteville, all votes pertaining to actions of review bodies will be conducted by a show of hands; or signed ballots that will be saved and attached to the minutes (forwarded to the provost's office in the case of a tenure decision); or each person's vote can be recorded in the minutes; or a roll call vote, if requested by at least one member, with each person's vote recorded in the minutes. Departmental plans must specify which method(s) of voting will be used.
- (h) To be considered a positive recommendation (i.e., supportive of renewal, tenure **at** the completion of the maximum probationary period, promotion, or salary) according to the RST guidelines at UW-Platteville, a simple majority of the votes cast must exist (more votes "for" than votes "against"). A personnel action that does not have a simple majority of the votes cast (either a tie or more votes "against" than votes "for") is considered a negative recommendation (i.e., against renewal, tenure **at** the completion of the maximum probationary period, promotion, or salary). **NOTE:** The granting of tenure **before** the completion of the maximum probationary period (that is, less than seven years, including any years granted toward tenure) may be recommended by the appropriate RTRB only on the affirmative vote of at least **four-fifths** of the membership of the RTRB.

- (i) According to the RST guidelines at UW-Platteville, abstentions from voting shall not be counted in determining a simple majority. The right to vote is limited to the members of the review body who are present in person or via synchronous discussion at the time the vote is taken at a legal meeting. [**Exception:** Members unavoidably absent from the meeting because of illness or emergency may vote by absentee ballot submitted to the chair prior to the meeting; members voting by absentee ballot must have reviewed the file prior to submitting the ballot.] There shall be no voting by proxy.

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.

- (j) Although e-mail can provide valuable assistance to help units and committees prepare for its business meetings, care must be taken not to use electronic distribution as a substitute for in-person discussion and action. **Asynchronous meetings and discussion (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes.**
- (k) In general, you may not close a meeting and immediately reconvene again in open session. In these instances, section 19.85 (2) applies: "No governmental body may commence a meeting, subsequently convene in closed session and thereafter reconvene again in open session within 12 hours after completion of the closed session, unless public notice of such subsequent open session was given at the same time and in the same manner as the public notice of the meeting convened prior to the closed session."
- (l) In cases where a decision is made by an individual such as a chairperson, dean, etc., the Open Meetings Law does not apply, since an individual does not constitute a "governmental body."

6.1.2.3 Checklist -- Protocol for Meeting in Closed Session

- The meeting notice must include notice of contemplated closed session (and identify the subject matter of that closed session) and, when necessary, a subsequent open session.
- A motion must be made in open session to convene in closed session.
- The presiding officer must announce:
 - the nature of the business to be considered in closed session and
 - the specific exemption(s) claimed to authorize meeting in closed session.
- The announcement of the presiding officer (above) must become a part of the record of the meeting.
- The motion must carry by majority vote and the vote of each member must be ascertained and recorded in the minutes.

- The only business which may be taken up in closed session is that which related to matters contained in the presiding officer's announcement.

6.2 Definitions and Voting in Departmental Affairs

6.2.1 Faculty and Academic Staff Definitions and Titles

UWS 1.01 Academic Staff

"Academic Staff" means professional and administrative personnel, other than faculty and classified staff, with duties and types of appointments that are primarily associated with higher education institutions or their administration.

UWS 1.04 Faculty

"Faculty" means persons who hold the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor in an academic department or its functional equivalent in an institution. The appointment of a member of the academic staff may be converted to a faculty appointment in accordance with UWS 3.01 (1)(c).

UWS 1.05 Faculty Status

By action of the appropriate faculty body and Chancellor of an institution, members of the academic staff may be designated as having "faculty status." Faculty status means a right to participate in faculty governance of an institution in accordance with the rules of the institution. Faculty status does not confer rank or tenure or convert an academic staff appointment into a faculty appointment.

Emeritus Titles

Emeritus faculty and academic staff titles are conferred by the chancellor of an institution according to criteria established by the institutional faculty and academic staff.

Visiting Faculty

The title "visiting professor" (associate, assistant, or instructor) is used for individuals who come from outside the UW System to an institution for temporary academic assignments. Normally such assignments do not last longer than one year. Use of these titles is primarily intended for faculty from other educational institutions (as opposed to visitors from, for example, government or industry). Normally, the title given should reflect the comparable rank at the individual's home institution.

Educational Preparation Code

The following educational preparation code was originally established by Res. #3650 and Res. #3668 of the Board of Regents of the former Wisconsin State Universities.

Code 1: Any of the following three categories qualify for this rating:

- Ph.D.
- Ed.D.
- Earned doctor's degrees equivalent to the Ph.D. and Ed.D. requiring the minimum equivalent of three full years of graduate study beyond the baccalaureate.

Code 2: Earned degrees requiring a minimum of three full years beyond the baccalaureate degree. All requirements for the doctorate met with the exception of the completion of the dissertation.

Code 3: A master's degree plus one full year of graduate study as measured by the institution where graduate work is applicable in a degree program. A specialist degree or its equivalent. Two-year Master's degree.

Code 4: Master's degree.

Code 5: Bachelor's degree.

Code 6: No bachelor's degree.

6.2.2 Voting Privileges in Departmental Affairs

Departments: Participation in voting concerned with departmental affairs (excluding personal decisions) may be extended to department members with academic staff appointments. Participation in voting concerned with departmental affairs (including personal decisions) may be limited or denied to faculty with academic appointments that are 50% or less within the department. Those decisions will be made by vote of the full time faculty within the department.

Colleges: Full participation in all voting concerned with college affairs may, by vote of all department members (as defined above) of departments assigned to that college, be limited or denied to those assigned 50% or less of an academic year appointment to a college department.

University: Article II, Section 1 of the Faculty Constitution is here taken to mean that full participation in all voting concerned with university-wide affairs is open to all faculty, regardless of status.

6.3 Faculty Personnel Rules

6.3.1 Recruitment and Initial Appointment

6.3.1.1 Eligibility to Participate in the Recruitment Process

All department members are eligible to take part in the recruitment and initial appointment process described in this section, except

- the incumbent in the position to be filled if declared ineligible by vote of the department, and
- candidates for the position who are already department members.

Individual departments may decide by departmental vote to further limit eligibility to members of the discipline or program in which the appointment will be made.

If the vacancy is that of a department chair, the voting members of the department shall elect one of its eligible members to act as department chair in all matters relating to recruitment and initial appointment.

6.3.1.2 Position Description and Vacancy Announcements

By majority vote of the full department membership (defined in section 6.3.1.1) or by majority vote of members of the discipline or program if so determined by the department, a statement shall be adopted specifying

- the responsibilities to be assigned,
- the corresponding competencies required in the person filling the vacancy, and
- what type of contract is desired.

The vote may reaffirm a previous statement of such responsibilities and competencies.

The college dean and the department chair, in consultation with the chancellor, the provost, and the department, will then determine whether the appointment will be a regular academic year (or twelve-month) contract or an academic staff contract.

After the type of contract has been determined, the department chair and/or the chair of the search and screen committee will invite appropriate faculty and appropriate students to recommend candidates and ensure that the position is advertised widely in suitable media. That notice must include a statement of the university's commitment to Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity recruitment policies and a statement indicating whether the appointment is to be filled by someone holding a regular academic year (or twelve-month) contract or an academic staff contract.

The department will keep in mind that where layoffs have occurred because of fiscal emergency, no person may be employed at the institution within three years to perform reasonably comparable duties to those of a faculty member laid off, without first offering reappointment to the laid-off faculty member without loss of tenure, seniority, or other rights.

6.3.1.3 Department Search and Screen Committee

Department search and screen committees must include a minimum of three faculty members from the department, subject to the exclusions outlined in section 6.3.1.1. A department may also vote to constitute itself as a search and screen committee.

If fewer than three faculty members from the department are available to take an active part in the search and screen process, the dean shall, after consultation with all the remaining department members, appoint additional faculty to the search and screen committee to make a committee of at least three. The additional faculty member(s) so appointed shall be members of a department or departments whose academic discipline is as nearly related as possible to the discipline of the department with the vacancy.

The final committee membership must be such that all required fields on the Position Search Form 2—Recruitment Plan are completed.

The college dean may, at his or her discretion, serve with the committee as consultant. Alternatively, the college dean may appoint the college assistant dean or associate dean to serve as his/her designee. Appropriate faculty and students will be invited to offer their evaluation of the candidates. The final selection is made by a majority vote of the search and screen committee on an affirmative motion.

6.3.1.4 Guidelines for Conducting a Search

Contact the Human Resources Office (2300 Ullsvik/ 608-342-1176) or consult the website (<http://www.uwplatt.edu/pers/index.html>) for information and forms pertaining to the search process.

6.3.1.5 Reimbursement for Interview Expenses

Prior to the interview, the Request for Authorization to Reimburse Applicant for Interview Expenses for Employees in Unclassified Service form must be completed and signed by the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services.

The candidate should be given a travel log to keep track of travel expenses along with a pocket travel guide. The pocket travel guide explains what travel expenses can be reimbursed; a supply of travel guides can be requested from the travel office. The log and the pocket guide should be sent to the candidate prior to the interview or given to the candidate at the interview.

On occasion the interview candidate is taken to lunch/dinner by a member of the search and screen committee (host). University policy allows reimbursement of a meal for the candidate

and **one host**, within the meal maximums allowed in the Travel Regulations. **Any additional attendees must either pay for their own meals or request reimbursement from Foundation funds.**

Once the interview is over, the interview candidate must sign the travel log, attach original receipts (not copies), and forward all materials to the department so a Web TER can be completed. The Web TER requires the traveler's signature, which may be provided by attaching the travel log. The Web TER lists all required documentation at the bottom. A copy of the Authorization to Interview must also be attached. When the Web TER is generated and all required documentation is attached, the supervisor signs it and forwards the Web TER and attachments to the travel office for reimbursement.

If it is necessary for an interview candidate to rent a car, a justification from the chairperson of the search and screen committee must be submitted with the Web TER; any personal travel cannot be reimbursed. The traveler may get state rates from the UW-Platteville contract vendors—Enterprise (Wisconsin) and National (out-of-state travel) – because they extend these rates to non-employees doing business with the university. However, the reservations for car rental must be made by a UW-Platteville employee, using the applicable booking codes. These rental charges should **not** be billed to the university but should be directly billed and paid by the non-employee.

6.3.1.6 Role of the Dean and Provost in the Recruitment Process

It is the responsibility of the search and screen committee chair to ensure that the appropriate paperwork is completed and forwarded to the dean for his or her approval. If the dean approves the candidate selected as the finalist for the position, he or she will sign the appropriate form and forward it to the provost. If the provost concurs with the dean's recommendation, the process moves forward with an offer to the candidate (see section 6.3.1.7).

If the dean does not approve the candidate selected as the finalist for the position, he or she will ask the department chair to convene a meeting of all department members (or members of the discipline or program if eligibility has been restricted as per section 6.3.1.1) in order to discuss the matter together. If, after the consultation, the dean's adverse judgment remains unchanged, the department will retrace the appropriate steps in sections 6.3.1.2 and 6.3.1.3 above and offer another recommendation.

If the provost does not find the dean's recommendation acceptable, the dean and the provost will meet to discuss the matter together. If the provost's adverse judgment remains unchanged, the department will retrace the appropriate steps in sections 6.3.1.2 and 6.3.1.3 above and offer the dean another recommendation.

6.3.1.7 Offering an Initial Contract

When the provost accepts the dean's recommendation, the department chair and the dean, in consultation with the provost, together negotiate the terms and conditions of the appointment, including duration of the appointment, salary, rank, starting date, ending date, general position

responsibilities, probation, tenure status, and any credit that will be given for prior service, including any years toward tenure. **NOTE:** Probationary faculty hired at mid-year will be evaluated (first review) with first-year probationary faculty hired in the fall semester of the next academic year.

If the candidate offers a verbal acceptance of an appointment on these terms, the provost, as the chancellor's designee, sends the following to the candidate:

- a letter of appointment that includes the terms as specified above,
- a copy of the department's profile of duties to be performed,
- an explanation of institutional and system rules and procedures relating to faculty appointments, and
- a form for the appointee to sign indicating formal acceptance of the appointment.

If the appointment is subject to advance approval by the Board of Regents, a statement to this effect must be included in the letter (UWS 3.03).

6.3.1.8 Types of Appointment and Length of Probationary Period

Faculty appointments may be for the academic year or twelve months and must be probationary or tenured.

The maximum probationary period shall be seven years as provided in UWS 3.04, and the maximum for a part-time position of at least half-time shall be ten years. No one holding less than a half-time appointment is eligible for tenure. A leave of absence, sabbatical leave, or a teacher improvement assignment does not constitute a break in continuous service and shall not be included in the probationary period (see section 6.3.2.4). Any shortening of the probationary period or counting of prior service must be based upon the recommendation of the department or its functional equivalent and approved by the chancellor or his or her designee.

Acting upon the recommendation of the department or its functional equivalent, the chancellor may grant prior service credit to the candidate for the purpose of reducing the maximum probationary period. Such creditable service must be (a) subsequent to completion of the terminal degree and (b) in positions that have expectations for productivity in the areas of research and creative activity and public and professional service, as well as teaching. Credit for prior service must be negotiated at the time of the initial appointment and included in the contract offered to the candidate.

6.3.2 Period of Employment and Related Policies

6.3.2.1 Period of Employment

Most members of the instructional staff are engaged on an academic year appointment, which extends for the nine-month academic year (39 weeks, including days of registration, final examinations, and commencement) specified in the UW-Platteville calendar as approved by the Board of Regents. [Consult the Registrar's Office web site for the current academic calendar (<http://www.uwplatt.edu/registrar/calendars.html>).]

The instructional staff may be employed as needed for the summer session. An additional two-ninths of the academic year salary is paid for a full-time summer appointment. Summer employment cannot be guaranteed because it is contingent upon enrollment, departmental needs, and the individual's preparation for available assignments. Preference is given to regular faculty members for summer session teaching before seeking off-campus candidates.

The instructional staff may also be employed as needed for the winter session and are paid according to policies set by the provost. Employment is contingent upon enrollment, departmental needs, the individual's preparation for available assignments, and his or her willingness to teach an 11-day course immediately preceding the beginning of the spring semester.

6.3.2.2 Full-time Teaching Load

A full-time semester teaching load is generally twelve credits or the equivalent. Faculty workload is initially determined by the department chair in consultation with the individual faculty member. A recommendation is submitted to the college dean who reviews the workloads of all faculty in the college. The provost is ultimately accountable for the determination of faculty workload.

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 workloads that include fewer than twelve credits of teaching (see also 6.3.2.3).

6.3.2.3 Policy on Split Appointments

If a faculty member 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 renewal and tenure review body (RTRB) chair and the department salary and promotion committee (DSPC) chair to obtain written 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.

The evaluation form of a faculty member to be reviewed and recommended by two or more such units will be marked so as to receive proper attention by the appropriate review body or bodies.

The purpose of this special procedure is to ensure fair consideration of a faculty member's work in more than one department, program, or unit.

Faculty 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 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. Performance reviews for faculty who are on limited appointments that do not include teaching assignments shall be based upon the major evaluation categories of job performance, professional/scholarly/creative activity, and university and public service activities as weighted by agreement between the faculty member, the department, and, when appropriate, the college dean.

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, all review bodies 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.

6.3.2.4 Leaves of Absence

Per UWS 3.04, a leave of absence, sabbatical leave, or a teacher improvement assignment does not constitute a break in continuous service and shall not be included in the probationary period. Responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption, significant responsibilities with respect to elder or dependent care obligations, disability or chronic illness, or circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member shall not constitute breaks in continuous service, nor shall they be included in the probationary period when those circumstances significantly impede the faculty member's progress toward achieving tenure. It shall be presumed that a request made because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption shall be approved.

6.3.2.5 Suspension of Tenure Clock

Requests to "suspend the tenure clock" may not be initiated once the tenure file has been submitted for review. A request to "suspend the clock" for any of the reasons listed in section 6.3.2.4 must be made in writing to the department chair. The approved request must be forwarded along with the approval recommendation in turn to the dean, provost, and chancellor (see section [6.3.7.14](#) for a detailed description of the approval process). The chancellor, in consultation with the department chair, dean, and provost, may grant the request. If the request is denied at any level, the denial must be based upon clear and convincing reasons and must be in writing. More than one request may be granted because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption.

More than one request may be granted to a probationary faculty member, but the total, aggregate length of time of all requests, except for a request because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption, granted to one probationary faculty member shall be no more than one

year. If a faculty member has been in probationary status for more than seven years because the clock has been “suspended” for one or more of the reasons listed in section 6.3.2.4, then the person shall be evaluated as if he or she had been in probationary status for seven years (see UWS 3.04).

Tenure is not acquired solely because of years of service. Granting tenure must result from an affirmative recommendation of the department or its functional equivalent and approval by the chancellor (see section 6.3.7).

6.3.2.6 Faculty Sabbatical Program

Section 1 Introduction

The purpose of the University of Wisconsin-Platteville faculty sabbatical program is to enable faculty to engage in intensive study, research, or other professional activity in order to become more effective teachers and scholars and to enhance their service to the University. During a sabbatical, it is expected that faculty will challenge and significantly extend their professional knowledge and skills. In addition, faculty are encouraged to broaden their geographical/cultural experiences.

Policies and procedures associated with the sabbatical program exist in accordance with guidelines established by the University of Wisconsin System and in Section 36.11 (17) of the Wisconsin Statutes.

Section 2 Types of Sabbaticals

Two types of sabbatical leaves are available to faculty members:

- A faculty member may take a sabbatical leave for an academic year and receive from the institution financial support at any level up to sixty-five percent of his/her full compensation for that period, in accordance with institutional policy.
- A faculty member may take a sabbatical leave for one semester of the academic year and receive from the institution financial support at any level up to a maximum of his/her full compensation for that period.

Section 3 Eligibility

A sabbatical leave is considered a **privilege** granted to faculty on the merit of past academic contributions. Such performance notwithstanding, eligible faculty are expected to submit an appropriate and timely proposal in accordance with established university guidelines. The relative merits of competing proposals will be evaluated at the department/school, college, and university levels.

Faculty are eligible for a sabbatical leave under the following terms:

- A faculty member must have completed six or more years of full-time instructional service, or its equivalent, in the UW System and not have taken a sabbatical within the UW System during the previous six years of full-time service, or its equivalent.
- Leaves of absence, regardless of source of funding (including personal resources), will be excluded in determining a faculty member's years of full-time service toward sabbatical eligibility.
- Preference shall be given to those making significant contributions to teaching and who have not had a leave of absence, regardless of source of funding, in the previous four years. The Board of Regents may also direct UW institutions to give preference to specific projects and/or themes. Faculty who are considering applying for a sabbatical should consult with the Director of Sponsored Programs.
- A sabbatical will **not** be awarded to a faculty member who is **not** to return to a permanent position in the full academic year following the sabbatical leave.

Section 4 Policy Statements

The following conditions govern the faculty sabbatical program:

1. In the administration of sabbaticals, salary funds generated by academic-year sabbatical leaves, by leaves without pay, by personnel turnover, or by personnel reassignment from GPR support within the college may be used to employ, where necessary, temporary replacement instructional staff to maintain the level and quality of instructional services to students.
2. In the administration of faculty sabbaticals, creditable service will—for retirement purposes—vary depending on the length of the sabbatical and the level of compensation. A faculty member considering a sabbatical level request should consult with the UW-Platteville fringe benefit coordinator prior to submitting a formal request.
3. A faculty member may receive and is encouraged to seek supplementary grants and other awards while on sabbatical leave. Such compensation when combined with the amount of institutional compensation, shall **not** exceed the full compensation normally received from his/her institution for that period.
4. Such additional grants or awards may be received by a faculty member only if the conditions for accepting the additional resources do not interfere with the stated purpose of a faculty member's sabbatical program.
5. A faculty member is encouraged to seek external support specifically for travel and unusual living expenses incidental to the sabbatical program without restriction by the full-compensation maximum (see Policy #3 above).

6. A faculty member may not use the sabbatical leave to accept other paid employment during the period of the leave, unless stipulated as a condition of the leave. If so stipulated, Policy #3 above is operative.
7. A faculty member must specify all grants or other awards applied for or to be received during the leave in his/her application for the sabbatical program.
8. **Preference may be given to applicants who have applied for external support.** Such support may be for salary, supplies and travel, or other items needed to support the sabbatical activities as recommended and discussed in Policy Statements #3 through #7. External support may also be employed by the department to accommodate the applicant's absence.
9. A faculty member must agree to return to the institution for at least one academic year of service after the completion of the sabbatical or repay any compensation (salary, plus the university's share of fringe benefits) received from the institution during the sabbatical.
10. Research involving human or animal subjects must be approved in advance by the appropriate governance groups and administrative units.
11. Publications or presentations resulting from work funded by this grant program should acknowledge that the funds to support the project came, in part, from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville faculty sabbatical program.
12. A faculty member must submit a final electronic report with the provost outlining the results of any research, professional activity, project, etc. completed during the sabbatical leave **within three months of returning to campus**. The final electronic report will be posted on the Improvement of Learning Committee website. In addition, a faculty member will be expected to share the results of any research/professional activity, project, etc. and this final report with university colleagues **within one year of returning to campus** in the form of a workshop, seminar, or similar presentation. Any faculty member who fails to submit an electronic report and share the results with university colleagues will be ineligible to receive additional funding opportunities in the future, including but not limited to Curricular Improvement Funds, Scholarly Activity Improvement Funds, Assessment Activity Funds, and sabbaticals.
13. Faculty proposing sabbatical leaves are **strongly** encouraged to leave campus in order to complete relevant research, professional activity, etc.
14. Academic department/schools and colleges are expected to cover faculty responsibilities (e.g., teaching, advising, service duties, extracurricular activities) for colleagues on sabbatical leave **without additional financial support or FTE positions** from outside the college. However, when a faculty member is on a sabbatical for an entire academic year, the thirty-five percent of his/her full compensation for that period may be used to cover the faculty member's responsibilities. Faculty on sabbatical leave

are **not** to be obligated to perform any department/school, college, or university duties during this period.

15. Academic departments/schools and colleges are expected to establish appropriate qualitative assessment methods to assure that the results of the sabbatical are consistent with the proposal. In addition, academic departments/schools and colleges are accountable for the completion of the proposed sabbatical activity by their faculty, including the final electronic report and sharing the results with university colleagues.

(See the Improvement of Learning Committee website for a copy of the application form.)

6.3.3 Department Chairs

6.3.3.1 Selection of a Department Chair

A department chair shall be elected before the completion of the term of the present department chair. A department chair shall be elected by a majority vote of the whole department faculty. Each full-time faculty member in the department is eligible for election. The department's designation shall take place with the advice and consent of the college dean, the provost, and the chancellor.

6.3.3.2 Removal of a Department Chair

A chair of a department may be removed from the position in either of two ways:

- according to procedures established by vote of the college faculty, or in the absence of these, according to procedures established by vote of the department faculty; **or**
- by the college dean in consultation with the department members.

6.3.3.3 Designation of Department Chairs

If a department chair resigns or is relieved of his or her duties as department chair, the department may pursue one of the following courses of action depending on the circumstances:

- If the resignation or the removal of a department chair does not lead to, or occur in conjunction with, a vacant faculty position, so that the position of department chair must be filled by someone who is presently a member of the department, the designation of a new department chair shall take place according to the procedures established by the college faculty or, in the absence of these, according to procedures established by vote of the department faculty. The department's designation shall take place with the advice and consent of the college dean, the provost, and the chancellor.
- If the resignation or the removal of a department chair does lead to, or occurs in conjunction with, a vacant faculty position, then by vote of the department members, the department may
 - determine that the position of department chair shall be filled by someone who is already a member of the department and proceed according to the provisions above and in consultation with the affirmative action officer to ensure the Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity principles are applied;
 - determine that the position of department chair shall be filled by the new faculty member to be appointed to fill the vacancy, and then proceed with the recruitment and initial appointment procedures outlined in section 6.3.1, being sure to include the duties of department chair in the position description and an explanation to all

- candidates that department chairs shall continue to serve at the pleasure of the department members, the dean, the provost, and the chancellor; **or**
- determine that the designation of the new department chair shall occur (according to the provisions stated above) after the appointment of the new faculty member, and that the latter will be considered a candidate along with other department members willing or desiring to serve as department chair. In this case, the department will assure that the position description includes a statement that the newly appointed faculty member will be, or may choose to be, a candidate for the position of department chair.

6.3.4 Review Bodies

6.3.4.1 Introduction

Current RST 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 University Rank, Salary, and Tenure Policy Commission (URSTPC).
6. The URSTPC as a policy formulating and monitoring body serving to guide all review processes and committees.
7. Affirmative action for equal employment opportunity as the responsibility of all reviewing agencies from the departmental to the university level.
8. Inclusion of extension duties 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 handbook.

6.3.4.2 General Functions of Review Bodies

For the purpose of faculty review, references to departments and/or department salary and promotion committees (DSPCs) are intended to include schools and/or school salary and promotion committees (SSPCs). The director of a school is intended to be equivalent to a department chair.

Department Salary and Promotion Committee (DSPC)

The primary function of the department salary and promotion committee is to make promotion in rank and salary recommendations based on pertinent data in accordance with a department- and university-approved plan.

Renewal and Tenure Review Body (RTRB)

The primary function of the department renewal and tenure review body is to make decisions regarding renewal of probationary faculty and the granting of tenure. Such decisions will be made in accordance with a department- and university-approved plan.

College Compensation Committee (CCC)

The primary function of the college compensation committee is to review and evaluate DSPC recommendations for salary and to make independent recommendations in accordance with a university-approved plan.

University Promotion Committee (UPC)

The primary function of the university promotion committee is to review and evaluate DSPC recommendations regarding promotion in rank and to make independent recommendations in accordance with a university-approved plan.

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

The primary function of the University Rank, Salary, and Tenure Policy Commission is to set policies and monitor all promotion in rank, salary, renewal, and tenure procedures.

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.

6.3.4.3 Voting Procedures for Review Bodies

All votes pertaining to actions of review bodies will be conducted by a show of hands; or signed ballots that will be saved and attached to the minutes (forwarded to the provost's office in the case of a tenure decision); or each person's vote can be recorded in the minutes; or a roll call vote, if requested by at least one member, with each person's vote recorded in the minutes. Departmental plans must specify which method(s) of voting will be used. In reporting the results of any personnel action requiring a vote, the vote count (votes for and votes against) will be recorded on the appropriate form and provided to the individual under consideration in the personnel action (see 6.3.7 for information about the tenure and early tenure voting process).

To be considered a positive recommendation (i.e., supportive of renewal, tenure **at** the completion of the maximum probationary period, promotion, or salary), a simple majority of the votes cast must exist (more votes "for" than votes "against"). A personnel action that does not have a simple majority of the votes cast (either a tie or more votes "against" than votes "for") is considered a negative recommendation (i.e., against renewal, tenure **at** the completion of the maximum probationary period, promotion, or salary). **NOTE:** The granting of tenure **before** the completion of the maximum probationary period (that is, less than seven years, including any years granted toward tenure) may be recommended by the appropriate RTRB only on the affirmative vote of at least **four-fifths** of the membership of the RTRB.

Abstentions from voting shall not be counted in determining a simple majority. The right to vote is limited to the members of the review body who are present in person or via synchronous discussion at the time the vote is taken at a legal meeting. [**Exception:** Members unavoidably

absent from the meeting because of illness or emergency may vote by absentee ballot submitted to the chair prior to the meeting; members voting by absentee ballot must have reviewed the file prior to submitting the ballot.] There shall be no voting by proxy. Asynchronous meetings and discussion (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes.

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 (see also section 6.1.2 “Wisconsin Open Meetings Law”).

6.3.4.4 Department Salary and Promotion Committees (DSPC)

Section 1 Establishment of Criteria for Evaluation

Each department, for the purpose of making recommendations about salary adjustments and promotion in rank, shall establish criteria to serve as the basis of faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness; professional, scholarly, and creative activities; and university and public service activities. The criteria must be consistent with current URSTPC policies as approved by the Faculty Senate and set forth in this handbook. Multi-disciplinary departments may elect to establish sub-plans for individual programs within the department (see also section 6.3.5.4).

For faculty who have teaching appointments, teaching effectiveness shall receive top priority. Consistent deficiencies in teaching effectiveness cannot be offset by superior achievements in scholarship and service.

Performance reviews for faculty with non-teaching assignments shall be based upon the major evaluation categories of job performance, professional/scholarly/creative activity, and university and public service activities as weighted by agreement between the faculty member, the department, and, when appropriate, the college dean.

Section 2 Establishment of Department Salary and Promotion Committees

Each department shall make provision for a department salary and promotion committee in accordance with one of the following two procedures.

On the initiative of the department faculty,

- The department may constitute itself, or some members thereof, as a department salary and promotion committee, providing that the salary and promotion committee shall include at least three tenured faculty members. Departments that do not have three tenured members who are eligible to serve on the committee shall select an additional member (or additional members) for the DSPC from other departments within the college; such additional members must be approved by the faculty in the department and the college dean; **or**
- Several departments, by majority vote of each, may choose to combine for

salary and promotion purposes; the combined departments shall then make provision for a department salary and promotion committee for the faculty in the combined departments; such a salary and promotion committee shall have at least three tenured members who meet the eligibility requirements described below.

The following individuals may **not** serve on any department salary and promotion committee:

- department chairs,
- probationary faculty members on a terminal contract,
- faculty who have resigned for reasons other than retirement,
- members of the college compensation committees, and
- members of the university promotion committee.

All other ranked faculty are eligible to serve on a department salary and promotion committee. The members of the committee shall elect their own chair on a yearly basis.

Section 3 Voting Eligibility

No department salary and promotion committee member may vote on any evaluation or recommendation concerning him- or herself or on any evaluation or recommendation that falls under UWS 8.03 (3), the rule governing nepotism.

Section 4 General Duties of Department Salary and Promotion Committees

The department salary and promotion committee shall

- Conduct reviews of all faculty under its jurisdiction for the purposes of salary and promotion recommendations. The DSPC's review of faculty will be based on both peer and student evaluation of professional performance. Such evaluations are to be elicited according to a plan adopted by the department that is
 - in compliance with evaluation criteria established according to the provisions of 6.3.4.4 section 1;
 - in compliance with Affirmative Action standards and Equal Employment Opportunity policies;
 - in compliance with standards listed in section 6.3.5; and
 - in accordance with general procedures set by the URSTPC.
- Use the evaluations to make appropriate recommendations to the CCC concerning merit award, compression, and/or inequity adjustments.
- Use the evaluations to make decisions concerning promotion in rank and forward these decisions to the university promotion committee.
- Share the DSPC's recommendation in writing with the affected faculty member before it is forwarded to the UPC.

- Provide constructive feedback to each faculty member so that he or she might be encouraged to improve his or her professional performance.
- Reconsider any of its evaluations and recommendations as is required if a faculty member invokes the privileges outlined in sections 6.3.8 and 6.3.9.

Section 5 Authority of Representative Department Salary and Promotion Committees

When a department salary and promotion committee is representative (i.e., when a department or group of departments select some of its members to form a department salary and promotion committee instead of acting as a whole on salary and promotion matters), the decisions of the department salary and promotion committee may not be countermanded or altered in any way by that department (or departments).

6.3.4.5 Renewal and Tenure Review Body (RTRB)

Section 1 Establishment of Criteria for Evaluation

Each department, for the purpose of making decisions about renewal and tenure, shall establish criteria to serve as the basis of faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness; professional, scholarly, and creative activities; and university and public service activities. The criteria must be consistent with current URSTPC policies as approved by the Faculty Senate and set forth in this handbook. Multi-disciplinary departments may elect to establish sub-plans for individual programs within the department.

For faculty who have teaching appointments, teaching effectiveness shall receive top priority. Consistent deficiencies in teaching effectiveness cannot be offset by superior achievements in scholarship and service.

Performance reviews for faculty with non-teaching assignments shall be based upon the major evaluation categories of job performance, research and creative activity, and professional and public service as weighted by agreement between the faculty member, the department, and, when appropriate, the college dean.

Faculty subject to a renewal or tenure decision when criteria have significantly changed since time of hire should confer with the department and department chair to negotiate and clarify the criteria to be used. Consideration must be given to length of service under the prior criteria, the terms and expectations under which the initial hire was made, the decision process used to change the criteria, and the extent of prior consultation with the faculty member with respect to the changed criteria. These clarifications will be summarized in writing, approved by the respective college dean, the provost, and the chancellor, and entered into the faculty member's professional record. Decision-makers will use these clarified criteria in making their recommendations.

Probationary faculty hired at mid-year will be evaluated (first review) with first-year probationary faculty hired in the fall semester of the next academic year.

In determining their specific criteria for renewal and tenure, departments shall conform to the university standards given in section 6.3.5.4. Departments and/or programs may choose to use section 6.3.5.5 (3) "Classification of Materials" as a reference guide in formulating their criteria for evaluation.

Section 2 Establishment of Renewal and Tenure Review Body

For the purpose of renewal and granting tenure, the functional equivalent of the department shall be all the tenured faculty members of the academic discipline to which the probationary faculty member has been appointed to teach (see the sub-section below for an exception to this practice). If the department includes more than one academic discipline, the faculty members (tenured and probationary) of the department, in consultation with the college dean, shall determine which discipline is appropriate for the purpose of making renewal and tenure recommendations. In disciplines with fewer than three tenured members, the decisions about renewal and tenure shall be made by the tenured members of the discipline and as many additional tenured members of the department as are necessary to create an RTRB of at least three tenured faculty members (see section below on augmentation of the RTRB). In the event that there are fewer than three tenured members in the probationary faculty member's discipline and the department as a whole, decisions about renewal and tenure shall be made by all tenured faculty in the department and as many additional tenured members from a related area as are necessary to create an RTRB of at least three tenured faculty members (see section below on augmentation of the RTRB). In all cases, the membership of the renewal and tenure review body must be clearly defined in the department's RST plan.

The department chair is responsible for convening the initial meeting of the renewal and tenure review body. If the department chair is a tenured faculty member of the academic discipline to which the probationary faculty member has been appointed to teach, he or she is also a voting member of the RTRB and eligible to serve as chair of that body, unless the departmental plan specifically prohibits the department chair from serving in this capacity.

Exception to Section 2 above: Faculty hired into an interdisciplinary program

For the purpose of renewal and granting of tenure in the case of faculty hired into an interdisciplinary program, the interdisciplinary group or council that oversees the program may elect to establish the RTRB in one of two ways:

- assign the probationary faculty member to a single academic discipline (e.g., a probationary faculty member with a degree in chemistry could be assigned to the chemistry program for RTRB purposes even though he/she does not teach exclusively in the chemistry program). If this option is selected, the probationary faculty member shall be evaluated according to the criteria established by the academic discipline and annually approved by the URSTPC.

- establish a separate RTRB. If this option is selected, the interdisciplinary group or council must create a separate evaluation plan that must be submitted annually for approval by the URSTPC. This plan may include sub-plans that address the review process for individual faculty. The chair of the interdisciplinary group or council is responsible for convening the initial meeting of the separate RTRB. If the chair of the interdisciplinary group or council is a member of the renewal and tenure review body, he or she is eligible to serve as chair of that body.

For both options above, the members of the RTRB must be clearly identified in the evaluation plan and the probationary faculty member must be informed of the composition of his or her RTRB. Once established, the RTRB for a probationary faculty member in an interdisciplinary program may not be modified without prior approval of the URSTPC.

Procedure for Augmentation of a Renewal and Tenure Body

In the event that there are fewer than three tenured faculty in a probationary faculty member's discipline, the department chair shall consult with the college dean to determine the list of faculty members within the department whose area of expertise is most closely related to that of the probationary faculty member. The list shall be submitted to the provost who shall randomly select faculty from the list to augment the RTRB in numbers sufficient to result in a committee of three.

In the event that there are fewer than three tenured faculty in a probationary faculty member's discipline and department as a whole, the department chair shall consult with the college dean to determine the list of faculty members from outside the department whose area of expertise is most closely related to that of the probationary faculty member. The list shall be submitted to the provost, who shall randomly select faculty from the list to augment the RTRB in numbers sufficient to result in a committee of three.

Section 3 Voting Eligibility

All tenured faculty members in the academic discipline (or its functional equivalent as defined in section 2 above), except for those who have resigned for reasons other than retirement and those excluded by other UWS regulations (e.g., s. UWS 8.03 (3), the rule governing nepotism), are eligible to vote on renewal and tenure of probationary faculty appointments.

Section 4 General Duties of the Department Renewal and Tenure Review Body

The department renewal and tenure review body shall:

- Conduct an annual evaluation of all probationary faculty under its jurisdiction for the purposes of renewal and tenure decisions. The RTRB's review of probationary faculty shall be based on both peer and student evaluation of professional

performance. Such evaluations are to be elicited according to a plan adopted by the department that is:

- in compliance with evaluation criteria established according to the provisions of 6.3.4.5. section 1;
 - in compliance with Affirmative Action standards and Equal Employment Opportunity policies;
 - in compliance with standards listed in section 6.3.5; and
 - in accordance with general procedures set by the URSTPC.
- Use the evaluations to make a decision concerning renewal or tenure.
 - Share the decision in writing with the affected faculty member, the appropriate dean, and the department chair (if he or she is not a member of the RTRB) prior to the time it is forwarded to the chancellor.
 - Reconsider any of its evaluations and recommendations as is required if a faculty member invokes the privileges outlined in section 6.3.12.
 - Abide by the more detailed rules and procedures for notification in matters having to do with nonrenewal, denial of tenure, and termination as set forth in section 6.3.12.

6.3.4.6 College Compensation Committees (CCC)

Section 1 Establishment of Criteria for Evaluation

Each CCC, for the purpose of making recommendations about salary adjustments, shall establish criteria to serve as the basis of faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness; professional, scholarly, and creative activities; and university and public service activities. The criteria must be consistent with current URSTPC policies as approved by the Faculty Senate and set forth in this handbook (see also section 6.3.5.4)

For faculty who have teaching appointments, teaching effectiveness shall receive top priority. Consistent deficiencies in teaching effectiveness cannot be offset by superior achievements in scholarship and service.

Performance reviews for faculty with non-teaching assignments shall be based upon the major evaluation categories of job performance, research and creative activity, and professional and public service as weighted by agreement between the faculty member, the department, and, when appropriate, the college dean.

Section 2 Membership and Chair of College Compensation Committees

Each CCC shall consist of members in that college and shall consist of at least five tenured faculty members. No more than two members may be from the same department and no more than one member from the same discipline. Each member shall be elected by the whole college faculty. Department chairs, school directors, members of the department or school salary and

promotion committees, and probationary faculty on a terminal contract are not eligible to serve. The college dean (or the assistant or associate dean as the dean's designee) shall also serve *ex officio* (non-voting).

Each CCC shall elect yearly a chair from its membership. The college dean (or the assistant or associate dean as the dean's designee) is eligible to serve (non-voting) in this capacity. Each CCC shall select yearly from its membership a member to serve on the URSTPC.

Section 3 Voting Eligibility on College Compensation Committees

No CCC member may vote on any evaluation or recommendation concerning him- or herself or on any evaluation or recommendation that falls under UWS 8.03 (3), the rule governing nepotism.

Section 4 General Duties of College Compensation Committees

The CCC shall

- Review and act upon the appropriate department salary and promotion committee's evaluations and recommendations concerning merit, inequity, and/or compression. Each CCC will require supporting information from the department salary and promotion committee. The CCC will consider the department chair's and Dean's recommendations when making its judgments.

The CCC may initiate the consideration of any faculty member under its jurisdiction for a merit award or inequity adjustment, but the CCC may **not** make a merit award or inequity adjustment without the concurrence of the department salary and promotion committee.

- Notify each faculty member in writing as soon as is practicable of all college compensation committee judgments concerning that member.
- Notify the department salary and promotion committee when the college compensation committee makes a judgment and/or recommendation contrary to one made by the department salary and promotion committee.
- Forward its recommendations concerning merit, inequity, and compression to the chancellor.
- Forward an annual report to the URSTPC that summarizes merit, inequities, and compression for the entire college.

6.3.4.7 University Promotion Committee (UPC)

Section 1 Membership and Chair of the University Promotion Committee

The UPC is comprised of six voting members (two faculty members per college). No more than one member from a department may be on the UPC. All faculty members must hold the rank of full professor. Members of the department salary and promotion committees are not eligible to serve on the UPC. Terms of service for the faculty members on the UPC will be three years, with two faculty members being replaced each year. In any given year, two colleges will nominate three full professors from their respective college faculty to a university ballot (six names on the ballot). All tenured and probationary faculty will have the right to vote to select two members of the UPC. Voting members may serve a maximum of two consecutive terms. The provost serves as chair (non-voting) of the UPC.

Section 2 General Duties of the University Promotion Committee

The UPC shall review and act upon the department salary and promotion committee's evaluations and recommendations concerning rank. The UPC will require supporting information from the department salary and promotion committee. The UPC will consider the departmental chair's and Dean's recommendations when making its judgments. In making its own recommendations, the UPC will take into account the same criteria and standards incumbent upon the department salary and promotion committee. The chair of the committee will forward the UPC's recommendations concerning rank to the chancellor.

6.3.4.8 University Rank, Salary, and Tenure Policy Commission (URSTPC)

Section 1 Membership and Chair of University Rank, Salary, and Tenure Policy Commission

The URSTPC is comprised of three faculty members (voting) from each college, with no more than one member from any department. One of the three representatives from each college is appointed by and from each college compensation committee annually. The other two representatives from each college must be tenured and are elected in an all-faculty election for two-year staggered terms. No member shall serve more than four consecutive years. The URSTPC shall elect yearly a chair from its membership.

The provost and the three college deans are *ex officio*, non-voting members of the URSTPC.

Section 2 General Duties of the University Rank, Salary, and Tenure Policy Commission

The URSTPC shall

- Evaluate and coordinate the policies of the department salary and promotion committees, the renewal and tenure review bodies, the college compensation committees, and the university promotion committee in a manner consistent with Faculty Senate and Board of Regents policies and procedures.
- Develop and recommend for Faculty Senate adoption university RST policies.

- Consult with the Academic Planning Council in areas where academic and budgetary priorities and policies relate to questions of rank, salary, and tenure.
- Set the general policy guidelines and procedural standards (in addition to, and in conformity with, the RST procedures set forth in Chapter 6 of the Faculty Handbook) that will serve to guide the department salary and promotion committees, the renewal and tenure review bodies, the college compensation committees, and the university promotion committee in their work, and assure that these committees are informed about the policy guidelines and procedural standards and carry them out.
- Establish the procedures according to which the resources for merit awards and inequity and compression adjustments shall be made available to the DSPCs and the CCCs, and monitor the standards and guidelines by which the DSPCs and the CCCs shall make those awards and adjustments.
- Recommend to the Faculty Senate the procedures for determining salaries.
- Submit an annual report to the Faculty Senate that summarizes the college compensation committee reports concerning merit, inequities, and compression.
- Conduct the faculty evaluations of the deans, provost, and chancellor, summarizing the evaluations and providing a copy of the summary to the administrator.
- Consult with the provost and the affirmative action officer when necessary.

6.3.5 Review of Performance

6.3.5.1 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 renewal 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 renewal, promotion, tenure, and salary recommendations, each review body will be responsible for including affirmative action and equal employment opportunity considerations in their deliberations.

6.3.5.2 UW-System Policies

On October 4, 1974, the Board of Regents approved policies requiring student evaluation of instruction for the following purposes: (1) improvement of instruction; (2) as information used in actions on promotion, renewal, and granting tenure; and (3) as information used in actions on salary increases. These requirements have been incorporated into local policies.

The full statement of the Board of Regents policies is available from the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor or at <http://www.wisconsin.edu/bor/policies/rpd/>

6.3.5.3 Periodic Review of Faculty

UWS 3.05 Periodic review. The faculty and chancellor of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students, shall establish rules providing for periodic review of faculty performance.

Section 1 Probationary Faculty

The information gathered through the various phases of periodic review of probationary faculty is used in making personnel decisions as well as in the formulation of plans for the professional development of the faculty member involved. To promote the retention of qualified probationary faculty, the institution encourages departments to assign mentors to the new faculty, to monitor retention goals, and, in conjunction with the administration, work to enhance the intercultural climate. The evaluation policies and procedures shall respect the dignity and the academic freedom of the individual and shall recognize the importance of good staff morale to the achievement of academic excellence.

Section 2 Tenured Faculty

The information gathered through the various phases of periodic review of tenured faculty is used to ensure continuing growth and development in professional skills; to encourage faculty to explore new ways to promote academic excellence; and to identify areas for improvement and provide solutions for problem areas.

Section 3 Department Chairs

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.**

Department chairs are responsible for ensuring that their files contain the annual evaluation of their performance as a chair by their department and college dean.

6.3.5.4 Criteria for Review

Section 1 Evaluation Criteria

Each department shall establish criteria to serve as the basis of faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness; professional, scholarly, and creative activities; and university and public service activities. The criteria must be consistent with current URSTPC policies as approved by the Faculty Senate and set forth in this handbook. Multi-disciplinary departments may elect to establish sub-plans for individual programs within the department.

For faculty who have teaching appointments, teaching effectiveness shall receive top priority. Consistent deficiencies in teaching effectiveness cannot be offset by superior achievements in scholarship and service.

Performance reviews for faculty with non-teaching assignments shall be based upon the major evaluation categories of job performance, professional/scholarly/creative activity and university and public service activities as weighted by agreement between the faculty member, the department, and, when appropriate, the college dean. The candidate must achieve a record of effectiveness in professional effort and responsibility in the non-teaching assignment (such as department chair or program co-ordinator) and must demonstrate skills and knowledge relevant to the job.

The URSTPC shall require of each department a set of guidelines stating how (1) teaching effectiveness; (2) professional, scholarly, and creative activity; and (3) service to the university and to the community are evaluated and how each of the three categories in the evaluation is weighted. Departments have the option of subdividing category number 3 (service) into two subcategories of service to the university and service to the community.

As stated in section 6.3.2.3, it is this university's policy that faculty with split appointments, those on leave of absence, sabbatical leaves, and especially those who have volunteered for retraining and reassignment will not be inadvertently penalized for their unusual assignments; instead all review bodies 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.

1) Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching expectations shall include, but not be limited to, classroom teaching and its ancillary activities such as advising, testing, supervision of independent work, career counseling, advising of student organizations, internships, student-faculty research projects, field trips, individual tutoring, coaching, supervision of student laboratory work, professional consultations with students on class progress and with colleagues on curriculum revision and development, class preparation and syllabus writing, and maintaining familiarity with technology. The relative weighting of these ancillary activities should be addressed in the departmental RST plan.

Effectiveness in teaching will be assessed through peer evaluations and student evaluations, as well as any other supporting materials that the faculty member includes in his or her file. Any additional types of evaluation that are required by a department or program must be clearly outlined in the departmental RST plan.

2) Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activities

Professional involvement and accomplishments in research/scholarly/creative activity may include, but are not limited to, student-faculty or faculty research/scholarly/creative activity involving traditional discipline-related activity or the scholarship of teaching and learning, publications, presentations at professional organizations, grants applied for, grants received, exhibitions of works of art, performances, video productions, software production, participation in scholarly/scientific meetings, professional development activities, and appropriate consulting work. Work in progress may also be considered.

3) University and Public Service Activities

University and public service activities are defined as significant contributions at the departmental, college, university, community, state, national, or international level in categories other than those identified above. Such activities include, but are not limited to, participating in faculty governance; sharing professional expertise with government, business or private non-profit entities; and participating in non-academic local, regional, national, and international organizations whose aims parallel the professional interests of the faculty.

Failure to adhere 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 2 Peer and Student Evaluations

Student Evaluations

The policy has been to encourage a wide range of practices. The departmental RST plan will include guidelines about student evaluations, including what instrument will be used and how the data are to be interpreted. Faculty are urged to use resources available at the Teaching and Learning Center in developing an evaluation form.

All review bodies should recognize that student evaluations are used for both RST purposes and for self-improvement. Student evaluations for RST purposes shall be separate from those for self-improvement.

The URSTPC shall review and approve the departmental procedures annually. The departments 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 renewal 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.

The **promotion file** must include a copy of the summary of student evaluations for all courses taught in **both semesters (fall and spring) of the preceding academic year.** [Exception: the file for faculty who have had significant and/or extended release time for non-teaching assignments must include all student evaluations available for the two most recent semesters.] In all cases, it is the responsibility of the department chair to place the summary of student evaluations in the promotion file.

Supporting data of student evaluation of teaching must be made available to the next higher review body or individual upon request.

The evaluation instrument(s) shall be distributed and collected by students, staff, or faculty (other than the course instructor) during prearranged class or exam time and submitted as specified by departmental procedures. The faculty member shall not be present during the administering of the evaluation. No information from the evaluations shall be released until grades have been turned in for the semester in which they were administered.

Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluation must be independent of formal student evaluation. Departments may use a variety of peer evaluation techniques, and one individual or several may conduct peer assessment. A designated individual, the department chair, the chair of a departmental review body, members of a departmental review body, or an ad hoc committee may solicit and summarize evaluations in a given department. The specific procedure and materials used must be described in the written guidelines of the departmental RST plan and be approved by the URSTPC. Peer evaluations must be completed for all actions involving renewal, tenure, promotion in rank, and salary recommendations. Peer evaluations will include assessment of performance in the three main categories of teaching effectiveness; professional, scholarly, and creative activities; and university and public service activities. Peer evaluations for faculty with non-teaching assignments shall be based upon the major evaluation categories of job

performance, professional/scholarly/creative activity and university and public service activities as weighted by agreement between the faculty member, the department, and, when appropriate, the college dean.

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

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

See also sections 6.3.6-6.3.9 for additional information on peer evaluation for renewal, tenure, promotion in rank, and salary recommendations.

6.3.5.5 Review Files

Section 1 General Guidelines

- (a) Each faculty member is to assemble and maintain the appropriate file for renewal, promotion, tenure, post-tenure, and salary purposes. In the event that exceptional circumstances prevent a faculty member from constructing his or her own file, the department chair will, to the best of his or her ability, assemble a file for that faculty member.

Probationary faculty members must submit annually a file for the purpose of renewal or tenure and a separate file for the purpose of salary review. As stated in section 6.3.5.4, 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.

Faculty seeking promotion must submit a separate file for the purpose of review for promotion. As stated in section 6.3.5.4, the promotion file must include a copy of the summary of student evaluations for all courses taught in both semesters (fall and spring) of the preceding academic year. [**Exception:** the file for faculty who have had significant and/or extended release time for non-teaching assignments must include all student evaluations available for the two most recent semesters.] In all cases, it is the

responsibility of the department chair to place the summary of student evaluations in the promotion file.

Tenured faculty members not seeking promotion and who are not up for post-tenure review are still required to submit annually a file for the purpose of salary review that minimally includes a copy of the “Salary Review Form” and a list of activities for the previous calendar year. As stated in section 6.3.5.4, all tenured faculty not seeking promotion must be evaluated by students in all classes they teach in one semester at least once every three years.

Tenured faculty who are up for post-tenure review must complete the appropriate form for post-tenure review **and** submit a file for the purpose of salary review (see bulleted information in the paragraph above for materials required for the salary review). As stated in section 6.3.5.4, all tenured faculty not seeking promotion must be evaluated by students in all classes they teach in one semester at least once every three years.

- (b) Faculty members must submit their file(s) to their department chair by the deadline set forth in the RST calendar. The department chair or the chair of the appropriate review body will add a summary of current peer evaluations to the file. The department chair will add a summary of current student evaluations to the file (see 6.4.5.4 above for more information about student evaluations and the promotion file). Since the peer evaluations must be independent of student evaluations, peer evaluations must be completed first.
- (c) 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 the URSTPC. The URSTPC will review and approve departmental plans annually. If the department and the URSTPC cannot reach agreement on the departmental plan, the final review and approval will be made by the provost.
- (d) 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 2 Format for the RST Files

Format for Renewal and Tenure File

Materials are to be submitted in a three-ring notebook (not to exceed one inch thick). The front cover and spine should indicate the action requested (renewal or tenure) and the faculty member’s name. Sections must be clearly labeled. The faculty member is responsible for submitting all materials listed below *in italics*. Any file that is incomplete or disorganized will be returned to the faculty member for corrections before the review process is initiated

The notebook is divided into the following sections:

Section I

- *A copy of the current **Form 1 “Recommendation for Renewal or Tenure”** should be placed at the front of this section.*
- **Form 2 “Record of Peer Evaluation”** and any attachments or materials required by departmental RST plans should be placed second in this section by the RTRB chair. **This form remains in this section during the entire probationary period.**
- **Form 3 “Record of Student Evaluation”** and any attachments should be placed third in this section by the department chair. **This form remains in this section during the entire probationary period.**
- Any counterstatements submitted by the faculty member should be placed fourth in this section.

Section II

- *Form 1s (and any attachments) from previous years should be placed first in this section.*
- *Counterstatements submitted by the faculty member in previous years should be placed second in this section.*

Section III

Faculty must include a copy of their current CV. CVs from previous years should be removed from the file.

Section IV

Faculty must include a copy of Form 4 “List of Activities” for the calendar year under review for the following categories:

- *teaching effectiveness (or job performance of faculty with non-teaching assignments);*
- *professional, scholarly and creative activities; and*
- *university and public service activities.*

(See 6.3.5.5 section 3 for a “Classification of Materials.”)

Section V

Form 4s from previous years are placed in this section by the faculty member.

Section VI

Retention: *Ancillary supporting materials for the year under review may be placed in this section by the faculty member (ancillary materials from the previous year should be removed). Any documentation of performance (e.g., syllabi, letters, scholarly papers) should be placed here. Departments may require additional materials, such as a statement of teaching philosophy or a reflection on courses taught.*

Tenure: *Ancillary supporting materials may reflect a **cumulative record** for the purposes of tenure review. Materials should be placed in this section by the faculty member, and a second binder may be used if necessary. Departments may require*

additional materials, such as a statement of teaching philosophy or a reflection on courses taught.

Format for Promotion File

Materials are to be submitted in a three-ring notebook (not to exceed one inch thick) that is clearly labeled as a request for promotion. Sections must be clearly labeled. The faculty member is responsible for submitting all materials listed below *in italics*. Any file that is incomplete or disorganized will be returned to the faculty member for corrections before the review process is initiated.

The notebook is divided into the following sections:

Section I

- *A copy of the departmental promotion plan should be placed first in this section.*
- *A copy of the “Request for Promotion to Full Professor” (Form 6) should be placed second in this section.*
- *A copy of a summary of student evaluations for all courses taught in both semesters (fall and spring) of the preceding academic year should be placed third in this section. [Exception: faculty who have had significant and/or extended release time for non-teaching assignments must submit all student evaluations available for the two most recent semesters.] In all cases, it is the responsibility of the **department chair** to place the summary of student evaluations in the form of a memo in the promotion file.*
- *Any counterstatements submitted by the faculty member should be placed fourth in this section.*

Section II

Faculty must include a copy of their current CV in this section.

Section III

*Faculty must include a narrative statement (up to three pages for teaching, two pages for scholarship, and two pages for service –singled-spaced, minimum 12 point font one side only) in this section. **All information should be listed in descending order of importance, with dates, rather than chronological order.** The most outstanding achievements should be highlighted. Lists should be used rather than narrative paragraphs whenever that would be more efficient.*

Section IV

Ancillary supporting materials may be placed in this section by the faculty member. Files that are forwarded from the DSPC to the UPC should not contain complete copies of documents and materials that are related to professional and scholarly growth (e.g., books, journals, tapes). Each level shall review evaluations of these materials and decide if, in any instances, they should wish the original documents forwarded to them. A second binder may be used for this section, if necessary.

Format for Salary File

All faculty—both probationary and tenured—must annually submit a separate file (in a binder or a folder) for the purpose of salary review that consists of the following materials:

- a copy of the “Salary Review Form” [Form 5]
- a list of activities for the previous calendar year [Form 4]
- optional ancillary supporting materials or materials that are required by the department. Files that are forwarded from the DSPC to the CCC should not contain complete copies of documents and materials that are related to professional and scholarly growth (e.g., books, journals, tapes). Each level shall review evaluations of these materials and decide if, in any instances, they should wish the original documents forwarded to them.

Format for Post-Tenure Review File

Faculty who are up for post-tenure review must complete the appropriate form (see section 6.6 of this handbook).

Section 3 Classification of Materials

The classification of RST materials given below is intended to assist faculty in **organizing** the information presented in their file; it is **not** intended to be viewed as a checklist of items that must be included in the file. Faculty are advised to consult with their department chair and/or the chair of the appropriate review body for assistance with classifying any materials that are not listed below.

Departments and/or programs may also use this classification of materials as a reference guide in formulating their departmental RST plans.

Teaching Effectiveness

Instructional Methodology

- Course syllabi
- Design and development of innovative teaching methods or media
- Student assignments, presentations, projects
 - Methods of assessing and evaluating student progress
 - Edited video tapes of classroom instruction

Evaluation

- Peer observation and review
- Presentation of material during peer observation sessions
- Student participation during peer observation sessions
- Communication with students during peer observation sessions
- Student evaluation
 - Student evaluation of course and instructional
 - Exit evaluations by students upon completion of the program

Service to Students

- Advisor and mentor to students
- Student evaluation of advising and mentoring
- Supervision of student research projects, laboratory work, independent studies, and internships
- Supervision and consultation on graduate projects, theses, and independent studies
- Advisor to a student group related to an academic discipline or, if the service is still appropriate to the category of teaching effectiveness, to a student group related to a non-academic area
- Assistance with job or graduate school placement
- Letters of recommendation for credential files, graduate school applications, internships, and scholarships
- Organization of student attendance and participation in student and/or professional conferences, field trips
- Use of varied forms of electronic media to support instructor accessibility, e.g., e-mail, class lists, bulletin boards

Enhancement of Teaching Skills

- Participation in programs and/or conferences for improving teaching
- Peer consultation or mentoring
- Team or collaborative teaching
- Faculty exchanges
- Observation of master teachers
- Changes in classroom approach that are connected to peer observations
- Changes in classroom approach that are based on student performance on assessments

Student Performance

- Student performance on assessments prepared by agents external to the immediate classroom
- Student performance on assessments prepared by the instructor

Support for Department Goals

- Curriculum development
- Development of new programs and/or licensure authorizations
- Off-campus teaching
- Participation in distance education
- Preparation and delivery of testimony in the State legislature related to the goals of the college and department
- Work with inservice professionals to provide on-site opportunities and exchanges for students as part of campus-based classroom experiences

Course Load

- Undergraduate and graduate courses taught
- Factors influencing the course load
 - Class sizes
 - Number of preparations per semester
 - Number of times the faculty member has taught the course

- Number of new instructional materials introduced in the course, e.g., using a new textbook, reader, or format
- Collaborative or team teaching involved in the course load
- Types of courses taught: proficiency, common core, required for a major program, general education, elective, laboratory, studio, clinical or field program
- Teaching and/or course development in interdisciplinary programs

Honors and Awards

- Grants for the improvement of teaching
- Awards recognizing teaching excellence by any level from a student organization through an international professional organization

Job Performance of Faculty with Non-Teaching Assignments

Skills and Knowledge

- Knowledge of job assignment
- Organization skills
- Communication skills

Management skills

- Responsible fiscal planning and budget management
- Curriculum and program planning
- Resource and technology planning

Professional effort

- Participation in programs for professional improvement
- Efficiency of operation
- Support for the unit staff
- Participation in the development of effective and efficient operational practices
- Support of university goals and mission
- Support of unit/service area goals and mission

Leadership

- Work with faculty and professional staff in defining context relevant goals and long term plans
- Coordination and marshaling of resources to achieve goals

Professional, Scholarly and Creative Activity

Published/Reviewed/Refereed/Invited Works

- Articles
 - Book or literature review
 - Bibliography
 - Essay or paper in an anthology
 - Professional journal article
 - Proceedings
 - Public/Trade journal article
 - Article translation
- Books

- Chapter in a book
- Book
- Monograph
- Book edited or translated
- Instructional materials, e.g., readers for courses, state curriculum guides, test banks, instructor's manuals
- Grant Proposals
 - Grant proposals accepted for funding
 - Grant proposals for which the funding decision is pending
 - Grant proposals submitted for funding
- Performance and Artistic Works
 - Short story, poem, dramatic work
 - Musical composition or arrangement
 - Choreography
 - Exhibition of works of art, graphics, crafts, and design
 - Performances and recitals, plays, and readings
 - Master classes and workshops
 - Direction of works in the performance arts
 - Recorded works in the performance arts
- Electronic Media
 - Computer software development
 - Multimedia projection
 - Web based graphic design generating virtual reality options
 - Broadcast, film, electronic media design and production
- Conferences
 - Papers
 - Presentations
 - Panels
 - Workshops
 - Scholarly consultations or seminars related to one's area of expertise
- Works in progress

Works Not Refereed or Not Adjudicated: presentations, papers, panels, workshops or performances at a professional meeting without a review policy

Honors and Awards: awards recognizing outstanding research and creative activity by any level from a department through an international professional organization.

Service to the Profession

- Editor of a professional journal
- Adjudicator of exhibit, performance, design, program, (i.e., serving as a member of a program, agency or school evaluation team for an accrediting agency)
- Reviewer of conference proposals or journal manuscripts
- Reviewer of grant proposal for funding agency
- Reviewer of promotion or personnel files as a member of an *ad hoc* credential review committee
- Reviewer/mentor of research in progress
- Discipline-related consultant

- Officer of or service to a professional association
- Attendance at professional meeting or conference
- Provider of non-credit continuing education
- Cooperative sharing of expertise with campus colleagues
- Presenter of inservice programs for faculty and staff
- Member or a state, regional, national, or international committee associated with one's discipline
- Officer in a state, regional, national, or international organization associated with one's discipline

Professional development activities

- Attending conferences or workshops
- Acquiring new knowledge or skills
- Participation in Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) activities

University and Public Service Activities

Service to Department, College, University, and/or System

- Member of a department, constituency, university, (or system committee)
- Officer of a department, constituency, or university committee
- Contributor to department, constituency, or university reports, (e.g., audit, accreditation, self-study)
- Assigned mentor or advisor to a probationary faculty member
- Participant in a campus activity requiring frequent, regular or extended investment of time and effort
- Advisor to a student group related to a non-academic discipline
- Advisor, consultant or judge for a student-organized activity or event on campus
- Organizer for a campus-sponsored conference
- Support staff member for a campus-sponsored conference
- Guest lecturer

Public Service

- Discipline-related presentation or service to a local, regional, or national agency or group
- Discipline-related service to community organizations

Honors and Awards

- Department, college, or university service awards
- Service award from a discipline-related professional organization

6.3.5.6 Procedures for Review

Section 1 The Departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan and Procedures

The department faculty will meet annually for the purpose of discussing the criteria and procedures of the departmental RST plan. Multi-disciplinary departments may elect to establish sub-plans for individual programs within the department. All RST plans must clearly define the

expectations for successful performance in the categories of (1) teaching effectiveness, (2) professional, scholarly, and creative activity, and (3) university and public service activities.

In addition to student evaluations, each phase of periodic review will provide for peer judgments of performance and may be conducted by means of classroom evaluations, information presented by the faculty member, information gathered through peer observations, or information provided by the department chair. For nonteaching faculty or faculty with a reduced teaching load, the plan shall follow the principles reflected in these guidelines with appropriate modifications based on the responsibilities and duties of the individual.

On an annual basis, the departmental RST plan (including any sub-plans) for the next academic year must be approved by the faculty in the department and submitted to the URSTPC for approval by the deadline set forth in the RST calendar (see section 6.4). If the department and the URSTPC cannot reach agreement on the departmental plan, the final review and approval will be made by the provost.

The departmental faculty evaluation plan shall include procedures that:

- Conform to the Wisconsin open meetings and records laws, the UW-System rules and policies, URSTPC guidelines, and Faculty Senate policies, all of which shall take precedence;
- Provide forms and procedures for administering and analyzing student evaluations and for maintaining the anonymity and integrity of those evaluations;
- Provide that the faculty member shall be given copies of all periodic reviews of faculty performance at the same time as such reports are submitted to the appropriate review body or individual;
- Provide that the faculty member be given an opportunity to examine his or her student evaluations; and
- Provide that the faculty member be given an opportunity to respond in writing to the student evaluations and the evaluation reports prepared by the appropriate review body or individual and that such responses are attached to the original documents before the evaluation report is forwarded to the next higher review body or individual.

Section 2 The Review Process

All departmental recommendations on renewal, promotion, tenure, and salary shall be based on a review of the materials in the faculty member's file. Recommendations must be reported on the appropriate form.

For renewal and tenure:

- Recommendation for Renewal or Tenure [Form 1]: completed by department chair, dean, RTRB, and chancellor

- Record of Peer Evaluation [Form 2]: completed by RTRB
- Record of Student Evaluation [Form 3]: completed by department chair

For promotion:

- Request for Promotion to Full Professor [Form 5]: completed by department chair, dean, DSPC, UPC, and chancellor

For salary:

- Salary Review [Form 6]: completed by department chair, DSPC, CCC, and chancellor

At all levels of review, the faculty member must be notified of the recommendation and allowed to request a 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, or evaluation by any review body or individual.

Faculty members must submit their file(s) to their department chair by the deadline set forth in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3). The department chair will include his or her evaluation as appropriate and ensure that the file is forwarded to the next review body or individual. The next review body or individual is then responsible for forwarding the file.

Higher levels of review, whether a body or an individual, may not accept any new "supporting evidence," regardless of the source, without the material first being reviewed by the appropriate lower-level review body or individual.

After the chancellor has taken action and the review process has been completed, files are returned to the appropriate department chair to be made available to individual faculty members.

Any department or college wishing to deviate from this procedure must have the approval of the appropriate college dean, the provost, and the URSTPC.

6.3.5.7 Responsibilities of Individuals and Review Bodies

Section 1 Faculty Members

It is the responsibility of all faculty who are to be reviewed for any action (renewal, tenure, post-tenure, promotion, or salary) in any given academic year to do the following:

- assemble the RST file(s) according to the university format (see section 6.3.5.5).
- submit the file(s) to the department chair by the deadline set forth in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3).

Second-year faculty only:

Because of notification laws set forth in state statutes, second-year faculty are required to submit their file (for renewal only) to the department chair by the deadline set in **October** (see section 6.4.3); second-year faculty must **also** submit files (for renewal and salary) to

the department chair by the deadline set for all probationary faculty in January (see section 6.4.3).

- abide by the procedures and deadlines for submitting counterstatements, requesting a reconsideration, and filing an appeal.
- complete the annual evaluation of the administrative performance of the department chair, the appropriate college dean, the provost, and chancellor.

Section 2 Department Salary and Promotion Committee Members and Chair

The composition of the DSPC is determined by the department. It is the responsibility of the members and chair of the department salary and promotion committee to do the following:

- meet to review the policies and procedures of the DSPC for inclusion in the departmental RST plan for the **next** academic year. The departmental RST plan must be submitted to the department for review and approval and then to the URSTPC for review and approval, following the deadlines for submission and approval set forth in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3).
- coordinate the evaluation of the department chair, according to the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3). The DSPC chair distributes evaluation forms to all department members, collects completed forms, summarizes results, sends the summary and the completed forms to the dean's office, and places a copy of the summary in the department chair's RST file.
- give faculty members **written** notice at least 20 calendar days prior to the departmental review (promotion and/or compensation).
- post a notice of the review (time, place, and purpose of the meeting) at least seven calendar days in advance in a public place regularly used for posting of notices by the department.
- ensure that the independent evaluations made by the department chair regarding salary and/or promotion and the independent evaluations made by the dean regarding promotion have been included in the faculty file **before** the file is reviewed by the members of the DSPC and that the faculty member has received a copy of the evaluation(s) prior to the meeting of the DSPC.
- notify the chair of the University Promotion Committee by October 15 of any promotion files that have been submitted for departmental review.
- convene a meeting (or meetings) in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law (see section 6.1.2). At that meeting the DSPC will:

- evaluate the requests made by faculty for promotion in rank and/or salary adjustments (merit/inequity/compression). Compensation requests will be evaluated using the salary inequity study summary distributed to the DSPC by the CCC.
 - conduct votes in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law.
 - complete the appropriate section of the form (to be placed at the front of the file) for promotion and/or the form for salary review, recording the number of votes for and against the action.
 - NOTE: Asynchronous meetings and discussion (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes.
- abide by the deadlines set by the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3) for notifying faculty of promotion and/or compensation recommendations.
 - give faculty under review written notice of the recommendations made. The notification must include information about the process for requesting a reconsideration of all recommendations. The reconsideration may include submission of a counterstatement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the DSPC. The DSPC also places a copy of the memo in the faculty member's file and notifies the department chair.
 - post a notice of the reconsideration meeting (time, place, and purpose of the meeting) at least 24 hours in advance in a public place regularly used for posting of notices by the department, if such a meeting has been requested by any faculty member under review. The reconsideration meeting must be convened in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law (see section 6.1.2). At that meeting the DSPC will:
 - conduct votes in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law.
 - complete the appropriate section of the form for promotion and/or the form for salary review, recording the number of votes for and against the original recommendation upon reconsideration.
 - NOTE: Asynchronous meetings and discussion (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes.
 - give any faculty member who has requested a reconsideration written notice of the results of the reconsideration, following the notification deadline set in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3). The DSPC also places a copy of the memo in the faculty member's file and notifies the department chair.
 - forward the **promotion file** to the chair of the university promotion committee (deadlines are set in the RST calendar—see section 6.4.3). In the event that a request for promotion is **not** recommended by the DSPC, it is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to determine if the file is to be sent to the chancellor or returned to the faculty member with no further action taken.

- forward the **compensation file** to the chair of the appropriate college compensation committee (deadlines are set in the RST calendar—see section 6.4.3).

Section 3 Renewal and Tenure Review Body Members and Chair

The membership and chair of the renewal and tenure review body are defined in section 6.3.4.5. It is the responsibility of the members and chair of the renewal and tenure review body to do the following:

- meet to review the policies and procedures of the RTRB for inclusion in the departmental RST plan for the **next** academic year. The departmental RST plan must be submitted to the department for review and approval and then to the URSTPC for review and approval, following the deadlines for submission and approval set forth in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3).
- give probationary faculty members **written** notice at least 20 calendar days prior to the meeting of the review body. This notice will inform the faculty member whether the review is to be conducted to determine a renewal decision only or to determine a decision for tenure. The notice must also include the statement that the individual has the right to request and receive an open meeting for the portion of the meeting that constitutes an evidentiary hearing or final action on consideration of **tenure** for that individual.
- post a notice of the review meeting (time, place, and purpose of the meeting) at least seven calendar days in advance in a public place regularly used for posting of notices by the department.
- ensure that the independent evaluation made by the department chair and the independent evaluation made by the dean have been included in the probationary faculty member's file **before** the file is reviewed by the members of the renewal and tenure review body and that the probationary faculty member has received a copy of the evaluations before the review body meets.
- convene a meeting (or meetings) in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law (see section 6.1.2).
 - conduct votes in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law.
 - complete the appropriate section of the form (front of the file) for renewal or tenure, recording the number of votes for and against the action. If signed paper votes are used, they must be attached to the minutes and forwarded to the provost's office.
 - NOTE: Asynchronous meetings and discussion (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes.
- abide by the deadlines set by the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3) for notifying probationary faculty of renewal and tenure decisions.

- give probationary faculty under review for renewal or tenure written notice of the decision made. NOTE: The RTRB will not provide to the probationary faculty member under review any written reasons for a negative decision unless requested to do so by the probationary faculty member; if requested, the RTRB is required to provide reasons (see section 6.3.12. for information about reconsideration and appeal). In the event that the decision on renewal or tenure is negative, the same notification must include information about reconsideration, appeal, and requesting written reasons for the decision. The reconsideration may include submission of a counterstatement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the RTRB. The RTRB also places a copy of the memo in the faculty member's file and notifies the department chair.
- post a notice of the reconsideration meeting (time, place, and purpose of the meeting) at least 24 hours in advance in a public place regularly used for posting of notices by the department, if such a meeting has been requested by any probationary faculty member under review (see 6.3.12 for information about reconsideration). The reconsideration meeting must be convened in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law (see section 6.1.2). At that meeting the RTRB will:
 - conduct votes in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law.
 - complete the appropriate section of the form for a renewal or tenure decision, recording the number of votes for and against the original decision upon reconsideration. If signed paper votes are used, they must be attached to the minutes and forwarded to the provost's office.
 - NOTE: Asynchronous meetings and discussion (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes.
- give any faculty member who has requested a reconsideration of a nonrenewal or denial of tenure written notice of the results of the reconsideration, following the notification deadline set in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3). In the case of a nonrenewal or denial of tenure **at** the completion of the maximum probationary period, the written notice must include information about the process for initiating a formal appeal (see section 6.3.12). The RTRB also places a copy of the memo in the faculty member's file and notifies the department chair.
- forward the file to the chancellor's office if the original decision for renewal or tenure is positive or becomes positive upon reconsideration. If the original decision for renewal or tenure **at** the completion of the maximum probationary period is negative and remains negative upon reconsideration (or remains unchanged because the faculty member did not exercise his or her right to reconsideration), the file remains under the jurisdiction of the renewal and tenure review body until such time as the period for filing a formal appeal has elapsed. If a formal appeal is filed by the aggrieved faculty member, the file is forwarded to the chair of the Appeals Commission. If a formal appeal is not filed by the aggrieved faculty member, the file is forwarded to the appropriate dean's office and the

chancellor's office is notified. (See section 6.3.12 "Nonrenewal of Probationary Appointments/Denial of Tenure.")

Section 4 Department Chair

It is the responsibility of the department chair to do the following:

- advise all probationary and tenured faculty of the deadlines set forth in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3) for submitting files for renewal, tenure, post-tenure, promotion, and salary review.
- distribute the departmental RST plan for the **current** academic year to all faculty in the department by the deadline set forth in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3).
- complete an independent written evaluation of probationary faculty for the purpose of renewal/tenure and salary, following the deadlines set forth in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3).
- complete an independent written evaluation of tenured faculty for the purpose of promotion, post-tenure and/or salary review, following the deadlines set forth in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3).
- submit the independent written evaluation to the appropriate review body (either the DSPC or the RTRB) for inclusion in the faculty member's file **before** the review body meets to take action. A copy of the chair's evaluation must be sent to the faculty member under review. It is recommended that the chair also meet in person with probationary faculty to review the evaluation.
- ensure that the summary of student evaluations for individual faculty members is placed in the appropriate file.
- notify tenured faculty who are in the rotation for post-tenure review during the academic year of the procedures (see section 6.3.10) and deadlines for review (see section 6.4.3). The department chair will also arrange for a meeting with the faculty member to review the appropriate form, after which the chair will forward the form to the appropriate dean to be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. If the faculty member's review reveals a need for significant improvement, the department chair will report such to the college dean, with a copy forwarded to the faculty member under review.
- conduct a vote of the tenured faculty members in the department to determine departmental support for recommendations to emeritus status for faculty who have formally notified the provost's office of their retirement date. The results of the vote are forwarded to the appropriate college dean.

Section 5 College Compensation Committee Members and Chair

The membership and chair of the college compensation committee are defined in section 6.3.4.6. It is the responsibility of the members and chair of the college compensation committee to do the following:

- meet to review the policies and procedures of the CCC for the purpose of submitting the CCC's evaluation plan for the **next** academic year to the URSTPC for review and approval, following the deadlines for submission and approval set forth in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3).
- distribute the salary inequity study summary, provided by the URSTPC chair, to the DSPC chairs.
- post a notice of the review meeting (time, place, and purpose of the meeting) at least seven calendar days in advance in a public place regularly used for posting of notices by the college and send an e-mail notice out to the college.
- convene a meeting (or meetings) in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law (see section 6.1.2). At that meeting the CC will:
 - evaluate the recommendations made by the department salary and promotion committees and the department chairs for salary adjustments (merit/inequity/compression), using the salary inequity study summary distributed to the CCC by the URSTPC.
 - conduct votes in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law.
 - complete the appropriate section of the salary review form, recording the number of votes for and against the action.
 - NOTE: Asynchronous meetings and discussion (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes.
- abide by the deadlines set by the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3) for notifying faculty of recommendations concerning salary adjustments.
- give faculty under review written notice of the recommendations made; the same notification must include information about the process for requesting a reconsideration of all recommendations. The reconsideration may include submission of a counterstatement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the CCC. The CCC also places a copy of the memo in the faculty member's file and notifies the DSPC and the department chair.
- post a notice of the reconsideration meeting (time, place, and purpose of the meeting) at least 24 hours in advance in a public place regularly used for the posting of notices by the college, if such a meeting has been requested by any faculty member under review. The reconsideration meeting must be convened in accordance with department- and

university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law (see section 6.1.2). At that meeting the CC will:

- conduct votes in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law.
 - complete the appropriate section of the salary review form, recording the number of votes for and against the original recommendation upon reconsideration.
 - NOTE: Asynchronous meetings and discussion (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes.
- give any faculty member who has requested a reconsideration written notice of the results of the reconsideration, following the notification deadline set in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3). The CCC also places a copy of the memo in the faculty member's file and notifies the DSPC and the department chair.
 - forward the file to the chancellor's office.
 - submit an annual report to the URSTPC that summarizes merit, inequities, and compression issues for the entire college.

Section 6 University Promotion Committee Members and Chair

The membership and chair of the university promotion committee are defined in section 6.3.4.8. It is the responsibility of the members and chair of the UPC to do the following:

- post a notice of the review (time, place, and purpose of the meeting) at least seven calendar days in advance in a public place regularly used for posting of notices by the university. DSPC chairs will notify the UPC chair by October 15 of any promotion files that have been submitted for departmental review; the UPC chair should begin the scheduling process at this time.
- convene one or more meetings as necessary for the purpose of reviewing as a group each candidate's teaching, professional development, and service accomplishments as presented in the promotion file. The meetings will be convened in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law (see section 6.1.2). NOTE: Asynchronous meetings and discussion (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes.
- convene a separate meeting for the purpose of voting on the promotion requests. The meeting will be convened in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law (see section 6.1.2). NOTE: Asynchronous meetings and discussion (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes. Votes must be conducted in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law.

- abide by the deadlines set by the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3) for notifying faculty of decisions concerning promotion in rank.
- complete the appropriate section of the form for promotion, recording the number of votes for and against the action.
- give faculty under review written notice of the recommendations made; the same notification must include information about the process for requesting a reconsideration of all recommendations. The reconsideration may include submission of a counterstatement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the UPC. The UPC also places a copy of the memo in the faculty member's file and notifies the DSPC, the department chair, and the dean.
- post a notice of the reconsideration meeting (time, place, and purpose of the meeting) at least 24 hours in advance in a public place regularly used for posting of notices by the university, if such a meeting has been requested by any faculty member under review. The reconsideration meeting must be convened in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law (see section 6.1.2). NOTE: Asynchronous meetings and discussion (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes. Votes must be conducted in accordance with department- and university-approved policies and with Wisconsin's Open Meetings Law.
- complete the appropriate section of the form for promotion, recording the number of votes for and against the original recommendation upon reconsideration.
- give any faculty member who has requested a reconsideration written notice of the results of the reconsideration, following the notification deadline set in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3). The UPC also notifies the faculty member under review that the chancellor is the court of last appeal. The UPC places a copy of the memo in the faculty member's file and notifies the DSPC, the department chair, and the dean. In the event that a request for promotion is not recommended by the UPC, it is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to determine if the file is to be sent to the chancellor or returned to the faculty member with no further action taken.

Section 7 University Rank, Salary, Tenure Policy Commission Members and Chair

The membership and chair of the university rank, salary, tenure policy commission are defined in section 6.3.4.6. It is the responsibility of the members and chair of the URSTPC to do the following:

- meet to review the departmental RST plans and the college compensation committee plans for the next academic year, following the deadlines for submission and approval set forth in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3).
- notify in writing each DSPC and CCC of any changes to be made (and the deadline for resubmission) or if no changes need to be made.

- submit any changes to the URST procedures for the next academic year to the Faculty Senate for approval.
- coordinate the process for evaluating the college deans, provost, and chancellor, following the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3).
- distribute the salary inequity study summary, provided by the university affirmative action officer, to the CCC chairs.
- submit an annual report to the Faculty Senate that summarizes the CCC reports.
- monitor the post-tenure review process in conjunction with the provost.
- respond to questions or concerns from any individual or review body.

Section 8 Deans

It is the responsibility of each college dean to do the following:

- complete the appropriate section of the forms for renewal, tenure, and promotion actions and notify the faculty under review of all recommendations made.
- serve on the college compensation committee as a non-voting member or, if so elected by the committee, serve as chair (non-voting). Alternatively, the dean may designate the college assistant dean or associate dean to serve in his/her place on the committee.
- distribute department chair evaluation forms to the chair of each department salary and promotion committee in the college, according to the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3). Completed evaluations are returned to the dean's office and used in the evaluation by the dean of the department chair's administrative performance.
- send a summary of post-tenure reviews to the provost's office by the deadline set forth in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3).
- forward a recommendation (concurrence with department or not) to the chancellor on granting emeritus status to faculty who have formally notified the provost's office of their retirement date.

Section 9 Provost

It is the responsibility of the provost to do the following:

- serve as a non-voting chair of the university promotion committee.

- monitor the post-tenure review process in conjunction with the URSTPC.
- notify department chairs of impending retirements.

Section 10 Chancellor

It is the responsibility of the chancellor to do the following:

- review renewal and tenure decisions made by the renewal and tenure review body at the department level, following the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3).
- abide by the provisions of UWS 3.06 in making renewal and tenure decisions.
- give probationary faculty under review for renewal or tenure written notice of the decision made, following the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3) and state statutes governing notification by the institution. In the event that the decision on renewal or tenure is negative, the same written notice must include information about reconsideration and requesting written reasons for the decision. The reconsideration may include submission of a counterstatement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the chancellor. A copy of the memo must be placed in the faculty member's file and forwarded to the appropriate department chair, RTRB chair, and college dean.
- give any faculty member who has requested a reconsideration (in person and/or through submission of a counterstatement) of a nonrenewal or denial of tenure decision written notice of the results of the reconsideration, following the notification deadline set in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3). A copy of the memo must be placed in the faculty member's file and forwarded to the department chair, RTRB, and dean.
- evaluate recommendations for promotion in rank made by the department salary and promotion committees and the university promotion committee. The final decision and notification of this decision will be made by the chancellor. A copy of the notification will be placed in the faculty member's file and forwarded to the department chair, the DSPC, the dean, and the UPC. The chancellor is the court of last appeal in all matters related to promotion in rank.
- evaluate the recommendations made by the department salary and promotion committees, the department chairs, and the college compensation committees for salary (merit/inequity/compression). The salary inequity study summary distributed to the URSTPC by the university affirmative action officer will be used for this evaluation. The final decision and notification of this decision will be made by the chancellor. A copy of the notification will be placed in the faculty member's file and forwarded to the department chair, DSPC, CCC, and dean.

6.3.6 Renewal of Probationary and Other Appointments

6.3.6.1 General Information

Section 1 UWS 3.01, 3.04, 3.06, 3.07, 3.08, 3.09, and 3.10

UWS 3.01 Types of appointments

(1) Appointments to the faculty are either tenure or probationary appointments. Faculty appointments carry the following titles: professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor.

(a) "Tenure appointment" means an appointment for an unlimited period granted to a ranked faculty member by the board upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic department, or its functional equivalent, and the chancellor of an institution via the president of the system.

(b) "Probationary appointment" means an appointment by the board upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic department, or its functional equivalent, and the chancellor of an institution and held by a faculty member during the period which may precede a decision on a tenure appointment.

(c) In accordance with s. 36.05 (8), Stats., academic staff appointments may be converted to faculty appointments by the action of the board upon the recommendation of the appropriate faculty body and the chancellor of an institution. Such faculty appointees shall enjoy all the rights and privileges of faculty.

(d) In accordance with s. UWS 1.05 members of the academic staff may be given faculty status. Members of the academic staff who have been given faculty status have employment rights under the rules and policies concerning academic staff.

(e) A person holding a faculty appointment under ss. 36.13 and 36.15, Stats., shall not lose that appointment by accepting a limited appointment for a designated administrative position.

UWS 3.04 Probationary appointments

(1) Each institution's rules for faculty appointments shall provide for a maximum 7-year probationary period in a full-time position, and may provide for a longer maximum probationary period in a part-time position of at least half time. Such rules may permit appointments with shortened probationary periods or appointments to tenure without a probationary period. Provision shall be made for the appropriate counting of prior service at other institutions and at the institution. Tenure is not acquired solely because of years of service.

(2) A leave of absence, sabbatical or a teacher improvement assignment does not constitute a break in continuous service and shall not be included in the 7-year period under sub.(1).

(3) Circumstances in addition to those identified under sub. (2) that do not constitute a break in continuous service and that shall not be included in the 7-year period include responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption, significant responsibilities with respect to elder or dependent care obligations, disability or chronic illness, or circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member, when those circumstances significantly impede the faculty member's progress toward achieving tenure. It shall be presumed that a request made under this section

because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption shall be approved. A request shall be made before a tenure review commences under s. UWS 3.06 (1) (c). A request for additional time because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption shall be initiated in writing by the probationary faculty member concerned and shall be submitted to a designated administrative officer who shall be authorized to grant a request and who shall specify the length of time for which the request is granted. Except for a request because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption, a request made because of other circumstances under this section shall be submitted to a designated administrative officer who shall be authorized to grant a request in accordance with institutional policies. A denial of a request shall be in writing and shall be based upon clear and convincing reasons. More than one request may be granted because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption. More than one request may be granted to a probationary faculty member but the total, aggregate length of time of all requests, except for a request because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption, granted to one probationary faculty member ordinarily shall be no more than one year. Each institution shall develop procedures for reviewing the requests.

(4) If any faculty member has been in probationary status for more than 7 years because of one or more of the reasons set forth in sub. (2) or (3) the faculty member shall be evaluated as if he or she had been on probationary status for 7 years.

UWS 3.06 *Renewal of appointments and granting of tenure*

(1) (a) General. Appointments may be granted only upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic department, or its functional equivalent, and the chancellor of an institution. When specified by the board, the institutional recommendation shall be transmitted by the president of the system with a recommendation to the board for action. Tenure appointments may be granted to any ranked faculty member who holds or will hold a half-time appointment or more. The proportion of time provided for in the appointment may not be diminished or increased without the mutual consent of the faculty member and the institution, unless the faculty member is dismissed for just cause, pursuant to s. 36.13 (5), Stats., or is terminated or laid off pursuant to s. 36.21, Stats.

(b) Criteria. Decisions relating to renewal of appointments or recommending of tenure shall be made in accordance with institutional rules and procedures which shall require an evaluation of teaching, research, and professional and public service and contribution to the institution. The relative importance of these functions in the evaluation process shall be decided by departmental, school, college, and institutional faculties in accordance with the mission and needs of the particular institution and its component parts. Written criteria for these decisions shall be developed by the appropriate institutional faculty bodies. Written criteria shall provide that if any faculty member has been in probationary status for more than 7 years because of one or more of the reasons set forth in s. UWS 3.04 (2) or (3), the faculty member shall be evaluated as if he or she had been in probationary status for 7 years.

(c) Procedures. The faculty and chancellor of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students, shall establish rules governing the procedures for renewal or probationary appointments and for recommending tenure. These rules shall provide for

written notice of the departmental review to the faculty member at least 20 days prior to the date of the departmental review, and an opportunity to present information on the faculty member's behalf. The probationary faculty member shall be notified in writing within 20 days after each decision at each reviewing level. In the event that a decision is made resulting in nonrenewal, the procedures specified in s. UWS 3.07 shall be followed.

UWS 3.07 Nonrenewal of probationary appointments

(1) (a) *Rules and procedures.* The faculty and chancellor of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students, shall establish rules and procedures for dealing with instances in which probationary faculty appointments are not renewed. These rules and procedures shall provide that, upon the timely written request of the faculty member concerned, the department or administrative officer making the decision shall, within a reasonable time, give him or her written reasons for nonrenewal. Such reasons shall become a part of the personnel file of the individual. Further, the rules and procedures shall provide for reconsideration of the initial nonrenewal decision upon timely written request.

(b) *Reconsideration.* The purpose of reconsideration of a nonrenewal decision shall be to provide an opportunity to a fair and full reconsideration of the nonrenewal decision, and to insure that all relevant material is considered.

1. Such reconsideration shall be undertaken by the individual or body making the nonrenewal decision and shall include, but not be limited to, adequate notice of the time of reconsideration of the decision, an opportunity to respond to the written reasons and to present any written or oral evidence or arguments relevant to the decision, and written notification of the decision resulting from the reconsideration.

2. Reconsideration is not a hearing or an appeal, and shall be nonadversary [sic] in nature.

3. In the event that a reconsideration affirms the nonrenewal decision, the procedures specified in s. UWS 3.08 shall be followed.

UWS 3.08 Appeal of a nonrenewal decision

(1) The faculty and chancellor of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students, shall establish rules and procedures for the appeal of a nonrenewal decision. Such rules and procedures shall provide for the review of a nonrenewal decision by an appropriate standing faculty committee upon written appeal by the faculty member concerned within 20 days of notice that the reconsideration has affirmed the nonrenewal decision (25 days if notice is by first class mail and publication). Such review shall be held not later than 20 days after the request, except that this time limit may be enlarged by mutual consent of the parties, or by order of the review committee. The faculty member shall be given at least 10 days notice of such review. The burden of proof in such an appeal shall be on the faculty member, and the scope of the review shall be limited to the question of whether the decision was based in any significant degree upon one or more of the following factors, with material prejudice to the individual:

(a) Conduct, expressions, or beliefs which are constitutionally protected, or protected by the principles of academic freedom, or

(b) Factors proscribed by applicable state or federal law regarding fair employment practices, or

(c) Improper consideration of qualifications for reappointment or renewal. For purposes of this section, “improper consideration” shall be deemed to have been given to the qualifications of a faculty member in question if material prejudice resulted because of any of the following:

- 1. The procedures required by rules of the faculty or board were not followed, or*
- 2. Available data bearing materially on the quality of performance were not considered,*

or

3. Unfounded, arbitrary or irrelevant assumptions of fact were made about work or conduct.

(2) The appeals committee shall report on the validity of the appeal to the body or official making the nonrenewal decision and to the appropriate dean and the chancellor.

(3) Such a report may include remedies which may, without limitation because of enumeration, take the form of a reconsideration by the decision maker, a reconsideration by the decision maker under instructions from the committee, or a recommendation to the next higher appointing level. Cases shall be remanded for reconsideration by the decision maker in all instances unless the appeals committee specifically finds that such a remand would serve no useful purpose. The appeals committee shall retain jurisdiction during the pendency of any reconsideration. The decision of the chancellor will be final on such matters.

UWS 3.09 *Notice periods*

(1) A faculty member who is employed on probationary appointment pursuant to s. 36.13, Stats., shall be given written notice of reappointment or nonreappointment for another academic year in advance of the expiration of the current appointment as follows:

(a) When the appointment expires at the end of an academic year, not later than March 1 of the first academic year and not later than December 15 of the second consecutive academic year of service;

(b) If the initial appointment expires during an academic year, at least 3 months prior to its expiration; if a second consecutive appointment terminates during the academic year, at least 6 months prior to its expiration;

(c) After 2 or more years of continuous service at an institution of the university of Wisconsin system, such notice shall be given at least 12 months before the expiration of the appointment.

UWS 3.10 *Absence of proper notification.*

If proper notice is not given in accordance with s. UWS 3.09, the aggrieved faculty member shall be entitled to a one-year terminal appointment. Such appointments, however, shall not result in the achievement of tenure.

Section 2 **Renewal/Tenure Decisions (decision vs. recommendation)**

Decisions

Decisions regarding renewal or granting of tenure are made at only two levels: the department (or its functional equivalent) and the chancellor (or the chancellor's designee).

NOTE: This can be very confusing, especially since UWS 3.01 includes language referring to departmental **recommendations** (see section 1 above). To be absolutely accurate, one would say that a departmental action supporting appointment, renewal, or tenure is a recommendation, since the chancellor need not accept the decision of the department or its functional equivalent. However, an action denying appointment, renewal, or tenure is always a **decision** since the chancellor cannot appoint or reappoint absent the affirmative recommendation of the department or its functional equivalent, and the Board cannot award tenure without the affirmative recommendation of the department or its functional equivalent except under extremely narrow circumstances.

If the department says yes, the chairperson, dean, and provost may all recommend no, and the chancellor will decide. If the department says no, that ends the matter unless there is an appeal. The chairperson's and college dean's separate recommendations, if different from the decision of the department, would not affect the decision.

Faculty have the right to appeal a **decision** not to renew or not to grant tenure made at the department level.

Recommendations

Recommendations regarding renewal or the granting of tenure may be made by a faculty member's department chairperson or college dean, or by the provost. An adverse **recommendation** made by these individuals is not subject to appeal. However, faculty who appeal an adverse decision may call as a witness any person who made an adverse recommendation to the individual making the decision.

6.3.6.2 Composition of the Renewal and Tenure Review Body

The composition of the renewal and tenure review body is defined in section 6.3.4.5.

6.3.6.3 Voting Eligibility

Voting eligibility on the renewal and tenure review body is defined in section 6.3.4.5.

6.3.6.4 Criteria for Evaluation

Each department, for the purpose of making decisions about renewal and tenure, shall establish criteria to serve as the basis of faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness; professional, scholarly, and creative activities; and university and public service activities. The criteria must be consistent with current URSTPC policies as approved by the Faculty Senate and set forth in this handbook. Multi-disciplinary departments may elect to establish sub-plans for individual programs within the department.

For faculty who have teaching appointments, teaching effectiveness shall receive top priority. Consistent deficiencies in teaching effectiveness cannot be offset by superior achievements in scholarship and service.

Performance reviews for faculty with non-teaching assignments shall be based upon the major evaluation categories of job performance, professional/scholarly/creative activity and university and public service activities as weighted by agreement between the faculty member, the department, and, when appropriate, the college dean.

Faculty subject to a renewal decision when criteria have significantly changed since time of hire should confer with the department and department chair to negotiate and clarify the criteria to be used. Consideration must be given to length of service under the prior criteria, the terms and expectations under which the initial hire was made, the decision process used to change the criteria, and the extent of prior consultation with the faculty member with respect to the changed criteria. These clarifications will be summarized in writing, approved by the respective college dean, the provost, and the chancellor, and entered into the faculty member's professional record. Decision-makers will use these clarified criteria in making their recommendations.

Probationary faculty hired at mid-year will be evaluated (first review) with first-year probationary faculty hired in the fall semester of the next academic year.

In determining their specific criteria for renewal, departments shall conform to the university standards given in section 6.3.5.4. Departments and/or programs may choose to use section 6.3.5.5 (3) "Classification of Materials" as a reference guide in formulating their criteria for evaluation.

6.3.6.5 Notification

The chair of the appropriate RTRB must give the faculty member at least 20 calendar days' advance written notice of the departmental review. This notice will inform the faculty member whether the review is to be conducted to determine a renewal decision only or to determine a decision on tenure. This notice will also inform the faculty member of his/her right to request an opportunity to appear before the committee to present information on his or her behalf.

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

6.3.6.6 Meeting for Discussion Prior to Vote

Before a vote is taken, the decision in question shall be discussed at a meeting of the renewal and tenure review body. The meeting shall be called under the provisions of s. 19.85, Wis. Stats., the Open Meetings Law (see section 6.1.2). The meeting shall be called and conducted by the chair so as to afford reasonable opportunities to ask questions, to offer additional information, and to discuss the decision in question. This discussion shall be based on documents in the probationary faculty member's file. The faculty member under review has the right to request an appearance before the renewal and tenure review body.

6.3.6.7 Voting Procedures

For at least a five-workday period before the vote is taken, every faculty member eligible to vote on the renewal decision shall be allowed access to the professional file for review purposes only.

As stated in section 6.3.4.3, all votes pertaining to actions of review bodies will be conducted by a show of hands; or signed ballots that will be saved and attached to the minutes (forwarded to the provost's office in the case of a tenure decision); or each person's vote can be recorded in the minutes; or a roll call vote, if requested by at least one member, with each person's vote recorded in the minutes. Departmental plans must specify which method(s) of voting will be used. In reporting the results of any personnel action requiring a vote, the vote count (votes for and votes against) will be recorded on the appropriate form and provided to the individual under consideration in the personnel action.

6.3.6.8 Counting of Votes

To be considered a positive recommendation (i.e., supportive of renewal), a simple majority of the votes cast must exist (more votes "for" than votes "against"). A personnel action that does not have a simple majority of the votes cast (either a tie or more votes "against" than votes "for") is considered a negative recommendation (i.e., against renewal).

Abstentions from voting shall not be counted in determining a simple majority. The right to vote is limited to the members of the review body who are present in person or via synchronous discussion at the time the vote is taken at a legal meeting. [**Exception:** Members unavoidably absent from the meeting because of illness or emergency may vote by absentee ballot submitted to the chair prior to the meeting; members voting by absentee ballot must have reviewed the file prior to submitting the ballot.] There shall be no voting by proxy. Asynchronous meetings and discussion (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes.

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 (see also section 6.1.2 "Wisconsin Open Meetings Law").

6.3.6.9 Reporting of Decision

Renewal and tenure review bodies shall decide annually to renew or not renew the appointment of faculty members on probationary appointments. The renewal and tenure review body shall forward to the chancellor its decision and the number of votes for and against renewal within five calendar days of the time of the committee's vote. It shall at the same time inform the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean of its decision in writing. **NOTE:** The RTRB will not provide to the probationary faculty member under review any written reasons for a negative decision unless requested to do so by the probationary faculty member; if reasons are requested, the RTRB chair is required to provide them (see section 6.3.12.2).

If the vote is for nonrenewal, the faculty member shall also be informed of his or her right to reconsideration and appeal and to receive written reasons for nonrenewal, as per UWS 3.07. If

written reasons are requested, they shall become a part of the personnel file of the individual (see section 6.3.12 for information about reconsideration and appeal).

In situations where the department's position allocation is reduced after the RTRB has made an affirmative recommendation, the department shall have the opportunity to reconsider its earlier recommendation in light of the reduction. 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 5 calendar days, and the faculty member shall be informed of the reconsideration and appeal procedures outlined in section 6.3.12.

6.3.6.10 Role and Authority of Chancellor

The RTRB and the chancellor make decisions on renewal and tenure considerations. All other levels of review make recommendations.

The chancellor shall inform the faculty member under review, the chair of the RTRB, the department chair, and the dean of his or her decision for the renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. If the decision is for nonrenewal, the faculty member shall also be informed of his or her right to reconsideration and to receive written reasons for nonrenewal, as per UWS 3.07. If written reasons are requested, they shall become a part of the personnel file of the individual (see section 6.3.12 for information about reconsideration and appeal).

6.3.6.11 Recommendation Concerning Renewal of Department Chairs

When the department chair is a probationary faculty member, he or she will not submit a recommendation for renewal concerning him- or herself. All other steps in the renewal process apply.

6.3.6.12 Recommendations Concerning Renewal of Academic Administrators

There are two types of renewal of academic administrators:

- a) When "renewal" applies to renewal of a probationary faculty appointment, all recommendations concerning such shall originate with the department wherein each holds rank.
- b) When "renewal" applies to the continuation of an administrative appointment, such as provost or college dean, the URSTPC shall solicit faculty contributions and shall forward them to the chancellor for consideration.

6.3.6.13 Reconsideration and Appeals

(See section 6.3.12 of this Faculty Handbook.)

6.3.7 Granting of Tenure

6.3.7.1 General Information

At public institutions, tenure and related legal principles are often codified in statutes and administrative rules. Chapter 36 of the Wisconsin Statutes creates the UW System, as well as the legal framework for faculty tenure and faculty governance. Section 36.13, Wis. Stats., defines faculty appointments and outlines the procedures for achieving tenure. Section 36.09(3), Wis. Stats., establishes the principle of shared university governance: the faculty of each institution—subject to the responsibilities and powers of the Board of Regents, the President of the System and the Chancellor—have the right to participate actively in the development of institutional policy and have the primary responsibility for educational and personnel matters, including tenure decisions. Administrative rules adopted by the Board of Regents, and institutional policies and procedures developed at each campus and approved by the Board, further implement these statutory provisions.

Once granted tenure, a faculty member may be dismissed only by the Board, and only for just cause or fiscal emergency, after due notice and hearing.

Section 1 UWS 3.01, 3.04, 3.06, 3.07, 3.08, 3.09, and 3.10

UWS 3.01 Types of appointments

(a) *“Tenure appointment” means an appointment for an unlimited period granted to a ranked faculty member by the board upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic department, or its functional equivalent, and the chancellor of an institution via the president of the system.*

(b) *“Probationary appointment” means an appointment by the board upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic department, or its functional equivalent, and the chancellor of an institution and held by a faculty member during the period which may precede a decision on a tenure appointment.*

UWS 3.04 Probationary appointments

(1) *Each institution's rules for faculty appointments shall provide for a maximum 7-year probationary period in a full-time position, and may provide for a longer maximum probationary period in a part-time position of at least half time. Such rules may permit appointments with shortened probationary periods or appointments to tenure without a probationary period. Provision shall be made for the appropriate counting of prior service at other institutions and at the institution. Tenure is not acquired solely because of years of service.*

(2) *A leave of absence, sabbatical or a teacher improvement assignment does not constitute a break in continuous service and shall not be included in the 7-year period under sub.(1).*

(3) *Circumstances in addition to those identified under sub. (2) that do not constitute a break in continuous service and that shall not be included in the 7-year period include responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption, significant responsibilities with respect to elder or dependent care obligations, disability or chronic illness, or circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member, when those circumstances significantly impede the faculty member's progress toward achieving tenure. It shall be presumed that a request made under this section*

because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption shall be approved. A request shall be made before a tenure review commences under s. UWS 3.06 (1) (c). A request for additional time because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption shall be initiated in writing by the probationary faculty member concerned and shall be submitted to a designated administrative officer who shall be authorized to grant a request and who shall specify the length of time for which the request is granted. Except for a request because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption, a request made because of other circumstances under this section shall be submitted to a designated administrative officer who shall be authorized to grant a request in accordance with institutional policies. A denial of a request shall be in writing and shall be based upon clear and convincing reasons. More than one request may be granted because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption. More than one request may be granted to a probationary faculty member but the total, aggregate length of time of all requests, except for a request because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption, granted to one probationary faculty member ordinarily shall be no more than one year. Each institution shall develop procedures for reviewing the requests.

(4) If any faculty member has been in probationary status for more than 7 years because of one or more of the reasons set forth in sub. (2) or (3) the faculty member shall be evaluated as if he or she had been on probationary status for 7 years.

UWS 3.06 *Renewal of Appointments and Granting of Tenure*

(1) (a) General. Appointments may be granted only upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic department, or its functional equivalent, and the chancellor of an institution. When specified by the board, the institutional recommendation shall be transmitted by the president of the system with his recommendation to the board for action. Tenure appointments may be granted to any ranked faculty member who holds or will hold a half-time appointment or more. The proportion of time provided for in the appointment may not be diminished or increased without the mutual consent of the faculty member and the institution, unless the faculty member is dismissed for just cause, pursuant to 36.13 (5), Stats., or is terminated or laid off pursuant to 36.21, Stats.

(b) Criteria. Decisions relating to renewal of appointments or recommending of tenure shall be made in accordance with institutional rules and procedures which shall require an evaluation of teaching, research, and professional and public service and contribution to the institution. The relative importance of these functions in the evaluation process shall be decided by departmental, school, college, and institutional faculties in accordance with the mission and needs of the particular institution and its component parts. Written criteria for these decisions shall be developed by the appropriate institutional faculty bodies. Written criteria shall provide that if any faculty member has been in probationary status for more than seven years because of one or more of the reasons set forth in UWS 3.04(2) or (3), the faculty member shall be evaluated as if he or she had been in probationary status for seven years.

(c) Procedures. The faculty and chancellor of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students, shall establish rules governing the procedures for renewal or probationary appointments and for recommending tenure. These rules shall provide for written notice of the

departmental review to the faculty member at least 20 days prior to the date of the departmental review, and an opportunity to present information on the faculty member's behalf. The probationary faculty member shall be notified in writing within 20 days after each decision at each reviewing level. In the event that a decision is made resulting in non-renewal, the procedures specified in UWS 3.07 shall be followed.

UWS 3.07 Nonrenewal of probationary appointments

(1) (a) Rules and procedures. The faculty and chancellor of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students, shall establish rules and procedures for dealing with instances in which probationary faculty appointments are not renewed. These rules and procedures shall provide that, upon the timely written request of the faculty member concerned, the department or administrative officer making the decision shall, within a reasonable time, give him or her written reasons for nonrenewal. Such reasons shall become a part of the personnel file of the individual. Further, the rules and procedures shall provide for reconsideration of the initial nonrenewal decision upon timely written request.

(b) Reconsideration. The purpose of reconsideration of a nonrenewal decision shall be to provide an opportunity to a fair and full reconsideration of the nonrenewal decision, and to insure that all relevant material is considered.

1. Such reconsideration shall be undertaken by the individual or body making the nonrenewal decision and shall include, but not be limited to, adequate notice of the time of reconsideration of the decision, an opportunity to respond to the written reasons and to present any written or oral evidence or arguments relevant to the decision, and written notification of the decision resulting from the reconsideration.

2. Reconsideration is not a hearing or an appeal, and shall be nonadversary [sic] in nature.

3. In the event that a reconsideration affirms the nonrenewal decision, the procedures specified in s. UWS 3.08 shall be followed.

UWS 3.08 Appeal of a nonrenewal decision

(1) The faculty and chancellor of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students, shall establish rules and procedures for the appeal of a nonrenewal decision. Such rules and procedures shall provide for the review of a nonrenewal decision by an appropriate standing faculty committee upon written appeal by the faculty member concerned within 20 days of notice that the reconsideration has affirmed the nonrenewal decision (25 days if notice is by first class mail and publication). Such review shall be held not later than 20 days after the request, except that this time limit may be enlarged by mutual consent of the parties, or by order of the review committee. The faculty member shall be given at least 10 days notice of such review. The burden of proof in such an appeal shall be on the faculty member, and the scope of the review shall be limited to the question of whether the decision was based in any significant degree upon one or more of the following factors, with material prejudice to the individual:

(a) Conduct, expressions, or beliefs which are constitutionally protected, or protected by the principles of academic freedom, or

(b) Factors proscribed by applicable state or federal law regarding fair employment practices, or

(c) Improper consideration of qualifications for reappointment or renewal. For purposes of this section, "improper consideration" shall be deemed to have been given to the qualifications of a faculty member in question if material prejudice resulted because of any of the following:

- 1. The procedures required by rules of the faculty or board were not followed, or*
- 2. Available data bearing materially on the quality of performance were not considered,*

or

3. Unfounded, arbitrary or irrelevant assumptions of fact were made about work or conduct.

(2) The appeals committee shall report on the validity of the appeal to the body or official making the nonrenewal decision and to the appropriate dean and the chancellor.

(3) Such a report may include remedies which may, without limitation because of enumeration, take the form of a reconsideration by the decision maker, a reconsideration by the decision maker under instructions from the committee, or a recommendation to the next higher appointing level. Cases shall be remanded for reconsideration by the decision maker in all instances unless the appeals committee specifically finds that such a remand would serve no useful purpose. The appeals committee shall retain jurisdiction during the pendency of any reconsideration. The decision of the chancellor will be final on such matters.

UWS 3.09 *Notice periods*

(1) A faculty member who is employed on probationary appointment pursuant to s. 36.13, Stats., shall be given written notice of reappointment or nonreappointment for another academic year in advance of the expiration of the current appointment as follows:

(a) When the appointment expires at the end of an academic year, not later than March 1 of the first academic year and not later than December 15 of the second consecutive academic year of service;

(b) If the initial appointment expires during an academic year, at least 3 months prior to its expiration; if a second consecutive appointment terminates during the academic year, at least 6 months prior to its expiration;

(c) After 2 or more years of continuous service at an institution of the university of Wisconsin system, such notice shall be given at least 12 months before the expiration of the appointment.

UWS 3.10 *Absence of proper notification.*

If proper notice is not given in accordance with s. UWS 3.09, the aggrieved faculty member shall be entitled to a one-year terminal appointment. Such appointments, however, shall not result in the achievement of tenure.

Section 2 Renewal/Tenure Decisions (decision vs. recommendation)

Decisions

Decisions regarding renewal or granting of tenure are made at only two levels: the department (or its functional equivalent) and the chancellor (or the chancellor's designee).

NOTE: This can be very confusing, especially since UWS 3.01 includes language referring to departmental **recommendations** (see section 1 above). To be absolutely accurate, one would say that a departmental action supporting appointment, renewal, or tenure is a recommendation, since the chancellor need not accept the decision of the department or its functional equivalent. However, an action denying appointment, renewal, or tenure is always a **decision** since the chancellor cannot appoint or reappoint absent the affirmative recommendation of the department or its functional equivalent, and the Board cannot award tenure without the affirmative recommendation of the department or its functional equivalent except under extremely narrow circumstances.

If the department says yes, the chairperson, dean, and provost may all recommend no, and the chancellor will decide. If the department says no, that ends the matter unless there is an appeal. The chairperson's and college dean's separate recommendations, if different from the decision of the department, would not affect the decision.

Faculty have the right to appeal a **decision** not to renew or not to grant tenure made at the department level.

Recommendations

Recommendations regarding renewal or the granting of tenure may be made by a faculty member's department chairperson or college dean, or by the provost. An adverse **recommendation** made by these individuals is not subject to appeal. However, faculty who appeal an adverse decision may call as a witness any person who made an adverse recommendation to the individual making the decision.

Section 3 Policy on Tenure Density

Tenure density shall be based on the proportion of tenured to nontenured faculty and teaching academic staff in each department or its functional equivalent and shall be monitored on a continuing basis. When tenure density is significantly high, 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 (or its functional equivalent) and the university. Exceptions to the above terminal degree requirement may be made in extraordinary cases where, prior to appointment, the department or its functional equivalent has made a written justification that both the academic dean and the provost have approved.

Tenure should be recommended only by a department or its functional equivalent that can demonstrate long-term programmatic need. Ordinarily, tenure should not be recommended by any department or its functional equivalent that is characterized by a significantly high tenure density or by falling enrollments. Written justification to grant tenure in these cases must accompany a recommendation from the department or its functional equivalent.

A department or its functional equivalent that is characterized by a significantly high tenure density or by falling enrollments must be candid about the prospects for tenure with probationary faculty at the time of hire. Such a department or its functional equivalent is also urged to make nonrenewal decisions as early as possible in all impending tenure cases.

6.3.7.2 Composition of the Renewal and Tenure Review Body

The composition of the renewal and tenure review body is defined in section 6.3.4.5.

6.3.7.3 Voting Eligibility

Voting eligibility on the renewal and tenure review body is defined in section 6.3.4.5.

6.3.7.4 Criteria for Evaluation

Each department, for the purpose of making decisions about renewal and tenure, shall establish criteria to serve as the basis of faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness; professional, scholarly, and creative activities; and university and public service activities. The criteria must be consistent with current URSTPC policies as approved by the Faculty Senate and set forth in this handbook. Multi-disciplinary departments may elect to establish sub-plans for individual programs within the department.

For faculty who have teaching appointments, teaching effectiveness shall receive top priority. Consistent deficiencies in teaching effectiveness cannot be offset by superior achievements in scholarship and service.

Performance reviews for faculty with non-teaching assignments shall be based upon the major evaluation categories of job performance, professional/ scholarly/creative activity and university and public service activities as weighted by agreement between the faculty member, the department, and, when appropriate, the college dean.

Faculty subject to a tenure decision when criteria have significantly changed since time of hire should confer with the department and department chair to negotiate and clarify the criteria to be used. Consideration must be given to length of service under the prior criteria, the terms and expectations under which the initial hire was made, the decision process used to change the criteria, and the extent of prior consultation with the faculty member with respect to the changed criteria. These clarifications will be summarized in writing, approved by the respective college dean, the provost, and the chancellor, and entered into the faculty member's professional record. Decision-makers will use these clarified criteria in making their recommendations.

In determining their specific criteria for tenure, departments shall conform to the university standards given in section 6.3.5.4. Departments and/or programs may choose to use section 6.3.5.5 (3) "Classification of Materials" as a reference guide in formulating their criteria for evaluation.

6.3.7.5 Notification

The chair of the appropriate RTRB must give the faculty member at least 20 calendar days' advance written notice of the departmental review. This notice will inform the faculty member whether the review is to be conducted to determine a renewal decision only or to determine a decision on tenure. This notice will also inform the faculty member of his/her right to request and receive an open meeting for the portion of the meeting that constitutes an evidentiary hearing or final action on consideration of tenure for that individual.

6.3.7.6 Meeting for Discussion Prior to Vote

Before a vote is taken, the decision in question shall be discussed at a meeting of the renewal and tenure review body. The meeting shall be called under the provisions of s. 19.85, Wisconsin Statutes, the Open Meetings Law (see section 6.1.2). The meeting shall be called and conducted by the chair so as to afford reasonable opportunities to ask questions, to offer additional information, and to discuss the decision in question. This discussion shall be based on documents in the probationary faculty member's personnel file. The faculty member under review has the right to request an appearance before the renewal and tenure review body and to be present for the portion of the meeting that constitutes an evidentiary hearing or final action on consideration of tenure for that individual.

6.3.7.7 Voting Procedures

For at least a five-workday period before the vote is taken, every faculty member eligible to vote on the granting of tenure shall be allowed access to the professional record for review purposes only.

As stated in section 6.3.4.3, all votes pertaining to actions of review bodies will be conducted by a show of hands; or signed ballots that will be saved and attached to the minutes (forwarded to the provost's office in the case of a tenure decision); or each person's vote can be recorded in the minutes; or a roll call vote, if requested by at least one member, with each person's vote recorded in the minutes. Departmental plans must specify which method(s) of voting will be used. In reporting the results of any personnel action requiring a vote, the vote count (votes for and votes against) will be recorded on the appropriate form and provided to the individual under consideration in the personnel action.

6.3.7.8 Counting of Votes

To be considered a positive recommendation (i.e., supportive of tenure **at** the completion of the maximum probationary period), a simple majority of the votes cast must exist (more votes "for" than votes "against"). A personnel action that does not have a simple majority of the votes cast (either a tie or more votes "against" than votes "for") is considered a negative recommendation (i.e., against tenure **at** the completion of the maximum probationary period). **NOTE:** The granting of tenure **before** the completion of the maximum probationary period (that is, less than seven years, including any years granted toward tenure) may be recommended by the appropriate

RTRB only on the affirmative vote of at least **four-fifths** of the membership of the RTRB (see section 6.3.7.12 below).

Abstentions from voting shall not be counted in determining a simple majority. The right to vote is limited to the members of the review body who are present in person or via synchronous discussion at the time the vote is taken at a legal meeting. [**Exception:** Members unavoidably absent from the meeting because of illness or emergency may vote by absentee ballot submitted to the chair prior to the meeting; members voting by absentee ballot must have reviewed the file prior to submitting the ballot.] There shall be no voting by proxy. Asynchronous meetings and discussion (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes.

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 (see also section 6.1.2 “Wisconsin Open Meetings Law”).

6.3.7.9 Reporting of Decision

The renewal and tenure review body shall forward to the chancellor its decision and the number of votes for and against tenure within five calendar days of the time of the committee’s vote. It shall at the same time inform the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean of its decision in writing. **NOTE:** The RTRB will not provide to the probationary faculty member under review any written reasons for a negative decision unless requested to do so by the probationary faculty member; if requested, the RTRB is required to provide reasons. The chair of the RTRB shall be responsible for ensuring that URSTPC policy is followed when written reasons have been requested (see section 6.3.12.2).

If the vote is for denial of tenure, the faculty member shall also be informed of his or her right to reconsideration and appeal and to receive written reasons for the denial of tenure, as per UWS 3.07. If written reasons are requested, they shall become a part of the personnel file of the individual (see section 6.3.12 for information about reconsideration and appeal).

6.3.7.10 Role and Authority of Chancellor

The RTRB and the chancellor make decisions on renewal and tenure considerations. All other levels of review make recommendations.

The chancellor shall inform the faculty member under review, the chair of the RTRB, the department chair and the dean of his or her decision on the granting of tenure. If the decision is for denial of tenure, the faculty member shall also be informed of his or her right to reconsideration and to receive written reasons for the denial of tenure, as per UWS 3.07. If written reasons are requested, they shall become a part of the personnel file of the individual (see section 6.3.12 for information about reconsideration and appeal).

6.3.7.11 Tenure and Promotion in Rank

As of January 2016, promotion to the rank of associate professor is concomitant with the tenure decision. Any probationary faculty member holding the rank of assistant professor who is granted tenure is also promoted to the rank of associate professor. Assistant professors tenured prior to January 2016 may apply for promotion to associate professor by submitting a written request to the DSPC (no file is required).

Faculty members hired at the rank of associate professor without tenure may be granted tenure without promotion to professor.

Associate professors may apply for promotion to professor when they have met the minimum university requirement for education and time in rank (see section 6.3.8).

6.3.7.12 Early Tenure

The length of the mandatory probationary period is established at the time of the initial appointment, but may be changed as provided in UWS 3.04, (1). “Early” tenure is considered to be the granting of tenure **before** completion of the maximum probationary period. Faculty at the rank of assistant professor may **not** be promoted to associate professor without a positive decision on tenure (either at or before the completion of the maximum probationary period).

(1) A faculty member who wishes to apply for an early tenure decision must present a written request for the early decision to the department chair or equivalent by the end of the semester prior to the academic year during which the decision is to be made.

(2) 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 the appropriate RTRB only on the affirmative vote of at least **four-fifths** of the membership of the RTRB. (See also section 6.3.4.5 (2) “Establishment of the Renewal and Tenure Body” and section 6.3.7.7 “Voting Procedures.”)

(3) If a faculty member’s request for early tenure is denied, the faculty member may request a reconsideration. The faculty member may **not** request an appeal or an additional early tenure consideration prior to the end of the mandatory probationary period established at the time of initial appointment.

(4) Denial of early tenure shall not prejudice action on the tenure decision to be made at the completion of the mandatory probationary period established at the time of the initial appointment.

6.3.7.13 Tenure upon Appointment

Faculty with outstanding credentials may be granted tenure at the time of the initial appointment. The granting of tenure upon appointment may be recommended by the appropriate RTRB only on the affirmative vote of at least **four-fifths** of the membership of the RTRB. (See also section

6.3.4.5 (2) “Establishment of the Renewal and Tenure Body” and section 6.3.7.7 “Voting Procedures.”) There must also be an affirmative decision by the chancellor.

The form used for initial appointment and tenure as well as all evidence required for making a tenure decision must accompany such a recommendation. The recommendation of the RTRB should be reviewed by the dean and the provost before being forwarded to the chancellor.

6.3.7.14 Circumstances That May Delay Tenure Decision

A leave of absence, sabbatical or a teacher improvement assignment does not constitute a break in continuous service and shall not be included in the 7-year period under UWS 3.04 (1). Circumstances in addition to those identified under UWS 3.04 (2) [leave of absence, sabbatical or a teacher improvement assignment] that do not constitute a break in continuous service and that shall not be included in the 7-year period include responsibilities with respect to childbirth and adoption, significant responsibilities with respect to elder or dependent care obligations, disability or chronic illness, or circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member, when those circumstances significantly impede the faculty member’s progress toward achieving tenure. The request shall be made in writing. It shall be presumed that a request made under this section because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption shall be approved. According to state statutes, a request for additional time “shall be made before a tenure review commences under s. US 3.06 (1) (c).”

- (a) A request for additional time because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption shall be initiated in writing by the probationary faculty member concerned and shall be submitted to the chair or academic unit head, who will forward it with a recommendation to the dean, who will forward it with a recommendation to the provost for approval. The provost shall specify the length of time for which the request is granted. The request should state the reason for the exception, and state the beginning date and the ending date of the leave. Final approval and notification shall be made by the chancellor.
- (b) Except for a request because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption, a written request made because of other circumstances under this section shall be submitted to the chair or academic unit head, who will forward it with a recommendation to the dean, who shall forward it with a recommendation to the provost for approval. The provost shall specify the length of time for which the request is granted. The request should state the reason for the exception and state the beginning date and the ending date of the leave. Final approval and notification shall be made by the chancellor. A denial of a request shall be in writing by the chancellor and shall be based on clear and convincing reasons.
- (c) More than one request may be granted because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption. More than one request may be granted to a probationary faculty member but the total, aggregated length of time of all requests, except for a request because of responsibilities with respect to childbirth or adoption, granted to one probationary faculty member ordinarily shall be no more than one year.
- (d) If additional time is needed, the approval process must be reinstated.

- (e) The department chair shall notify the tenured faculty members that the leave has been approved and does not constitute a break in service. The chair does not need to notify the tenured faculty members as to the reason for the request.
- (f) If any faculty member has been in probationary status for more than 7 years because of one or more of the reasons set forth in this section, the faculty member shall be evaluated as if he or she had been on probationary status for 7 years.

6.3.7.15 Tenure of Administrators

All recommendations concerning the granting of tenure to department chairs, deans, and other administrative faculty shall originate with the department (or its functional equivalent) wherein the faculty rank is held and shall be based on academic achievement and experience.

Administrative candidates who may be offered tenure at the time of their hiring shall meet with the appropriate RTRB for the department or its functional equivalent in which they seek tenure during the campus interview process. In cases where the candidate might be considered for tenure in more than one department of its functional equivalent, the provost and/or chancellor shall identify, in consultation with the candidate, which department shall first consider the candidate for tenure.

To implement this policy, the chancellor informs the identified departments in writing that one, or more, of the candidates invited for campus interviews might potentially be tenured into their department. The chancellor also provides the department(s) with the following written information: (a) the curriculum vitae of the candidate(s); (b) a copy of the Faculty Handbook criteria on awarding tenure; (c) a copy of the criteria for considering tenure within the respective department; and (d) information about the potential impact of this hire on existing and future tenure-track positions in the department.

During the campus interview, the candidates meet with members of the identified department. Following that meeting, the tenured members of the department (or its functional equivalent) discuss the merits of the candidate relevant to the tenure criteria and forward a recommendation to the chancellor. The granting of tenure to administrators may be recommended by the appropriate RTRB only on the affirmative vote of at least **four-fifths** of the membership of the RTRB. (See also section 6.3.4.5 (2) “Establishment of the Renewal and Tenure Body” and section 6.3.7.7 “Voting Procedures.”) There must also be an affirmative decision by the chancellor.

Prior to the administrator returning to the department, the chancellor and/or provost shall meet with the department chair to consider the appropriate assignment of responsibilities.

6.3.7.16 Reconsideration and Appeals

(See section 6.3.12 of this Faculty Handbook.)

6.3.8 Promotion in Rank

6.3.8.1 General Information

It should be noted that no UWS Personnel Rule mentions promotions. The only reference to rank is UWS 3.01, which designates the titles that faculty appointments may carry. In place of System-wide rules, UWS 3.03 “Appointments—General” states that, “The faculty of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students and with the approval of the chancellor, shall develop rules relating to faculty appointments.” The Faculty Senate and the chancellor, therefore, have primary responsibility for these policies, including policies governing promotion in rank.

Faculty promotion in rank is granted by the Board of Regents and, at UW-Platteville, is based on the positive recommendations of a candidate’s department salary and promotion committee, the university promotion committee, and the chancellor. The university promotion committee reviews promotion recommendations advanced by departments and gives fair and full consideration to all relevant materials that are presented on a candidate’s behalf. The university promotion committee should not attempt to preempt the academic judgments of department salary and promotion committees but should provide for the equitable evaluation of all candidates in terms of the formal criteria previously delineated as they may specifically apply to that department. In other words, the university promotion committee evaluates procedure and ascertains that criteria have been met as claimed.

6.3.8.2 Composition of the Department Salary and Promotion Committee and the University Promotion Committee

The composition of the department salary and promotion committee is defined in section 6.3.4.4.

The composition of the university promotion committee is defined in section 6.3.4.5.

6.3.8.3 Voting Eligibility

Voting eligibility on the department salary and promotion committee is defined in section 6.3.4.4

Voting eligibility on the university promotion committee is defined in section 6.3.4.5.

6.3.8.4 Criteria for Evaluation/Minimum Degree and Experience Requirements

Each department, for the purpose of making recommendations about promotion in rank, shall establish criteria to serve as the basis of faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness; professional, scholarly, and creative activities; and university and public service activities. The criteria must be consistent with current URSTPC policies as approved by the Faculty Senate and set forth in this handbook. Multi-disciplinary departments may elect to establish sub-plans for individual programs within the department.

For faculty who have teaching appointments, teaching effectiveness shall receive top priority. Consistent deficiencies in teaching effectiveness cannot be offset by superior achievements in scholarship and service.

Performance reviews for faculty with non-teaching assignments shall be based upon the major evaluation categories of job performance, professional/scholarly/creative activity and university and public service activities as weighted by agreement between the faculty member, the department, and, when appropriate, the college dean. Faculty who have had significant and/or extended release time for non-teaching assignments must still submit all student evaluations available for the two most recent semesters.

Faculty subject to a promotion decision when criteria have significantly changed since the last promotion should confer with the department and department chair to negotiate and clarify the criteria to be used. Consideration must be given to length of service under the prior criteria, the terms and expectations under which the initial hire was made, the decision process used to change the criteria, and the extent of prior consultation with the faculty member with respect to the changed criteria. These clarifications will be summarized in writing, approved by the respective college dean, the provost, and the chancellor, and entered into the faculty member's professional record. Decision-makers will use these clarified criteria in making their recommendations.

All candidates for promotion will be evaluated in three areas: (1) teaching effectiveness, (2) professional, scholarly, and/or creative activities, and (3) university and public service. For purposes of promotion, the area of "university and public service" is to be given equal weight with the area of "professional, scholarly, and/or creative activities." In all cases, individuals must demonstrate excellent performance in teaching effectiveness (category 1) in order to receive favorable consideration for promotion. Individuals must also demonstrate excellent performance in **one** of the other two areas (either category 2 or category 3) and satisfactory performance in the other in order to receive favorable consideration for promotion.

In general, candidates for promotion will be evaluated on accomplishments in the three areas listed above since their last promotion. An exception may be made, however, for faculty who have had significant and/or extended release time for non-teaching assignments. In this case, faculty may be evaluated on a teaching record that includes years prior to their last promotion.

In general, activity conducted by the candidate prior to joining the faculty at UW-Platteville will be given less weight than activity conducted since becoming a UW-Platteville faculty member. Candidates should provide evidence in all three areas for their time at UW-Platteville.

Promotion is a privilege based upon qualifications exceeding established minimal criteria and is recommended by an informed collective peer judgment. All candidates should understand clearly that eligibility status and departmental recommendation do not assure or imply that a promotion will be made.

Promotion to the rank of associate professor automatically accompanies a positive decision on tenure (see section 6.3.8.11). Faculty at the rank of assistant professor may **not** be promoted to

associate professor without a positive decision on tenure (either at or before the completion of the maximum probationary period).

A faculty member is eligible to **apply** for promotion to the rank of professor if he or she has been in the rank of associate professor for at least four full years and has met **one** of the following minimum criteria:

- 1) possesses an earned doctorate or equivalent in an appropriate discipline and has at least ten years of documented effective teaching at the college level, including at least four years at UW-Platteville.
- or**
- 2) possesses a master's degree in an appropriate discipline with significant academic preparation beyond the master's and has at least 18 years of documented effective teaching at the college level, including at least 15 years at UW-Platteville.

All equivalents to the earned doctorate will be decided on a case-by-case basis.

In determining their specific criteria for promotion, departments shall conform to the university standards listed in section 6.3.5.4.

6.3.8.5 Notification

Faculty members who anticipate requesting promotion must notify their department chair and chair of the department salary and promotion committee by the deadline set forth in the RST calendar (see section 6.4.3).

6.3.8.6 Review Process

General

Candidates for promotion are responsible for assembling the review file. Evidence that is submitted by candidates for promotion should be as specific and detailed as possible. Candidates should submit all pertinent evidence with comprehensive documentation since the last promotion. Material should be arranged in chronological order. Whenever possible, the material should be summarized. Original copies of teaching evaluations, publications, or other voluminous or bulky materials may be included in the file submitted to the department salary and promotion committee but should not be transmitted to the next level of review. Candidates may submit evidence of writings that have not been published as evidence of professional and scholarly growth. These should be clearly labeled and the DSPC should carefully evaluate such writing. Candidates should provide information that would make each activity or reference meaningful (i.e., candidates are encouraged to define the importance of each activity or reference). Materials and/or additional information may not be added to the promotion file after the initial level of review.

All members of the DSPC who vote on promotion should be thoroughly familiar with the contents of each file and be prepared to make a professional judgment on the quality and quantity

of such work. Before forwarding the files to the university promotion committee, the chair of the DSPC should prepare a written statement that clearly assesses the quality and quantity of such work. Attention should be given to such assessment factors as the quality of journals or exhibits. Files that are forwarded from the DSPC to the UPC should not contain complete copies of documents and materials that are related to professional and scholarly growth (e.g., books, journals, tapes). Each level shall review evaluations of these materials and decide if, in any instances, they should wish the original documents forwarded to them; then they should record their own assessment on the promotion form.

Candidate's Narrative Statements

These statements describe the candidate's accomplishments in the three categories of (1) teaching effectiveness, (2) professional, scholarly, and creative activity, and (3) university and public service activity. The candidate may write up to three pages for teaching, two pages for scholarship, and two pages for service (singled-spaced, minimum 12 point font one side only). All information should be listed in descending order of **importance**, with dates, rather than chronological order. The most outstanding achievements should be highlighted. A special effort should be taken to emphasize the value and quality of the work, not merely the quantity. Do not duplicate items. If an activity could be included in more than one area, place it in the most appropriate area. Lists should be used rather than narrative paragraphs whenever that would be more efficient.

Student Evaluations

Those seeking promotion must submit a copy of the summary of student evaluations **for all courses taught in both semesters (fall and spring) of the preceding academic year.** [Exception: Faculty who have had significant and/or extended release time for non-teaching assignments must submit all student evaluations available for the two most recent semesters.] Supporting student evaluation of teaching data must be made available to any review body or individual upon request.

Departmental recommendations for promotion are submitted to the UPC (in care of the provost) by the deadline set forth in the RST calendar. With each candidate's file, the department submits a copy of the departmental definitions and expectations for teaching, professional development, and service. The members of the UPC shall read each file and evaluate the work done in each of the areas of faculty responsibility, based on the department's definitions.

There will be a minimum of two meetings of the UPC during the fall semester. The first meeting (which may be continued over more than one meeting time) will be for the purpose of reviewing as a group each candidate's teaching, professional development, and service accomplishments as presented in the promotion file. The second meeting will be for the purpose of voting on each candidate's file. Both meetings will be called under the provisions of s. 19.85, Wis. Stats., the Open Meetings Law (see section 6.1.2).

6.3.8.7 Voting Procedures

All votes pertaining to actions of review bodies will be conducted by a show of hands; or signed ballots that will be saved and attached to the minutes (forwarded to the provost's office in the case of a tenure decision); or each person's vote can be recorded in the minutes; or a roll call vote, if requested by at least one member, with each person's vote recorded in the minutes. Departmental plans must specify which method(s) of voting will be used. In reporting the results of any personnel action requiring a vote, the vote count (votes for and votes against) will be recorded on the appropriate form and provided to the individual under consideration in the personnel action (see section 6.3.4.3).

6.3.8.8 Counting of Votes

To be considered a positive recommendation (i.e., supportive of promotion), a simple majority of the votes cast must exist (more votes "for" than votes "against"). Any personnel action that does not have a simple majority of the votes cast (either a tie or more votes "against" than votes "for") is considered a negative recommendation (i.e., against promotion).

Abstentions from voting shall not be counted in determining a simple majority. The right to vote is limited to the members of the review body who are present in person or via synchronous discussion at the time the vote is taken at a legal meeting. [**Exception:** Members unavoidably absent from the meeting because of illness or emergency may vote by absentee ballot submitted to the chair prior to the meeting; members voting by absentee ballot must have reviewed the file prior to submitting the ballot.] There shall be no voting by proxy. **Asynchronous meetings (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes.**

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 (see also section 6.1.2 "Wisconsin Open Meetings Law").

6.3.8.9 Reporting of Recommendation

Departmental Level

The chair of the department salary and promotion committee shall forward to the university promotion committee its recommendation and the number of votes for and against promotion, following the timeline for notification as set forth in the RST calendar. It shall at the same time inform the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean of its recommendation in writing. The faculty member will also be informed of his or her right to reconsideration in the case of a negative recommendation for promotion (see section 6.3.8.13).

University Level

The chair of the university promotion committee shall forward to the chancellor its recommendation and the number of votes for and against promotion, following the timeline for notification as set forth in the RST calendar. It shall at the same time inform the faculty member, the DSPC chair, the department chair, and the dean of its recommendation in writing. The

faculty member will also be informed of his or her right to reconsideration in the case of a negative recommendation for promotion (see section 6.3.8.13).

6.3.8.10 Role and Authority of Chancellor

The chancellor shall inform the faculty member under review, the chair of the DPC, the department chair, the dean, and the chair of the UPC of his or her decision on the request for promotion, following the timeline for notification as set forth in the RST calendar.

6.3.8.11 Tenure and Promotion in Rank

As of January 2016, promotion to the rank of associate professor is concomitant with the tenure decision. Any probationary faculty member holding the rank of assistant professor who is granted tenure is also promoted to the rank of associate professor. Assistant professors tenured prior to January 2016 may apply for promotion to associate professor by submitting a written request to the DSPC (no file is required).

Faculty members hired at the rank of associate professor without tenure may be granted tenure without promotion to professor.

Associate professors may apply for promotion to professor when they have met the minimum university requirement for education and time in rank (see section 6.3.8).

6.3.8.12 Recommendations Concerning the Promotion of Department Chairs, Deans, and Other Administrative Faculty

All recommendations concerning the promotion of department chairs, deans, and other administrative faculty shall originate with the department wherein each holds rank, and shall be based on academic achievement and experience.

6.3.8.13 Reconsideration of a Negative Recommendation

The purpose of the reconsideration is to give the faculty member denied promotion an opportunity to present any relevant information or make a statement to the review body or individual. The review body or individual will then reconsider its original decision in order to provide a good faith reevaluation of the faculty member requesting promotion.

A candidate denied recommendation for promotion at any level of review may file a written request with the appropriate review body or individual asking for the reasons for denial. The candidate may also file a written request for reconsideration by the review body or individual of the negative recommendation on promotion within 10 calendar days of written notification of the recommendation. A reconsideration may include submission of a counterstatement and/or a request for a personal appearance before the appropriate review body or individual. Requests for reconsideration shall be based upon violations of specified procedures or failure to consider pertinent evidence. If the candidate under review requests to meet with the UPC, the members of the appropriate DSPC are entitled to advance notification and have the right to be present at the meeting.

If a reconsideration has been requested of a negative recommendation that originated with the DSPC or the UPC, the review body will reconvene, with adequate notice, and it will fairly reconsider all relevant materials based on the candidate's request. The review body will then provide written notice of the results of the vote and an explanation of its recommendation upon reconsideration to the candidate, following the timeline for notification as set forth in the RST calendar. If the recommendation upon reconsideration is positive, the promotion file is forwarded to the next higher level of review. If the recommendation upon reconsideration is negative, the faculty member may plead his or her case to the next higher review body.

If the negative decision originated with the chancellor, the candidate may **request** a meeting with the chancellor as soon as practicable; the candidate does not have the **right** to require the chancellor to participate in such a meeting. In the event that the chancellor agrees to meet with the candidate, the chancellor will provide written notice of the results of his/her reconsideration decision to the candidate within 10 days of the time of the meeting.

A candidate denied recommendation for promotion by either the DSPC or the UPC may choose to plead his or her case directly to the next higher review level without first going through a reconsideration process. The next higher review body will consider the negative recommendation(s) at the lower level when making its independent recommendation or, in the case of the chancellor, the final decision.

The faculty member does **not** have the right to the formal appeal process outlined in section 6.3.12.

6.3.9 Recommendations Concerning Merit Awards and Inequity Adjustments

6.3.9.1 General Information

Department salary and promotion committees shall annually review each faculty member under its jurisdiction for the purpose of identifying those faculty deserving of merit awards and/or inequity and/or compression adjustments. The evaluations and recommendations shall be made in the light of the criteria, standards, and procedures identified in departmental and college compensation plans. Such recommendations and supporting evidence shall be forwarded to the appropriate college compensation committee for final faculty-level approval or disapproval, and each faculty member shall be informed promptly whether such a merit award and/or inequity and/or compression adjustment has been recommended or not.

6.3.9.2 Composition of the Department Salary and Promotion Committee and the College Compensation Committee

The composition of the department salary and promotion committee is defined in section 6.3.4.4.

The composition of the college compensation committee is defined in section 6.3.4.6.

6.3.9.3 Voting Eligibility

Voting eligibility on the department salary and promotion committee is defined in section 6.3.4.4

Voting eligibility on the college compensation committee is defined in section 6.3.4.6.

6.3.9.4 Criteria for Evaluation

Each department, for the purpose of making recommendations about adjustments in salary, shall establish criteria to serve as the basis of faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness; professional, scholarly, and creative activities; and university and public service activities. The criteria must be consistent with current URSTPC policies as approved by the Faculty Senate and set forth in this handbook in section 6.3.5.4. Multi-disciplinary departments may elect to establish sub-plans for individual programs within the department.

For faculty who have teaching appointments, teaching effectiveness shall receive top priority. Consistent deficiencies in teaching effectiveness cannot be offset by superior achievements in scholarship and service.

Performance reviews for faculty with non-teaching assignments shall be based upon the major evaluation categories of job performance, professional/scholarly/creative activity and university and public service activities as weighted by agreement between the faculty member, the department, and, when appropriate, the college dean.

6.3.9.5 Notification

The chair of the DSPC must give the faculty member at least 20 calendar days' advance written notice of the departmental review.

6.3.9.6 Salary Recommendations

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.

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.

The college compensation committee may initiate the consideration of any faculty member under its jurisdiction for a salary adjustment (merit/inequity /compression), but the CCC may not recommend a salary adjustment without the concurrence of the department salary and promotion committee.

Definition of Meritorious Performance

Meritorious performance is measured in objective as well as subjective ways that stem from assessment techniques such as observations, evaluation instruments, discussions, feedback, and written materials. The following are essential concepts and elements necessary to judge meritorious performance:

- Meritorious performance must be achievable within one's position description.
- Meritorious performance must be attainable for each individual member, regardless of how other members have been judged in their roles.
- In addition to financial compensation, meritorious performance may be recognized and rewarded through oral and written recognition, special assignments, provision for personal growth, etc.
- The basis for performance evaluation will be (1) the degree of accomplishment of the faculty member's individual professional objectives and (2) overall performance in relationship to professional expectations as established through the peer review process.

6.3.9.7 Voting Procedures

All votes pertaining to actions of review bodies will be conducted by a show of hands; or signed ballots that will be saved and attached to the minutes (forwarded to the provost's office in the case of a tenure decision); or each person's vote can be recorded in the minutes; or a roll call

vote, if requested by at least one member, with each person's vote recorded in the minutes. Departmental plans must specify which method(s) of voting will be used. In reporting the results of any personnel action requiring a vote, the vote count (votes for and votes against) will be recorded on the appropriate form and provided to the individual under consideration in the personnel action (see section 6.3.4.3).

6.3.9.8 Counting of Votes

To be considered a positive recommendation (i.e., supportive of a salary adjustment), a simple majority of the votes cast must exist (more votes "for" than votes "against"). A personnel action that does not have a simple majority of the votes cast (either a tie or more votes "against" than votes "for") is considered a negative recommendation (i.e., against a salary adjustment).

Abstentions from voting shall not be counted in determining a simple majority. The right to vote is limited to the members of the review body who are present in person or via synchronous discussion at the time the vote is taken at a legal meeting. **[Exception: Members unavoidably absent from the meeting because of illness or emergency may vote by absentee ballot submitted to the chair prior to the meeting; members voting by absentee ballot must have reviewed the file prior to submitting the ballot.]** There shall be no voting by proxy. **Asynchronous meetings (electronic or otherwise) are contrary to state statutes.**

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 (see also section 6.1.2 "Wisconsin Open Meetings Law").

6.3.9.9 Reporting of Recommendation

Departmental Level

The chair of the department salary and promotion committee shall forward to the college compensation committee its recommendation and the number of votes for and against a salary adjustment, following the timeline for notification as set forth in the RST calendar. It shall at the same time inform the faculty member and the department chair of its recommendation in writing. The faculty member will also be informed of his or her right to reconsideration in the case of a negative recommendation for a salary adjustment (see section 6.3.9.12).

College Level

The chair of the college compensation committee shall forward to the chancellor its recommendation and the number of votes for and against a salary adjustment, following the timeline for notification as set forth in the RST calendar. It shall at the same time inform the faculty member, the DSPC chair, and the department chair. The faculty member will also be informed of his or her right to reconsideration in the case of a negative recommendation for a salary adjustment (see section 6.3.9.12).

6.3.9.10 Role and Authority of Chancellor

The chancellor shall inform the faculty member under review, the chair of the DPC, the department chair, and the chair of the CCC of his or her decision on the request for a salary adjustment, following the timeline for notification as set forth in the RST calendar.

6.3.9.11 Salary Recommendations Concerning Department Chairs

Recommendations concerning the salary of department chairs shall originate with the department salary and promotion committee.

6.3.9.12 Salary Reconsiderations

Faculty members who have been denied a salary adjustment (merit/inequity/compression) by the DSPC, the CCC and/or the chancellor may request a reconsideration at any level of review. The reconsideration must be scheduled at the earliest practicable time and in accordance with the provisions of s. 19.85, Wis. Stats., the Open Meetings Law (see section 6.1.2). The faculty member is also entitled to (a) a postponement of any review action scheduled at a higher level until the reconsideration at the lower level has taken place, and (b) prompt notice of the results of any reconsideration.

If no reconsideration is requested, the faculty member may still request that the file be sent to the next higher review body or individual. The next higher review body or individual will consider the negative recommendation(s) at the lower level when making their independent recommendation or, in the case of the chancellor, the final decision. The faculty member does **not** have the right to the formal appeal process outlined in section 6.3.12.

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

UW-Platteville is committed to the principle of equal reward for equal service and wishes to emphasize its absolute commitment to the UW-System Affirmative Action policy and guidelines.

Correcting inequities without creating new ones is a high priority for the department salary and promotion committees and the college compensation committees regarding salary. In determining an inequity, the department salary and promotion committees and the college compensation committees should consider comparable faculty and not “select” a few individual cases to support a claim of inequity. The term “inequity” is defined as the salary difference attributable to differences in the salary level of the faculty member when compared to the salary of other UW-Platteville faculty members within the same discipline or when compared to external appropriate, comparable academic peer groups in the field.

Inequity decisions must be based on convincing documentation.

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.

The years and quality of service to this university should be considered before total years of experience.

6.3.10 Post-Tenure Review

6.3.10.1 Review Cycle

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 so that they may positively contribute to the mission and goals of the department, the college, and the university.

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

Post-tenure reviews must be completed at the department level by March 31 of the assigned year.

6.3.10.2 Review Process

The faculty member will complete the form for post-tenure review (see section 6.6), which includes a personal plan for continuing growth and development. The form 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 will address development needs of the faculty member to make progress toward achieving the plan's goals, and the department chair will recommend ways of helping the faculty member meet those goals.

Results of the post-tenure faculty reviews will be transmitted by the department chair to the college dean. The post-tenure reviews will become part of a personnel file of the faculty member concerned. The file will be retained in the college dean's office.

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.

The dean will send a summary of the post-tenure reviews to the provost by April 15 of the assigned year.

Monitoring the post-tenure review process is the responsibility of the provost in conjunction with the URSTPC.

6.3.11 Emeritus Status

6.3.11.1 Qualifications

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

- meet one of the following two conditions:
 - have at least 20 years of relevant experience in higher education at an accredited institution with at least the last 10 years at UW-Platteville, **or**
 - have at least 20 years of relevant experience in education (any level) with at least the last 15 years at UW-Platteville.
- be officially retired from the UW-System.
- 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 appropriate college dean.

6.3.11.2 Recommendation Process

- (a) The provost informs the department chairs of impending retirements.
- (b) Department chairs conduct a vote of tenured department members to determine departmental support for recommendation to emeritus status.
- (c) The department recommendation is forwarded through the appropriate college dean for comment (concurrence with department or not).
- (d) The chancellor reviews the recommendations and takes action.

6.3.11.3 Privileges Afforded to Emeriti Faculty

Emeriti faculty are entitled to an official UW-Platteville network account and a free UW-Platteville parking permit (note: **replacement** parking permits must be purchased). Programs, departments, and colleges may offer additional privileges and/or resources to emeriti faculty at their discretion.

6.3.12 Nonrenewal of Probationary Appointments and Denial of Tenure

6.3.12.1 General Information

Section 1 UWS 3.07, 3.08, 3.09, and 3.10

UWS 3.07 Nonrenewal of probationary appointments

(1) (a) Rules and procedures. The faculty and chancellor of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students, shall establish rules and procedures for dealing with instances in which probationary faculty appointments are not renewed. These rules and procedures shall provide that, upon the timely written request of the faculty member concerned, the department or administrative officer making the decision shall, within a reasonable time, give him or her written reasons for nonrenewal. Such reasons shall become a part of the personnel file of the individual. Further, the rules and procedures shall provide for reconsideration of the initial nonrenewal decision upon timely written request.

(b) Reconsideration. The purpose of reconsideration of a nonrenewal decision shall be to provide an opportunity to a fair and full reconsideration of the nonrenewal decision, and to insure that all relevant material is considered.

1. Such reconsideration shall be undertaken by the individual or body making the nonrenewal decision and shall include, but not be limited to, adequate notice of the time of reconsideration of the decision, an opportunity to respond to the written reasons and to present any written or oral evidence or arguments relevant to the decision, and written notification of the decision resulting from the reconsideration.

2. Reconsideration is not a hearing or an appeal, and shall be nonadversary [sic] in nature.

3. In the event that a reconsideration affirms the nonrenewal decision, the procedures specified in s. UWS 3.08 shall be followed.

UWS 3.08 Appeal of a nonrenewal decision

(1) The faculty and chancellor of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students, shall establish rules and procedures for the appeal of a nonrenewal decision. Such rules and procedures shall provide for the review of a nonrenewal decision by an appropriate standing faculty committee upon written appeal by the faculty member concerned within 20 days of notice that the reconsideration has affirmed the nonrenewal decision (25 days if notice is by first class mail and publication). Such review shall be held not later than 20 days after the request, except that this time limit may be enlarged by mutual consent of the parties, or by order of the review committee. The faculty member shall be given at least 10 days notice of such review. The burden of proof in such an appeal shall be on the faculty member, and the scope of the review shall be limited to the question of whether the decision was based in any significant degree upon one or more of the following factors, with material prejudice to the individual:

- (a) Conduct, expressions, or beliefs which are constitutionally protected, or protected by the principles of academic freedom, or*
- (b) Factors proscribed by applicable state or federal law regarding fair employment practices, or*
- (c) Improper consideration of qualifications for reappointment or renewal. For purposes of this section, "improper consideration" shall be deemed to have been given to the qualifications of a faculty member in question if material prejudice resulted because of any of the following:*
 - 1. The procedures required by rules of the faculty or board were not followed, or*
 - 2. Available data bearing materially on the quality of performance were not considered, or*
 - 3. Unfounded, arbitrary or irrelevant assumptions of fact were made about work or conduct.*

(2) The appeals committee shall report on the validity of the appeal to the body or official making the nonrenewal decision and to the appropriate dean and the chancellor.

(3) Such a report may include remedies which may, without limitation because of enumeration, take the form of a reconsideration by the decision maker, a reconsideration by the decision maker under instructions from the committee, or a recommendation to the next higher appointing level. Cases shall be remanded for reconsideration by the decision maker in all instances unless the appeals committee specifically finds that such a remand would serve no useful purpose. The appeals committee shall retain jurisdiction during the pendency of any reconsideration. The decision of the chancellor will be final on such matters.

UWS 3.09 Notice periods

(1) A faculty member who is employed on probationary appointment pursuant to s. 36.13, Stats., shall be given written notice of reappointment or nonreappointment for another academic year in advance of the expiration of the current appointment as follows:

(a) When the appointment expires at the end of an academic year, not later than March 1 of the first academic year and not later than December 15 of the second consecutive academic year of service;

(b) If the initial appointment expires during an academic year, at least 3 months prior to its expiration; if a second consecutive appointment terminates during the academic year, at least 6 months prior to its expiration;

(c) After 2 or more years of continuous service at an institution of the university of Wisconsin system, such notice shall be given at least 12 months before the expiration of the appointment.

UWS 3.10 Absence of proper notification

If proper notice is not given in accordance with s. UWS 3.09, the aggrieved faculty member shall be entitled to a one-year terminal appointment. Such appointments, however, shall not result in the achievement of tenure.

Section 2 Renewal/Tenure Decisions (decision vs. recommendation)

Decisions

Decisions regarding renewal or granting of tenure are made at only two levels: the department (or its functional equivalent) and the chancellor (or the chancellor's designee).

NOTE: This can be very confusing, especially since UWS 3.01 includes language referring to departmental **recommendations** (see section 1 above). To be absolutely accurate, one would say that a departmental action supporting appointment, renewal, or tenure is a recommendation, since the chancellor need not accept the decision of the department or its functional equivalent. However, an action denying appointment, renewal, or tenure is always a **decision** since the chancellor cannot appoint or reappoint absent the affirmative recommendation of the department or its functional equivalent, and the Board cannot award tenure without the affirmative recommendation of the department or its functional equivalent except under extremely narrow circumstances.

If the department says yes, the chairperson, dean, and provost may all recommend no, and the chancellor will decide. If the department says no, that ends the matter unless there is an appeal. The chairperson's and college dean's separate recommendations, if different from the decision of the department, would not affect the decision.

Faculty have the right to appeal a **decision** not to renew or not to grant tenure made at the department level.

Recommendations

Recommendations regarding renewal or the granting of tenure may be made by a faculty member's department chairperson or college dean, or by the provost. An adverse **recommendation** made by these individuals is not subject to appeal. However, faculty who appeal an adverse decision may call as a witness any person who made an adverse recommendation to the individual making the decision.

6.3.12.2 Reconsideration of Nonrenewal or Denial of Tenure

Section 1 Overview of Process

Statement of Reasons

Once a nonrenewal or denial of tenure notice has been received from the RTRB or the chancellor, the faculty member has the right to request and receive a written statement of reasons by the decision-maker. The written request for those reasons must be made within five calendar days of receipt of the nonrenewal or denial of tenure notice. **NOTE:** The RTRB will not provide to the probationary faculty member under review any written reasons for a negative decision unless requested to do so by the probationary faculty member; if requested, the RTRB is

required to provide reasons. The chair of the RTRB shall be responsible for ensuring that URSTPC policy is followed when written reasons have been requested.

If a written request for reasons is made, the statement of reasons must be provided to the faculty member prior to the reconsideration. The statement of reasons also becomes a permanent part of the individual's RST file. Faculty members have the right to review their own RST file. Faculty members also have the right to make written responses to any statements in the file and to have those responses placed in their RST file.

Reconsideration

The faculty member has the right to request a reconsideration by the decision-maker provided the request is submitted in writing within 20 calendar days of receipt of the written reason(s) for nonrenewal or denial of tenure. Any written request for reconsideration must be granted. The faculty member also has the right of access to all materials which may have a direct bearing on a presentation at the reconsideration meeting. Any reconsideration must be held within 20 calendar days of receipt of the request for reconsideration, except that this time limit may be extended by mutual consent of the parties. The faculty member must be informed in writing of the decision within five calendar days after the initial reconsideration meeting, except that this time limit may be extended by mutual consent of the parties.

Written notice of a nonrenewal decision at either level of review (RTRB or chancellor) constitutes proper notice of nonrenewal as specified in UWS 3.07. If the affected faculty member requests a reconsideration in writing, he or she is further entitled to a ten-calendar-day advance notice of the reconsideration.

Review at the next appropriate level is postponed until the reconsideration at the lower level has been concluded.

If reconsideration results in a decision favorable to the faculty member, the reconsideration decision supplants the original, and the positive recommendation is sent forward to the next appropriate level.

If reconsideration affirms the initial decision made at the department level, the faculty member may either drop the matter or proceed to an appeal (see section 6.3.12.3). Exception: If the faculty member has been denied tenure before the completion of the maximum probationary period, he or she does not have the right to the formal appeal procedures outlined in section 6.3.12.3.

Section 2 Reconsideration Proceedings

- (a) It is to be understood that the purpose of the reconsideration shall be to provide an opportunity for a fair and full re-examination of all the relevant factors and circumstances, so that every reasonable effort shall have been made to assure that the

decision was a sound one. Reconsideration is not a hearing or an appeal, and shall be non-adversarial in nature.

- (b) Reconsideration by the RTRB or the chancellor shall be completed and the faculty member informed in writing of the decision within five calendar days after the initial reconsideration meeting. This period can be extended upon mutual consent of the faculty member and the RTRB or the chancellor if extenuating circumstances exist.
- (c) The faculty member requesting reconsideration shall have the right to be counseled by any person(s) of choice. [In cases where there are multiple counselors, the convening party (whether the RTRB or the chancellor) may restrict discussion of each major issue to a single counselor. Determination whether more than one counselor should address an issue should be a procedural and unappealable determination of the RTRB or the chancellor.]
- (d) Reconsideration meetings shall be properly noticed and conducted according to 19.85 Wis. Stats. (see 6.2.1 “Wisconsin Open Meetings Law”). The faculty member being reconsidered may request that the meeting be held in open session. Members of the public attending an open meeting shall not have the right to participate in the proceedings.
- (e) The faculty member requesting reconsideration shall be given the opportunity to present his or her statements in writing prior to the initial meeting. The faculty member requesting reconsideration shall also be invited to appear before the RTRB or the chancellor to present further oral evidence germane to the decision.
- (f) The RTRB and the chancellor as well as the faculty member involved in the reconsideration proceedings shall have access to all documents used to make the nonrenewal or denial of tenure decision.
- (g) Audio recordings shall be made of all reconsideration meetings, with copies available at no cost to the faculty member. The provost’s office shall keep this recording along with other documents pertaining to the proceedings.
- (h) The chairperson of the RTRB or the chancellor shall prepare a report that identifies the time, date, and location of the meeting, along with an identification of those present at the meeting. This report shall identify the evidence that was reviewed and considered. The report shall also include a written decision on the request for reconsideration of the decision as well as the rationale in support of that decision. Copies of this report shall be filed with all concerned parties and added to the faculty member’s personnel file.
- (i) If reconsideration affirms the original decision, that reconsideration process ends. The faculty member requesting reconsideration of a nonrenewal decision or a denial of tenure at the completion of the maximum probationary period has the right to appeal under the provisions of section 6.3.12.3.

[NOTE: If the faculty member has been denied tenure before the completion of the maximum probationary period, he or she does not have the right to the formal appeal procedures outlined in section 6.3.12.3.]

- (j) If the reconsideration results in a change of decision by either the RTRB or the chancellor, the prior decision is rescinded, and the decision in favor of renewal or tenure shall be advanced through the decision-making process. In these instances, each review level shall take action on the matter as soon as possible after receiving the file so as to restore the normal decision-making timeline. All of the provisions for action and consequences of renewal and tenure decisions shall be as if a nonrenewal or denial of tenure decision had not taken place.
- (k) The provost shall be the custodian of the minutes and reports of all levels of review involved in the reconsideration process. All documents shall be kept in a file, separate from the personnel files. The faculty member shall have access to review the contents of this file and may request copies of any documents or materials.

6.3.12.3 Appeal of Nonrenewal or Denial of Tenure

Section 1 Applicable Documents

A faculty member contemplating an appeal after having received notice of nonrenewal or denial of tenure is advised to become familiar with

- the appropriate departmental personnel rules and procedures;
- the appropriate sections of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, the UW System faculty personnel rules; and
- related documents in this handbook.

Section 2 Counsel

A faculty member contemplating an appeal may wish to seek advice from senior faculty or legal counsel familiar with the policies and procedures. The right to invite and seek council from an individual (or individuals) of the faculty member's choice during any hearing is guaranteed under these procedures.

Section 3 Burden of Proof and Scope of Appeals

Burden of Proof

The burden of proof in an appeal of nonrenewal or denial of tenure is on the faculty member.

Scope of Appeals

The scope of the appeal shall be limited to whether material prejudice to the individual resulted because the decision was based in any significant degree upon:

- conduct, expressions, or beliefs which are constitutionally protected, or protected by the principles of academic freedom; or
- factors proscribed by applicable state or federal law regarding fair employment practices; or
- improper consideration of qualifications, which shall be deemed to have occurred if material prejudice resulted because:
 - procedures required by the faculty or Board were not followed; or
 - available data bearing materially on the quality of performance were not considered; or
 - unfounded, arbitrary, or irrelevant assumptions of fact were made about work or conduct (see UWS 3.08 in section 6.3.12.1).

Section 4 Time Limits

Termination of Appeal

Failure to meet any time limits established by these procedures will likely end the proceedings. A faculty member considering an appeal of nonrenewal or denial of tenure is urged to review these procedures and to act promptly.

Length of Process

The time limits are intended to ensure action within a reasonable time period; nevertheless, the appeal process may be lengthy. The deliberative process in particular may take several months to conclude: the issues are significant; there is no limit on the number of deliberative sessions which may be held; and there is no limit on the length of the recesses which may occur between sessions.

Action on Nonrenewal or Denial of Tenure

The university will proceed on a nonrenewal or denial of tenure decision even if an appeal is in progress in order to meet obligations to provide adequate notice of nonrenewal as prescribed in UWS 3.09. Written notice of a nonrenewal decision at either level of review constitutes proper notice of nonrenewal as specified in UWS 3.09.

Section 5 Presence at Meetings

No Exclusions

Under the provisions of 19.89 of the Open Meetings Law, no member of a governmental body may be excluded from any meeting of that body. In addition, no member may be excluded from meetings of the body's subunits unless the rules of the parent body specifically state otherwise.

Right to Open Meeting

A probationary faculty member has the right to request and receive an open meeting for any meeting of a department, or unit, or subunit involving an evidentiary hearing or final action on consideration of **tenure** for that individual, even when departmental policies provide that subunit or committee meetings be restricted to members of the subunit or committee.

NOTE: A meeting with an administrator for the purpose of performance evaluation, even where the end result of the discussion will be a recommendation on renewal or the granting of tenure, is not subject to the provisions of the Open Meetings Law: an individual administrator is not a “formally constituted subunit.” *19.85 Wis. Stats.*

Section 6 Rules and Procedures

Filing an appeal

Upon receipt of written notification that nonrenewal or denial of tenure at the completion of the maximum probationary period was affirmed in the reconsideration, the faculty member has 20 calendar days in which to request a hearing by the Appeals Commission (25 calendar days if notice is by first class mail and publication). An aggrieved faculty member who does not exercise his or her right to reconsideration still retains the right to appeal a nonrenewal or denial of tenure.

- Failure to meet the 20 day deadline is presumptively likely to end the appeal.
- The request must be in writing and addressed to the chairperson or convener of the Appeals Commission.
- The request should provide a historical resume of all actions taken to this point and must state clearly and specifically the precise foundation on which the appeal is to be based.
- UWS 3.08 details the acceptable bases for an appeal (see section 6.3.12.1).

A faculty member may withdraw the appeal at any time. Upon receipt of a written request to withdraw an appeal, the chair of the appeal panel shall forward a copy of the request and the file to the dean. Such withdrawal terminates consideration of the faculty member’s application for renewal or tenure. The dean will return the file and attached materials to the appellant.

Notification

The chairperson of the Appeals Commission will review the request for an appeal. If the chairperson determines that the appellant holds a faculty appointment, the chairperson will:

- provide written notification of the request for hearing to the provost so System legal counsel may be advised a case is pending;

- begin a file of all correspondence concerning the appeal, which will be passed on to the chairperson of the appeal panel;
- provide written notification to the chairperson of the appellant’s renewal and tenure review body, the department chairperson, the dean, the provost, the chancellor, and the chairperson of the Faculty Senate that an appeal is in progress; and
- provide copies of all correspondence to the
 - appellant;
 - appeal panel; and
 - the members of the RTRB.

Appointment of an Appeal Panel

An appeal panel of five members shall be selected by the Appeals Commission to hear a particular case (see section 4.2 “The Faculty Bylaws” of this handbook; specifically, **Part II, Article III, Section 6 “Appeals Commission”** of the Faculty Bylaws).

Appeal Date

The appeal panel must meet to hear the matter within 20 calendar days of receipt of the request for an appeal, except that this time limit may be extended by mutual consent of the parties or by order of the appeal panel. The faculty member requesting a hearing must receive a ten-calendar-day advance notice of the hearing.

Appeal Panel Chairperson’s Responsibilities

Once the appeal panel is appointed, the chairperson of the panel assumes responsibility for the appeal process. The chairperson must:

- conduct the hearing under the provisions of UWS 3.08, these policies and procedures, and the guidelines for appeal hearings (which may be found in section 7 of 6.3.12.3);
- establish appropriate communication with the appellant, the chairperson of the appellant’s renewal and tenure review body, the department chairperson, the dean, the provost, and the chancellor, and keep each informed of the proceedings in the appeal;
- keep records of all correspondence among all the principals from the initiation of the appeal through its conclusion;
- appoint a secretary for the appeal panel and provide for a verbatim transcript of the hearing (usually a sound recording);
- secure appropriate facilities, schedule evidentiary hearings, and provide notices to conform with the Open Meetings Law;

- secure appropriate facilities and schedule and conduct deliberative sessions in which the panel formulates its findings and recommendations;
- distribute materials as necessary;
- prepare the written report of the panel's findings and recommendations and transmit the panel's report to the chancellor and other appropriate parties;
- send a copy of the appeal hearing procedures with each written notification of the hearing, and send written notification (see below) of the appeal hearing to the appellant, the decision-maker(s), other involved individuals, and witnesses asked to appear on behalf of the parties or called by the appeal panel.

Written notification of the appeal hearing must include statements

- of the date, time, and place of the hearing;
- that all parties may be represented by an individual(s) of their choice, which may include legal counsel;
- that normally, by a vote of the appeal panel, the evidentiary hearing and the deliberative sessions will be closed but the appellant, upon timely written request to the chairperson, has the right to request an open evidentiary meeting. Any such request in the case of an appeal of denial of tenure shall be honored.
- of whether the evidentiary hearing and the deliberative meeting will be closed or open;
- that both parties have a right to copies of all documentary evidence relevant to the appeal;
- **that all parties, including witnesses, are expected to provide to the appeal panel chairperson sufficient copies of their documentary evidence for all other parties, and that these materials should be provided in sufficient time prior to the hearing for distribution to all parties, but that failure to provide such copies will not preclude an individual from giving testimony;**
- that either party may call persons to offer evidence or testimony;
- that both parties will be sent a list of the names of any persons to be called by either party, or by the appeal panel;
- that either party may offer testimony from any source;
- that the appeal panel is not bound by statutory rules of evidence but may hear testimony having reasonable probative value;
- that adjournments will be granted to enable either party to investigate evidence as to which a valid claim of surprise is made;
- that the appellant has the right to a verbatim record of the hearing, which may be a sound recording, at no cost;
- that any personal notes made during the procedures and retained by a participant are **subject to subpoena** if the appeal is not resolved at the institutional or System level and becomes a legal matter;

- that a quorum for the evidentiary hearing consists of four members of the appeal panel;
- that a quorum for the deliberative sessions consists of four members of the appeal panel, except that in an emergency, the chairperson may declare a quorum when only three members are present;
- that the burden of proof as to the validity of the appeal is on the appellant; and
- that the appeal panel will give written statements of its findings and recommendations to the chancellor, provost, appropriate dean, department chairperson, appellant, and decision-maker(s).

Communication between the appeal panel and the appellant

All communication concerning an appeal by the appellant should be directed to the chair of the appeal panel and be limited to issues of policy and procedure. The appellant may not seek general advice or counsel from any member of the appeal panel at any point in the appeal process.

Section 7 Appeal Proceedings

Quorum

While all five members will be present whenever possible, a quorum for the appeal hearing and for meetings of the appeal panel consists of four members of the committee.

In an emergency, the chairperson of the appeal panel has the discretion to declare a quorum for deliberative sessions when only three members of the appeal panel are present.

Notice

Notices of meetings must be posted in a public forum (**without identifying the appellant**) and must indicate whether the meetings will be open or closed.

Confidentiality

All matters related to the appellant and the appeal are maintained in the strictest confidentiality by appeal panel members, except as may be necessary to meet provisions of the Open Meetings Law or other similar statutory, administrative rule, or faculty governance requirements.

Following the conclusion of all deliberations and the submittal of the appeal panel's report, the chairperson will collect all drafts and other documents related to the appeal from the members of the panel, from any appointed secretary, and from all other parties except the appellant and the appellant's representative(s). All minutes and materials provided by the parties and not forwarded to the chancellor as a part of the report will be sealed and filed in the office of the chancellor for a period of five years, after which they will be destroyed as permitted under the Public Records Law.

[**NOTE:** Participants are reminded that any personal notes made during the procedures and retained after the appeal hearing are **subject to subpoena** if the appeal is not resolved at the institutional or System level and becomes a legal matter.]

Evidentiary and Deliberative Sessions

The appeal process consists of an evidentiary hearing and a deliberative meeting.

The purpose of the evidentiary hearing is to determine the facts of the situation. Both parties may provide evidence at the evidentiary hearing and both parties have the right to be counseled by another individual(s), which may be legal counsel. The appeal panel is not bound by legal rules of evidence. The burden of proof is on the appellant.

The purpose of the deliberative meeting is for the appeal panel to reach its conclusions, after which the chairperson of the appeal panel will write a draft report of the findings and recommendations of the appeal panel. Each member of the appeal panel must sign the final report or file a dissent. The report will be distributed within 10 days of the close of deliberations.

Closed and Open Sessions

Evidentiary hearings and deliberative meetings must be conducted according to 19.85 Wis. Stats. (see 6.2.1 “Wisconsin Open Meetings Law”). The evidentiary meeting on an appeal of a tenure denial will be open if requested by the appellant. Closed meetings require a majority vote of the hearing committee by a roll call vote.

If the evidentiary hearing is closed, only parties directly involved in the appeal (exclusive of the audio technician) may attend. Those permitted to attend, who may speak when recognized by the chairperson for that purpose, are

- members of the appeal panel;
- the appellant;
- members of the RTRB;
- representatives for the parties;
- witnesses for the parties;
- individuals specifically called or designated by the appeal panel, which may include legal counsel; and
- an appointed secretary, who need not be a member of the panel.

If the evidentiary hearing is open, anyone may attend but only those parties directly concerned with the appeal and recognized for the purpose of speaking by the chairperson of the hearing committee are permitted to speak.

Procedure for Evidentiary Hearing and Deliberative Meeting

The chairperson of the appeal panel convenes the hearing and serves as presiding officer. The chairperson assumes all the normal responsibilities of a committee chairperson and rules on such

questions as may arise on the procedure of the hearing, admissibility of evidence, and all other matters related to the hearing.

The evidentiary hearing normally proceeds in the order described here, but the chairperson may change the order and procedures as circumstances may require.

- Call to order; introduction of members of the panel and of the secretary.
- Explanation of the Open Meetings Law and either
 - explanation of limitations of open meetings, if an open meeting has been requested, or
 - a request for a motion to close the meeting under the appropriate section(s) of 19.85 Wis. Stats. [19.85 (a), (b), (c), or (f)], and a roll call vote on the motion.
- Introduction of the appellant, and the appellant's representative(s), if any.
- Introduction of the decision-maker(s), and the decision-maker's representative(s), if any.

- Presentation of the appeal by the appellant or the appellant's representative.
- Presentation of witnesses on behalf of the appellant.
- Questions of appellant and appellant's witnesses by members of the appeal panel.
(Questions of the appellant and appellant's witnesses by the decision-maker or the decision-maker's representative should be addressed to the chair of the appeal panel.)

- Presentation of all relevant materials by the decision-maker or by the decision-maker's representative.
- Presentation of witnesses on behalf of the decision-maker.
- Questions of decision-maker and decision-maker's witnesses by members of the appeal panel.
(Questions of the decision-maker or the decision-maker's witnesses by the appellant or the appellant's representative should be addressed to the chair of the appeal panel.)

- Presentation by any witnesses who may have been called by the appeal panel and questions of these witnesses by members of the appeal panel.
(Questions of the appeal panel's witnesses by the appellant, the appellant's representative, the decision-maker or the decision-maker's representative should be addressed to the chair of the appeal panel.)

- Additional questions, if any, of witnesses by members of the appeal panel.

- Rebuttal or closing comments by the decision-maker or the decision-maker's representative.
- Rebuttal or closing comments by the appellant or the appellant's representative.

- Conclusion of the evidentiary hearing.
If the deliberative meeting does not follow immediately after the evidentiary hearing, the chairperson will request a motion to recess the hearing and to

reconvene at the deliberative meeting (if possible, the date and time of the session will be included in the motion to recess), and will conduct a roll call vote on the motion.

The appeal panel deliberates on the appeal and writes a report which includes the findings and recommendations of the panel.

Findings

As noted in section 3 “Burden of Proof and Scope of Appeals” (see above), a finding that the facts are as described by the appellant is not, by itself, enough to find that the appeal is valid. The facts must support the contention that at least one of the factors described under UWS 3.08 entered into the decision to a significant degree and with material prejudice to the appellant.

The burden of proof is on the appellant to provide evidence that at least one impermissible factor entered into the decision to a significant degree and with material prejudice to the appellant.

Decision Upheld

If the committee finds for the decision-maker, it recommends the appeal be denied, and the appeal is ended.

Decision Rejected

If the committee finds for the appellant, it makes its recommendations for remedy as follows:

Recommendations for Remedy

All cases under UWS 3.08 must be remanded for reconsideration by the decision-maker(s) **unless** the appeal panel specifically finds that a remand would serve no useful purpose. If the appeal panel finds a remand would serve no useful purpose, the reasons for this finding must be included in the appeal panel’s final report.

Even if it remands the matter, the appeal panel retains jurisdiction until it is satisfied that the appellant’s rights have not been violated.

Possible Remedies for a **Nonrenewal**

If the committee finds that an appeal of a decision for nonrenewal is valid, possible remedies include, but are not limited to:

- reconsideration by the RTRB;
- reconsideration by the RTRB under instructions from the committee; or
- a recommendation to the chancellor.

Possible Remedies for a **Denial of Tenure.**

If the committee finds that an appeal of a denial of tenure is valid, possible remedies include, but are not limited to:

- reconsideration by the RTRB;
- reconsideration by the RTRB under instructions from the committee; or
- where the committee specifically finds that impermissible factors were used as a basis for denial and that no useful purpose would be served by a remand for reconsideration, a recommendation that a **special ad hoc credential review (“Notestein”) committee** (Wisconsin Statutes 36.13 (2) (b)) be convened to provide an independent recommendation for tenure (see section below “Notestein Provisions” for procedures and findings).

In cases of an appeal of a tenure decision made by a renewal and tenure review body, if the appeal panel directs that an ad hoc credential review committee be formed, the appeal panel chair shall forward all materials to the Faculty Senate Chair, including any materials to be considered by the ad hoc committee.

Report

At an appropriate time in the deliberations, the chairperson recesses the meeting and prepares a draft report. The draft is circulated among the members, after which the panel reconvenes to review the draft and make appropriate modifications. After the report has been adopted by the appeal panel, each member of the panel signs the report or files a dissent.

- The report shall be adopted by a majority of the members of the appeal panel. The vote shall be a roll call vote, which shall be recorded.
- The report shall be distributed not later than 10 days following the close of deliberations.
- The chairperson provides a verbatim record of the hearing and a copy of the report to the faculty member, and a copy each of the report to the chancellor, the provost, the appropriate dean, the department chairperson, and the chairperson of the renewal and tenure review body.

Notestein Provisions

This section applies to an appeal of denial of tenure at the completion of the maximum probationary period that originated in an academic department (or its functional equivalent). After following the procedures listed above (i.e., after the matter has been remanded by the appeal panel for reconsideration—with or without restrictions—or after making a finding that such a remand would serve no useful purpose), if the appeal panel finds that the denial of tenure continues to be based on impermissible factors (as listed under UWS 3.08(1)), the following procedures shall apply:

- (1) The report of the appeal panel to the chancellor must include a specific finding that one or more impermissible factors were considered by the academic department (or functional equivalent) in reviewing the credentials and in forming the recommendation that denied tenure.

- The report shall also list, identify and discuss the specific impermissible factor(s), as found by the appeal panel.
- On the basis of these findings, the appeal panel's report shall also recommend to the chancellor the formation (as set forth below) of an ad hoc or "Notestein" committee to make a recommendation on tenure as a substitute for the recommendation originally offered by the department (or functional equivalent).
- Recognizing the importance of resolving any pending appeal, the chancellor and the involved faculty are properly expected to devote the time required to bring this further review to an expeditious resolution.

(2) The chancellor shall approve all recommendations from appeal panels to form an ad hoc credential review committee. In these instances, the chancellor shall also inform the probationary faculty member of the specific actions that are to follow as provided under these rules.

(3) Upon receiving copies of the chancellor's action on the report of the appeal panel, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, or a committee appointed by the Faculty Senate, shall appoint an ad hoc committee and chair to independently review the credentials of the concerned faculty member.

- The ad hoc committee shall have five members, including the chair, with at least three faculty members from UW-Platteville. The committee membership may include faculty appointed from outside the institution. The chair must be a member of the UW-Platteville faculty.
- No person may be appointed to this committee unless the person is knowledgeable or experienced in the academic field of the concerned faculty member or in a substantially similar academic field (per section 10 36.13(2)(b)3., stats.). No member of this committee may be a member of the academic department, or its functional equivalent, that has made the negative recommendation (per section 36.13(2)(b)3, 5 stats.)

(4) The ad hoc committee shall review the aggrieved faculty member's file, or, at the choice of the aggrieved faculty member, a revised file that contains all materials submitted to the RTRB at the time of the original decision, including the independent evaluation made by the department chair and the dean, but that excludes any evaluation by the RTRB on the matter of tenure and any materials relating to the appeal. This provision does not extend, change, or modify the original probationary period in that performance data beyond the time of the decision of the initial level of review shall not be considered or allowed. The ad hoc committee shall use the criteria for tenure as established by the department and the university.

- The ad hoc committee shall not base its tenure recommendation upon impermissible factors, as defined by UWS 3.08(1).

- Within 20 working days after appointment, unless the time is extended for cause by order of the provost, the ad hoc committee shall send its recommendation concerning tenure for the aggrieved faculty member to the following individuals and offices: the chair of the appeal panel, the chair of the committee that made the initial decision of denial of tenure, the appropriate chairperson, the appropriate dean, the chair of the Faculty Senate, the provost, and the chancellor.

(5) a. If the ad hoc committee recommends the **denial of tenure**, the chancellor will inform the faculty member of that decision to deny tenure. In this instance, the faculty member will be afforded an opportunity to request the reasons for the decision, and to pursue reconsideration of the decision through discussions with the ad hoc committee in a manner consistent with the general framework set forth in these rules.

If the ad hoc credential review committee, either initially or upon reconsideration, makes a negative decision, the appellant is, upon written application to the chair of the ad hoc credential review committee, allowed to copy all documents, transcripts and audio recordings possessed by the ad hoc credential review committee. In the case of a negative decision by the ad hoc credential review committee, the chancellor may not recommend that the Board of Regents grant tenure.

b. If the ad hoc committee recommends that **tenure be granted**, that recommendation shall have the force and status of the initial recommendation from the renewal and tenure review body, and the chancellor subsequently may recommend to the Board of Regents that a tenured appointment be granted without a concurring recommended action from the appellant's academic department(s) or functional equivalent. The Chancellor's decision is final (UWS 3.08, (3)). Such action is in accord with Wis. Stats. 36.13 (2) (b).

If the chancellor decides to recommend a grant of tenure, the chancellor shall include in his or her written recommendation to the President of the University of Wisconsin System a summary of the original findings of impermissible factors and a specific notation that the recommendation for tenure was made by the ad hoc committee acting as a substitute for the department (or functional equivalent).

The campus administration shall be financially responsible for legitimate travel expenses incurred by the ad hoc credential review committee members who come from other institutions. Reimbursement shall be limited to transportation, lodging, and meals.

6.3.13 Dismissals

All procedures for dismissal for cause are set forth in UWS 4. The standing committee charged with hearing dismissal cases mandated in UWS 4 shall be the Appeals Commission (see the Faculty Bylaws, Part II, Article III, Section 6). In a dismissal case, if the chancellor is advised that a faculty member should be suspended from his or her duties, pending the outcome of the case, he or she shall consult the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate before taking such action (see also section 9.4).

6.3.14 Faculty Terminated Because of Fiscal Emergency

The procedures for all faculty who are terminated because of fiscal emergency are set forth in UWS 5. The hearing committees mandated in UWS 5.11 shall be the Appeals Commission (see the Faculty Bylaws, Part II, Article III, Section 6). Seniority in matters of termination shall be by rank, and within rank, according to the total years of service to the local university (see also section 9.5).

6.3.15 Retirements

Unclassified employees are bound contractually to the university. Although contract language varies, it is expected that faculty planning to retire from employment at UW-Platteville will submit a letter of retirement as far in advance of the effective date as possible, with the date of the retirement clearly stated in the letter. The retirement date for faculty is normally the last day of the contract year (or the fall semester). A hard copy of this letter must be signed by the individual, dated and submitted to the department chair or the immediate supervisor. The retirement letter will be forwarded through the appropriate administrative levels for acceptance.

The Human Resources Office and/or Employee Trust Funds (ETF) are available to assist employees contemplating retirement in obtaining information necessary to make informed decisions on retirement issues. It is to the advantage of the employee to contact one of these offices well in advance of his or her planned retirement effective date.

All university property provided to the employee must be returned by the retirement date, and the employee should complete an Exit Checklist.

See also section 7.2 “Checkout for Terminating Personnel” and section 9.7 “Dismissal of Faculty in Special Cases.”

6.3.16 Complaints and Grievances

6.3.16.1 General Information

The general meanings of the words *complaint* and *grievance* are set forth in the Faculty Bylaws, Part II, Article III, Section 7. The Complaints and Grievances Commission and the chancellor shall insure that pertinent rules and procedures are followed, including those identified in UWS 6.01 and 6.02.

6.3.16.2 Complaints

The following procedure shall be followed:

- The complainant shall state his or her complaint in writing to the chancellor, who shall review the complaint and take administrative action. The chancellor's administrative action may be to dismiss the complaint, invoke appropriate disciplinary action, or refer the complaint to the Complaints and Grievances Commission. A hearing by the commission shall take place at the request of the chancellor or, if the chancellor invokes a disciplinary action, at the request of the faculty member involved.
- The chancellor and the commission shall ensure that the faculty member involved receives:
 - a written statement of the complaint,
 - at least ten calendar days to prepare an appropriate response,
 - a written statement of the commission's findings within five calendar days of its decision, and
 - a prohibition of further jeopardy for the same incident of alleged misconduct after a final decision.

The chancellor shall also ensure that the appropriate university officials are apprised of the commission's findings and the chancellor's decision. The chancellor's decision on the recommendations of the commission, or on the complaint in the absence of a commission recommendation, shall be final, except that the Board of Regents at its option may grant a review on the record. All parties are due as prompt a resolution of the matter as is practicable.

6.3.16.3 Grievances

The following procedure shall be followed:

A faculty member with a grievance may submit his or her grievance to the Complaints and Grievances Commission. The aggrieved faculty member is entitled to a hearing before the commission within twenty calendar days of the written submission of the grievance to the commission chair. The colleague or colleagues against whom the grievance is lodged are entitled to at least a ten-calendar-day notice of all hearings related to the case. All parties are due as prompt a resolution of the matter as practicable.

6.3.16.4 Reporting Procedures

Reporting procedures are outlined in the Faculty Bylaws, Part II, Article III, Section 7.