MOTION to delete section 3.14 and amend sections 3.17(1), 3.17(3), 3.19, and 5.20 to eliminate Divisional Executive Committee review of promotions to full professor.

1. Revise UWM Policies and Procedures to:

   Delete Section 3.14 of UWM Policies and Procedures:

   3.14 Advice on Tenured Appointment as Professor or Promotion to Professor

   (1) Divisional Executive Committees are charged with making recommendations for promotion to professor to the dean of the appropriate school or college. (See Chapter 4.20).

   (2) Recommendations for tenured appointments as full professor or promotion to full professor shall be considered by a subcommittee of the appropriate Divisional Executive Committee. This subcommittee shall be composed of all regular Divisional Executive Committee members who hold the rank of full professor. Should there be fewer than three full professors eligible to serve for a given candidate, the Divisional Executive Committee chair shall appoint the necessary additional members from among former Divisional Executive Committee members holding the rank of full professor. These additional appointments will bring the subcommittee membership to three.

   This subcommittee shall make recommendations for tenured appointments as professor or promotion to the rank of full professor and shall transmit its decision, accompanied by a detailed statement of the reasons that ground it, to the Dean through the Chair of the Divisional Executive Committee.

   (3) Procedures for review of candidates for promotion to full professor will otherwise follow procedures identical to those used for promotion to associate professor, including the right of the candidate to choose an open meeting.

   (4) Each Divisional subcommittee of full professors shall elect one of its members as chairperson.

   (5) A quorum of the subcommittee of full professors will be a majority of the subcommittee members, but not fewer than three.

   (6) An associate professor who is a member of a divisional executive committee must cease to be a member if his/her own promotion is to be reviewed by the Divisional Subcommittee during his/her tenure. Such action shall become effective as soon as positive recommendation has been made by his/her Departmental Executive Committee.
Revise 3.17 (1):

3.17 Criteria for Advice

(1) Teaching, research and service are all to be considered in any judgment concerning promotion or appointment with tenure, specifically as measured by demonstrated teaching ability, professional competence, past and anticipated creative accomplishments, and contributions and service to the public, the University, and to the faculty member's profession. Annually each Divisional Executive Committee shall distribute to every member of the Division a written statement of the standards and guidelines governing its deliberations in cases concerning promotion or appointment to tenure at within tenure rank.

Delete 3.17 (3):

(3) All tenured associate professors being considered for promotion to the rank of professor shall be evaluated in conformity with current written standards and guidelines or, at the candidate's option, those in effect during the year immediately preceding the year of consideration for promotion.

Revise 3.19:

3.19 Waiver of Review by Divisional Executive Committees or Subcommittees

In dealing with an appointment or promotion with tenure, a Divisional Executive Committee or Subcommittee may waive review where a Divisional Executive Committee of a different division has previously recommended appointment or promotion.

Revise 5.20:

5.20 Procedures for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Positive recommendations from the departmental executive committee are directed to the dean of the school or college. Upon receiving the recommendation and the accompanying documentation, the dean evaluates the material to the subcommittee of full professors of the appropriate divisional executive committee for advice. If the subcommittee's recommendation is negative, the subcommittee chairperson notifies the divisional executive committee chairperson, the department chairperson, and the faculty member concerned provisions regarding reconsideration and written reasons as outlined in 5.17 will apply. If the recommendation of the subcommittee of full professors is positive, it is transmitted through the divisional executive committee chairperson to the dean [5.17(1)]. If the dean does not accept the subcommittee's departmental executive committee's recommendation, the dean notifies the divisional executive committee chairperson, the chairperson of the departmental executive committee, and the faculty member concerned. The faculty member may request written reasons and/or reconsideration as provided in 5.17(2). If the faculty member requests written reasons and/or reconsideration within twenty (20) working days, the dean shall respond to the request within ten (10) working days. The dean transmits all actions to the chancellor with the dean's recommendation.
2. The University Committee recommends that the effective date of this new procedure be the 1994-95 academic year and shall review the operation of this procedure during 1998-99 academic year and report to the Faculty Senate the results of its review.

Rationale

The University Committee (UC) recommends removing the Divisional Executive Committees from the promotion to full professor review process for the listed reasons:

1) Divisional Committee involvement in promotion to full professor goes back to the mid-1970’s. At that time, it was believed that an outside-of-department review was necessary for oversight of quality and procedures across the various departments. Additionally, some faculty felt that UWM was not, as yet, mature enough for some departments to conduct promotion reviews on their own. To that end, the Divisional Committee was put into the review process to ensure appropriate quality control.

2) During the 1992/93 academic year, the UC reviewed promotion to full professor procedures. One Committee-of-the-Whole discussion took place at a UWM Faculty Senate Meeting. We also surveyed the faculty for their opinions. The survey results presented no clear mandate but did suggest some kind of change of our current procedure would be desirable and/or necessary. We asked the current Divisional Committees to review the survey results and provide us with their recommendations. The Divisional Committees prefer to continue reviewing promotion to full credentials.

After considering all these factors, the UC now recommends support of the proposed legislation. We feel the time has come to accept the fact that we have matured as an institution to the point where departments should be expected to conduct appropriate promotion to full reviews. The campus data clearly indicate that we have a disproportionate number of associate professors, in comparison with comparable institutions. Suggested reasons from the survey include:

(1) Some departments defer to and are more concerned about perceived divisional expectations than their own.

(2) Faculty with a balanced record with respect to teaching, research and service should be considered for promotion.

(3) Divisional Committees have moved from an oversight role to conducting de novo reviews. This has created what some faculty have referred to as an "adversarial process."

(4) In the context of the UWM Tenured Faculty Development and Review Policy, it is entirely appropriate for departments to be primarily responsible for recommending faculty for promotion to full professor. This will provide the impetus for clarification and development of departmental missions and support departmental faculty involvement in all three areas of professional responsibility.
Schools/colleges may wish to establish committees to advise the dean with respect to departmental criteria and procedures. Finally, we recommend that the UC review the operation of this new procedure during the academic year 1998-99 should the proposed legislation pass.
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