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XIV. Procedures for Appointment and Review of Teaching Academic Staff, Movement to Probationary Status, and Promotion to Indefinite Status

These are the adopted policies of the Executive Committee. They are reviewed annually in the fall for possible amendments. They continue in effect without annual adoption.

**I. Rules Governing Executive Committee Meetings[[1]](#endnote-1)**

The following rules will govern the Executive Committee meetings during the academic year.

1. *Roberts Rules of Order, Ninth Edition,* Scott Foresman, 1990 is the LSB Executive Committee's rules of parliamentary procedure, to the extent that such rules do not conflict with controlling state statutes or University regulations.
2. Written ballots will be used for all motions concerning tenure or promotion decisions, and "show of hands" for all contract renewal and probationary appointment motions and for all other motions, lacking any adopted motion to the contrary by a Committee member.
3. The Executive Committee may conduct a meeting by conference call or electronic meeting when necessary.
4. The LSB Executive Committee agendas and minutes will be distributed to all full‑time LSB faculty and academic staff.
5. All of the actions of the Executive Committee will be immediately reported in the minutes of the Executive Committee.
6. Minutes of the Executive Committee will report a committee member as attending or not attending.
7. A quorum of the Executive Committee shall be defined as a majority of the members of the Executive Committee excluding individuals on sabbatical leave and those excused for the semester.
8. The LSB Executive Committee Policies and Procedures continue in effect without annual adoption.

 **II. Subject Areas of the LSB Faculty and Subcommittee Structure**

**for the LSB Executive Committee[[2]](#endnote-2)**

Subject Areas of the LSB faculty are the following:

Accounting, Taxation, and Business Law

Finance, Managerial Economics, and Real Estate

Information Technology Management

Management

Marketing

Supply Chain, Operations Management, and Business Statistics

Members of the faculty will choose, within the end of the first semester at UWM, the initial area(s) with which they wish to affiliate. Faculty members may change their area(s) at any time, except that non‑tenured faculty may not change their areas in the year of consideration for tenure. A non‑tenured faculty member may request simultaneous consideration by two or more subcommittees.

The Executive Committee will have subcommittees for each subject area. Every member of the Executive Committee will choose one of the subcommittees. Each area subcommittee will annually elect a chair. The area subcommittee of the Executive Committee constitutes the search and screen committee for recruiting new faculty in the area. For chaired and endowed chaired positions, the chair of the Executive Committee with the approval of the Executive Committee forms the search and screen committee.

The chairs of the area subcommittees and the chair of the Executive Committee form the Academic Planning Committee, which will work with the Dean's office in developing the annual recruitment plan for approval by the full Executive Committee in spring. The APC will have budgetary responsibility in conjunction with the Office of the Dean. APC members, as a subcommittee of the Executive Committee, will share information with faculty and work in good faith cooperatively to manage the budget of the school.

**III. Procedures for Personnel Reviews[[3]](#endnote-3)**

Preamble: The purpose of these procedures is to guide personnel reviews by the Executive Committee of the Sheldon B. Lubar School of Business with regard to evaluations of candidates' research, teaching, and service. These guidelines supplement the pertinent provisions of UWM Policies and Procedures, Section 5.15 through 5.20.

1. Tenure Decisions

* 1. Discussion of cases.

		1. The candidate for tenure places two copies of all relevant materials, consistent with Divisional requirements, on file at least four weeks prior to the scheduled consideration of the case by the Executive Committee. One paper copy and one electronic copy will be held in a secure place. Peer evaluation of teaching performance from senior faculty in the subject area is required. The letters from external reviews are obtained utilizing the procedures outlined in Section C.
		2. The elected chair of the Subject Area Subcommittee will call a meeting. The Subject Area Subcommittee is to follow all procedures applicable to the Executive Committee including the dissemination of an agenda and minutes. The Subject Area Subcommittee will discuss the case and prepare its presentation to the full Executive Committee.
		3. The consideration of a candidate by the Executive Committee will begin with the report by the chair of the Subject Area Subcommittee or another senior faculty member designated by the area chair. The report will provide a critical assessment of the candidate's record in terms of the adopted criteria for tenure. The report is not to exceed 15 minutes.
		4. Other members of the Executive Committee join the discussion (30 minutes or less), and then the Executive Committee members vote.
	2. Sequencing of Cases.

	In years involving more than one tenure case, the order of consideration by the Executive Committee will be determined by random selection. The Executive Committee chair draws candidates' names prior to the first meeting of the fall semester. Whenever possible, the Executive Committee will consider only one tenure case at a meeting. If scheduling requires two tenure or promotion cases at the same meeting, the candidates must not be from the same subject area.
	3. Outside Reviewers.

		1. Names, letters, and current vitas from the reviewers that are solicited under this procedure are to remain strictly confidential; *i.e.*, perusal, possession, and discussion thereof are restricted to LSB Executive Committee members, members of the pertinent UWM divisional committee, and others as may be properly designated by the LSB Executive Committee.

		If anyone intentionally violates this confidentiality rule, he or she could be personally liable and subject to internal discipline.
		2. Names of potential reviewers are gathered by the Subject Area chair from the senior faculty in the candidate's area during the month**s** preceding August 1. The candidate will be invited to submit names of potential reviewers.
		3. The candidate is given an opportunity to review this list of potential reviewers. If a candidate asks to delete a name from this list, the reasons must be provided in writing. The chair of the Executive Committee will make the final decision in such a dispute after conferring with senior faculty in the candidate's area.
		4. Preference is given to retaining full professors as outside reviewers. Initial contacts with potential reviewers are made by the chair of the Subject Area Subcommittee, with reviewers being called in a sequence agreed to by the chair of the Executive Committee and the chair of the Subject Area Subcommittee.
		5. The chair of the Executive Committee sends each reviewer the candidate's vita and no more than four publications and no more than one working paper, all selected by the candidate, along with a memo indicating established criteria that the reviewer's letter should address. The information should be sent by August 1 preceding the semester of consideration. The chair will send these materials to at least five reviewers.
		6. The reviewers shall accompany their letter with a current vita.
1. Promotions to Professor.

	* 1. The candidate places three copies of all relevant materials,consistent with Divisional requirements, on file at least four weeks prior to scheduled consideration of the case by the Executive Committee. One paper copy and one electronic copy will be held in a secure place.
		2. The Executive Committee solicits letters from outside reviewers using the procedures listed under section C above for tenure cases.
		3. Selection and ranking of outside reviewers for candidates is made by the chair of the Executive Committee and the chair of the Subject Area Subcommittee with which the candidate has affiliated.
		4. The candidate presents his or her own case orally to the Executive Committee (15 minutes or less). The candidate answers any questions and then leaves the room. The Executive Committee discusses the case (45 minutes or less), and then the Committee votes.
2. Faculty Members Requesting Consideration for Tenure and/or Promotion.

	* 1. Requests for voluntary tenure consideration and for promotion from Associate to full Professor shall be made in writing to the chair of the Executive Committee by July 1 preceding the academic year during which consideration is requested.
3. First Contract Renewals.

	* 1. The candidate places two copies of all relevant materials on file at least four weeks prior to consideration of the case by the Executive Committee. One paper copy and one electronic copy will be held in a secure place.
		2. The elected chair of the Subject Area Subcommittee will call a meeting to discuss the case. The Subcommittee is to follow all procedures applicable to the Executive Committee including the dissemination of an agenda and minutes.
		3. The Subject Area Subcommittee chair will present the candidate's case to the Executive Committee in 5 minutes or less. The Executive Committee discusses the case (5 minutes or less), and then votes.
		4. The Subject Area Subcommittee chair shall provide feedback to the candidate after consideration of the case by the Executive Committee.
4. Second Contract Renewals and Mid‑Term Reviews.

	* 1. Each candidate receives a second contract‑renewal consideration and a mid‑term review, scheduled for the fall semester two years prior to his or her mandatory tenure review. Faculty hired with three years remaining to tenure shall have the mid‑term review prior to making an offer.
		2. The candidate places two copies of all relevant materials on file at least four weeks prior to consideration of the case by the Executive Committee. One paper copy and one electronic copy will be held in a secure place.
		3. The elected chair of the Subject Area Subcommittee will call a meeting to discuss the case. The Subject Area Subcommittee is to follow all procedures applicable to the Executive Committee including the dissemination of an agenda and minutes.
		4. The consideration of a candidate by the Executive Committee will begin with the report of the chair of the candidate's Subject Area Subcommittee. The report will provide a critical assessment of the candidate's record in terms of the adopted criteria for tenure. The report is not to exceed 10 minutes. Other members of the Executive Committee join the discussion (15 minutes or less), and then the Executive Committee votes.
		5. The Subject Area Subcommittee chair shall provide feedback to the candidate after consideration of the case by the Executive Committee.

**IV. Procedures for Considering Appointments to Distinguished Professorships,**

 **Chairs, Research Professorships, and other Named Positions[[4]](#endnote-4)**

1. Criteria for Appointments

Applicants for new appointments will prepare a vita and a proposal outlining a personal agenda for use of the resources associated with the position during the appointment period, and meet other application requirements associated with the position.

Individuals generally will be judged in terms of their past accomplishments and their proposed contributions to the instructional, research, and service missions of the Sheldon B. Lubar School of Business, and with respect to the other requirements of the position. Specifically, proposals should outline the applicant's proposed role as a senior leader in the school, and should show how the resources of the position help contribute to this role.

2. Procedure for Renewals

It is presumed that current holders of such positions should merit renewal. It is recommended that the Dean continue existing appointments unless he or she determines it necessary to appoint an outside committee for a recommendation. Should the Dean not renew the position, it shall be treated as an initial appointment.

3. Procedure for Initial Appointments

All applications for new positions shall be forwarded to the Dean, to be ranked by an outside evaluation committee. The Executive Committee may forward a list of potential evaluation committee members. It is hoped the selection will be made from the list submitted. The ranking of the outside evaluation committee shall be made directly to the Dean.

4. Appointments

The Executive Committee shall approve all initial and renewal appointments.

**V. Criteria for Indefinite Status Appointments[[5]](#endnote-5)**

The qualifications of candidates for promotion from probationary Lecturer to indefinite status and Senior Lecturer are reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Sheldon B. Lubar School of Business primarily in terms of the following criteria:

* Demonstrated superior teaching ability
* Substantial professional development, which may include research and publications
* Significant service contributions to the community, the University, and other relevant organizations

The burden of proving demonstrated superior teaching and substantial professional development and service rests on the individual who is applying for indefinite status and promotion to Senior Lecturer. Recommendation for indefinite status and promotion to Senior Lecturer is based on the best judgments of the members of the Executive Committee in recognizing academic and professional excellence, as well as the changing needs and opportunities that face the Sheldon B. Lubar School of Business.

**VI. Criteria for Tenure Appointments[[6]](#endnote-6)**

The qualifications of candidates for appointment or promotion to tenure are reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Sheldon B. Lubar School of Business primarily in terms of the following criteria:

* Excellence in academic research and creative or scholarly production
* Demonstrated superior teaching ability
* Substantial professional service contributions to the community, the University, and other relevant organizations

Criteria for excellence in research scholarship, teaching effectiveness, and service contributions cannot be reduced to prefigured formulae or average performance levels. It is recognized that not all individuals will excel equally in all three major areas of research, teaching, and service. A candidate, however, must make at least a minimum contribution in all three areas. A claim for tenure cannot be made on the basis of capability in one or even two areas, to the exclusion of the other(s). The burden of proving excellence rests on the individual who is seeking one of the highest honors that the academic community can pay a colleague‑the bestowal of tenure.

A tenure decision is inherently complex. Recommendation for tenure is based on the best judgments of members of the Executive Committee in recognizing academic and professional excellence, as well as the changing needs and opportunities that face the Sheldon B. Lubar School of Business.

**VII. Criteria for Promotion to Professor[[7]](#endnote-7)**

The qualifications of candidates for appointment or promotion to full professor are reviewed by the LSB Executive Committee primarily in terms of the following criteria.

* + - Excellence in academic research and creative or scholarly production.
		- Demonstrated superior teaching ability.
		- Substantial professional service contributions to the community, the University, and other relevant organizations.

Achievements in each of these areas should indicate national and/or international recognition, significantly exceed the performance demonstrated by most of the' successful candidates for promotion to associate professor, and surpass the candidate's own performance at the time of promotion to associate professor. Promotion to full professor is a recognition of excellence, rather than an automatic step in one's career.

Criteria for excellence in research scholarship, teaching effectiveness, and service contributions cannot be reduced to prefigured formulae or average performance levels. It is recognized that not all individuals will excel equally in all three major areas of research, teaching, and service. A candidate, however, must make at least a minimum contribution in all three areas. A claim for promotion cannot be made on the basis of capability in one or even two areas, to the exclusion of the other(s).

A promotion decision is inherently complex. Recommendation for promotion to full professor is based on the best judgments of members of the Executive Committee in recognizing academic and professional excellence.

**VIII. Criteria for Merit Recommendations[[8]](#endnote-8)**

The following criteria will be used in determining the annual merit recommendations.

* Meritorious performance in the past one year relative to teaching performance, and university and professional service.
* Meritorious performance in the past three years relative to scholarly research.
* Equitable structural relationships relative to both internal and external pay equity, considering elements such as market factors, outside offers, promotion, salary inequities within and between ranks, etc.
* Seniority, age, length of service, or years in rank are not considered in determining merit recommendations

Annual merit recommendations are determined equitably without regard to race, religion, sex, national origin, and political views, except where existing salary inequities, which derived from one or more of these factors need correction.

**IX. Research Value Policy[[9]](#endnote-9)**

The Executive Committee regards research in each subject area as equally valuable. The research of individuals is judged on the basis of quality and contribution to their respective fields.

**X. Mentoring Program Procedures[[10]](#endnote-10)**

1. The Chair of the Executive Committee will serve as procedural mentor in matters related to contract renewal, tenure and promotion.
2. Non‑tenured faculty members will be offered a mentor in non‑procedural matters from senior faculty choosing to participate. Area chairs will be included among the faculty available for mentoring.
3. Mentors and "mentees" will negotiate a mutually satisfactory agreement as to purpose, scope, limitations, confidentiality, frequency of meetings, and duration of the mentoring arrangement.
4. Mentors and mentees will agree to a no‑fault conclusion to the relation­ship if, for any reason, it seems inappropriate.
5. Non‑tenured faculty member's written response to the mentoring offer will serve as documentation of the program.

**XI. Tenured Faculty Review and Development Procedures[[11]](#endnote-11)**

1. All tenured faculty whose development plans are expiring shall prepare and submit a development plan by a date as established by the Executive Committee each year.
2. No faculty member whose tenure at the University of Wisconsin‑Milwaukee begins on the first day of the fall semester will be required to prepare a Tenured Faculty Development Plan that year. Their first development plan will be required during the second year after tenure is effective.
3. The development plan approval subcommittee will schedule its own meetings to discuss and approve or reject each plan.
4. A copy of each tenured faculty member's development plan will be reproduced and distributed to the development plan approval subcommittee in a timely manner prior to all meetings.
5. One copy of each tenured faculty member's development plan will be maintained in the Dean's office for public inspection.
6. The EC Policies Sections XI, XII, and XIII are updated to be consistent with UWM Faculty Document No. 3083, Post-Tenure Review Policy, dated November 17, 2016.

**XII. Guidelines for Tenured Faculty Review and Development[[12]](#endnote-12)**

These guidelines have been developed to comply with the UWM policy on tenured faculty review and development. They reflect the *Guidelines for Tenured Faculty Review and Development* adopted by the UW Board of Regents (May 8, 1992), and are intended to address policy and procedural aspects concerning review of tenured LSB faculty. These have been further updated to be consistent with UWM Faculty Document No. 3083, Post-Tenure Review Policy, dated November 17, 2016.

These guidelines have been developed emphasizing a collegial review process that stresses area participation, while allowing for constructive feedback for tenured faculty development.

1. Faculty Development Plans
	1. Each tenured LSB faculty member is expected to submit a faculty development plan, starting Fall 1994. Plans are to be submitted to the chair of the Executive Committee by December 16, 1994.
	2. The period of the initial plan will vary from 3 to 5 years.
	3. The review of tenured faculty members will be sequenced randomly within an area. The sequence will determine the length of the initial plan of 3 to 5 years.
	4. Plans should address an individual faculty member's goals in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. These goals should relate to the mission of the area, school, and university. Activities that a faculty member may pursue to achieve these goals should also be specified.
	5. The plan is expected to comprise 1‑2 pages. However, this does not preclude the submission of plans that are significantly longer than the norm.
	6. Faculty development plans are expected to be formulated within the framework of the LSB's normal workload policies for tenured faculty and available resources pertinent to LSB faculty. However, in some circumstances where special retraining and improvement is needed for satisfactory performance of assigned responsibilities, a request may be made for alteration of the normal workload or specific additional resources not ordinarily available. Any such special requests should be discussed with and approved by the Dean.
	7. The guidelines do not specifically address the content of the plan. However, it is expected that the procedures for approval and review of plans will not infringe upon commonly accepted standards of academic freedom.
2. Approval Process for Faculty Development Plans
	1. Criteria for approval should be established by the Executive Committee. These criteria should recognize that contributions from individual faculty members may vary significantly, but still be consistent with the mission of the area, school, and university.
	2. Faculty development plans will be evaluated by a subcommittee of 3 persons, comprising 2 members from the tenured faculty in the Lubar School of Business and the chair of the Executive Committee. The subcommittee shall be constituted so as to preclude self‑approval.
	3. Mechanisms for appealing negative actions on approval should be available to individual faculty members.
	4. The subcommittee will file the development plans with the Dean's Office.
	5. Approval of initial plans must be completed by May 1 of the academic year.
	6. Plans may be modified at any time, subject to approval by the approval subcommittee. The modified plans shall be filed with the Dean's Office.
3. Review Process

	1. Reviews are to be conducted on a schedule whereby one‑third of the eligible faculty are to be reviewed each year, starting with the 1997-98 academic year. New tenured faculty members will be rotated into the sequence. In cases of disproportionate reviewing loads in some years, some redistribution may be adopted. The reviews to be conducted in an academic year will be announced in the first meeting of the Executive Committee in September.
	2. Exceptions to this policy are permissible due to leaves of absence or sabbaticals.
	3. The review will be conducted by a subcommittee of 3 persons, comprising 2 members from the tenured faculty in the Lubar School of Business and the chair of the Executive Committee. The subcommittee shall be constituted so as to preclude self-evaluation..
	4. A faculty member under review may choose to have the specific membership of . the review subcommittee altered through a written objection to the chair of the Executive Committee.
	5. Review materials could include any or all of the following: plan, vita, annual summaries, teaching evaluations, letters of evaluation, grants, reports, papers, and self-assessment of the plan. It is not expected that external letters of evaluation will be requested as part of this process, though the guidelines allow for a faculty member under review to submit such letters. The choice of material for consideration is left to the faculty member under review. It is expected that the future Faculty Development Plan also be assembled at this time, which will be reviewed as in Section XII.2.
	6. The findings of the review subcommittee will be shared with the faculty member. A review will result in an assessment of "Meets Expectations" or "Does Not Meet Expectations".
	7. If the review does not meet expectations, the procedures specified in with UWM Faculty Document No. 3083, Section III.K through Q, Post-Tenure Review Policy, dated November 17, 2016, will be followed.
	8. A positive review for promotion to full professor shall be considered a comprehensive post-tenure review.
	9. Reviews should be completed by May 1 of the academic year.
	10. Annually, all plans and reviews will be voted upon by the full Executive Committee in May, and the outcome reported in the minutes.
	11. All plans and reviews will be filed with the Dean's Office.
	12. Review findings and responses may be used in the merit process for the subsequent year.
4. Record Keeping

	1. All plans, approvals, review findings, and responses will be maintained in the faculty member's personnel file.

**XIII.** **Criteria for Approval and Review of**

**Tenured Faculty Review and Development Plans[[13]](#endnote-13)**

1. *Tenured faculty are expected to contribute substantially to the instructional mission of the school.* Contributions pertain to the programmatic needs of the school and to a high quality of instruction. Instructional quality can be evidenced by development of new and existing courses to enhance the school's course offerings, innovations in instruction, student advising and mentoring activities, teaching awards, teaching evaluations, and supervision of independent student work.
2. *Tenured faculty are expected to demonstrate sustained development in their scholarship.* Publications and creative achievements provide the primary means of demonstrating the results of research and scholarship, but the LSB also values other scholarly activities that make a positive contribution to the development and reputation of the faculty. Scholarship is demonstrated in terms of the quality and number of publications, research grant activity, awards, contributions made at professional meetings, and talks given at other colleges and universities.
3. *Tenured faculty are expected to make substantial contributions to their area, school, university, community, and profession.* Faculty members who function as good citizens in the academic environment enhance the visibility of, and respect for, the school and university throughout the community and profession. Service contributions can take the form of serving on or chairing school and university committees, editorship and reviewing activities, participation in and contributions to local or national organizations.

The relative importance of these three endeavors clearly differs among tenured faculty members. However, each faculty member's plan should address anticipated activities in all three domains of instruction, scholarship, and service.

**XIV. Procedures for Appointment and Review of Teaching Academic Staff, Movement to Probationary Status, and Promotion to Indefinite Status**[[14]](#endnote-14)

Preamble: The purpose of these procedures is to guide personnel reviews by the Executive Committee of the Sheldon B. Lubar School of Business with regard to evaluations of teaching academic staff. These guidelines supplement the pertinent provisions of UWM Chapters 104, 107, and 108.

1. Initial Fixed-Term Appointment

The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs will consult with the Subject Area Chair on a candidate or candidates for an initial appointment of teaching academic staff. The Subject Area Subcommittee will give its recommendation to the Executive Committee on the candidate. The Executive Committee will vote and forward its recommendation to the Dean. If the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs believes that a fast response is necessary, the Executive Committee can conduct an email ballot. The initial appointment will be of a one‑year duration only, unless the recruitment plan called for a search for a 2 or 3 year fixed term appointment.

1. Assessment of need (after the initial appointment)

The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Subject Area Subcommittee Chair make an assessment of the need for an extension of the initial contract for a limited time period. The assessment may be based on examination of material such as overall short‑term enrollment projections and course specific enrollment projections. The Subject Area Subcommittee Chair will consult with each member of the Subject Area Subcommittee either in a formal meeting or informally.
2. First Contract Renewals

The First Contract Renewal will take place early in the second semester of the initial one‑year contract (soon after Fall semester teaching evaluations are available). The contract may be renewed for a maximum of a three‑year period.

The candidate provides the Subject Area Subcommittee Chair with two copies of all relevant material at least two weeks prior to the consideration of the case by the Subject Area Subcommittee.

The Chair of the Subject Area Subcommittee will call a meeting to discuss the case. The Subcommittee is to follow all procedures applicable to the Executive Committee including the dissemination of an agenda and minutes. The Associate Dean of the Academic Affairs will be invited to attend this meeting.

The Subject Area Subcommittee evaluates the performance of the candidate based on achievements in the areas of teaching, professional development and/or service. The Subject Area Subcommittee Chair will make a recommendation on contract renewal to the Executive Committee.

The Subject Area Subcommittee Chair shall provide feedback to the candidate after consideration of the case by the Executive Committee.
3. Assessment of need (after the first contract renewal)

The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Subject Area Subcommittee make an assessment of need. The assessment may be based on examination of material such as overall short‑term and long‑term enrollment projections and course specific enrollment projections.

In the case of a limited‑time need, the candidate may be considered for a further contract renewal on a fixed term basis.

In the case of continuing need, the candidate may be considered for a further contract renewal and change of status to probationary status.
4. Second Contract Renewals

Contract renewal considerations will be scheduled in the last year of the existing contract. The contract may be renewed for either a maximum of three years as a fixed term contract or with a change of status to probationary status. In the latter case all policies applicable to probationary appointments will apply.

The candidate provides the Subject Area Subcommittee Chair with two copies of all relevant material at least two weeks prior to the consideration of the case by Subject Area Subcommittee.

The Chair of the Subject Area Subcommittee will call a meeting to discuss the case. The Subcommittee is to follow all procedures applicable to the Executive Committee including the dissemination of an agenda and minutes. The Associate Dean of the Academic Affairs will be invited to attend this meeting.

The Subject Area Subcommittee evaluates the performance of the candidate based on achievements in the areas of teaching, professional development and/or service. The Subject Area Subcommittee Chair will make a recommendation on contract renewal to the Executive Committee.

The Subject Area Subcommittee Chair shall provide feedback to the candidate after consideration of the case by the Executive Committee.
5. Movement to Probationary Status

Consistent with UWM Chapter 104 Academic Staff Appointments, the Executive Committee may recommend to the Dean movement of a person working under fixed-term contracts to probationary status. The probationary period shall be not less than one year nor greater than seven years, where prior service may be used in determining the length of the probationary period.

Probationary teaching academic staff receive annual written evaluations in the spring of each year from their area Chair. Annual evaluations are based on annual reports submitted by all faculty on their previous year’s academic activities, vita, and teaching evaluations.

1. Promotion to Indefinite Status

The Executive Committee will take up the case for recommending granting Indefinite Status in the sixth year of a seven year probationary period (or earlier if prior service has been granted). This is based on UWM Chapter 108 Notice Periods that Probationary Teaching Academic Staff must have 12 months notice.

* 1. Discussion of cases for indefinite status.

		1. The candidate for indefinite status places three copies of all relevant materials, consistent with Category B Academic Staff Review Committee requirements, on file at least four weeks prior to the scheduled consideration of the case by the Executive Committee. One paper copy and one (or more) electronic copies will be held in a secure place. Peer evaluation of teaching performance from senior faculty in the subject area is required.
		2. The elected chair of the Subject Area Subcommittee will call a meeting. The Subject Area Subcommittee is to follow all procedures applicable to the Executive Committee including the dissemination of an agenda and minutes. The Subject Area Subcommittee will discuss the case and prepare its presentation to the full Executive Committee.
		3. The consideration of a candidate by the Executive Committee will begin with the report by the chair of the Subject Area Subcommittee. The report will provide a critical assessment of the candidate's record in terms of demonstrated superior teaching ability and substantial professional development and service contributions to the community, the University, and other relevant organizations. The report is not to exceed 15 minutes.
		4. Other members of the Executive Committee join the discussion (30 minutes or less), and then the Executive Committee members vote.
	2. Sequencing of Indefinite Status Cases.

	In years involving more than one indefinite status case, the order of consideration by the Executive Committee will be determined by random selection. The Executive Committee chair draws candidates' names prior to the first meeting of the fall semester. Whenever possible, the Executive Committee will consider only one indefinite status case at a meeting. If scheduling requires two indefinite status cases at the same meeting, the candidates must not be from the same subject area.
1. Adopted 9‑12‑90, 9‑11‑91, 9‑9‑92, 9‑8‑93, 11‑24‑93, 9‑14‑94, 9‑6‑95, 12‑4‑96, 9‑17‑97 and continuing without annual adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. Adopted 9‑12‑90, 9‑11‑91(revised), 9‑9‑92, 9‑8‑93, 9‑14‑94, 9‑6‑95, 12‑4‑96, 9‑17‑97, 5-11-11, 9-26-12 and continuing without annual adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. Adopted 9‑14‑94, 9‑6‑95, 12‑4‑96, 9‑17‑97, amended 9-24-08, amended 9-25-13, and continuing without annual adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. Adopted 11‑19‑86, amended 9‑14‑88, affirmed 2‑28‑96,12‑4‑96, 9‑17‑97 and continuing without annual adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. Adopted 9-28-2011 and continuing without annual adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. Adopted 10‑30‑1985 and annually thereafter, 9‑17‑97 and continuing without annual adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. Adopted 3‑28‑90 and annually thereafter, 9‑17‑97 and continuing without annual

adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. Adopted 3‑28‑90, 10‑27‑93, 9‑14‑94, 9‑6‑95, 12‑4‑96, 9‑17‑97 and continuing without annual adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. Adopted 11‑10‑93, 9‑14‑94, 9‑6‑95, 12‑4‑96, 9‑17‑97 and continuing without annual adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. Adopted 4‑6‑94, 9‑14‑94, 9‑6‑95, 12‑4‑96, 9‑17‑97 and continuing without annual adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
11. Adopted 9‑14‑94; revised 9‑28‑94, 9‑6‑95, 12‑4‑96, 9‑17‑97, 9-27-17 and continuing without annual adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
12. Adopted 4‑6‑94, revised 5‑4‑94, adopted 9‑14‑94, 9‑6‑95,12‑4‑96, 9‑17‑97, 9-27-17 and continuing without annual adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
13. Adopted 12‑7‑94, 9‑6‑95, 12‑4‑96, 9‑17‑97 and continuing without annual adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
14. Adopted 9-3-03, revised 9-28-11, and continuing without annual adoption. [↑](#endnote-ref-14)