1 Overview of Faculty Reviews

The Executive Committee conducts reviews of faculty for contract renewal (retention), merit distribution, and tenure and promotion decisions in accordance with UW-Milwaukee Faculty Policies and Procedures. The Executive Committee of the School of Freshwater Sciences establishes criteria for these reviews (see SFS Criteria for Faculty Reviews).

The Executive Committee is charged with conducting the following personnel reviews of School of Freshwater Sciences:

1. Annual reviews of faculty for making “merit” salary recommendations based on their contributions in teaching, research and service.

2. Reviews of probationary faculty for the purpose of renewing/extending employment contracts.
3. Reviews of faculty preparing for tenure and/or promotion.

4. Reviews of tenured faculty members no less then every five years.

5. Formal and informal reviews of all faculty within the School as part of various review processes.

2. "Open Meeting Law" Guidelines

While the vast majority of School of Freshwater Sciences faculty meetings are held in "Open Session", Wisconsin Statutes, 19.85 provides options for "Closed Session". Copies of these Statutes are available in the Secretary of the University’s office.

2.1 Candidates seeking tenure

The statutes state that candidates seeking tenure have the right to request an "open meeting"; that is, the Executive Committee meeting is open to the public and no confidential material is entered as evidence. This right may be exercised at both the School and Divisional levels.

2.2 Candidates seeking Promotion only

The Wisconsin State Statutes state that meetings held for the purpose of promotion, compensation or performance evaluation are exempt from the "open meeting law". This means that the Executive Committee, at its discretion, will most likely conduct these meetings in "closed session." With respect to faculty, UW-Milwaukee Policies and Procedures have extended to candidates seeking promotion to full professor the right to an open meeting of the Divisional Executive Committee. However, the School Executive Committee is not obliged to honor a request for an open meeting when considering promotion to full professor. Should the School's meeting be closed and the Divisional Meeting open, then all confidential letters of evaluation used at the School level will be replaced with open letters of evaluation after the School review and prior to the Divisional review. This will cause a delay in decision-making process.

2.3 Candidates undergoing annual and retention/reappointment reviews

Since retention reviews involve performance review, they are exempt from the "Open Meeting Law". This means that the Executive Committee, at its discretion, will most likely conduct these meetings in "closed session"

3 Annual Merit/Salary Reviews.
All faculty members are required to submit a copy of their *Annual Summary and Assessment of Academic Activities for Faculty* and copies of the documents listed in the SFS *Criteria for Faculty Reviews* to the chair of the School of Freshwater Sciences Executive Committee two weeks prior to the annual merit salary meeting.

The Executive Committee reviews all faculty every academic year for the purposes of merit/salary evaluation.

In general, the criteria outlined in SFS *Criteria for Faculty Reviews* will be used by the School of Freshwater Sciences’ Executive Committee to evaluate its faculty for merit salary increases. Merit salary recommendations cannot be made on an across-the-board basis but must be based upon the activities of faculty members.

### 3.1 Process for Annual Merit/Salary Reviews

The Executive Committee will read the contents of each faculty member’s *Annual Summary and Assessment of Academic Activities for Faculty* and copies of documents listed in the SFS *Criteria for Faculty Reviews*. A closed meeting will follow in which the Executive Committee will review each faculty member’s record and make its recommendations. Associate and full professors will leave the room while their merit allocation is discussed. After the review of each individual faculty member’s record is completed, a general discussion will be conducted to resolve any disparities or differences. The Executive Committee Chair, on behalf of the Executive Committee, will inform each faculty member, in writing, of the merit money (points) allocated to that faculty member. Specifically, the chair will report the amount of money in the pool, the amount (or percent) of the money (points) that the faculty member received, and the maximal and minimal amount (or percent) of money (points) awarded. The chair will also report to each faculty member the ratings he or she received for research, teaching, and service.

### 4. Annual Reviews of Untenured Faculty

The Executive Committee annually reviews all untenured faculty for the purposes of contract renewal and for assessing a faculty member’s progress toward tenure and promotion. These reviews must be presented to the faculty member in writing and copies are retained in the faculty member’s personnel file. The faculty member may provide a response within two weeks that is retained in his or her personnel file.

The purpose of the annual review is to advise an untenured faculty on his or her progress toward promotion and tenure. The annual review also forms the basis of the Executive Committee’s recommendations on contract renewal (extension).
5. Reviews for Faculty Tenure and Promotion

The Executive Committee expects a faculty member under review for tenure and/or promotion to provide the committee with all materials and documentation typically provided for a tenure/promotion review with the exception of letters from colleagues and external reviewers.

The format used to present these materials should reflect those of the faculty member’s divisional affiliation. Faculty members are strongly advised to organize his or her vitae and documentation of scholarly activities as per their divisional executive committee’s formatting guidelines. These guidelines are updated each year and are available through the Secretary of the University’s office. Upon request, the Executive Committee will provide input in the preparation of review materials prior to their submission.

5.1 Reviews for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

A candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate that he or she has achieved a high standard of quality as a scholar, has engaged in high-quality research and teaching, and has provided service to the School, the University, the profession and the public. The Executive Committee places prime importance on scholarly activity when considering candidates for tenure. An important consideration for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is evidence of a continuous trend of high quality intellectual and professional growth and development and of regional/national.

It should be noted that while similar criteria are employed in the recommendation for reappointment (contributions in the areas of research, teaching and service), the expectations concerning the faculty member’s contributions are greater in the case of the tenure decision. The critical difference between a recommendation for reappointment and a recommendation for promotion with tenure is the distinction between satisfactory progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure, and the actual accomplishment of the tenure criteria.

5.2 Reviews for Promotion to Professor

The Executive Committee expects candidates for promotion to professor to have achieved recognition for their teaching, research and service activities beyond the boundaries of the University and the local community. While the range of scholarly activities is similar for both promotion to associate professor with tenure and to professor, a candidate for promotion to professor shall have scholarly contributions that result in national and/or international recognition.
5.3 Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Review

The first step in the tenure and/or promotion process is for the Executive Committee to vote to consider a faculty member for tenure and promotion. This usually occurs early in the fall semester. If the vote affirms the Executive Committee’s willingness to consider, the candidate must assemble and organize all evidence that will be used to support the faculty member’s tenure/promotion case. This evidentiary materials file should be assembled and organized according to the guidelines of the divisional committee with which the faculty member is associated. These guidelines are available through the Secretary of the University’s office. Members of the Executive Committee and the office staff work with the faculty member in assembling this material; however, the primary responsibility for constructing a file lies with the candidate.

All tenure and promotion reviews require professional reviews of the candidate’s scholarly (research, teaching and service) activities. The Executive Committee’s procedures for the identification of external reviewers are presented in section 5.4. The “Open Meeting Law” Guidelines presented in section 2 address the aspects of confidential versus open letters. A candidate should carefully consider these options and must indicate his or her preference prior to the determination of the final list of external reviewers.

When the tenure/promotion file is ready, the Executive Committee will consider the materials and vote by written ballot. This ballot shall contain the motion before the committee, the date of the meeting, the individual’s vote (yes, no, abstain), and the signature of the individual voting. These ballots will be collected by the chair of the committee and retained in the confidential personnel files for the duration of the candidate’s employment at University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Members of the Executive Committee must be present in order to vote. Proxy votes are not allowed. Under extraordinary circumstances, and with the permission of the executive committee members, a member of the executive committee may participate in the meeting by video or audio teleconferencing assuming they have access to all materials placed before the committee by the candidate. A majority affirmative vote is required for the passage of a motion recommending tenure and/or promotion. The vote on a decision of tenure/promotion shall be recorded in the minutes of the executive committee.

If the School’s executive committee forwards a negative decision that will result in non-retention for a faculty member, the dean must accept that decision, subject to appeal procedures outlined in University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Policies and Procedures, and inform the faculty member of the date when the faculty member’s appointment is terminated.

If the executive committee forwards a positive recommendation for tenure, the dean shall forward that recommendation to the appropriate divisional
If the dean decides not to accept the divisional committee's advice, the dean shall notify the chairperson of the divisional executive committee, and the executive committee of the School, with a copy to the individual involved, of the decision within a reasonable time. If the faculty member, within twenty (20) working days, requests written reasons and/or reconsideration, the dean shall respond to the request using the same procedures outlined for the School's executive committee within ten (10) working days.

All departmental executive committee positive recommendations received by the dean shall be forwarded to the chancellor together with relevant documentation and the advice of the School's executive committee and the dean.

If the chancellor's decision concerning tenure is negative, a non-renewal notice is effective upon its issuance by the dean. Subsequent hearing or subsequent appeals, as stated in University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Policies and Procedures 5.19 for issuing a non-renewal notice, do not extend the time limits. The chancellor shall supply a detailed statement of the reasons that ground the decision, if requested by the candidate.

5.4 Procedures for Determining External Reviewers

All Divisional Committees require letters from external evaluators/reviewers assessing the candidate's scholarly activities. The School of Freshwater Sciences Executive Committee must request these letters from impartial experts outside the University (excluding co-authors, major professor and advisor, etc., unless justification is provided for an exception). The candidate may suggest names of outside reviewers to include or exclude, but the final decision as to whom to ask to perform these external evaluations is exclusively the Executive Committee's. Candidates for tenure/promotion should NOT contact the outside reviewers. Both the School of Freshwater Sciences and divisional committees prefer that these external evaluation letters to be confidential and that the letters be sent directly to the chair of the Executive Committee. The chair shall make these letters available to the Executive Committee prior to their tenure/promotion deliberations.

The School of Freshwater Sciences Executive Committee will develop a list of potential external reviewers. All discussion requiring external reviews by the Executive Committee will be conducted in “closed session.” The list should include names of individuals who themselves are nationally and/or internationally recognized scholars in the area. The creditability of the reviewers is absolutely critical and therefore attention should be paid to ensure that the reviewers are:
1. Nationally or internationally recognized for research in the area(s) of the candidate being reviewed.
2. National or international involvement in professional societies providing forums for the dissemination of research and scholarly work in the area(s) of the candidate being reviewed.

The list should provide the proposed reviewer’s name, professional address/phone number, and a brief biographical statement describing each individual’s potential contribution to the review and a statement listing any and all previous contact or affiliation with the candidate.

The Executive Committee will then meet in closed session (pursuant to Wisconsin Statutes, 19.85) to finalize the list of external reviewers. The committee reserves the right to add names to the list that may not have been suggested by the candidate. The finalization of the list will be done by collegial consensus among members of the Executive Committee. Should one or more of the identified reviewers be unable to participate, the committee will reconvene before replacing these individual(s).

6. Criteria and Procedures for Tenured Faculty Review and Development

Every tenured School of Freshwater Sciences faculty member will be reviewed no less than once every five years. Reviews for promotion to full professor will constitute a faculty review for the purposes of a Tenured Faculty Review.

The School of Freshwater Sciences Guidelines for Review of Tenured Faculty is based on University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee S-52.75.

The general purpose of the School of Freshwater Sciences Tenured Faculty Review is to assess each faculty member’s activities and performance, in accordance with the mission of the School of Freshwater Sciences and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. The specific intent of the Tenured Faculty Review is to:

(1) determine whether the individual tenured faculty member is meeting his or her professional obligations to the school and university.

(2) maximize the productivity of tenured faculty by having them develop career plans, assess the attainment of these plans and receive constructive feedback.

6.1 Criteria for Tenured Faculty Review

The School of Freshwater Sciences, in order to fulfill its mission, requires its faculty to be scholars: a knowledgeable expert who professes, or shares, that
knowledge with others. As such, its tenured faculty is expected to perform the following three scholarly activities: research, teaching and service. The criteria outlined in the SFS Criteria for Faculty Reviews are used to assess if an individual tenured faculty member is meeting his or her research, teaching and service obligations. The criteria have been chosen to reflect the mission of the School of Freshwater Sciences. Furthermore, they are not designed to infringe on the accepted standards of faculty academic freedom, including, but not limited to, the freedom to undertake original, unconventional, or politically unfashionable lines of scholarship.

6.2 Procedures for Conducting Tenured Faculty Review

Each calendar year, the Executive Committee Chair will nominate a Tenured Faculty Review Committee to organize and implement the reviews of tenured faculty scheduled for that year. The Faculty Review Committee will be composed of members of the School’s Executive Committee. The slate of nominees will be submitted to the Executive Committee for approval by written ballot.

A faculty member scheduled for review, who objects to the composition of the Tenured Faculty Review Committee, should discuss the reasons for the objection with the School’s Executive Committee. If the Executive Committee finds the reasons acceptable, it will constitute an alternative committee for the purpose of reviewing that person.

All faculty members scheduled for a Tenured Faculty Review will receive a written notice of their review from the chair of the School’s Executive Committee no later than April 1 of the calendar year in which the review will be conducted. The notice will ask the faculty member to provide the chair of the School’s Executive Committee with:

1. Current Summary of Career Plans (including any approved revisions) for the period being reviewed.

2. A current vitae.

3. Annual Summary and Assessment of Academic Activities for Faculty for the past five years.

3. Proposed Summary of Career Plans for the next review period (including any faculty development plans). This summary should outline individual plans for performing research, instructional and service activities.

5. Any other material that the faculty member being reviewed deems relevant to the review.
The chair of the Executive Committee shall provide copies of all materials submitted to members of the Tenured Faculty Review Committee. This committee shall review all materials. If either the Tenured Faculty Review Committee or the faculty member being reviewed desire a face-to-face meeting, the Tenured Faculty Review Committee shall schedule such a meeting.

The Tenured Faculty Review Committee, after reviewing all relevant materials and using the criteria specified in Section I of this document, will prepare a written report that assesses the faculty member's performance in meeting his or her career plans. A copy of the review findings shall be given to the Chair of the School’s Executive Committee and the faculty member being reviewed no later than December 1 of the calendar year in which the review takes place.

The faculty member who was reviewed (if he or she wishes), may submit a written response by December 15th to the findings of the Tenured Faculty Review Committee. This response should be given to the chair of the School’s Executive Committee who will file the response with the review findings.

The chair of the School’s Executive Committee will schedule a meeting between the members of the Tenured Faculty Review Committee and the faculty member who was reviewed, if either party wishes to discuss the review findings or the faculty member's response. The chair of the School’s Executive Committee will attend this meeting.

A copy of the review findings and any written response by the reviewed faculty member shall be:

1. Given to all members of the School’s Executive Committee.
2. Placed in the reviewed faculty member's School personnel file.
3. Forwarded, along with Annual Summary and Assessment of Academic Activities for Faculty reports, to the Dean of the School of Freshwater Sciences in the next Annual Summary and Assessment of Academic Activities for Faculty.

Furthermore, a copy of all documents used in the review (vitae, Annual Summary and Assessment of Academic Activities for Faculty reports, and summary of career plans) shall be placed in the faculty member's School personnel file.

The Chair of the School’s Executive Committee will be responsible for keeping a written record of all Tenured Faculty Reviews conducted during a
calendar year, including the names of the Tenured Faculty Review Committee members. This record will be forwarded along the faculty Annual Summary and Assessment of Academic Activities for Faculty reports, to the Dean of the School of Freshwater Sciences in the next calendar year.

The findings of each Tenured Faculty Review, in a given calendar year, will be included in the set of materials considered in the next calendar year when recommendations are made for faculty salary increases.

6.3 Implementation

The School of Freshwater Sciences, in establishing its schedule of Tenured Faculty Reviews, will schedule faculty members who have recently participated in a promotion review at the end of its entire Tenured Faculty Review cycle.

7. Appointments Types

7.1 Joint Appointments

A continuing commitment, shared between the departments or equivalent units and the university, is incurred upon the appointment of a probationary or tenured faculty member. For a tenured member of the faculty, that continuing commitment extends for as long as the faculty member holds tenure. For a probationary faculty member, the term of the continuing commitment coincides with the term of appointment.

A "joint appointment" involves more than one department or school/college. A "joint probationary appointment" or "joint tenure appointment" occurs when two or more departments/schools/colleges share a continuing commitment to a faculty member of at least twenty-five percent. Such appointments are made at the time of appointment or later with the agreement of the faculty member, the School of Freshwater Sciences and/or another academic unit.

1. In the case of an appointment that is less than full-time, the continuing commitment is for the same fraction as the appointment.

2. In the case of an appointment that is divided among several departments, units, and schools/colleges, the fraction of the continuing commitment assignable to each shall be specified. The total continuing commitment or its division among departments or units may be changed only by agreement among the individual, the departmental executive committees, and the deans involved.

3. By agreement of the faculty members and the dean, the level of school activity of the individual may differ from the continuing commitment in
any given year. Such an occasional deviation does not in itself alter the continuing commitment.

4. In the event of the dissolution of a department, the school/college holding a continuing commitment to a faculty member shall make an effort to identify an alternative department, or school/college that is mutually suitable and that will assume the continuing commitment of the former department/school/college. If no such department/school/college can be found, the University will assume the continuing commitment.

7.2 Affiliate Appointments

An affiliate appointment is one that allows a faculty member to be associated with a department without a continuing obligation, commitment, tenure, governance rights or a continuing commitment by the department, school/college. Affiliations may be granted by the departmental executive committee only to probationary and tenured faculty, and only for fixed terms. With the approval of the departmental executive committee, affiliate appointments may be extended beyond one term.

7.3 Adjunct Faculty Appointments

The School of Freshwater Sciences recognizes the need for expertise of individuals outside the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee for the benefit of its instructional and research activities. Such individuals may be granted the title of Adjunct Professor.

Appointments with the title Adjunct Professor carry no tenure and are non-remunerative, academic staff appointments. Such appointments are to be made officially by the dean of the School of Freshwater Sciences upon recommendation by its faculty. Copies of the appointment letter should be sent to the Provost and the Office of Human Resources. Appointees to the adjunct faculty will be issued a university identification card and will be granted limited use of specified university facilities such as the library, campus network, and other facilities required to conduct activities related to their appointment.

Department or program in the course catalogs of the University may list adjunct faculty. Appointments are to be reviewed and approved annually by the faculty of the School of Freshwater Sciences. If it is determined that an adjunct faculty member is no longer active or is not interested in continuing the appointment, the School of Freshwater Sciences should recommend to their dean that the appointment be terminated.
Appendix

The attached "Open Meeting Law" form must be signed and filed with the chair of the executive committee prior to any formal tenure review being conducted by the executive committee.

School of Freshwater Sciences

"OPEN MEETING LAW" (Wisconsin Statutes 19.85) Candidates Seeking Tenure Status: Wis. Stats. 19.85(1) (b) states that candidates seeking tenure have the right to request an "open meeting"; that is, the executive committee meeting is open to the public and no confidential material is entered as evidence. This right may be exercised at both the departmental and divisional executive committee meetings.

Candidates Seeking Promotion Only: Wis. Stats. 19.85(1) (c) states that meetings held for the purpose of promotion, compensation, or performance evaluation are exempt from the open meeting law; i.e., candidates for promotion where tenure is not involved do not have a statutory right to an open meeting. However, in section 3.14(3) of the UWM Policies and Procedures, the faculty senate has extended to candidates seeking promotion to full professor the right to an open meeting of the divisional executive committee. There is no similar conferral of that right at the departmental executive committee level of review. The departmental executive committee is not, therefore, obliged to honor a request for an open meeting when considering promotion to full professor, but may do so if it chooses.

Solicited confidential letters of evaluation cannot be used to aid either the departmental or divisional executive committee’s decision when the meeting is open. If, following a closed meeting at the departmental level, you choose to exercise your right to an open meeting at the divisional level, all confidential letters of evaluation will be removed from the tenure or promotion file. It will be your responsibility, and that of your chairperson, to replace the confidential letters with non-confidential letters of evaluation. Since the divisional executive committee will take no action until your file is completed, a change from a closed to an open meeting could result in significant delays in your tenure consideration.

When submitting documents to the dean and the divisional executive committee for tenure or promotion, the candidate is required to submit the following form:
Name: _______________________________             Date: __________________________

Meeting Intention (please circle number):

1. I request that the School and Divisional Tenure Review be conducted in "Open Session".
2. I request that the School and Divisional Tenure Review be conducted in "Closed Session".

Having read the "School of Freshwater Sciences Faculty/Staff 'Open Meeting Law' Guidelines", and I

1. Am aware of my rights with respect to Wisc Stats 19.85, and
2. Assume my responsibility with respect to compliance by filing this form with the chair or the School’s Executive Committee prior to the publishing of the agenda for meetings where my reviews will take place.

________________________________  ________________________________
Signature of Candidate    Signature of Executive Committee Chair

Original - attached to review materials; 1 copy - to Personnel File (Dean's Office); 1 copy - to candidate under review