



Division of Arts & Humanities  
Executive Committee

LUB N450  
414 229-5998 phone

Division of Arts & Humanities  
2017-18 Annual Report

**DATE:** May 2018  
**TO:** Faculty of the Division of Arts & Humanities  
**FROM:** Division of Arts & Humanities Executive Committee  
**RE:** 2017-18 Annual Report

In accordance with Sections 3.07, 3.15(2) and 6.12 of the UWM *Policies and Procedures*, a report of the activities of the Executive Committee of the Division of Arts and Humanities is below.

**I. MEMBERSHIP**

**A. 2017-18 Executive Committee**

Professor Joseph Rodriguez	History	Humanities	2020
Associate Professor William Watson	Theatre	Arts	2020
Associate Professor Sheila Feay-Shaw	Music	Arts	2019
Professor Margaret Atherton <sup>1</sup>	Philosophy	Humanities	2019
Professor Yevgeniya Kaganovich <sup>2</sup>	Art & Design	Arts	2019
Professor William Keith (Chair)	English	Humanities	2018
Associate Professor Joseph Peschio	Foreign Lang. & Lit.	Humanities	2018

<sup>1</sup> Repl M. Newman (2019-E)    <sup>2</sup>Repl D. Wutz 2017-18 leave (2019-E)

**B. 2018-19 Executive Committee**

Professor Stuart Moulthrop	English	Humanities	2021
Professor Michael Newman	Journ, Adv & Media Std	Humanities	2021
Professor Joseph Rodriguez (Chair)	History	Humanities	2020
Associate Professor William Watson	Theatre	Arts	2020
Professor Margaret Atherton <sup>1</sup>	Philosophy	Humanities	2019
Associate Professor Sheila Feay-Shaw	Music	Arts	2019
Professor Darci Wutz	Dance	Arts	2019

<sup>1</sup>Repl M. Newman (2019-E)

**C. 2018-19 Alternate Members**

Persons eligible to serve as alternate members. The year listed indicates how long, according to the five-year rule, they will remain eligible.

Professor William Keith	English	Humanities	2023
Associate Professor Joseph Peschio	Foreign Lang. & Lit.	Humanities	2023
Associate Professor William Wood	Anthropology	Humanities	2022
Professor Anne Basting	Theatre	Arts	2022
Professor Cesar Ferreira	Spanish & Portuguese	Humanities	2021
Associate Professor Robert Grame	Art & Design	Arts	2021
Associate Professor Bernard Zinck	Music	Arts	2021
Professor Robert Schwartz	Philosophy	Humanities	2020
Professor Rebecca Dunham	English	Humanities	2019
Associate Professor Peter Paik	French, Ital. & Comp Lit	Humanities	2019
Associate Professor Kathleen Wheatley	Spanish & Portuguese	Humanities	2019

**II. COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee scheduled 15 meeting for the 2017-18 academic year.

August 31, 2017	Personnel consideration /schedule meetings for Fall 2017
September 21, 2017	<i>Canceled - no business</i>
October 10, 2017	<i>Canceled - no business</i>
October 21, 2017	<i>Canceled - no business</i>
November 9, 2017	Trudy Turner, Sec of Univ/ Personnel consideration
November 30, 2017	Personnel consideration
December 12, 2017	Personnel consideration/ schedule meetings for Spring 2018
February 6, 2018	Personnel consideration
February 13, 2018	Personnel consideration
February 20, 2018	<i>Canceled - no business</i>
February 27, 2018	Personnel consideration
March 13, 2018	Personnel consideration
March 27, 2018	Personnel consideration/Post-Tenure Review Discussion
April 10, 2018	Post-Tenure Review Discussion/Britz letter
April 24, 2018	Personnel consideration/Post-Tenure Review Procedures/ review criteria, elect 2017-18 chair

**III. RECOMMENDATIONS ON PERSONNEL CASES**

**A. Recommendations by Entire Executive Committee**

- Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
- Appointment to Associate Professor with Tenure

POSITIVE		NEGATIVE		TOTAL
Arts	Hum	Arts	Hum	
6	2	0	0	<b>8</b>
0	0	0	0	0

**B. Recommendations by Subcommittee/Full Professors**

Promotion to Professor  
 Appointment to Professor

Arts	Hum	Arts	Hum	TOTAL
2	2	0	0	4
0	0	0	0	0
POSITIVE		NEGATIVE		
Arts	Hum	Arts	Hum	TOTAL
8	4	0	0	12

**C. Total Recommendations Forwarded**

**IV. CRITERIA**

There were no revisions to the *Arts & Humanities Criteria for Tenure and Promotion or Appointment to Associate and Full Professor* document.

**V. LETTERTOTHEPROVOST**

The committee discussed, composed and sent a letter to Provost Britz about concerns over faculty workloads. A copy of the letter is attached.

**VI. POST-TENURE REVIEW**

In response to the UWM Post-Tenure Review Policy (Faculty Document No. 3083), the Division of Arts & Humanities Executive Committee adopted Procedures for Responding to Negative Post-Tenure Review and a Checklist for Post-Tenure Review Files to be Submitted for Review. These documents outline the procedures and criteria that the Committee will use to advise the Dean about whether the “Does Not Meet Expectations” judgment is justified. (See Attachments.)

Division of Arts & Humanities  
*Executive Committee*

## **PROCEDURES FOR RESPONDING TO A NEGATIVE POST-TENURE REVIEW**

**May 2018**

This document lays out the procedures and criteria that the Committee will use to advise the Dean about whether the “Does Not Meet Expectations” judgment is justified.

Upon the vote of a Departmental Executive Committee that a tenured faculty member has failed to meet expectations relative to departmental criteria and a 5-year Faculty Development Plan on file (UWM Faculty Document No. 3083), the Dean of the relevant college will seek the advice of the Division of Arts & Humanities Executive Committee. The role of the Divisional Executive Committee is to determine whether or not sufficient reasons are provided for the judgment of the Department that the faculty member “Does Not Meet Expectations,” and submit that evaluation to the Dean.

The Dean’s request for advice will be forwarded to the Chair of the Divisional Executive Committee, along with files prepared for a Departmental recommendation of “Does Not Meet Expectations” from a faculty member’s post-tenure review in accordance with the outline provided below. The Committee strongly urges the Department to refer to the checklist to ensure that the file conforms to the content and organization requirements. The Committee will return incomplete files that do not follow the provided outline. Completed files should be sent to the appropriate Dean, and not directly to the Divisional Executive Committee. After a sufficiency examination by the Dean, the Dean should transmit the file to the Divisional Executive Committee, along with a request for advice.

1. The materials forwarded to the Divisional Executive Committee should include: 1) the Primary File, 2) the Appendix, and 3) the transmittal letter from the Dean, requesting advice from the Division of Arts & Humanities Executive Committee on the extent to which sufficient reasons are provided for the judgment of the Department that the faculty member “Does Not Meet Expectations.” A checklist of the content to be included in the Primary File and Appendix is located in Appendix X.
2. Once the Dean has requested advice from the Divisional Executive Committee and electronically transmitted the materials described above, the Committee will review the materials and set a meeting date and time.
3. At the meeting of the Division of Arts & Humanities Executive Committee, a representative of the Departmental Executive Committee will make a presentation to the Divisional Committee, answering their questions about the documentation provided. Discussion will center on the extent to which the Department adhered to their criteria and policies for post tenure review, and not on the qualities of the faculty member.

4. The faculty member will have the opportunity to make a presentation and answer questions from the Divisional Executive Committee at the same meeting, without the representatives of the department EC present.
5. Following review of materials and discussion, the Divisional Executive Committee members will discuss and vote on:
  - a) whether or not the process followed by the Department was sufficient, and
  - b) to the extent possible, given the information available, whether or not the candidate meets expectations.

A vote of “sufficient” means the Divisional Executive Committee assesses the process followed by the Department as adhering to the policies outlined in UWM Faculty Document 3083 and finds that the decision made by the Department is supported by the provided documentation and description of process. A vote of “insufficient” means the reasons for the Department’s decision are not sufficiently supported by processes and/or documentation.

6. The outcome of the vote is then transmitted to the Dean within 10 business days, for their further consideration.

APPENDIX X

Checklist for Post-Tenure Review Files Submitted for Review to the Division of Arts & Humanities Executive Committee

The following is a checklist for materials that must be included in the file of Deans seeking advice on Departmental votes of “Does Not Meet Expectations” during post-tenure review. It is to be completed by the chair of the relevant (department, college, or school) executive committee or individual (other than the faculty member) responsible for forwarding the file.

Submit a digital version of all materials. The digital version must be transmitted via a flash drive or OneDrive/SharePoint link. (Please note that the entire path, including the file name and folder names, must contain fewer than 200 characters.)

<b>A. Primary file (in chronological order):</b>	
	Index
	Faculty member’s Name, email address, and phone number
	Name of Department Chair or Contact, email address, and phone number
	A letter from the Chair of the Department Executive Committee describing attendance at the Executive Committee meeting and the vote (ayes/nays/abstentions)
	A copy of the Department’s post tenure review policy/procedures and criteria guiding the review - these should have been approved by the Department Executive Committee prior to the construction and approval of the faculty member’s 5-year Faculty Development Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If Departmental post-tenure review criteria have changed since the approval of the faculty member’s 5-year Faculty Development Plan, these should also be provided.</li> </ul>
	The Department Executive Committee’s written summary of the review, including but not limited to: a description of the process followed by the reviewers and Department, and pertinent points leading to the Department vote of “Does Not Meet Expectations”

	Evidence of the expectations for the faculty member, including their latest 5-year Faculty Development Plan and prior reviews conducted by the Department
	Other relevant evidence considered by the Departmental Executive Committee in their decision
	The faculty member's written response (if any) to the summary
<b>B. Appendix:</b>	
	The Department Chair's dated, written notice of the post-tenure review to the faculty member.
The faculty member's:	
	Current curriculum vitae
	Annual activity reports and/or merit reports during the period under review
	Materials providing evidence of the faculty member's research, teaching, and service activities during the review period, as well as all other activities that are relevant to the review
	<p>A timeline or calendar of relevant events between the submission and Departmental approval of the faculty member's 5-year Faculty Development Plan, and the vote by the Departmental Executive Committee; this timeline should include dates of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Review and approval of the 5-year Faculty Development Plan by the Departmental Executive Committee;</li> <li>ii. Completion of annual reviews;</li> <li>iii. Faculty member notification of the Post-Tenure Review and completion dates; and</li> <li>iv. Date of Departmental Executive Committee vote on the post-tenure review of the faculty member.</li> </ul>