UW-W Faculty Personnel Rules

Chapter 3 Sections (click on section heading to jump to that section):

A. Development and Revision of Standards and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

1. General policies

- a. Standards and procedures must be consistent with state and university reappointment, tenure, and promotion policies as defined by and procedures.
- b. Department, constituency, and university standards of evaluation for purposes of reappointment, tenure and/or promotion shall be in effect one year after the Faculty Senate and the Chancellor approve the standards.
- c. Pending approval of constituency standards, the university standards shall be used in lieu of approved constituency standards. Similarly, pending approval of department standards, constituency standards shall be used in lieu of approved department standards.
- d. Schedules for reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be in accordance with UW System and UW-Whitewater policy. Timelines (III, I of these rules) for reviews shall be published by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on or before the first contract day of the academic year.
- e. All materials submitted for review shall adhere to a common university format, referred to in these rules as the portfolio (III, F of these rules).
- f. The dean of each respective constituency shall provide faculty members with the format instructions for submitting portfolios.

2. Department standards committee

- a. Formation: Each department shall establish a committee to develop standards and procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions.
- b. Functions
    - (1) Write
        - (a) Write department standards that are consistent with the constituency and university standards and the mission and goals of the department, constituency, and university. Since probationary faculty shall demonstrate substantial progress toward meeting the standards for tenure and/or promotion, the committee may wish to write intermediate or formative standards for probationary faculty.
        - (b) Write department procedures that are consistent with these rules to be used when making reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion decisions.
        - (c) Define any elements of the format for submitting reappointment, tenure and/or promotion materials that are unique to the department. These elements must be consistent with the portfolio established by the University Standards Committee (III, C, 1, f, (1) - (3) and III, F of these rules).
    - (2) Review: Assure that the content of the Document of Intent (III, C, 1, c and d; III, C, 4, a; and III, F, 2 - 4 of these rules) indicates the probationary faculty member's commitment to make substantial progress toward meeting the department standards for tenure and/or promotion.
    - (3) Report
        - (a) Submit the standards and procedures to the tenured faculty in the department for approval.
        - (b) Submit department's approved standards and procedures to the constituency standards committee for review, possible negotiation and adjustment (III, A, 3, b, (4), (a) of these rules), and approval.
        - (c) After the constituency standards committee approves the department standards, submit department's standards and procedures to the Chancellor for review.
            - i) The focus of the Chancellor's review shall be to identify inconsistencies among the department standards and procedures and the constituency and university standards and procedures and/or the mission and goals of the department, constituency, and university.
            - ii) If the Chancellor finds inconsistencies among the department standards and procedures and the constituency standards and

procedures and/or the mission and goals of the department and constituency, then the Chancellor shall request negotiation with the department (III, A, 2, b, (4), (b) of these rules).
        - iii) The request for negotiation shall be in writing and shall specify the inconsistencies the Chancellor has identified. The request shall be delivered to the chair of the department standards committee.
    - (d) Following the Chancellor's review and any needed negotiations, submit the department standards and procedures to the constituency standards committee for approval and inclusion in the final standards and procedures package to be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval. Official Faculty Senate actions shall go to the Chancellor for approval.
    - (e) When all required approvals have been granted (III, A, 1, b of these rules), forward copies of the department standards and procedures to the department, the constituency standards committee, the dean, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor for reference during reappointment and tenure and/or promotion procedures.
- (4) Negotiate
    - (a) If the constituency standards committee finds that these department standards do not show parity with other department standards within the constituency or in some way are not consistent with the constituency standards, the university standards, or the goals and mission of the department, constituency, or university, then the department standards committee shall
        - i) negotiate these differences with the constituency standards committee,
        - ii) submit a copy of the adjusted standards produced by these negotiations to the department for approval, and
        - iii) upon approval by the tenured faculty of the department, follow procedures listed in III, A, 2, b, (3), (b) through (e) of these rules.
    - (b) If the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee finds that these department standards are not consistent with the constituency standards, the university standards, or the goals and mission of the department, constituency, or university, then the department standards committee and a representative from the constituency standards committee shall
        - i) negotiate with the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee to seek resolution of these differences,

            - ii) submit a copy of the adjusted standards produced by the negotiations to the tenured faculty of the department for approval, and
            - iii) if approved by the tenured faculty of the department, follow procedures listed in III, A, 2, b, (3), (b) through (e) of these rules.
        - (c) If, after twelve months' negotiation, the parties are unable to resolve differences (III, A, 2, b, (4), (a) and/or (b) of these rules), either of the differing parties may request that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee identify an individual to serve as a mediator. This individual must be external to the university and acceptable to both of the differing parties. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall make arrangements for the mediator and mediation session(s).

3. Constituency standards committee

- a. Formation: Each constituency shall have a constituency standards committee composed of at least one tenured faculty member from each department. The total membership of the committee shall include proportionate representation from all departments within the constituency.
    - (1) The tenured faculty from each constituency shall determine
        - (a) the total number of representatives on this committee,
        - (b) the basis for defining proportionate representation, and
        - (c) percentage of committee members that constitutes a quorum.
    - (2) Each department's faculty shall elect its representative(s) to this committee.
    - (3) Departments without tenured faculty shall elect their representative(s) from the tenured faculty of other department(s) within the constituency.
- b. Functions
    - (1) Write
        - (a) In consultation with the constituency dean, write constituency standards that are consistent with the university standards and the mission and goals of the departments, constituency, and university.
        - (b) Prescribe the format for writing and submitting department standards and procedures.
    - (2) Review
        - (a) Review departments' standards and procedures to appraise
            - i) the compatibility of these standards with the constituency's approved standards, the university standards, and the mission and goals of the department, constituency, and university,
            - ii) the degree of parity among them, and

        - iii) their consistency with procedures specified in III, C, D, and E of these rules.
    - (b) Review the portfolios of faculty members who are applying for reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.
- (3) Report
    - (a) Present the constituency standards and procedures to the tenured faculty of the constituency for approval.
    - (b) Submit a copy of the constituency's approved standards and procedures to the University Standards Committee for review and approval.
    - (c) After the University Standards Committee approves the constituency standards, submit constituency's standards and procedures to the Chancellor for review.
        - i) The focus of the Chancellor's review shall be to identify inconsistencies among the constituency standards and procedures and the university standards and procedures and/or the mission and goals of the constituency and/or university.
        - ii) If the Chancellor finds inconsistencies among the constituency standards and procedures and the university standards and procedures and/or the mission and goals of the constituency and university, then the Chancellor shall request negotiation with the constituency (III, A, 3, b, (4), (b) of these rules).
        - iii) The request for negotiation shall be in writing and shall specify the inconsistencies the Chancellor has identified. The request shall be delivered to the chair of the constituency standards committee.
    - (d) Following the Chancellor's review and any needed negotiations, submit the constituency standards and procedures to the University Standards Committee for approval and inclusion in the final standards and procedures package to be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval. Official Faculty Senate actions shall go to the Chancellor for approval.
    - (e) When all required approvals have been granted (III, A, 1, b of these rules), forward copies of the constituency standards and procedures to the departments, the constituency standards committee, the dean, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor for reference during reappointment and tenure and/or promotion procedures.
- (4) Negotiate
    - (a) To support making changes to be approved by the tenured faculty of each respective department (III, A, 2, b, (3), (a) through (e) of these

rules), consult with the department standards committees to negotiate (III, A, 2, b, (4), (a) of these rules) adjustments in standards and procedures to achieve
    - i) conformity with the approved format for the submission of standards (III, A, 3, b, (1),(b) of these rules),
    - ii) parity among the departments' standards and procedures,
    - iii) consistency with the department, constituency, and university goals and missions.
- (b) If the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee finds that the constituency standards are not consistent with the university standards or the goals and mission of the constituency or university, then the constituency standards committee and a representative from the University Standards Committee shall
    - i) negotiate with the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee to seek resolution of these differences,
    - ii) submit the adjusted standards produced by these negotiations to the tenured faculty of the constituency for approval, and
    - iii) upon approval by the tenured faculty of the constituency, follow procedures listed in I, III, A, 3, b, (3), (b) through (e) of these rules.
- (c) If, after twelve months' negotiation, the parties are unable to resolve differences (III, A, 3, b, (4), (a) or (b) of these rules), either of the differing parties may request that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee identify an individual to serve as a mediator. This individual must be external to the university and acceptable to both of the differing parties. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall make arrangements for the mediator and mediation session(s).

4. University Standards Committee

- a. Formation: The faculty of the university shall elect a University Standards Committee composed of an equal number of representatives from each constituency. The Elections Committee shall conduct this election (UW-Whitewater Handbook - Faculty Committees).
- b. Functions
    - (1) Write: In consultation with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs,
        - (a) write university standards that are consistent with the university mission and goals,
        - (b) make revisions of the timeline (III, I of these rules) as needed,
        - (c) identify the types of evidence required in the portfolio (III, F of these rules), and

        - (d) prescribe the format for the portfolio.
    - (2) Review: Review constituency standards and procedures to appraise
        - (a) the compatibility of these standards and procedures with the university standards and the mission and goals of the constituency and the university,
        - (b) the degree of parity among them, and
        - (c) their consistency with the procedures specified in III, C, D, and E of these rules.
    - (3) Report
        - (a) Present recommendations as specified in III, A, 4, b, (1) of these rules to the Faculty Senate for approval. Official Faculty Senate actions shall go to the Chancellor for approval.
        - (b) Present the final standards and procedures documents to the Faculty Senate for approval. Official Faculty Senate actions shall go to the Chancellor for approval.
        - (c) When all required approvals have been granted (III, A, 1, b of these rules), forward copies of the university standards and procedures to the department standards committees, the constituency standards committees, the dean, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor for reference during reappointment and tenure and/or promotion procedures.
    - (4) Negotiate
        - (a) To support making changes to be approved by the tenured faculty of each respective constituency (III, A, 3, b, (3), (a) through (e) of these rules), consult with constituency standards committees to negotiate adjustments in standards and procedures to achieve
            - i) parity among constituencies and
            - ii) consistency with the standards, procedures, and missions and goals of the constituencies and the university.
        - (b) If the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee finds that the university standards and procedures cannot be approved because of inconsistency with the goals and mission of the university, then
            - i) the University Standards Committee and a representative elected by the Faculty Senate shall negotiate with the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee to seek resolution of these differences,
            - ii) submit the adjusted standards produced by these negotiations to the Faculty Senate for approval,
            - iii) upon approval by the Faculty Senate, follow procedures listed in (III, A, 4, b, (3), (b) and (c) of these rules).

        - (c) If, after twelve months' negotiation, the parties are unable to resolve differences (III, A, 2, b, (4), (a) or (b) of these rules), either of the differing parties may request that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee identify an individual who is external to the university to serve as a mediator. This individual must be acceptable to both of the differing parties. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall make arrangements for the mediator and mediation session(s).

5. Faculty Senate

- a. Consider resolutions presented to it by the University Standards Committee.
- b. Report
    - (1) Forward copies of all resolutions concerning reappointment, tenure and/or promotion decisions to the Chancellor for approval.
    - (2) Forward copies of all resolutions concerning reappointment, tenure and/or promotion decisions to the university archives for storage.
    - (3) Forward copies of resolutions concerning reappointment, tenure and/or promotion decisions to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for reference and dissemination to affected parties.
- c. Elect a representative as needed in negotiations with the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee and the University Standards Committee (III, A, 4, b, (4), (b) of these rules).
- d. Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall identify a mediator (III, A, 2, b, (4), (c); III, A, 3, b, (4), (c) and III, A, 4, b, (4), (c) of these rules).

6. Implementation of Standards

- a. Standards shall become effective at the beginning of the next academic year following approval by the Chancellor.
- b. For reappointment and tenure/promotion to associate professor,
    - (1) The probationary faculty member shall use the standards in effect at the time of initial appointment, or
    - (2) Any subsequently approved standards if the probationary faculty member notifies the department by e-mail and/or in writing prior to submission of the portfolio of their desire to use the subsequently approved standards.
- c. For promotion of a tenured assistant professor to associate professor,
    - (1) The faculty member shall use the standards in effect three years prior to the application for promotion, or
    - (2) Any subsequently approved standards if the faculty member notifies the department by e-mail and/or in writing prior to submission of the portfolio of their desire to use the subsequently approved standards.

- d. For promotion to professor,
    - (1) The faculty member shall use the standards in effect three years prior to the application for promotion, or
    - (2) Any subsequently approved standards if the faculty member notifies the department by e-mail and/or in writing prior to submission of the portfolio of their desire to use the subsequently approved standards.
- e. The department shall be responsible for determining that the applicable university standards, constituency standards and department standards are included in the portfolio.

Section B. Authorization, Recruitment, and Initial Appointment

1. Authorization: A department seeking authorization to recruit a faculty member shall, in consultation with the dean

- a. describe duties and responsibilities of the position,
- b. define required and desired applicant qualifications, and
- c. determine rank(s) (UWS 3.01) and salary range(s) for the position.

2. The **dean shall submit the request for authorization** to recruit a faculty member to the Chancellor for approval.

3. **Recruitment:** A department authorized to recruit a faculty member

- a. may define a search committee by open and fair procedures previously agreed upon by the department members and dean which, through its composition and/or procedures, shall demonstrate the university's commitment to diversity and provide for faculty and student participation in the recruitment and selection processes. (This search committee will act on behalf of the department in those functions determined by the department),
- b. shall meet with the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action to establish the guidelines for recruitment procedures,
- c. shall establish recruitment procedures, and
- d. shall submit the recruitment procedures, position description, and advertisement to the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action to assure that they are consistent with federal, state, UW System, and UW-Whitewater policies.

4. When the **Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action approves** the recruitment procedures, the department or its search committee shall

- a. distribute advertisements for the position, making every effort to identify and attract a diverse pool of applicants,
- b. establish the process and criteria for reviewing credentials, and
- c. determine the method for selection of candidates.

5. Selection of candidates

- a. The department or its search committee shall
  - (1) review applicants' credentials,
  - (2) create a list of candidates for approval by the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for initial interview,
  - (3) provide a list of the remaining applicants and the reason(s) each was not recommended for immediate interview, and
  - (4) forward the search packet to the dean.
- b. The dean shall
  - (1) review the list of candidates submitted by the department or its search committee to ascertain if the established procedures have been implemented in accordance with III, B, 3 and 4 of these rules, and
  - (2) based on this review, either
    - (a) sign the Recruitment Sign-off Sheet and forward it to the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, or
    - (b) negotiate suggested changes with the department or its search committee and then sign the Recruitment Sign-off Sheet.
- c. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action shall
  - (1) review the candidates' qualifications to certify that the candidates' qualifications conform to the position description as advertised, and
  - (2) forward the certified list to the department or its search committee.

6. Interview

- a. The department or its search committee shall interview each candidate to determine the candidate's qualifications for appointment. If the appointment is to be at a rank higher than assistant professor, then additional interviews are required.

    - (1) The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs also shall interview any candidate to be considered for appointment at the associate professor rank.
    - (2) The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Chancellor also shall interview any candidate to be considered for appointment at the professor rank.
- b. The department chair shall interview all candidates and inform them of department policies and procedures.
- c. The dean shall interview all candidates and inform them of constituency policies and procedures.
- d. At each interview level, the same core questions and format must be used during the interview of all candidates.

7. Recommendation of candidate

- a. At the close of the interview process, the department or its search committee, the department chair, and the dean shall meet to consider the respective views of the candidates' strengths and weaknesses, the department's needs, and proposed terms of employment. At the close of this consideration, the department or its search committee and the dean shall
    - (1) prepare a written document including:
        - (a) statement of their recommendation of the candidate to be offered the position,
        - (b) list of the terms of employment including terms of initial appointment (III, B, 8 of these rules) including
            - i) rank
            - ii) credited prior service used to set the mandatory tenure decision, if any
            - iii) years of teaching experience that may be used for promotion eligibility (III, B, 8, d, (3) & (4) of these rules), and
            - iv) conditions for conversion to faculty status, if necessary (III, B, 8, a, (3) of these rules).
        - (c) signatures of all members of the department or its search committee and the dean participating in this consideration process.
    - (2) If the department or its search committee and dean do not reach consensus to recommend any of the candidates, then the department or its search committee shall file a written
        - (a) request with the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs asking that they meet with the department or its search committee, department chair, and the dean to again work toward consensus to recommend a finalist, or

        - (b) request with the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action that the search be continued, or
        - (c) recommendation with the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action that the search be terminated.
- b. When the actions specified in III, B, 7, a of these rules have been concluded, the dean submits the document prepared in III, B, 7, a, (1) of these rules to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who shall forward the document and name of the finalist to the Chancellor for his recommendation.
- c. If the Chancellor agrees with the recommendation prepared in III, B, 7, a, (1) of these rules, then the Chancellor shall request that the dean
    - (1) contact the finalist and
    - (2) negotiate what would be an acceptable offer of employment following the terms described in III, B, 7, a, (1), (b) of these rules.
- d. If the Chancellor agrees with the recommendation prepared in III, B, 7, a, (1) of these rules, but the dean was unable to negotiate with the candidate an acceptable offer of employment following the terms described in III, B, 7, a, (1), (b) of these rules, then the dean shall meet with the department or its search committee and the department chair to either
    - (1) recommend one of the other candidates as determined in III, B, 7, a, of these rules, and prepare a written recommendation of the candidate as in III, B, 7, a, (1) of these rules, or
    - (2) request continuation or termination of the search (III, B, 7, a, (2) of these rules).
- e. If the Chancellor disagrees with the recommendation prepared in III, B, 7, a, (1) of these rules, the Chancellor shall request that the dean meet with the department or its search committee and the department chair to
    - (1) recommend one of the other candidates as determined in III, B, 7, a, of these rules, and prepare a written recommendation of the candidate as in III, B, 7, a, (1) of these rules, or
    - (2) request continuation or termination of the search (III, B, 7, a, (2) of these rules).

8. Initial appointments

- a. Type of appointment
    - (1) Probationary faculty appointment: The initial faculty appointment shall be for two years and the candidate must meet the minimum requirements for appointment specified in these Rules (III.H.1-2).
    - (2) ABD probationary faculty appointment: The initial appointment shall be for one year and the candidate must meet the minimum requirements for appointment specified in these Rules (III.H. 1-2).

    - (3) Tenured faculty appointment: The initial appointment may be with tenure if the department finds that the candidate has met the department standards for tenure and both the department and Chancellor recommend granting tenure. The candidate must meet the minimum requirements for appointment at the appropriate rank as specified in these Rules (III.H).
- b. Rank at the time of initial faculty appointment shall be as determined in III, B, 1 of these rules and advertised (III, B, 4, a of these rules).
    - (1) Assistant professor only on the affirmative recommendation of the department (III, B, 7, a of these rules).
    - (2) Associate professor only on the affirmative recommendations of the department and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (III, B, 7, a, (1) of these rules).
    - (3) Professor only on the affirmative recommendations of the department, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor (III, B, 7, a, (2) of these rules).
- c. Appointment in more than one academic department
    - (1) At the time of the initial appointment or reassignment to faculty status in more than one department, the departments, in consultation with dean(s), and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, shall negotiate the terms of the joint appointment including
        - (a) assignment of a home department, and
        - (b) standards to be used in evaluations for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion, and department responsibilities.
        - (c) procedure that shall be used to resolve disagreements regarding reappointment, tenure and/or promotion decisions,
    - (2) The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall report the negotiated terms of joint appointment to the Chancellor.
        - (a) If the Chancellor does not approve the terms of appointment, then the Chancellor shall request that the faculty member, departments, dean(s) and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs renegotiate the terms of appointment.
        - (b) If the Chancellor approves all aspects of the terms of joint appointment, including the method for resolving disagreements regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion decisions, then the Chancellor shall record the terms of the joint appointment in the faculty member’s appointment or reassignment letter (III, B, 10 of these rules)
    - (3) The academic departments, respective college dean(s) and the constituency standards committees, when applicable, in which a probationary or a tenured faculty member holds an appointment shall

review the faculty member's performance for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion

- d. Probationary periods: In accordance with both state law and the accepted standards of academic practice defined by the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors, the length of the probationary period of a faculty member shall be determined using the following principles:
    - (1) The maximum probationary period of a faculty member without prior service credit shall be 7 years in a full-time appointment and 10 years in an appointment which is at least half-time, but less than full-time (UWS 3.04, (1)).
    - (2) A candidate may request credit for up to three years of prior service at the rate of one year for each year of full-time faculty or equivalent service at UW-Whitewater and/or at other colleges or universities. Acting upon the department's recommendation, the Chancellor may grant prior service credit to the candidate (III, B, 10, f of these rules). Such creditable service shall 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.
    - (3) For a candidate who receives credit for prior service, at the discretion of the department and with the approval of the probationary faculty member, a full review may be held for two full years before the mandatory tenure and/or promotion decision. This review may take place even if no decision for reappointment is necessary. Probationary faculty in the first year of a two year contract who receive a strong appraisal in this review, the recommendation of the department, and agreement of the chancellor, may be offered a two year contract so that
        - (a) a consultation is done in the next year and
        - (b) the mandatory tenure and/or promotion review arrives in the year their contract is to be reviewed.
    - (4) A candidate whose term of employment begins at the associate professor rank may request credit for up to three years for the purpose of determining the time of the mandatory tenure decision. However, once the minimum number of years in rank has been achieved and tenure has been granted, the faculty member may request that up to seven of their years of full-time faculty service at other colleges or universities and/or at UW-Whitewater be used to determine eligibility for promotion to professor.
    - (5) A candidate whose term of employment begins at the assistant professor rank may request credit for up to three years for the purpose of determining the time of the mandatory tenure decision. However, once the minimum

number of years in rank has been achieved and tenure has been granted, the faculty member may request that up to three of their years of full-time faculty service at other colleges or universities and/or at UW-Whitewater be used to determine eligibility for promotion to associate professor.
    - (6) A candidate whose term of employment begins at the rank of instructional academic staff in a faculty line (III, B, 8, a, (3) of these rules) and who completes all requirements of a terminal degree during an academic year shall complete that year as an instructional academic staff member. Their mandatory probationary period will begin in the fall of the subsequent academic year; however, such a candidate may wish to request an early tenure decision (III, C, 2, c of these rules).
- e. When a faculty member begins service in the spring semester, the faculty member shall select one of the following options:
    - (1) Accept an appointment as academic staff for the initial semester upon receipt of a letter from the Chancellor stipulating that
        - (a) the salary during the initial semester shall be that of a faculty member of the rank appropriate to the candidate's qualifications in the salary line assigned to the position,
        - (b) appointment as faculty commences in the fall subsequent to the spring appointment,
        - (c) the date of the first reappointment decision and of the mandatory tenure decision shall be based on an appointment as faculty in the fall subsequent to the initial spring appointment, and
        - (d) the first reappointment decision shall include performance data from all semesters of full-time instructional service at UW-Whitewater beginning with the date of initial appointment as determined in III, B, 10 of these rules.
    - (2) Accept an appointment as faculty for the initial semester upon receipt of a letter from the Chancellor stipulating that
        - (a) appointment as faculty commences in the spring,
        - (b) the date of the first reappointment decision and of the mandatory tenure decision shall be based on an appointment as faculty in the fall prior to the initial spring appointment, and
        - (c) the first reappointment decision shall include performance data from all semesters under contract at UWW.

9. Offer of employment

- a. If the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee supports the candidate and the conditions in III, B,7, a, (1), (b) of these rules, the dean
    - (1) contacts the candidate to make an unofficial offer according to the terms in III, B, 7, a, (1),(b) of these rules;
    - (2) sends the candidate a memorandum of understanding specifying the terms agreed upon under III, B, 9, a, (1) of these rules with copies to the department or its search committee and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
- b. If the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee supports the candidate, but does not support the conditions in III, B, 7, a, (1), (b) of these rules, then the department or its search committee and the dean negotiate the terms at issue with Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee. The dean then
    - (1) contacts the candidate to make an unofficial offer according to the negotiated terms, and
    - (2) sends the candidate a memorandum of understanding specifying the terms agreed upon under III, B, 9, b, (1) of these rules with copies to the department or its search committee and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
- c. If the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee does not support the candidate or satisfactory terms cannot be negotiated under III, B, 9, b of these rules or the candidate declines the offer, then the department or its search committee and the dean shall
    - (1) submit the name of another acceptable candidate, or
    - (2) submit the name(s) of additional candidate(s) to be invited for campus interview(s), or
    - (3) request permission of the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action to continue the search, or
    - (4) request permission of the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action to terminate the search.

10. Appointment letter: The Chancellor's appointment letter shall include

- a. items listed in UWS 3.03,
- b. the approximate date of first review,
- c. assignment of home department (III, C, 9, a, (1) of these rules),
- d. department standards for tenure and promotion,
- e. notice that for subsequent reviews, other standards may be established in accordance with UWS 3.06, (1), (b),
- f. statement of the number of years of credited prior service, if any,

- g. credited prior service used to set the mandatory tenure decision, if any,
- h. years of teaching experience that may be used for promotion eligibility,
- i. the date of mandatory tenure decision, if applicable, and
- j. a statement that acceptance of the appointment is an acceptance of all stated employment conditions.

Section C. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

1. General policies

- a. Faculty appointments shall be renewed only on the affirmative decision of the department and Chancellor as required by UWS 3.06, (1), (a) except as provided in UWS 3.07, (1), (b); UWS 3.08, (1)-(3).
- b. Tenure is an appointment for an unlimited period, granted to a faculty member by the Board of Regents upon the affirmative decision of the appropriate academic department, or its functional equivalent, and the Chancellor of an institution via the president of the system. At UW-Whitewater, tenure may be granted either as a condition of initial appointment, or upon successful completion of the probationary period in accordance with UWS 3.04 and 3.06 and III, C, 2, b or c and III, C, 4, e, (2), (b) and III, C, 4, e, (4) of these rules.
- c. Performance reviews for teaching faculty are based upon the major evaluation categories of teaching, research and creative activity, and professional and public service as weighted by agreement between the probationary faculty member and the department as recorded in the Document of Intent (III, C,3, b and Appendix A, paragraph D of these rules). Performance reviews for faculty with non-teaching assignments are based upon the major evaluation categories of job performance, research and creative activity, and professional and public service as weighted by agreement between the probationary faculty member and the department as recorded in the Document of Intent.
- d. Reappointment, tenure and/or promotion is recommended for those who, in the judgment of their peers, satisfy the department's discipline-related standards and the constituency and university standards. Such judgment shall take into account the weighting of performance in each category as agreed upon by the faculty member and the department as recorded in the Document of Intent.
- e. Since the portfolio (Appendix A, paragraph E and III, F of these rules) is a cumulative record of performance, deficiencies in performance identified in earlier reviews that have been designated by the department as corrected shall not be held against the candidate in subsequent reappointment and tenure and/or promotion decisions.

- f. The Standard Classification of Performance Data (III, G of these rules) provided in the portfolio shall be used for all reviews.
    - (1) Not all performance data need to be part of a performance review, but any performance datum listed is eligible for inclusion.
    - (2) Department standards committees may add performance data to an evaluation category, but may not remove an item from the standard classification or move it to a different category.
    - (3) The University Standards Committee recommends revisions of the Standard Classification of Performance Data to the Faculty Senat e for approval.

2. Types of decisions

- a. Decisions within the probationary appointment period
    - (1) Affirmative or reappointment for additional academic year(s) within the probationary term. This decision does not confer tenure. See consultation and review schedule chart in Appendix C.
    - (2) Negative or non-reappointment. When negative decisions are made during the probationary period, the conclusion of the contract period in which the negative decision was rendered represents the termination of the appointment, but the time requirements for written notification of non-reappointment given in UWS 3.09 apply.
- b. Decisions at the end of the maximum probationary appointment period: A decision to reappoint at the end of the maximum probationary period (III, B, 10, g & I of these rules) is a decision to recommend tenure. The decision must be made during the review which immediately precedes the deadline for notice of reappointment/non-reappointment for the period following the maximum probationary period. If the decision is negative, the faculty member will be offered a terminal contract for one additional academic or fiscal year, whichever is appropriate (UWS 3.09, (c)).
- c. Optional early tenure decisions: The length of the mandatory probationary period is established at the time of the initial appointment (III, B, 7, a, (1), (b), ii); III, B, 8, d; and III, B, 10, g & I of these rules), but may be changed as provided in UWS 3.04, (1). Faculty members who have had a total of four or more years of full-time instructional service or the equivalent at UW-Whitewater and/or at other colleges or universities may request consideration for an early tenure or early tenure and promotion decision (III, B, 8, e, (1), (e) of these rules).
    - (1) A faculty member who wishes to apply for an early tenure or early tenure and promotion 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) When the department denies tenure and/or promotion in early decision cases, the department must cite the standards which have not been met (III, C, 4, f, (1), (g)of these rules).
    - (3) If a faculty member's request for early tenure or early tenure and promotion is denied, then the faculty member may not request
        - (a) a reconsideration (III, C, 4, f, (3), (b)of these rules) or appeal (III, E of these rules). However, the faculty member may request that the dean review the department's decision and procedures as specified in III, C, 4, f, (h) (iii)or these rules), or
        - (b) an additional early tenure and/or promotion consideration prior to the end of the mandatory probationary period established at the time of initial appointment.
    - (4) Denial of early tenure or early tenure and promotion shall not prejudice action on the tenure and/or promotion decision to be made at the completion of the mandatory probationary period established at the time of the initial appointment.
- d. Promotion
    - (1) Associate Professor: As of May, 1999, promotion to the rank of associate professor is concomitant with the tenure decision (FS989-48). 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 May, 1999, may apply for promotion to associate professor when they have met the minimum university requirements for education and time in rank (III, H, 1 of these rules).
    - (2) Professor: Associate professors may apply for promotion to professor when they have met the minimum university requirement for education and time in rank (III, H, 1 of these rules).

3. Faculty member's responsibilities

- a. Assemble the portfolio organized according to the university format (III, F and III, G of these rules). The portfolio is a cumulative record of the faculty member's performance at UW-Whitewater.
- b. Write a Document of Intent (Appendix A, paragraph D of these rules) so that its fulfillment would represent significant progress toward satisfying the department, constituency, and university standards for tenure and/or promotion. Probationary faculty members shall submit a Document of Intent for each review period to the department standards committee for review. Generally the probationary faculty member will write the Document of Intent in consultation with the supervisor, i.e., department chair, department standards committee, or other appropriate person(s) specified by the department

    - (1) by the third Friday in September for new faculty members, or
    - (2) within 10 (ten) business days of the department consultation during non-review years, or
    - (3) within 10 (ten) business days of the department consultation following the review and decision by the department.
- c. Place a copy of the approved and signed Document of Intent in the portfolio and submits a copy to the supervisor. Subsequent performance consultations and reviews assess progress in fulfilling the indicators of quality identified in the Document of Intent.
- d. Satisfy the department requirements.

4. Department's responsibilities

- a. Document of Intent. Within 10 (ten) business days from the time the faculty member submits the Document of Intent to the department, the department standards committee shall review a probationary faculty member's annual Document of Intent to insure that its fulfillment would represent significant, continuous progress toward a reasonable expectation, but not a guarantee, of an affirmative tenure and/or promotion decision. If needed, the department standards committee negotiates adjustments in the Document of Intent with the probationary faculty member. The department chair and a representative of the department standards committee shall sign the faculty member's approved Document of Intent.
- b. Notice of performance consultation or performance review and decision. See consultation and review schedule chart in Appendix C of these rules.
    - (1) The faculty member being reviewed shall receive a written notice at least 15 (fifteen) business days prior to the department review. The department shall post a notice of the review at least 5 (five) business days in advance in a public place regularly used for posting of notices by the department.
    - (2) The notice shall include
        - (a) time and place of the review,
        - (b) decision to be made,
        - (c) period of performance to be evaluated,
        - (d) standards and procedures to be used,
        - (e) notice that the faculty member may present information orally or in writing,
        - (f) notice that other persons may present information in writing or, with the consent of the committee, orally,
        - (g) statement that the review will be conducted in accordance with UWS 3.06; and III, C, 4, b-f of these rules, and applicable state law governing meetings of public bodies,

        - (h) statement informing the faculty member that he or she has the right to submit a written rebuttal to the department's reports of decision and/or subsequent reports of recommended action (III, D of these rules)
        - (i) statement informing the faculty member that he or she has the right to request a reconsideration (UWS 3.07, (1), (b) or UWS 3.08, (3) and III, C, 4, f, (3) (h) and (i), III, C, 4, f, (3), (b) of these rules) and the right to request an appeal (UWS 3.08; III, C, 4, f, (3), (a) and (c); and III, E of these rules) of any report of decision,
- c. Department performance consultation (See consultation and review schedule chart in Appendix C of these rules.)
    - (1) In consultation years (See consultation and review schedule chart in Appendix C of these rules), a consultation shall be conducted by a subset of the tenured faculty in the department. This subset shall consist of the department chair and at least one other member. At least one of these two shall have observed the probationary faculty member's teaching (See Appendix B of these rules).
    - (2) This committee shall
        - (a) consult with the probationary faculty member on the progress made in fulfilling the indicators of quality identified in the Document of Intent, and
        - (b) write a summary of the consultation session.
    - (3) The probationary faculty member and the committee members shall sign the summary indicating that they have reviewed its contents.
    - (4) The probationary faculty member shall place the summary in the portfolio for that year.
    - (5) With the probationary faculty member, the committee shall consider the content of the Document of Intent for the subsequent year.
- d. Department performance review with decisions. Refer to the review schedule in Appendix C of these rules.
    - (1) A review shall be conducted by a department committee which shall have at least 3 members, one of whom is the department chair. The faculty of the department (III, C, 4, e, (3) of these rules) shall choose the composition of this committee within the following parameters:
        - (a) the entire tenured faculty of the department, or
        - (b) tenured faculty of the department selected by the tenured faculty of the department, or
        - (c) tenured faculty of the department selected by the faculty of the department.

- (2) A quorum of this committee shall be 3, or more than one-half the regular membership, whichever is greater.
- (3) If a department does not have sufficient tenured faculty available for a quorum, then the dean of the constituency shall appoint tenured faculty of related disciplines to the department committee so that there are sufficient tenured faculty to constitute a quorum. Such appointed members shall participate only in the review(s) which they are appointed to conduct and any reconsideration under UWS 3.07, (1), (b) or UWS 3.08, (3) and III, C, 4, d, (3) of these rules.

- e. Review procedures
  - (1) Periods of review
    - (a) Probationary reappointment: The initial review shall include the period since the initial appointment as a faculty member. For subsequent reviews, the period considered shall be the period since the previous review.
    - (b) Tenure: For granting tenure, the period to be considered shall be the probationary faculty member's entire period of credited service except as provided in III, C, 2, c. and III, H,1, e of these rules.
    - (c) Promotion: For promotion the period of review shall be the faculty member's time of service in the current rank up to the time the faculty member submits the portfolio to the department for review. Accomplishments after the faculty member submits the portfolio for review by the department shall count toward subsequent promotion applications.
  - (2) No faculty member shall review the portfolio of a faculty member in another department of the university, except as provided in III, C, 4, d, (3) and III, B, 8, c. of these rules and as provided for as a member of the constituency standards committee (III, C, 6 of these rules) or as a member of an appeal panel drawn from the Faculty Appeals, Grievances, and Disciplinary Hearing Committee (III, E, 2, b. and c. of these rules) or as a member of an ad hoc credential review committee (III, E, 3, c of these rules).
  - (3) A decision about reappointment, tenure and/or promotion shall be made only after the department has evaluated the faculty member's performance in relation to established department, constituency, and university standards and procedures established according to: III, A of these rules; annual Document of Intent (Appendix A, paragraph D of these rules); Board of Regents Policy 74-13; Student Evaluation of Instruction (Appendix B, parts A & B of these rules); and Peer Evaluation (Appendix B, part C of these rules). Such judgments shall take into account the weighting of performance in each

category as agreed upon by the faculty member and the department as recorded in the Document of Intent.

- (4) The department may consider any information that is relevant, of reasonable probative value, and recorded as part of the Report of Decision (III, C, 4, f, (1) of these rules).
- (5) The department may request further information, explanation or clarification from the faculty member.
- (6) During the faculty member's first review, i.e., fall of the second year on campus (See consultation/review schedule chart of these rules.), the department shall make two decisions, one for reappointment and a second to determine the length of contract to be offered, i.e., a contract for one year or a contract for two years. In the case of faculty members who were granted three years of credited experience at the time of the initial appointment, the department shall make only the reappointment decision in the second year on campus because the mandatory tenure decision would occur in the fall of the third year on campus.
- (7) During all subsequent reviews, the department shall make two decisions, one for reappointment and a second to determine the length of contract to be offered, i.e., a contract for one year or a contract for two years.
- (8) Procedures for the review of faculty holding positions in more than one department are described in III, B, 8, c. of these rules.
- (9) An affirmative decision requires the affirmative votes of a majority of the members participating in the review.
    - (a) A participant is defined as any individual who is a qualified decision-maker or a tenured member of the department and who is
        - i) present during the review and discussion of the faculty member's documented performance, and
        - ii) free of disqualifying conflicts of interest (as defined in UWS 8.03, 8.04, Regent Policy 91-8, and UW-Whitewater, Consensual Relationship Policy, 1997).
    - (b) Because an affirmative decision requires the affirmative votes of the majority of the members participating in the review, a participant's abstention has the effect of a negative vote.
    - (c) The chair of the meeting, if a tenured faculty member, shall participate in the discussion and shall vote according to the above
    - (d) The chair of the department, if a tenured faculty member and also a member of the review committee, shall participate in the discussion and shall vote according to the above.

- f. Document requirements and disposition

- (1) The department's Report of Decision for a faculty member shall be a single document and include
    - (a) date and time of meeting
    - (b) members of the review committee present
    - (c) list of procedures followed during the review, for example, whether the review was conducted as an open or a closed meeting according to Wisconsin Statutes 19.81-19.98
    - (d) summaries of any oral presentation by the faculty member and any oral presentation(s) by any other person(s) with the consent of the tenured faculty
    - (e) subjects considered under III, C, 4, b, (2), (c)-(f) and III, C, 4, e (4)-(6) of these rules
    - (f) statements of the decision made, including motions and roll call votes. A roll call vote is required to decide if the meeting will be held in closed session. The only roll call vote required is the vote to go into closed session.
    - (g) standards-based reasons supporting the decision made (UWS 3.07, (1), (a),
    - (h) for an affirmative decision, a statement informing the faculty member that he or she has the right to submit a written rebuttal to the department's Report of Decision or to the Reconsideration Report of Decision (III, D of these rules)
    - (i) For a negative decision, a statement informing the faculty member of his or her right to request a reconsideration (III, C, 4, f, (3), (a-b) of these rules) and the right to request an appeal (III, C, 4, f, (3), (a) and (c) of these rules)
    - (j) by attachment, the notice of review
    - (k) within 10 (ten) business days of the review, the department shall email and send a hard copy to the faculty member of the Report of Decision and deliver the portfolio to the dean for review
- (2) Affirmative Decisions
    - (a) Feedback session following affirmative decision for reappointment
        - i) The tenured faculty of each department shall establish procedures for advising faculty whose application for reappointment was approved by the department.
        - ii) During the feedback session, tenured faculty member(s) shall
            - a) discuss the faculty member's performance evaluation and

            - b) identify and discuss specific areas of concern that may influence the Document of Intent for the next review period (III, C, 3, b and III, C, 4, a of these rules).
        - (b) Documentation of the feedback session. Each feedback session must be documented with:
            - i) Date
            - ii) Participants
            - iii) Record of the topics discussed including the areas of concern
            - iv) Signatures of faculty member and the department representative(s) which acknowledge that the feedback session occurred and that the record is an accurate account of the topics discussed.
            - v) The record of the feedback session shall be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file and a copy placed in the portfolio behind the Report of Decision by the faculty member once the review process is completed.
    - (3) Negative decisions:
        - (a) Within 10 (ten) business days, the department chair shall email and send a hard copy to the faculty member of the Report of Decision containing the statement of the decision made and the standards-based reasons supporting the decision (UWS 3.07, (1), (a)). Along with the Report of Decision, the department chair shall inform the faculty member in writing of the right to request a reconsideration (UWS 3.07,(1), (b) or UWS 3.08, (3) and III, C, 4, f, (3), (a-b) of these rules) and the right to request an appeal (UWS 3.08; III, C, 4, f, (3), (a and c); III, E of these rules).
        - (b) If the faculty member chooses to request a reconsideration, then the faculty member must file a written request for the reconsideration with the department chair. The request for a reconsideration must be filed within 10 (ten) business days from the emailed date of the Report of Decision from the department chair.
        - (c) Following the reconsideration, if the faculty member chooses to file an appeal, then the request for an appeal must be filed in writing with the Chair of the Faculty Senate. Appeals of department decisions must be filed within 15 (fifteen) business days of the emailed date of the Reconsideration Report of Decision (UWS 3.08, (1)).
        - (d) The faculty member may request that an appeal panel be drawn from the Faculty Appeals, Grievances, and Disciplinary Hearing Committee (UWS 3.08, and III, E, 1 of these rules) to appeal the decision of the department (III, E, 1of these rules). The department chair shall

hold the portfolio and all relevant documents. Following the reconsideration, the department chair shall forward the portfolio and all relevant documents produced during the review sequence to the appropriate review agent, e.g., the chair of the Faculty Senate if a valid appeal has been filed (III, E, 1, b of these rules) or the dean.

- (e) For reappointment, tenure, and/or tenure and promotion, the faculty member may withdraw his or her reconsideration at any time prior to its completion. Such withdrawal terminates consideration of the faculty member's current application for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion.
- (f) Upon receipt of the written request to withdraw from a reconsideration or an appeal, the department chair shall
    - i) send copies of the written request to the dean, the constituency standards committee, and the Chancellor, and
    - ii) forward the portfolio to the Chancellor who shall secure copies of all relevant produced during the review sequence for possible use as required by law and return the originals to the faculty member.
- (g) When the department makes a negative decision on applications for reappointment or tenure or tenure and promotion, if the faculty member
    - i) does not request a reconsideration, then the department chair shall forward the portfolio to the Chancellor who shall secure copies of all relevant documents produced during the review sequence for possible use as required by law and return the originals to the faculty member, or
    - ii) does request a reconsideration, then upon completion of the reconsideration, the department chair shall forward the portfolio and all relevant documents produced during the review sequence to the appropriate review agent, i.e., the chair of the Faculty Senate if a valid appeal has been filed (III, E, 1, b of these rules) or the dean.
- (h) When the department makes a negative decision on applications for promotion only, if the faculty member
    - i) does not request a reconsideration, but submits a written request that the portfolio be forwarded to the dean for review, then the department chair shall forward the portfolio, including the Report of Decision, to the dean, or
    - ii) does not request a reconsideration, then the department chair shall return the portfolio to the faculty member, or

        - iii) does request a reconsideration, then, upon completion of the reconsideration, the department chair shall forward the portfolio and all relevant documents produced during the review sequence to the appropriate review agent, i.e., the chair of the Faculty Senate if a valid appeal has been filed (III, E, 1, b of these rules) or the dean.
- (i) Procedures following a negative decision for reappointment, tenure, or tenure and promotion
    - i) Reconsideration of a negative decision
        - a) The purpose of the reconsideration process is to provide an opportunity for the faculty member to address the reasons for the negative decision and to ensure that all relevant material is considered.
        - b) Within 10 (ten) business days of receiving a negative Report of Decision, the faculty member may file a written request for a reconsideration with the department chair (UWS 3.07, (1), (b) and (III, C, 4, f, (3), (a), of these rules).
        - c) If the faculty member does request a reconsideration, the department shall conduct the reconsideration within 10 (ten) business days of receipt of the written request and with at least 3 (three) business days' notice to the faculty member requesting reconsideration or on a date mutually agreed upon by the faculty member requesting reconsideration and the department.
        - d) The faculty members participating in the reconsideration session shall be the same faculty members who participated in the initial review session with the exception of faculty members who may have resigned or retired (excepted) since the initial review session. Faculty members who are unavailable to meet in a timely manner may be excepted if mutually agreed upon by the faculty member requesting the reconsideration and the department. In the absence of a quorum (III, C, 4, d, of these rules), excepted faculty members may be replaced if mutually agreed upon by the faculty member requesting the reconsideration and the department. (The definition of department can be found in Appendix A of the Personnel Rules).
        - e) At the reconsideration, the faculty member may be assisted by a person of his or her choice.

        - f) Within 15 (fifteen) business days of the reconsideration, a Reconsideration Report of Decision, including the standards-based reasons for the decision , shall be provided to the faculty member in the form of a hard copy and an email attachment. Copies of the report also shall be filed in the department office and placed in the faculty member's portfolio, which is then forwarded to the appropriate review agent, i.e., the chair of the Faculty Senate if a valid appeal has been filed (III, E, 1, b of these rules) or the dean if the reconsideration decision is affirmative.
    - ii) The faculty member shall have the right to request an appeal panel from the Faculty Appeals, Grievances, and Disciplinary Hearing Committee. If the faculty member requests an appeal panel, the department decisions shall be submitted to this panel for consideration (III, E, 2, a of these rules).
    - iii) In case of a negative decision for reappointment, following completion of a reconsideration, if the faculty member
        - a) does not request an appeal, the department chair shall forward the portfolio and all relevant documents including the reports of decision, and rebuttals produced during the review sequence to the dean.
        - b) does request an appeal, the department chair shall forward the portfolio and all relevant documents including the reports of decision, requests for a reconsideration and/or an appeal, and rebuttals produced during the review sequence to the chair of the Faculty Senate who shall deliver the documents to the chair of the appeals panel (III, E, 2, c, (1) of these rules).
    - iv) In case of a negative decision for tenure or tenure and promotion, following completion of a requested reconsideration, if the faculty member
        - a) does not request an appeal, the department chair shall forward the portfolio and all relevant documents including the reports of decision, and rebuttal produced during the review sequence to the dean.
        - b) does request an appeal, the department chair shall forward the portfolio and all relevant documents including the reports of decision, requests for a reconsideration and/or an appeal, reports of recommended action, and

rebuttals produced during the review sequence to the chair of the Faculty Senate who shall deliver the documents to the chair of the appeals panel (III, E, 2, c, (1) of these rules).

- v) In case of a negative decision for promotion only, if the faculty member
  - a) does not request a reconsideration, but submits a written request that the portfolio be forwarded to the dean for review, then the department chair shall forward the portfolio and all relevant documents including the Report of Decision, and rebuttals to the dean, or
  - b) does not request a reconsideration or forwarding of the portfolio for further consideration, then the department chair shall return the portfolio to the faculty member, or
  - c) does request a reconsideration, then, upon completion of the reconsideration, the department chair shall forward the portfolio and all relevant documents including the request for a reconsideration, reports of decision, and rebuttals produced during the review sequence to the dean.

5. Dean's responsibilities

- a. The dean shall review and evaluate the faculty member's portfolio to ascertain that the department's Report of Decision or Reconsideration Report of Decision shows
  - (1) conformity with department(s), constituency, and university standards and procedures
  - (2) consistency with the data in the portfolio, and
  - (3) fulfillment of the Document of Intent.
- b. When reviewing the faculty member's portfolio, the dean may request further explanation or clarification of materials in or referred to in the portfolio from the faculty member and/or department(s). The request must be in writing and copied to all parties. The response to the request must be in writing and copied to all parties.
- c. The dean shall
  - (1) write a Report of Recommended Action using standards-based reasons to support or refute the department's Report of Decision or Reconsideration Report of Decision, and include a statement informing the faculty member that he or she has the right to submit a written rebuttal to the dean's Report of Recommended Action (III, D of these rules).

- (2) add the Report of Recommended Action to the portfolio, provide a hard copy to the faculty member, and send a copy as an email attachment to the faculty member and department.
- (3) ensure that any rebuttal is placed in the portfolio behind the Report of Recommended Action,
- (4) deliver the portfolio to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs or, when applicable, to the Constituency Standards Committee Chair for review.

6. Constituency standards committee's responsibilities:

- a. A review shall be conducted by the constituency standards committee which shall be constituted according to III, A, 3, a of these rules.
- b. The constituency standards committee shall review and evaluate the faculty member's portfolio to ascertain that the department's Report of Decision or Reconsideration Report of Decision, and the dean's Report of Recommended Action show
  - (1) conformity with department, constituency, and university standards and procedures
  - (2) consistency with the data in the portfolio, and
  - (3) fulfillment of the Document of Intent.
- c. When reviewing the faculty member's portfolio, the constituency standards committee may request further explanation or clarification of materials in or referred to in the portfolio from the faculty member, department(s) and/or dean(s). The request must be in writing and copied to all parties. The response to the request must be in writing and copies to all parties.
- d. The constituency standards committee shall
  - (1) write a Report of Recommended Action using standards-based reasons to support or refute the department's Report of Decision or Reconsideration Report of Decision and/or the dean's Report of Recommended Action, and including
    - (a) date and time of the meeting,
    - (b) members of the constituency standards committee present, and
    - (c) statement informing the faculty member that he or she has the right to submit a written rebuttal to the constituency standards committee's Report of Recommended Action (III, D of these rules).
  - (2) add the Report of Recommended Action to the portfolio, provide a hard copy to the faculty member, and send a copy as an email attachment to the faculty member, department, and dean.
  - (3) ensure that any rebuttal is placed in the portfolio behind the Report of Recommended Action and
  - (4) deliver the portfolio to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for review.

7. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' responsibilities

- a. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall review and evaluate the faculty member's portfolio to ascertain that the department's Report of Decision or Reconsideration Report of Decision, the dean's Report of Recommended Action and, when applicable, the constituency standard committee's Report of Recommended Action show
    - (1) conformity with department, constituency, and university standards and procedures,
    - (2) consistency with the data in the portfolio, and
    - (3) fulfillment of the Document of Intent.
- b. When reviewing the faculty member's portfolio, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs may request further explanation or clarification of materials in or referred to in the portfolio from the faculty member, department(s), dean(s), and/or constituency standards committee(s). The request must be in writing and copied to all the parties. The response to the request must be in writing and copied to all parties. c. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall:
    - (1) write a Report of Recommended Action using standards-based reasons to support or refute the department's Report of Decision or Reconsideration Report of Decision, dean's Report of Recommended Action and/or constituency standards committee's Report of Recommended Action; and including a statement informing the faculty member that he or she has the right to submit a written rebuttal (III, D of these rules) to the Vice Chancellor's Report of Recommended Action.
    - (2) add the Report of Recommended Action to the portfolio, provide a hard copy to the faculty member, and send a copy as an email attachment to the faculty member, department, dean, and, when applicable, constituency standards committee chair.,
        - (a) ensure that any rebuttal is placed in the portfolio behind the Report of Recommended Action, and
        - (b) deliver the portfolio to the Chancellor for review and decision no earlier than 3 (three) business days after the emailed date of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Report of Recommended Action to the faculty member.

8. Chancellor's responsibilities

- a. For all decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, or tenure and promotion, the Chancellor shall follow the notice periods listed in UWS 3.09.
- b. When reviewing the faculty member's portfolio, the Chancellor may request further explanation or clarification of materials in or referred to in the portfolio

from the faculty member, department(s), dean(s), constituency standards committee(s), and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The request must be in writing and copied to all parties. The response to the request must be in writing and copied to all parties.

- c. Affirmative decisions: The Chancellor shall:
  - (1) write a Report of Decision using standards based reasons;
  - (2) add the Report of Decision to the portfolio, provide a hard copy to the faculty member and send a copy as an email attachment to the faculty member, department(s), dean(s), and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and, when applicable, constituency standards committee chair(s) and
  - (3) submit a written Report of Recommended Action to the Board of Regents for all faculty recommended for tenure or tenure and promotion.
- d. Negative decisions:
  - (1) In cases of promotion only, the Chancellor's decision is final and the Chancellor shall
    - (a) write a Report of Decision using standards-based reasons;
    - (b) add the Report of Decision to the portfolio, provide a hard copy to the faculty member and send a copy as an email attachment to the faculty member, department(s), dean(s), and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and, when applicable, constituency standards committee chair(s);
    - (c) place copies of all reports of decisions and reports of recommended actions in the faculty member's personnel file, and
    - (d) return the portfolio to the faculty member upon completion of all personnel actions.
  - (2) In cases of reappointment, tenure, or tenure and promotion, the Chancellor shall
    - (a) write a Report of Decision using standards-based reasons and including a statement informing the faculty member that he or she has the right to request a reconsideration (UWS 3.07,(1), (b) or UWS 3.08, (3) and III, C, 4, g, (2), (a) of these rules) and the right to request an appeal (UWS 3.08; III, C, 4, g, (2), (b); and III, E of these rules). If the faculty member chooses to request a reconsideration, then the faculty member must file a written request for reconsideration with the Chancellor. The request for a reconsideration must be filed within 7 (seven) business days from the emailed date of the Chancellor's Report of Decision.
    - (b) add the Report of Decision to the portfolio, provide a hard copy to the faculty member and send a copy as an email attachment to the faculty member, department(s), dean(s), and Vice Chancellor for

Academic Affairs, and, when applicable, constituency standards committee chair(s);
    - (c) place copies of all reports of decisions and reports of recommended actions in the faculty member's personnel file and
    - (d) secure copies of all relevant documents incl u ding the portfolio, reports of decision, requests for a reconsideration and/or an appeal, reports of recommended action, and rebuttals produced during the review sequence for possible use in an appeal of the Chancellor's decision or as required by law.
- (3) In cases of reappointment, tenure, or tenure and promotion, if the faculty member chooses to request a reconsideration of the Chancellor's decision, the faculty member must file a written request for the reconsideration with the Chancellor. The request for a reconsideration must be filed within 7 (seven) business days from the emailed date of the Chancellor's Report of Decision.
    - (a) In the reconsideration, the Chancellor shall review all relevant material and write a Reconsideration Report of Decision using standards-based reasons,
    - (b) add the Reconsideration Report of Decision to the portfolio, provide a hard copy to the faculty member and send a copy as an email attachment to the faculty member, department, dean, and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, and, when applicable, constituency standards committee chair, and
    - (c) place a copy of the Reconsideration Report of Decision in the faculty member's personnel file.
    - (d) If the Chancellor's original decision is sustained, the Reconsideration Report of Decision shall include a statement informing the faculty member of his or her right to appeal, and secure copies of all relevant documents including the portfolio, reports of decision, requests for a reconsideration and/or an appeal, reports of recommended action, and rebuttals produced during the review sequence for possible use in an appeal of the Chancellor's decision or as required by law.
    - (e) Following the reconsideration, if the faculty member chooses to file an appeal, then the request for an appeal must be filed in writing with the Chair of the Faculty Senate. Appeals of Chancellor's decision must be filed within 15 (fifteen) business days of the emailed date of the Reconsideration Report of Decision (UWS 3.08, (1)).
    - (f) Upon completion of the appeal process, the appeal panel chair shall send copies of its Report of Findings and recommended Action(s) to the appellant, department(s), deans (s), constituency standards

committee(s), if applicable, Faculty Senate Chair, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and to the Chancellor. The decision of the Chancellor is final. The Chancellor shall return all documents to the faculty member.

- (g) If the Chancellor's original decision is reversed, the Chancellor shall submit a written Report of Recommended Action to the Board of Regents for tenure or tenure and promotion.
- (h) If the faculty member does not request a reconsideration when the Chancellor makes a negative decision on applications for reappointment, tenure, or tenure and promotion, the decision of the Chancellor will be final (UWS 3.08, (3)). The Chancellor shall return all documents to the faculty member.

Section D. Rebuttals

- A faculty member may submit a written rebuttal to the department's Report of Decision (III, C, 4, f, (2); III, C, 4, g, (2), (a), vi) of these rules) and/or to any or all Reports of Recommended Action (III, C, 5, a - c; III, C, 6, b - d; III, C, 7, c, and III, C, 8, e of these rules).
- Within 3 (three) business days of the emailed date of the Report of Decision and/or Reports of Recommended Action, the faculty member must notify the review party of the intent to write a rebuttal.
- The rebuttal must be received by the review body within 7 (seven) business days after the emailed date of the Report of Decision and/or Report of Recommended Action being rebutted.
- Such rebuttals shall be placed in the portfolio behind the Report of Decision or Report of Recommended Action being rebutted.
- The portfolio is then forwarded on to the next review body.
- The faculty member shall understand that the writing of rebuttal(s) may alter the timeline for reappointment and/or tenure and promotion decisions.

Section E. Appeals

1. Appellant's responsibilities:

- a. Submit a valid appeal to the chair of the Faculty Senate.
- b. To be valid, the appeal must

    - (1) be in writing,
    - (2) specify the decision(s) which is being appealed (III, C, 4, f, (2); III, C, 4, g, (2), (a), vi); and III, C, 8, b of these rules),
    - (3) state the grounds of the appeal by reference to some part of UWS 3.08, (1) and by reference to the relevant records of review and reports of decision, and reconsideration, (III, C, 4, f, (2); III, C, 4, g, (2), (a), vi), and III, C, 8, e of these rules), and
    - (4) The faculty member shall be allowed to request only one panel during any given academic year's review sequence, and
    - (5) be delivered to the chair of the Faculty Senate prior to the time that materials are to be delivered to the next level in the review process (See timeline, III, I of these rules).
- c. The appellant may submit evidence or argument to the appeal panel from the Faculty Appeals, Grievances, and Disciplinary Hearing Committee.
- d. The appellant may be assisted by a person of his or her choice.
- e. The burden of proof is on the appellant.
- f. 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 or the Faculty Senate chair if the panel has not been assembled shall forward an email copy of the request to the department(s), dean(s), and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and, when applicable, constituency standards committee chair(s); and the portfolio to the faculty member. Such withdrawal terminates consideration of the faculty member's application for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion.

2. Faculty Senate chair's and/or the Faculty Senate chair's designee's responsibilities:

- a. Upon receipt of an appeal, the chair shall determine whether or not the appeal is valid (see UWW III, E, 1, b).
- b. If the appeal is determined to be valid, the chair and/or the chair's designee shall form a Faculty Appeals and Grievance Committee panel.
- c. If the appeal is determined not to be valid, the chair and/or the chair's designee shall inform the appellant, specifying why the appeal was not valid, and request that an amended appeal be submitted within three business days. If an amended appeal is not submitted in a timely fashion, the chair or the chair's designee shall forward the portfolio to the appropriate review agent.
    - (1) If an amended appeal is submitted, the chair and/or the chair's designee shall determine if the amended appeal is valid.
    - (2) If the amended appeal is determined to be valid, the chair and/or the chair's designee shall form a Faculty Appeals and Grievance Committee panel.

    - (3) If the amended appeal is determined still not to be valid, the chair and/or the chair's designee shall inform the appellant and the portfolio shall be forwarded to the appropriate review agent.
- d. The finding that an appeal is not valid is not to be construed as a negative Report of Findings and Recommended Action(s) (see UWW, III, E, 2, f, (6)). The appellant, in this instance, shall not have exhausted all avenues of appeal as would occur with a negative Report of Findings and Recommended Action(s) (see III, E, 2, f, (6), (c) and (e)).
- e. The Faculty Senate chair shall appoint a designee to determine whether or not an appeal is valid if the chair is in the same department as the appellant or if the chair perceives that there is a conflict of interest.

3. The composition and responsibilities of the appeal panel from the Faculty Appeals, Grievances, and Disciplinary Hearing Committee

- a. An appeal panel from the Faculty Appeals, Grievances, and Disciplinary Hearing Committee hears an appeal when a faculty member files a valid appeal (III, E, 1, b of these rules) of negative reappointment, promotion, or mandatory tenure and/or promotion decision(s) (III, C, 4, f, (2); III,C, 4, g, (2), (a), vi) of these rules).
- b. Composition
    - (1) Upon receiving a valid appeal (III, E, 1, b of these rules), the Faculty Senate Chair shall assemble a five-member appeal panel from the Faculty Appeals, Grievances, and Disciplinary Hearing Committee to review the appellant's portfolio and all relevant materials.
    - (2) An appeal panel shall not include a member of the appellant's department(s) or constituency standards committee.
    - (3) The panel shall elect a chair by simple majority vote.
- c. Proceedings
    - (1) The Faculty Senate Chair shall deliver the appellant's portfolio and other relevant documents including reports of decision, requests for a reconsideration and/or an appeal, reports of recommended action, and rebuttals produced during the review sequence to the chair of the appeal panel.
    - (2) The appeal panel shall schedule the review of the decision(s) being appealed and give the appellant notice that the
        - (a) review shall be in accordance with UWS 3.08,
        - (b) appellant may submit evidence or argument to the panel, and
        - (c) appellant may be assisted by a person of his or her choice, and
        - (d) burden of proof is on the appellant.
    - (3) The review of the decision(s) being appealed shall be conducted in accordance with UWS 3.08.

- (4) Material, information, and evidence to be considered by the appeal panel
  - (a) The appeal panel shall review the decision(s) of the department (III, C, 4, f (1) and (2) or III, C, 4, g, (2), (a), vi) of these rules) and/or the Chancellor (III, C, 8, a of these rules) for evidence that any negative decision was based in any significant degree upon impermissible factors, as defined in UWS 3.08, with material prejudice to the faculty member.
  - (b) The appeal panel may hear any witnesses and consider any evidence relevant to issues addressed in UWS 3.08 offered by either the appellant or the respondent(s). The panel may request additional relevant evidence or testimony for its consideration.
- (5) The findings and recommended action of the appeal panel shall be determined by simple majority vote of the panel.
- (6) The appeal panel shall issue a written Report of Findings and Recommended Action(s) within 15 (fifteen) business days of receipt of the portfolio. This time limit may be extended by mutual agreement of the appeal panel and the appellant.
- (7) The appeal panel shall retain jurisdiction during the pendency of any reconsideration (III, E, 2, e, (1) and (2) of these rules).
- (8) Following any reconsideration initiated under III, E, 2, e, (1) and (2) of these rules, the appeal panel shall review the report of the reconsideration process. The panel shall issue a second report stating either
  - (a) the panel supports the reconsideration decision, or
  - (b) the panel finds that such reconsideration decision is based in significant degree upon impermissible factors (UWS 3.08).

- d. Record of Proceedings
  - (1) A Record of Proceedings shall be made throughout the appeal process. The chair of the appeal panel shall maintain the integrity of this record.
  - (2) The record of proceedings shall contain the following items
    - (a) date and time of meetings, correspondence, or other relevant communication,
    - (b) members of the appeal panel present,
    - (c) list of motions made and voted upon during the appeal, including any vote to go into closed sessions according the Wisconsin Statutes 19.81-19.98.
    - (d) documentation of testimony or evidence presented,
    - (e) statement of the findings and recommended action made, and
    - (f) standards-based reasons supporting the findings and recommended action made.
- e. Types of Recommended Actions

- (1) Affirmative recommended actions involving promotion or reappointment: The report of the appeal panel shall include an explanation of how the decision(s) was/were based in any significant degree upon impermissible factors, as defined in UWS 3.08, with material prejudice to the faculty member; and either
    - (a) include, with or without instructions, a remand to the deciding body at whichever level the appealed decision was based in any significant degree upon impermissible factors. In such case, the chair of the appeal panel shall return the portfolio and all relevant documents including the reports of decision, requests for a reconsideration and/or an appeal, reports of recommended action, and rebuttals produced during the review sequence along with the panel's Report of Findings and Recommended Action(s) to the appropriate deciding body which shall reconsider under UWS 3.08, (3) and report its consequent decision to the appeal panel or
    - (b) include a statement explaining why such remand would serve or has served no useful purpose. In such case, the recommended action by the appeal panel shall be considered to be an affirmative recommended action for reappointment or promotion. Depending on the decision appealed, the chair of the appeal panel shall forward the portfolio and all relevant documents including the reports of decision, requests for are consideration and/or an appeal, reports of recommended action, and rebuttals produced during the review sequence along with the panel's Report of Findings and Recommended Action(s) to the agent that would be in line to make the next recommendation or decision in the review sequence.
- (2) Affirmative recommended actions involving mandatory tenure: The report of the appeal panel shall include an explanation of how a decision for tenure was based in any significant degree upon impermissible factors, as defined in UWS 3.08, with material prejudice to the faculty member. And such report shall either
    - (a) include, with or without instructions, a remand to the deciding body at whichever level the tenure denial was based in any significant degree upon impermissible factors. In such case, the appropriate deciding body shall reconsider under UWS 3.08, (3) and report its consequent decision to the appeal panel
    - (b) or all of the following
        - i) a statement that such remand would serve or has served no useful purpose, and

        - ii) direction to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to appoint an ad hoc credential review committee, sometimes referred to as a "Notestein committee" (Wisconsin Statutes 36.13 (2) (b))–except that in the case of an appeal of the Chancellor's decision, the panel from the Faculty Appeals, Grievances, and Disciplinary Hearing Committee shall continue in the place of and fulfilling the role of an ad hoc credential review committee, deliberating and reporting by the procedures specified in III, E, 3,d-h of these rules,
        - iii) a list of credential materials the ad hoc credential review committee is to consider, and
        - iv) notice to the appellant that the appellant may submit a written request to the Faculty Senate Chair to terminate the process at any time.
    - (3) Negative decisions involving reappointment, tenure and/or promotion: The committee shall make a written report of its findings and decision. Such report shall include a statement that the appealed decision was not based in any significant degree on any impermissible factors as defined in UWS 3.08 with material prejudice to the faculty member. The chair of the appeal panel shall forward the portfolio and all relevant documents including the reports of decision, requests for a reconsideration and/or an appeal, reports of recommended action, and rebuttals produced during the review sequence to the Chancellor who shall secure copies of all documents for possible use as required by law.
- f. Report and disposition of the Report of Findings and Recommended Action(s), records, and documents
    - (1) The appeal panel chair shall forward the Record of Proceedings to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. At the end of five years, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall send the personnel file to the University Archives for permanent storage.
    - (2) The appeal panel chair shall send copies of its Report of Findings and Recommended Action(s) to the appellant, department(s), dean(s), constituency standards committee(s) if applicable, Faculty Senate Chair, and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for reference. The appeal panel chair also shall place one copy of the Report of Findings and Recommended Action in the appellant's portfolio.
    - (3) In cases of an appeal of a tenure decision, 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 credential review committee (III, E, 2, e, (2), (b), iii) and III, E, 3 of these rules).

- (4) If the Faculty Senate Chair, Faculty Senate Secretary, or any member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee participated in any level of the review process, then she or he shall not participate in identifying, appointing, or administering the ad hoc credential review committee.
- (5) When the appeal panel makes an affirmative Report of Findings and Recommended Action(s) in a promotion or reappointment case and does not remand the case to the deciding or recommending body at whichever level the appealed decision or recommended action was made, the appeal panel chair shall place a copy of the Report of Findings and Recommended Action(s) in the portfolio and forward the portfolio to the appropriate review agent, i.e., the dean or the chair of the constituency standards committee, or the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for review and decision. Refer to the review schedule in Appendix C of these rules.
- (6) When the appeal panel makes a negative Report of Findings and Recommended Action(s)
    - (a) The appeal panel chair forwards copies of the report of the appeal panel findings and Report of Findings and Recommended Action(s) to the appellant, department(s), dean(s), the constituency standards chair(s) if applicable, Faculty Senate Chair, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
    - (b) If the appellant submits a written withdrawal of the appeal, the appeal panel chair shall return the portfolio and attached materials to the appellant and forward copies of the written request to withdraw to the
        - i) department,
        - ii) Faculty Senate Chair, and
        - iii) Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
    - (c) In a reappointment or mandatory tenure decision, since there are no further appeals possible, the appeal panel chair shall deliver the portfolio to the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs where it shall be retained with the faculty member's personnel file. At the end of five years, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall send the personnel file and portfolio to the University Archives for permanent storage.
    - (d) Upon written request to the appeal panel chair, an appellant whose appeal of a non-renewal decision is denied by the appeal panel shall be allowed to copy all documents, recordings, or other transcripts of oral testimony or argument heard by the appeal panel.

        - (e) In a promotion decision affecting a tenured faculty member, since there are no further appeals possible, the appeal panel chair shall return the portfolio to the appellant.

4. Ad hoc credential review committee's composition and responsibilities

- a. This section complies with Wisconsin Statutes 36.13, (2), (b), when the Faculty Appeal and Grievance Committee appeal panel
    - (1) finds that a denial of tenure was based in a significant degree upon impermissible factors as defined in UWS 3.08 with material prejudice to the faculty member, and
    - (2) directs the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to appoint an ad hoc credential review committee (III, E, 2, e, (2), (b), ii) of these rules).
- b. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee administers proper operation of the ad hoc credential review committee and retains jurisdiction over all conduct, proceedings, and materials until the committee submits its report to the Chancellor.
- c. Composition
    - (1) At the direction of the Faculty Appeals, Grievances, and Disciplinary Hearing Committee appeal panel, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall select the ad hoc credential review committee.
    - (2) The ad hoc credential review committee shall consist of five members from the appellant's discipline or from substantially allied disciplines.
        - (a) Three members shall be tenured faculty members employed at UW-Whitewater, but no member shall be from the appellant's department(s) or its equivalent.
        - (b) Two members shall be tenured faculty members employed at other accredited universities, and must have academic credentials and qualifications that reside within the appellant's discipline.
    - (3) The Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall name a committee chair from among the UW-Whitewater membership.
    - (4) The Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall have 20 (twenty) business days from the receipt of the appeal panel's direction to form the ad hoc credential review committee.
- d. Proceedings
    - (1) All members of the ad hoc credential review committee shall review the documentary evidence as specified in Wisconsin Statutes 36.13, (2), (b).
    - (2) All members of the ad hoc credential review committee shall discuss their review of the faculty member's performance as represented by the portfolio contents via synchronous electronic exchange or a face-to-face meeting at least one time during their deliberations.

    - (3) The ad hoc credential review committee shall determine if the faculty member qualifies for tenure under all applicable UW-Whitewater department standards and Board of Regents Policy 74-13, Student Evaluation of Instruction.
    - (4) The ad hoc credential review committee shall not base its decisions upon impermissible factors as defined by UWS 3.08.
    - (5) The ad hoc credential review committee shall complete its work within 20 (twenty) business days from the date of publication (Wisconsin Statutes 19.81-19.98) of the ad hoc credential review committee's membership.
    - (6) A Record of Proceedings shall be made throughout the appeal process. The chair of the appeal panel shall maintain the integrity of this record.
- e. Record of Proceedings: The Record of Proceedings shall contain the following items
    - (1) date and time of meetings, correspondence, or other relevant communication,
    - (2) members of the appeal panel present,
    - (3) list of motions made and voted upon during the appeal, including any votes to go into closed sessions according the Wisconsin Statutes 19.81-19.98.
    - (4) documentation of testimony or evidence presented,
    - (5) written Report of Findings and Decision, and
    - (6) written, standards-based reasons supporting the findings and decision.
- f. Types of decision
    - (1) Affirmative decision supporting the award of tenure: If the ad hoc credential review committee finds that the faculty member does meet the qualifications for tenure, then in its Report of Findings and Decision, the ad hoc credential review committee shall include an explicit, standards-based rationale for its findings
    - (2) Negative decision supporting the denial of tenure: If the ad hoc credential review committee finds that the faculty member does not meet the qualifications for tenure, then in its Report of Findings and Decision, the ad hoc credential review committee shall include an explicit, standards-based rationale for its findings, specific instances in which the faculty member's performance as documented in the credentials had not met one or more applicable standard.
- g. Report and disposition of findings, decision, records, and documents
    - (1) The ad hoc credential review committee shall submit a written Report of Findings and Decision to the
        - (a) Chancellor,
        - (b) appellant,

        - (c) appellant's academic department(s),
        - (d) chair of the constituency standards committee,
        - (e) dean,
        - (f) Faculty Senate Chair, and
        - (g) chair of the appeal panel from the Faculty Appeals, Grievances, and Disciplinary Hearing Committee.
    - (2) The ad hoc credential review committee shall submit all materials to the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall place the Report of Findings and Decision of the ad hoc credential review committee in the appellant's official personnel file.
- h. Actions based on the findings and decision of the ad hoc credential review committee
    - (1) If the ad hoc credential review committee makes an affirmative decision, 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 Wisconsin Statutes 36.13 (2) (b).
    - (2) If the ad hoc credential review committee makes a negative decision,
        - (a) 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.
        - (b) the Chancellor may not recommend that the Board of Regents grant tenure.
- i. The campus administration shall reimburse the Faculty Senate account for the compensation of legitimate travel expenses incurred by the ad hoc credential review committee members who come from other institutions. Compensation shall be limited to transportation, lodging, and meals.

Section F. The Portfolio

1. Disposition of the Portfolio: In so far as the portfolio is a synthesis of a faculty member's professional performance, it belongs to the faculty member. Once the faculty member has submitted the portfolio to the department for review, the only materials that shall be added to the portfolio are those specified in these rules (III, C, 5, d; III, C, 6, f; III, D; and III, F, 4). Documents shall not be removed from the portfolio without the consent of the faculty member. Likewise, the faculty member may not add or remove

documents specified in these rules without the explicit consent of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. In case of negative decisions for reappointment or tenure, the Chancellor shall secure copies of all relevant documents including the portfolio, reports of decision, requests for a reconsideration and/or an appeal, reports of recommended action, and rebuttals produced during the review sequence for possible use as required by law.

2. General Guidelines for Preparation of the Portfolio

- a. New faculty starting in the Fall of 2022 and thereafter shall submit their portfolios via the online Faculty Portfolio (Purple Book) application, which is found here: https://purplebooks.uww.edu/
- b. Probationary faculty who entered their current position before the Fall of 2022 shall continue to submit their portfolios via hardcopy binders until such time as they are promoted and/or tenured.
- c. Faculty seeking promotion to the rank of Professor will use hardcopy binders until the Fall of 2026, after which time they will use the online Faculty Portfolio (Purple Book) application.

3. For each year period presented in the portfolio, the following basic documentation should be included:

- a. Updated vita
- b. Document of Intent (Appendix A, paragraph D of these rules)

• c. A narrative statement- including:
o (1) approach to teaching and how it is consistent with the select mission of the

department and/or strategic plan of the university;
o (2) research agenda, current projects, and accomplishments and in what way this

agenda and the projects are consistent with the select mission of the department

and/or the strategic plan of the University
o (3) service activities and how they help support the fulfillment of the select

mission of the department and/or the strategic plan of the University.
o (4) Include only accomplishments during the time period covered by the

Document of Intent.

- d. Performance Evaluation Form prepared by candidate, using standard classification of

  performance data
- e. A Summary of Teaching Evaluations (formatted in accordance with the Department's

  standard or common practice)
- f. A Peer Review of Teaching
- g. Representative artifacts of teaching/non-teaching job performance, research/creative

  activities, and professional and public service activities. The evidence included in the portfolio shall be representative, and thus, limited to one or two examples in each category for each year of review. However, the faculty member should have complete documentation available upon request.
- h. Notice of consultation or review
- i. Letter of consultation/decision from the Department, Constituency Standards

  Committee, College Dean, Provost, and/or Chancellor, as relevant
- j. Any documents produced through an appeal process or other reviews

---

Section G. Standard Classification of Performance Data

1. Guidelines for using the standard classification of performance data

When preparing the portfolio, the faculty member is expected to use the standard classification scheme to determine where various activities should be listed. The extent of the list is not intended to suggest that any one faculty member should have an example of each type of listed activity; the intent is to indicate where to place the wide variety of teaching, scholarly, and professional and public service enterprises in which the faculty engage.

2. Changes in the standard classification

- a. Departments and units responsible for performance evaluations may add items of performance to a category, but may not remove an item from the standard classification.

- b. Departments and units responsible for performance evaluations may not move items among categories for the standard classification.
- c. The Faculty Senate is responsible for revisions of the standard classification. At the time the Faculty Senate approves revisions of the standard classification, it also shall define the effective date of the revisions to insure reasonable and just lead time.
- d. In the narrative statement, the faculty member should discuss the activities included in an order that suits the coherence and enhances the meaning of the narrative, not the order in which the activities are listed in this classification scheme. This narrative should establish the context of the faculty member's position and the relevance and importance of the activities in fulfilling the responsibilities associated with the position.

3. Since the major purpose of the portfolio is to chronicle the development of a faculty member throughout his or her professional career, the **relative emphasis given to the different categories may change over time** which would be reflected in the order in which the activities are considered in the narrative statement.

4. The standard classification is used for all performance reviews, i.e. for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion decisions.

- a. Teaching Activities
    - (1) Instructional Methodology
        - (a) Course syllabi
        - (b) Design and development of innovative teaching methods or media
        - (c) Student assignments, presentations, projects
        - (d) Methods of assessing and evaluating student progress
        - (e) Edited video tapes of classroom instruction
    - (2) Evaluation
        - (a) Peer observation and review (See Appendix B, part C of these rules.)
            - i) Presentation of material during peer observation sessions
            - ii) Student participation during peer observation sessions
            - iii) Communication with students during peer observation sessions
            - iv) Student evaluation of course and instructional approach (See Appendix B, parts A and B of these rules.)
        - (b) Exit evaluations by students upon completion of the program
    - (3) Service to Students
        - (a) Advising and mentoring students
        - (b) Student evaluation of advising and mentoring
        - (c) Supervision of student research projects and independent studies

        - (d) Supervision and consultation on graduate projects, theses, and independent studies
        - (e) Assistance with job or graduate school placement
        - (f) Writing letters of recommendation for credential files, graduate school applications, internships, and scholarships
        - (g) Organizing student attendance and participation in student and/or professional conferences
        - (h) Using varied forms of electronic media to support instructor accessibility, e.g., e- mail, class lists, bulletin boards
    - (4) Enhancement of Teaching Skills
        - (a) Participation in programs and/or conferences for improving teaching
        - (b) Peer consultation or mentoring
        - (c) Team or collaborative teaching
        - (d) Faculty exchanges
        - (e) Observation of master teachers
        - (f) Changes in classroom approach that are connected to peer observations
        - (g) Changes in classroom approach that are based on student performance on assessments
        - (h) Changes in classroom approach that result from personal analysis of one's own teaching in the light of review of research, literature, or interactions with in- service personnel.
    - (5) Student Performance
        - (a) Student performance on assessments prepared by agents external to the immediate classroom
        - (b) Student performance on assessments prepared by the instructor
    - (6) Support for Department Goals
        - (a) Curriculum development
        - (b) Developing new programs and/or licensure authorizations
        - (c) Off-campus teaching
        - (d) Participation in distance education
        - (e) Preparing and delivering testimony in the State Legislature related to the goals of the college and department
        - (f) Working with in-service professionals to provide on-site opportunities and exchanges for students as part of campus based classroom experiences
    - (7) Course Load
        - (a) Undergraduate and graduate courses taught
        - (b) Factors influencing the course load

            - i) Class sizes
            - ii) Number of preparations per semester
            - iii) Number of times the faculty member has taught the course
            - iv) Number of new instructional materials introduced in the course, e.g., using a new textbook, reader, or format
            - v) Collaborative or team teaching involved in the course load
            - vi) Types of courses taught: proficiency, common core, required for a major program, general education, elective, laboratory, studio, clinical or field program
    - (8) Honors and Awards
        - (a) Grants for the improvement of teaching
        - (b) Awards recognizing teaching excellence by any level from a student organization through an international professional organization Performance of Faculty with Non-teaching Assignments
- b. Job
    - (1) Skill and Knowledge
        - (a) Knowledge of job assignment
        - (b) Organization skills
        - (c) Communication skills
    - (2) Management skills
        - (a) Responsible fiscal planning and budget management
        - (b) Curriculum and program scheduling
        - (c) Resource and technology planning
    - (3) Professional Effort
        - (a) Participation in programs for professional improvement
        - (b) Efficiency of operation
        - (c) Support for the unit staff
        - (d) Participation in the development of effective and efficient operational practices
        - (e) Support of university goals and mission
        - (f) Support of unit/service area goals and mission
    - (4) Leadership
        - (a) Work with faculty and professional staff in defining context relevant goals and long term plans
        - (b) Coordination and marshaling of resources to achieve goals
- c. Research and Creative Activity
    - (1) Published/Reviewed/Refereed/Invited Works
        - (a) Articles
            - i) Book or literature review
            - ii) Bibliography

        - iii) Essay or paper in an anthology
        - iv) Professional journal article
        - v) Proceedings
        - vi) Public/Trade journal article
        - vii) Article translation
    - (b) Books
        - i) Chapter in a book
        - ii) Book
        - iii) Monograph
        - iv) Book edited or translated
        - v) Instructional materials, e.g., readers for courses, state curriculum guides, test banks, instructor's manuals
    - (c) Grant Proposals
        - i) Grant proposals accepted for funding
        - ii) Grant proposals for which the funding decision is pending
        - iii) Grant proposals submitted for funding
    - (d) Performance and Artistic Works
        - i) Short story, poem, dramatic work
        - ii) Musical composition or arrangement
        - iii) Choreography
        - iv) Exhibition of works of art, graphics, crafts, and design
        - v) Performances and recitals, plays, and readings
        - vi) Master classes and workshops
        - v) Direction of works in the performance arts
        - vi) Recorded works in the performance arts
    - (e) Electronic Media
        - i) Computer software development
        - ii) Multimedia production
        - iii) Web based graphic design generating virtual reality options
        - iv) Broadcast, film, electronic media design and production
    - (f) Conferences
        - i) Papers
        - ii) Presentations
        - iii) Panels
        - iv) Workshops
        - v) Scholarly consultations or seminars related to one's area of expertise
    - (g) Works Not Refereed or Not Adjudicated: Presentations, papers, panels, workshops, or performances at a professional meeting without a review policy

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

- d. Professional and Public Service Activities
  - (1) Service to the Profession
    - (a) Editor of a professional journal
    - (b) Adjudicator of exhibit, performance, design, program, i.e., serving as a member of a program, agency, or school evaluation team for an accrediting agency
    - (c) Reviewer of conference proposals or journal manuscripts
    - (d) Reviewer of grant proposals for funding agency
    - (e) Reviewer of promotion or personnel files as a member of an ad hoc credential review committee
    - (f) Reviewer/mentor of research in progress.
    - (g) Discipline-related consultant
    - (h) Officer of or service to a professional association
    - (i) Attendance at professional meeting or conference
    - (j) Provider of non-credit continuing education
    - (k) Cooperative sharing of expertise with campus colleagues
    - (l) Presenter of in-service programs for faculty and staff
    - (m) Member of a state, regional, national, or international committee associated with one's discipline
    - (n) Officer in a state, regional, national, or international organization associated with one's discipline.
  - (2) Service to Department, Constituency, University, and/or System
    - (a) Member of a department, constituency, university, or system committee
    - (b) Officer of a department, constituency, or university committee
    - (c) Contributor to department, constituency, or university reports, i.e., audit, accreditation, self-study
    - (d) Assigned mentor or advisor to a probationary faculty member
    - (e) Advisor to a student group
    - (f) Participant in a campus activity requiring frequent, regular or extended investment of time and effort, e. g., serving as the Men's Faculty Athletic Representative for the NCAA
    - (g) Advisor, consultant, or judge for a student organized activity or event on campus, e. g., judging homecoming floats or candidates
    - (h) Organizer for a campus sponsored conference
    - (i) Support staff member for a campus sponsored conference
  - (3) Public Service

- (a) Discipline-related presentation or service to a local, regional, or national agency or group
- (b) Discipline-related service to community organizations
- (4) Honors and Awards
- (a) Department, constituency, or university service awards
- (b) Service award from a discipline-related professional organization

Section H. University Minimum Requirements for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and/or Promotion

1. Instructor:

Any instructor hired or assigned to teach a college-credit course must meet the following qualifications:

- a. Instructors teaching courses for undergraduate-level credit must hold a Master's degree or higher in the discipline or subfield associated with the courses to be taught. If the instructor holds a Master's degree or higher in a discipline or subfield other than that in which he or she is teaching, that faculty member must have completed a minimum of 18 graduate credit hours in the discipline or subfield associated with the courses to be taught and have minimum educational code 3. These qualifications apply to all situations where an instructor or faculty member is assigned to teach an undergraduate college-credit course, including, overloads, Winterim/Summer courses, and dual-enrollment courses taught in high schools and other settings.
  - i. Tested experience may substitute for an earned degree or portions thereof. The qualification of instructors on the basis of tested experience must be performed on a case-by-case basis. The experience must be deemed to be equivalent to the degree otherwise required for teaching the courses, and it must include a breadth and depth of experience outside of the classroom in real-world situations relevant to the discipline or subfield of the courses to be taught.
  - ii. Years of experience in teaching a course cannot be the sole basis for qualifying an instructor to teach—other factors and types of relevant experience must be involved.
  - iii. When using tested experience as the qualification, the experience must satisfy the minimum qualifications and threshold for experience specified for the advertised position or for the course to be taught. It is the responsibility of the academic department or other hiring authority to specify the

minimum qualifications and levels of experience and to document how the instructor meets those in the appointment process.
    - iv. In determining that tested experience is sufficient, approval is required by the department chair associated with the hire or course assignments, and by the dean. It is best practice that the department chair makes his/her decision in consultation with faculty in the discipline or subfield as much as is practical given the timeline needed to conduct the hire or course assignment.
- b. Instructors teaching courses for graduate-level credit must hold the terminal degree determined by the discipline and have a record of research, scholarship or achievement appropriate for the graduate program associated with the course and meet the requirements of educational code 1. If the instructor is not a member of the Graduate Faculty of UW-Whitewater, then an approved exception must be granted per Sections 5 and 6 of the Constitution of the Graduate Faculty. Graduate-level courses can be assigned to instructors who do not hold terminal degrees if the instructors qualify on the basis of tested experience (see III H.1.a.i-iv above).

2. Assistant Professor:

- a. Must hold a Ph.D. or other terminal degree appropriate to the discipline and also meet the qualifications for teaching courses explained in H.1 above.
    - i. The Ph.D. or other terminal degree must be from a college or university that has regional accreditation or equivalent national or international accreditation, but no one shall be disqualified on this account if they were hired to a faculty line at UW-Whitewater prior to May 1, 1996 and served in a faculty line at UW-Whitewater continuously since then.
    - ii. An M.F.A., MLS or other terminal degree (other than Ph.D.) must be deemed appropriate preparation for a faculty line in the discipline as determined by three bodies, for example, a professional organization, the university, and the area of specialization.
- b. Candidates who are A.B.D. (all but dissertation completed, in their terminal degree) can be hired at the rank of Assistant Professor, on a one-year contract, if they have a written agreement to complete their dissertation by the date of the scheduled review for reappointment. If the Ph.D. or other terminal degree is not officially completed by the scheduled review date, the appointment is terminated at the end of the first year (See Section III J. Review, Reappointment, and Tenure Timeline of these rules). The agreement to complete the dissertation must be submitted before the date of initial appointment and signed by the candidate, the department chair of the hiring department, and by the dean. The A.B.D. period and all accomplishments therein will count as part of the probationary period for purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion reviews.

3. Associate Professor:

To be eligible for promotion to the rank of associate professor, the faculty member must:

- a. satisfy the minimum requirements listed above for instructor and for assistant professor,
- b. have at least four years of full-time college or university teaching and/or appropriate experience at the rank of assistant professor, and
- c. have a minimum of three academic years in rank of assistant professor at this university before the effective date of the promotion to the rank of associate professor.

4. Professor:

To be eligible for promotion to the rank of professor, the faculty member must:

- a. satisfy the minimum requirements listed above for instructor and for assistant professor;
- b. have at least ten total years of full-time college or university teaching or other appropriate experience; and
- c. have a minimum of three academic years in the rank of associate professor if the faculty member was appointed or promoted to associate professor on this campus before the effective date of the promotion to the rank of professor.

Exceptions to the above requirements may be made if a candidate's unusual qualifications are judged to possess exceptional merit. The burden of proof of such merit shall be on the applicant and the department originating the application. The constituency standards committee makes the final decision on making exceptions to the university minimum requirements policy.

Section I. Educational Preparation Code

1. Educational preparation codes and requirements

Educational Education Preparation Code Requirement Code

- Ph.D., Ed.D. Earned doctorate equivalent to the Ph.D. or Ed.D. requiring the minimum equivalent of three full years of graduate study beyond the baccalaureate degree.
- A refereed** terminal degree in the area of specialization, e. g., M.F.A. in studio arts.

- Earned degree requiring a minimum equivalent of three full years of graduate study beyond the baccalaureate degree. All requirements for the doctorate met with the exception of the completion of the dissertation (ABD).
- A Master's degree in the discipline or subfield relevant to the courses to be taught plus one full year of graduate study as measured by the institution where graduate work is applicable in a degree program, or a Master's degree in the discipline or subfield relevant to the courses to be taught, or a Master's degree in another discipline and completion of a minimum of 18 graduate credits in the discipline or subfield relevant to the courses to be taught.
- A Master's degree in another discipline plus tested experience in the discipline or subfield relevant to the courses to be taught.
- Baccalaureate degree plus tested experience equivalent to a Master's degree in the discipline or subfield relevant to the courses to be taught.

*Only doctorates from accredited (regional accreditation associations, or equivalent national or international accreditation) colleges and universities will entitle a faculty member to Educational Code 1, but no one granted Educational Code 1 prior to May 1, 1996, shall lose Educational Code 1 on this account.
**Refereed as determined by three bodies, for example, a professional organization, the university, and the area of specialization.

2. Unresolved questions concerning the assignment of Educational Code shall be submitted to the University Standards Committee for decision

---

Section J. Review, Reappointment, and Tenure Timeline

1. 1. Submission of a rebuttal to a Report of Decision from a department and/or to any Report of Recommended Action may delay the forwarding of the portfolio to the next review body by a maximum of 7 (seven) business days.

   2. Exceptions to this timeline shall be made in cases of faculty members who are on leave at the time of the deadline. These exceptions shall accommodate for the leave period while also allowing the individual to complete their review within the academic year. Upon returning from leave, the faculty member shall begin their review cycle within two weeks. This applies to FMLA/WFMLA or unpaid leaves of absence.

   3. Delays or submission errors due to technological issues with the online Faculty Portfolio (Purple Book) application shall be accommodated in the timeline as

necessary. Any such delays or submission errors shall be corrected without negative impact on the applicant.

4. Timeline grid

First Class Day of the Second Week of Classes

All faculty members (excluding first-year faculty) scheduled for a review and decision granting reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion submit their portfolios to the departments (See consultation/review schedule chart, Appendix C of these rules). The Portfolio will be “locked” (meaning restricted to view-only status) after this date, with the exception that the Department Chair may “roll back” the portfolio to the faculty this date, with the exception that the Department Chair may “roll back” the portfolio to the faculty member to correct an error. At least 20 days prior to the date of review, the departments must give these candidates Notice of Review (UWS 3.06(c)).

Third Friday in September
First Friday in October

Document of Intent for first-year faculty is due to their Department Chairs.

All faculty members (excluding first-year faculty) scheduled for a department consultation shall submit their portfolios to the departments, i.e., those faculty members who are in their third and fifth years on campus. The Portfolio will be “locked” (meaning restricted to view-only status) after this date, with the exception that the Department Chair may “roll back” the portfolio to the faculty member to correct an error. (See consultation/review schedule chart, Appendix C of these rules).

Fourth Monday in October

Departments forward all reappointment portfolios and reports of decisions to the constituency dean(s). (See consultation/review schedule chart, Appendix C of these rules). After the portfolio is submitted to the dean, the Department Chair will no longer have the ability to “roll back” the submission.

The portfolio shall be forwarded to the constituency dean(s) only after the department holds a requested reconsideration. When the department completes a reconsideration, its Reconsideration Report of Decision shall replace the original Report of Decision in the portfolio to be forwarded to the constituency dean(s) for review.

November First

The constituency dean(s) shall forward to the Constituency Standards Committee (CSC) all portfolios of persons in their second year of initial contract and who, due to their years of credited service, are within two years of their mandatory tenure decision.

November Fifteenth

The constituency dean(s) shall forward to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs all portfolios, reports of decision, reports of recommended action, and rebuttals affecting faculty scheduled for second year reviews.

The CSC shall forward to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs all portfolios of persons in their second year of initial contract and who, due to their years of credited service, are within two years of their mandatory tenure decision.

December First

The constituency dean(s) shall forward to the Constituency Standards Committee (CSC) all portfolios, reports of decision, reports of recommended action, and rebuttals for the reviewed faculty members a) who are in their fourth year, b) who applied for tenure or promotion with tenure, or c) who applied for promotion to professor.

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall forward to the Chancellor all portfolios, reports of decision, reports of recommended action, and rebuttals affecting faculty scheduled for second year reviews.

December Fifteenth

In accordance with UWS 3.09, (1), (a), the Chancellor shall notify second year probationary faculty of reappointment decisions. The Chancellor also shall inform the probationary faculty of the date of their next reappointment review and decision. This date will be determined by the department decision to offer a two year or a one year contract.

January First

The constituency dean shall place a Report of Recommended Action in the portfolio of faculty members in their third and fifth year scheduled for a review and forward copies to the faculty members and the department. Constituency dean forwards portfolios to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Second Friday in January

All ABD faculty members scheduled for a first year review and decision granting reappointment must submit their portfolios to the departments (See consultation/review schedule chart, Appendix C of these rules). The Portfolio will be “locked” (meaning restricted to view-only status) after this date, with the exception that the Department Chair may “roll back” the portfolio to the faculty member to correct an error. At least 20 days prior to the date of review, the departments must give these candidates Notice of Review (UWS 3.06(c)).

Fourth Monday in January

The CSC shall have completed preparation of Reports of Recommended Action for the reviewed faculty members a) who are in their fourth year, b) who applied for tenure or promotion with tenure, or c) who applied for promotion to professor. The CSC shall place the committee’s Report of Recommended Action in each reviewed faculty member’s portfolio. The CSC shall deliver a copy of the Report of Recommended Action to the faculty member and the department. The CSC shall forward to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs all portfolios including report of decision, recommended actions, and rebuttals.

Fourth Friday in January

Departments must have completed the Department Review for all first year ABD faculty, and forward all probationary first year ABD Faculty reappointment portfolios and reports of decisions to the constituency dean(s). (See consultation/review schedule chart, Appendix C of these rules). After the portfolio is submitted to the dean, the Department Chair will no longer have the ability to “roll back” the submission.

The portfolio shall be forwarded to the constituency dean(s) only after the department holds a requested reconsideration. When the department completes a reconsideration, its Reconsideration Report of Decision shall replace the original Report of Decision in the portfolio to be forwarded to the constituency dean(s) for review.

First Friday in February

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall place a Report of Recommended Action in the portfolio of faculty members in their third or fifth year scheduled for a review and

forward copies to the faculty members, department and constituency dean. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs forwards portfolios to the Chancellor.

Second Friday in February

The constituency dean(s) shall forward to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs all portfolios, reports of decision, reports of recommended action, and rebuttals affecting ABD faculty scheduled for first year reviews.

All first-year faculty with terminal degree in hand at time of appointment must submit their Portfolios to their departments. The Portfolio will be “locked” (meaning restricted to view-only status) after this date, with the exception that the Department Chair may “roll back” the portfolio to the faculty member to correct an error.

Third Friday in February

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall review the portfolios for first year probationary faculty members hired as ABD. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall prepare a Report of Recommended Action, place a copy of the report in the portfolio, and send a copy of the report to the faculty member, the faculty member’s department, and constituency dean(s). The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs forwards portfolios including all reports of decisions, recommended actions, and rebuttals to the Chancellor for review and decision.

Fourth Friday in February

Consultations for first year faculty with terminal degree in hand at time of appointment must be completed.

Second Friday in March

The Department Chair will no longer have the ability to “roll back” the submission for first-year faculty with terminal degree in hand at time of appointment.

Fourth Friday in February

The Chancellor shall prepare a Report of Decision for faculty members in their third or fifth year scheduled for a review. The Chancellor shall forward a copy of the Report of

Decision to the faculty member, the department, Constituency Dean and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

By March 1st
The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall review the portfolios for the reviewed faculty members a) who are in their fourth year, b) who applied for tenure or promotion with tenure, or c) who applied for promotion to professor. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall prepare a Report of Recommended Action, place a copy of the report in the portfolio, and send a copy of the report to the faculty member and the faculty member's department, CSC, and dean(s). The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs forwards portfolios including all reports of decisions, recommended actions, and rebuttals to the Chancellor for review and decision.

By April 1st

In accordance with UWS 3.09, (1), (a), the Chancellor shall notify first year probationary faculty hired as ABD of reappointment decisions. The Chancellor shall prepare a written, standards- based Report of Decision for ABD faculty members in their first year review. The Chancellor also shall inform the probationary faculty of the date of their next reappointment review and decision. This date will be determined by the department decision to offer a one year contract. The Chancellor shall forward a copy of the Report of Decision to the faculty member, the department, Constituency Dean and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The Chancellor shall prepare a written, standards- based summary of the portfolio review and decision. The Chancellor shall forward a copy of this summary to the faculty member, the department, the CSC, and the dean(s).

First Friday in May

All Faculty Portfolios are opened for the next year in the electronic system.

*Persons hired as ABD in their first year of initial contract are reviewed in year 1 by the specific timeline for year 1 probationary faculty (department, dean, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Chancellor)

*Persons in their second year of initial contract with no years of credited service are reviewed by the specific timeline for second year persons (department, dean, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Chancellor)

*Persons in their second year of initial contract with two or three years of credited service are reviewed by December 15thby the department, dean, CSC, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Chancellor

Timeline Summary (UWS 3.09 (1) (a-c))

~~~~~~

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 2023-05-09

Approved by the Chancellor on 2023-06-05
~~~~~~

Appendix C: Review, Reappointment and Tenure Decision Schedules

A. Review, reappointment, and tenure schedule including a maximum of three-years of experience credited

B. Mandatory six-year tenure/promotion decision and recommendation schedule,

1. All Decisions and Recommendations Positive

2. Negative Decision in Mandatory Tenure Decision

1. This table displays the impact of years of credited experience on the review and reappointment schedule, it lists only the department actions in each year. The remainder of the reappointment review structure during the decision years includes reviews and written, standards-based recommendations by the constituency dean, the constituency standards committee, and the vice chancellor for academic affairs. Each of these recommendations, any rebuttals, the department decision(s), and appeal panel record (if appeal filed) become a part of the portfolio for the year in question. Similarly, the record of consultation without decision and relevant materials for the years in which consultation is held within the department become a part of the portfolio for the year in which the consultation occurs.

Review, Reappointment, and Tenure Schedule Including a Maximum of Three Years of Experience Credited

Years in Probationary Cycle	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	5th year	6th year

0 years credited experience	Department ***consultation*** following first semester on campus Department ***decision*** for ABD	*Department ***decision***; fall of second year on campus	Department ***consultation*** or decision; fall of third year on campus	Department ***decision***; fall of fourth year on campus	Department ***consultation or decision***; fall of fifth year on campus	Mandatory tenure ***decision***; fall of sixth year on campus
1 year credited experience	Department ***consultation;*** following first semester on campus	*Department ***decision***; fall of second year on campus- one year contract to align with tenure review in 4th year	Credited year of experience applied	Department ***decision***; fall of third year on campus	Department ***consultation or decision***; fall of fourth year on campus	Mandatory tenure ***decision***; fall of fifth year on campus
2 years credited experience	Department ***consultation;*** following first semester on campus	*Department ***decision***; fall of second year on campus- one or two year contract could be given	Credited year of experience applied	Credited year of experience applied	Department ***consultation or decision***; fall of third year on campus	Mandatory tenure ***decision***; fall of fourth year on campus
3 years credited experience	Department ***consultation;*** following first semester on campus	*Department ***decision***; fall of second year on campus- one year contract only as next year is the mandatory tenure decision	Credited year of experience applied	Credited year of experience applied	Credited year of experience applied	Mandatory tenure ***decision***; fall of third year on campus

***review is to be completed by December 15**

---

2 Mandatory Six-Year Tenure/Promotion Decision and Recommendation Schedule, All Decisions and Recommendations Positive (assuming no credited prior years of service)

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	5th year	6th year	7th year
Department	Consultation, two year contract	Decision[2]	Consultation or decision[1]	Decision	Consultation[3] or decision[1]	Decision, positive	No action
Dean	No action, two year contract	Recommendation[2]	No action[2], or recommendation	Recommendation	No action, or recommendation	Recommendation	No action
Constituency Standards Committee	No action, two year contract	No action	No action	Recommendation	No action, or recommendation	Recommendation	No action
Provost	No action, two year contract	Recommendation[2]	No action[2], or recommendation	Recommendation	No action, or recommendation	Recommendation	No action

Appeal Panel from Faculty Appeals, Grievances and Disciplinary Hearing Committee	No action, two year contract	No action	No action	No action	No action	No action	No action
Chancellor	No action, two year contract	Decision[2]	No action[1], or decision[2]	Decision	No action, or decision	Decision, positive	No action
Board of Regents	No action	No action	No action	No action	No action	Decision, positive	No action

[1]If a two-year contract, no decision, but consultation within department. If a one-year contract, decision.

[2]If a two-year contract, no action. If a one-year contract, a recommendation.

---

3. This table indicates the actions taken by the different agents in the review process for cases in which a mandatory tenure review results in a negative decision. When faculty members have two or three years of credited experience, the mandatory tenure decision would occur in the third, fourth, or fifth year on campus, thus the process in the third, fourth, and fifth years would follow the sixth year structure shown in this table. Negative mandatory tenure decisions would follow the seventh year structure shown in this table which would occur in the fourth, fifth, and sixth year which corresponds to the respective mandatory tenure decision year.

3 Mandatory Tenure or Tenure/Promotion Decision and Recommendation Schedule, Negative Decision in Mandatory Tenure Decision

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	5th year	6th year	7th year
Department						Decision, negative following reconsideration (UWS 3.07, (1), (b))	If appeal panel returns materials with instruction, review and make decision
Dean						Recommendation[1]	No actoin
Constituency Standards Committee						Recommendation[1]	No action
Provost						Recommendation[1]	No action
Appeal Panel from Faculty Appeals, Grievances, and Disciplinary Hearing Committee						If an appeal is filed, Chair of Faculty Senate receives valid appeal and Faculty Senate Executive Board empanels five member appeal panel from the Faculty Appeals, Grievances and Disciplinary Hearing Committee. Panel begins hearing appeal in Spring term.	Complete hearing appeal; may return materials to department with instructions or may request that a Notestein committee be empaneled.
Chancellor						Decision[2]	Decision[2]
Board of Regents						No action	Decision/No action pending Chancellor's decision[2]

[1] Rebuttals may be filed by the faculty member being reviewed following recommendations. Such rebuttals shall become a part of the portfolio.

[2] Since both the department and chancellor's decisions must be positive to award tenure (UWS 3.06, 1, (a)), the negative decision from the department in the sixth year automatically leads to non-renewal, thus terminates employment. Because this non-renewal decision occurs after the second year, the faculty member shall be offered a one year contract for the seventh year (UWS 3.06, 1, (a) and UWS 3.09, 1, (c)). Appeal may be processed during the seventh year. Without a positive recommendation from the university appeal panel with instruction to the department to review the sixth year materials again or to submit the sixth year materials to a Notestein committee, the sixth year negative department decision would be sustained. "The decision of the Chancellor will be final on such matters (UWS 3.08 (3)).