

**LIBERAL ARTS AND EDUCATION COLLEGE RANK,
SALARY AND TENURE COMMITTEE
(LA&E CRSTC) PROCEDURES
2007-2008**

Section 1 General Function of Review Bodies

- a. Department Review Body (DRB).
The primary function of the DRB is to make salary, promotion, tenure and retention recommendations based on pertinent data in accordance with a department and college approved plan.
- b. Liberal Arts and Education College Rank, Salary, and Tenure Committee (Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC).
The primary function of the Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC is to make salary decisions subject to review by the Vice Chancellor, and to review and evaluate DRB recommendations for promotion, tenure and retention in accordance with a university approved plan.
- c. Both of the ABOVE REVIEW BODIES will act in direct accordance with AFFIRMATIVE ACTION and EQUAL OPPORTUNITY LAWS AND REGULATIONS. The University Affirmative Action Office will direct the attention of the various review bodies to affirmative action problems and needs.
- d. DRB Plans should include the:
 1. Methods used to gather student evaluations insuring that the teacher being evaluated not be present during any part of the evaluation process.
 2. Methods and criteria used to make peer evaluations.
 3. Methods used to organize the DRB.
 4. Ranking of teaching, scholarly, and professional activities, and service to the university and the community.
 5. Copies of all student and peer evaluations that are in current use.

Section 2 The File

- a. Each faculty member is encouraged to build and edit a personal file for promotion, retention, tenure, and salary purposes. DRB chairpersons shall assemble a file for those faculty who are unable to submit a file. Faculty members requesting promotion, reappointment or tenure must use the format outlined in (b).
- b. Format for URST File (required of anyone requesting promotion, retention or tenure).

*Three-ring notebook not to exceed approximately one inch thick.

*Notebook divided into sections including the following:

Section I - Updated vita

Section II - Peer Evaluation and Student Evaluations

Peer Evaluation will include evaluation in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly and Professional Activity, and University and Community Service for at least the last three years listed as outstanding (5), above normal (4), normal (3), below normal (2), or low (1). Student Evaluations will include evaluations for all courses taught for at least the last three years listed as outstanding (5), above normal (4), normal (3), below normal (2), or low (1).

Section III - Narrative Statement or List of Activities for current year including Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly and Professional, and University and Community Service.

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

Section V - Material added to a file at any level must be dated and signed and a copy must be sent to the individual involved.

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

Section VII - Ancillary Supporting Materials. Any documentation of performance, e.g., syllabi, letters, scholarly papers, etc., should be placed here.

- c. The faculty member should submit his/her file to the DRB. The DRB must add to the file a summary of current student and current peer evaluations. The peer evaluations must be independent of student evaluations.
- d. There will be no single scheme for the solicitation of student and peer evaluations, but every department must follow a plan that has been approved by the Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC. The Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC will review departmental plans annually, one year in advance of the plans actual use. In the event that the DRB and the

CRSTC cannot reach agreement on the department plan, the final review and approval will be made by the URSTPC.

5d. DRBs will include in their annual plan criteria for peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness and weights if applicable.

- e. For non-tenured faculty full student and peer evaluations must be conducted each semester during their first three years of service. For those seeking promotion full student and peer evaluations must be submitted for any three of the last six semesters prior to the request for promotion. For tenured faculty not seeking promotion the DRB may make its salary recommendations with only a vita update URSTPC Form I. For non-tenured faculty and all faculty seeking promotion, the full student and peer evaluation processes must be annual. Student evaluations must be conducted each semester for faculty during their first three years of service. For those seeking promotion, a three year accumulation of student and peer evaluations must be submitted. When student evaluations are submitted by a faculty member, the evaluations should be for all courses taught in that semester. For tenured faculty not seeking promotion, the DRB may make its recommendations without requiring current student and peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness. In such cases, the full review is required once every three years. However, no department or DRB may deny a request for a full review of a faculty member if so requested by the faculty member.

<u>Rank/request</u>	<u>Section I</u>	<u>Section II</u>	<u>Section III</u>	<u>Section IV</u>	<u>Section V</u>	<u>Section VI</u>	<u>Section VII</u>
	Current year Updated Vita	Current and Previous years' Form 1 Peer Evaluations / Student Evaluations	Current Year Narrative or List of Activities (Vita Update Sheet)	Past Narrative/List of Activities (Vita Update Sheet)	Additions to the file	Additions to the file after an adverse decision	Ancillary Supporting Materials
Assistant Professor Seeking Salary and Retention	(X)	Current and All Previous Years' / Both Semesters all Classes for the current year	(X)	Every year while at UW-P	If Applicable	If Applicable	(X)
Assistant Professor Seeking Promotion	(X)	Current and All Previous Years' / Any three out of the last six semesters	(X)	Since acquiring current rank; (PI)	If Applicable	If Applicable	(X)
Assistant/ Associate Professor Seeking Tenure	(X)	Current and All Previous Years / Any three out of the last six semesters	(X)	Every year while at UW-P; (PI)	If Applicable	If Applicable	(X)
Associate Professor Seeking Salary	(X)	(NR)	(X)	(NR)	If Applicable	If Applicable	(NR)
Associate Professor Seeking Promotion	(X)	Current and All Previous Years / Any three out of the last six semesters	(X)	Since acquiring current rank; (PI)	If Applicable	If Applicable	(X)
Full Professor Seeking Salary	(X)	(NR)	(X)	(NR)	If Applicable	If Applicable	(NR)
All Equity Requests							
Professor- Five Year Review							

Section 3 The Review Process

- a. All departmental recommendations on retention, promotion, salary increases, and tenure shall be based on a review of student and peer evaluation data, the vita, and other materials in the faculty member's file. These recommendations are reported on the "Teaching Faculty Evaluation Report 2002." The DRB is only required to check the appropriate box under Peer and Student Evaluation. Numerical ratings will not be forwarded to the CRSTC. The peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness must be independent of formal student evaluations.
- b. The DRB may rank all those recommendations for promotion within each rank.
- c. The faculty member must be notified of the DRB recommendation so that he/she can add further comments to the file and/or request reconsideration if he/she so chooses. The faculty member may not remove or change the statements of the review body without the consent of the review body; however, he/she may add a counter statement with respect to peer evaluation, student evaluation, DRB evaluation or the statement by the department chairperson.
- d. It is the responsibility of the department chairperson to make a summary of all recommendations, flag any file with a counter statement, and forward the summary and the files to the Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC. A flag is intended to prevent any unusual case from going unnoticed and indicates to the next review body those files which may need extra attention.
- e. Each review body shall place a memorandum in each faculty file indicating the date that it was reviewed and the date(s) of every action taken.
- f. The Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC follows the Faculty Bylaws, Part II, Article V, Section 3a, in carrying out its responsibility for reviewing recommendations of DRBs.
- g. All Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC recommendations for promotion or tenure, both positive and negative, must be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor.
- h. The Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC may rank all recommendations (within rank) for promotion and forward both its own and the DRB rankings.
- i. The Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC returns copies of any additions to the file to the faculty member and to the DRB. The faculty member may submit another statement. Note: The CRSTC will not accept any new "supporting evidence," regardless of the source, without the material being reviewed by the DRB.

- j. The department chairperson again collects any additional statements for the files and forwards them to the college dean who prepares a summary of the recommendations of the college faculty members and flags those files with counter statements.
- k. The dean then forwards the files for promotion to the Vice Chancellor using URSPC Form 1.
- l. After completion of the RST process, the complete files are returned to the department chairpersons.
- m. Any faculty member who chooses not to prepare a file will be considered as fairly as possible in light of whatever information is available to his/her department.
- n. Any department that wishes to deviate from this procedure must clear its procedures with the CRSTC and the dean.

Section 4 Evaluation Criteria

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

Section 5 Peer and Student Evaluations

- a. Student Evaluations. The policy has been to encourage a wide range of practices as long as departmental procedures are reviewed and approved annually by the CRSTC. Decisions about student evaluations, including what instrument will be used and how the data are to be interpreted, shall be made by the DRB. It is recommended that the DRBs use the resources

available at the Teaching Excellence Center in developing an evaluation form.

Annually the departmental procedures are reviewed and approved by the CRSTC. In situations where agreement can't be reached, the final review and approval will be made the Provost. The departments and colleges should keep the process as simple and as fair as possible and should see that no questions are included that would destroy student anonymity. Recommendations for reappointment, promotion and the granting of tenure must be based on a cumulative annual record as specified in Section 2e above.

Any faculty member is free to add additional evaluations from previous semesters to his/her file. Faculty members have the right to respond to all summary statements of student evaluations prepared for retention, promotion, tenure, and salary purposes. (See Table in 2e.)

- b. Peer Evaluations. Peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness must be independent of student evaluation. Departments may use a variety of peer evaluation techniques. Peer evaluations may be made by a single individual or by several. Evaluations in a given department may be solicited and summarized by a designated individual, the chairperson of the department, chairperson of the DRB, the DRB, or an ad hoc committee. Whatever the procedure, it must be embodied in the written guidelines of the DRB and reviewed by the Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC.
- c. When conducting peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness, the following methods and information may be considered:
 - 1. Classroom, laboratory or workshop observations by the department chair or a DRB member should be conducted, followed by a discussion with the faculty member of his/her strengths and weaknesses and a written summary report by the observer.
 - 2. A complete list of classes taught specifying student credit hours and indicating whether graduate or undergraduate level.
 - 3. Copies of all syllabi and samples of tests or, in classes without tests, samples of assignments.
 - 4. Vita.
 - 5. Unique educational experience(s).
 - 6. A set of personal goals to enhance teaching effectiveness developed by each faculty member with evidence of progress toward meeting these goals.
 - 7. Percent of time assigned to teaching.

Section 6 Reappointment of Non-tenured Faculty

- a. The criteria used in reviewing non-tenured faculty members for reappointment shall include the following in this order:
 - 1) teaching effectiveness
 - 2) scholarly and professional activities
 - 3) service to the community in the area of the faculty member's expertise and to the university
- b. It will be necessary for the DRBs and the Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC to review first- and second-year faculty before other faculty since recommendations concerning reappointments of second-year faculty must reach the Vice Chancellor by mid-November and those concerning first-year faculty must be received by mid-February.
- c. A file will be submitted to the DRB, Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC, and Vice Chancellor for each non-tenured faculty being reviewed for reappointment and the file should include the following:
 - 1) up-to-date vita
 - 2) narrative progress report (optional)
 - 3) cumulative summaries of student and peer evaluations
 - 4) department chairperson's statement
 - 5) a well-documented recommendation by the DRB concerning the renewal or non-renewal of the faculty member
 - 6) a recommendation by the CRSTC which must include evaluation in terms of the criteria listed in "a" above
 - 7) a letter from the tenured faculty of the discipline reviewing the faculty's prospects for tenure (required beginning in the second year). A copy of this statement shall be given directly to the individual.
- d. Calendar of due dates (look in University Guidelines for specific dates.)

2nd-year faculty	CRSTC recommendations to Vice Chancellor by early December
1st-year faculty	CRSTC recommendations to Vice Chancellor by mid-February
2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5 th , 6th year faculty	CRSTC recommendations to Vice Chancellor by late March

Second-year faculty must be notified of non-renewal for a third year by mid-December and first-year faculty must be notified of non-renewal for second year by February.

Section 7 Post-Tenure Review

- a. At least once every five years, the professional performance of tenured faculty will be reviewed. This review may be conducted simultaneously with the faculty annual merit review; it is not a retenuing process; it should be considered a supplement to the normal merit review. The purpose of the review is to encourage and support the growth and development of faculty in a way that positively contributes to the mission and goals of the department, the college and the university.

- b. The initial plan:
Each tenured faculty member will create a performance portfolio containing a statement which articulates plans for future teaching, scholarly activity and service to the university and community. The faculty member will meet with the department chair to review his or her plan and to ascertain the appropriateness of the plan as it relates to the mission and goals of the department, the college and the university.
- c. The criterion for conducting the review is as follows:
1. The review will be conducted by the department chair, the DRB or its functional equivalent.
 2. Each tenured faculty member will maintain his or her performance portfolio.
The portfolio should contain evidence of professional accomplishments during the last five years and a statement that articulates plans for future teaching, scholarly activity, and service to the university and community. Summary of recent student and peer evaluations should be included in the portfolio.
 3. On the basis of information contained in the performance portfolio, a written evaluation of the faculty post-tenure performance shall be prepared. The evaluation shall address the developmental needs of the faculty member to make progress toward achieving the plan's goals and shall recommend ways of helping the faculty member to meet agreed-upon goals. Post-tenure review evaluations, together with the information on which they are based, shall become part of a personnel file of the faculty member concerned. The file will be retained in the college dean's office.
 4. If the faculty member's review reveals a need for significant improvement in performance, the chair will report such to the academic dean. The dean and the chair, in consultation with the faculty member, will recommend a retraining or redevelopment program and shall assist the faculty to find resources to fund such a program.
 5. Each department will develop written criteria and procedures for its post-tenure reviews based on the above guidelines. Copies of these post-tenure criteria and procedures will be filed in both the departmental and dean's offices and will be available upon request. Results of the post-tenure faculty reviews will be transmitted through the department chair to each reviewing level.
 6. Monitoring the post-tenure review process is the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor in conjunction with the university committee.

Section 8 Salary Recommendations

- a. The DRBs have the responsibility of making recommendations concerning salary increases according to guidelines formulated by the URSTPC, the Chancellor, the Faculty Senate, and the Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC.

Section 9 Inequity Defined and a Statement of the High Priority to be Given to Inequity Adjustments

- a. The Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC is committed to the principle of equal reward for equal service. It emphasizes that the College is absolutely committed to the UW System Affirmative Action policy and guidelines, and those of UW-Platteville.
- b. A high priority for the DRB and the CRSTC in regard to salary is to correct inequities but without creating new ones. In determining an inequity, the DRBs and the Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC will consider all comparable faculty in the College, and not "select" a few individual cases to support a claim of inequity.
- c. Inequity decisions will be based on convincing documentation.
- d. The years and quality of service to this University should be considered before total years of experience.
- e. It is not only length of service but also quality of service to this University which must be considered. If other faculty with the similar backgrounds and years of experience are receiving higher salaries, this does not automatically indicate an inequitable situation.

Section 10 Promotion: Numbers and Minimum Criteria

- a. Academic rank must continue to have credibility. The following guidelines will be followed by the DRB and the Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC as they make their recommendations for promotion. These are minimum criteria for promotion. (See attached Appendix A: College of Liberal Arts and Education Standards for Promotion for more detail.)

Assistant Professor

For promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor, the candidate must have demonstrated achievement in three areas: 1) teaching effectiveness, 2) scholarly and professional activities, and 3) university service. The candidate must also meet one of the following criteria:

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

Associate Professor

For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must have demonstrated significant achievement in three areas: 1) teaching

effectiveness, 2) scholarly and professional activities, and 3) university service. The candidate must also meet one of the following criteria:

- 1) an earned doctorate or equivalent in an appropriate discipline, plus at least five years of excellent teaching at the college level, or
- 2) a master's degree in an appropriate discipline plus at least 15 years of excellent teaching at the college level (at least 10 years at UW-P.)

Professor

For promotion to the rank of professor, the candidate must have demonstrated significant achievement in three areas: 1) teaching effectiveness, 2) distinguished professional and scholarly activities, and 3) university service. The candidate must also meet one of the following criteria:

- 1) an earned doctorate or equivalent in an appropriate discipline plus at least ten years of excellent teaching at the college level, or
- 2) a master's degree in an appropriate discipline with significant academic preparation beyond the master's plus at least twenty-five years of excellent teaching at the college level (at least 20 years at UW-P.)

In addition, it is expected that an individual will be in the associate professor rank five years before being promoted to the professor rank.

- b. Significant achievement in distinguished professional and scholarly activities includes recognized participation in research, scholarship, the arts, professional practice, and other specialized work associated with the academic expertise of the faculty member.
- c. All equivalents to the earned doctorate will be decided on a case by case basis, except that an MFA will be considered a terminal degree and equivalent to the doctorate for the purpose of promotion.
- d. The Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC will rank all those recommended for promotion within each rank. The integrated promotion lists may be ranked in priority order.

Section 11 Policy on Tenure: Numbers and Criteria

- a. It is university policy that the proportion of tenured to non-tenured faculty must be continuously examined and evaluated, especially in any department or college with a tenure density in excess of 70 percent. Tenure should be recommended only in those cases where the candidate has received the appropriate terminal degree and is deemed to be an exceptional present and future asset to the department and the University. (See attached Appendix B: College of Liberal Arts and Education Standards for Tenure, for more detail.)
- b. Tenure should be recommended only by a department that can demonstrate long-term programmatic need. Ordinarily, tenure should not be recommended by any department characterized by a tenure density over 70 percent or by falling enrollments. Written justification to exceed these limits must accompany a recommendation from the DRB.

- c. The Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC urges the departments to make and document non-renewal recommendations as early as possible in all probationary faculty cases where such action is justified. Departments and the College must be candid about the prospects for tenure with probationary faculty.
- d. Retention of women and protected minorities is educationally significant and must be considered.

Section 12 A Reaffirmation of Affirmative Action Goals

The university is deeply committed to ensuring equal opportunity for all individuals. It is university policy to correct underutilization of women and minorities at all levels of employment and in all academic programs, and to assure equal compensation of comparable work, equal opportunity for merited advancement, and equal opportunity for retention and tenure. Positive action to implement this policy must be continuous and aggressive. Therefore, every reviewing body is required to see that these goals are a part of their RST procedures. In promotion, retention, and tenure decisions each review body will be responsible for including affirmative action and equal employment opportunity considerations in their deliberations. Also, adherence to Federal, State, System and campus guidelines on discriminatory harassment or conduct based on race, sex, religion, color, creed, disability, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry or age shall also be considered in the evaluation process.

Section 13 Policy on Split Appointments

- a. If an individual holds a split appointment between two or more departments, programs, or units, that individual is to be evaluated and recommended by the group in which he or she holds the major fraction of appointment. The area doing the evaluation shall obtain input from the other area(s) in which the individual has a partial appointment. In the case of a 50/50 appointment, the faculty member may designate the primary evaluating department, program, or unit.
- b. The file of a faculty member to be evaluated and recommended by two or more such units will be flagged automatically so as to receive proper attention by the Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC. The purpose of this special procedure is to insure fair consideration of a faculty member's work in more than one department, institute, or program.
- c. University personnel who have appointments split between teaching and administrative services will participate in the departmental, college, and university RST evaluation process. They will be evaluated and recommended by each group and their files will be flagged so as to receive adequate attention by the Vice Chancellor before the final recommendation goes to the Chancellor. The department or unit to which a majority of the staff member's time is assigned will have the primary

responsibility for moving evaluation materials forward.

- d. It is this university's policy that faculty with split appointments, those on leaves of absence, sabbatical leaves, and especially those who have volunteered for retraining and reassignment will not be inadvertently penalized for their unusual assignments; instead DRBs and the Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC will be expected to reward unusual efforts made on behalf of the total university. The Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC will review the files of all such faculty with care and consideration.

Section 14 Open Meeting Procedures for All Review Bodies

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

Section 15 Review of Department Chairperson

- a. A department chairperson's teaching effectiveness will be evaluated in the same manner as other department members. The department chairperson's file should also contain:
 - 1) Annual evaluations of his/her performance as a chairperson by his/her department.
 - 2) The college dean's evaluation of his/her performance as chairperson.
- b. It is the responsibility of the department chairperson to have these additional items in his/her file.

Section 16

These procedures were adopted by the Liberal Arts and Education CRSTC on December 15, 1999. They are subject to modification by the College of Liberal Arts and Education faculty. It is further understood that additional changes may be necessary pursuant to recommendations of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on RST Procedures as enacted by Faculty spring 2000.