

UW SYSTEM TENURE POLICY TASK FORCE

**October 22, 2015, 1:00 PM
1220 Linden Drive, 1820 Van Hise Hall
Madison, Wisconsin**

Agenda

- I. Welcome and Logistics – *Regent Chair John Behling*
- II. Review of Discussion/Minutes from Last Meeting – *Regent Chair John Behling*
- III. Task Force Discussion of Draft Recommendations
 - a. UW System Policy on Faculty Layoffs
 - b. UW System Policy on Post Tenure Review
 - c. Review of Existing Regent Policy on Faculty Tenure and Possible Changes
- IV. Meeting Summary
- V. Goals and Plans for Upcoming Meeting(s)
- VI. Adjourn

Thursday, October 22nd

Tenure Task Force - Discussion of Draft Recommendations

UW System Policy on Faculty Layoffs

- Include an opening statement on purpose of policy recognizing the hope that this policy will be rarely invoked, the purpose of providing adequate notice and protections for affected faculty members should these tough decisions have to be made
- Include Appropriate Definitions
- Define criteria to identify when 1) a financial emergency/exigency exists, and 2) when a program or budget decision is such that layoffs are warranted; the development of these criteria should reflect the shared-governance process
- Identify who the decision-maker(s) is for the case of 1) financial emergency/exigency, and 2) program or budget decision resulting in layoffs (here also consider existing frameworks on campuses for closing and modifying programs)
- Clarify how individual decisions to layoff faculty members are made (seniority, rank, area of discipline, etc.)
- Clearly state that no faculty member can be laid off or terminated solely because of his or rights as protected by the First Amendment or principles of Academic Freedom
- Ensure adequate notice period for those who will be placed in layoff status; potentially different periods for probationary faculty and tenured faculty (also, the statute covers academic staff)
- Provide a process to have an individual or body review, at the request of a faculty member subject to layoff, the layoff decision and clearly identify the Board Review process and timeline
- Describe what rights a laid-off faculty member retains including, rights to reinstatement, options at other System institutions, retraining, etc. and for how long those rights are held by the faculty member
- Make clear at what point a probationary faculty member or tenured faculty member is “terminated” as a result of a layoff
- Promote consistency and uniformity of this policy across the System

UW System Policy on Post Tenure Review

- Opening statement that the purpose of post-tenure review is to recognize outstanding achievement and to help identify and remedy, from a developmental point of view, any deficiencies
- Establish a consistent time at which this occurs (every 3, 4, or 5 years following the awarding of tenure)
- Define what standard of review is: “adequate,” “satisfactory,” “excellence”
- Define consistent criteria to be applied in performing the review
- Identify how the review will be conducted, including who will perform the review and what documents constitute the “review” documents (here, need to be sensitive to concerns about making it too onerous, but also recognizing that all other employees are reviewed annually; also need to find out how this intersects with FARs and other ongoing assessment tools)

- Reaffirmation that First Amendment protections and the principles of Academic Freedom will not be infringed upon as part of this review
- Provision of how merit pay will be tied to the review
- Reference to appropriate disciplinary processes—including termination—for failure to improve following a substandard review
- Provision of how a substandard review will be used initially to assist that faculty member in improving his or her performance
 - Underperforming faculty, who have been duly informed of the required performance expectations for faculty members as determined by university-wide and shared governance-approved criteria, should be notified in writing by the chief academic officers, given reasons and documentation for their perceived underperformance, and have an opportunity to respond in writing concerning those area(s) of perceived underperformance..
 - Faculty identified by their peers and university leadership as underperformers must develop a written plan to remedy any perceived deficiencies in conjunction with his or her Department Chair and Dean. Uniform university-wide time restrictions (deadlines) should apply.
 - The Dean of the College in which the faculty member is housed will determine progress on the plan at least each semester, for a minimum of xx semesters (or whatever the interval and cycle is for post-tenure review at the institution). Each semester, a letter documenting progress or non-progress will be put in the faculty member's personnel file. If the faculty member under review meets at least X% of the recommended improvement expectations and metrics in any academic year, no further review is necessary.
 - Faculty not meeting at least X% of the recommended improvement expectations and metrics will undergo a semester-by-semester review by the chief academic officer of the institution. Time restrictions (deadlines and "last warning" time posts) apply as well as all other state and federal laws governing employee development and behavior/performance modifications.
 - If a faculty member does not meet improvement expectations long-term (as defined by a system wide standard, e.g. three post-tenure review cycles), the Chair or Dean may bring a complaint under Chapter UWS 6 for potential disciplinary action.

TENURE POLICY TASK FORCE RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO RPD 20-23, FACULTY TENURE

BACKGROUND

On June 5, 2015, the Board of Regents adopted Regent Policy Document (RPD) 20-23, Faculty Tenure. Language in RPD 20-23 replicates statutory language contained in s. 36.13, Wis. Stats., that was repealed by the 2015 Wisconsin Act 55 (Executive Budget Act). This Regent policy is to sunset on the date that the Board adopts a tenure policy as a result of the work of the Tenure Policy Task force, which shall not be later than April 11, 2016.

REQUESTED ACTION

Approval of Resolution _____, adopting revisions to Regent Policy Document 20-23, Faculty Tenure, as recommended by the Tenure Policy Task Force.

DISCUSSION

At its March 2015 meeting, the Board of Regents adopted a resolution stating that if the state legislature adopted the Governor's proposal to remove shared governance and tenure from the statutes with an effective date earlier than July 1, 2016, the Board would adopt policies that reflected existing statutory language. The Joint Finance Committee's action did not remove shared governance from Chapter 36, Wis. Stats., but it did remove tenure. In anticipation that the Joint Finance Committee action would stand as the budget progressed through the Senate and Assembly, the Board adopted at its June 2015 meeting RPD 20-23, Faculty Tenure, which replicates the language of s. 36.13, Wis. Stats.

Also, at the Board's March 2015 meeting the President of the Board and the President of the UW System announced the creation of a Tenure Policy Task Force. One of the charges of the task force was to review the Board tenure policy and recommend revisions, if needed. The revisions, if any, developed by that group, if and when approved by the Board, would supersede the policy on faculty tenure adopted at the June 2015 meeting.

The Tenure Policy Task Force met several times between August 2015 and December 2015. The Task Force reviewed RPD 20-23 and recommended some revisions (Attachment A). Below is a summary of the recommended revisions:

1) Adding Definitions for 'Dismissal' and 'Just Cause'

The current Board policy on faculty tenure references 'dismissal' and 'just cause.' While definitions for these two terms exist elsewhere, it would be convenient to have these definitions in the policy itself.

2) Updating Statutory References in 1 (c)

A new statutory section, s. 36.22, Wis. Stats., was created, and the policy would need to reference this newly created section. This new section:

- a) defines layoff, termination, and program change;
- b) establishes the rights of faculty members who are laid off or terminated;
- c) specifies that seniority be followed in layoff considerations unless a clear and convincing case is made that program or budget needs dictate other considerations;
- d) establishes notification requirements;
- e) requires the establishment of a faculty hearing committee to serve as a hearing committee for layoff or termination;
- f) prescribes the requirements for review hearings by the faculty hearing committee and hearing procedures;
- g) lays out the condition and process for recommending layoff decisions of the Chancellor and the hearing committee to the Board of Regents for review; and
- h) establishes the structure for board review.

3) Deleting 3 (c)

Section 3 (c), which replicates the repealed s. 36.13, Wis. Stats, specifies how an individual who was not a ranked faculty member on August 15, 1991, and an individual who held an unranked or probationary appointment under Chapter 37, 1971 Stats, prior to July 10, 1974, should be treated after the merger. UW Human Resources assigned the title code of “Associate Professor-U” to these faculty members who met the criteria. According to UW Human Resources, there are no longer any UW employees holding this title code today.

RELATED REGENT POLICIES

None.

RPD 20-23: FACULTY TENURE

POLICY	NOTES
<p>Scope</p> <p>This policy describes the authority of the University of Wisconsin System Board of Regents to grant faculty tenure.</p>	
<p>Purpose</p> <p>The purposes of this policy are to define who may be granted tenure, establish conditions under which a faculty member having tenure may be dismissed; and require UW System institutions to develop procedures for dismissal notice and hearing.</p>	
<p>Definitions</p> <p>For the purpose of this policy, the following definitions are used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) “Probationary appointment” means an appointment by the board held by a faculty member during the period which may precede a decision on a tenure appointment. (b) “Tenure appointment” means an appointment for an unlimited period granted to a ranked faculty member by the board. (c) <u>“Dismissal” means the permanent elimination of a faculty member’s employment by the system.</u> (d) <u>“Just cause” for dismissal includes, but is not limited to, serious criminal misconduct, as defined in Chapter UWS 7.02.</u> 	<p>Definitions copied from either State Statutes or Administrative Codes.</p>
<p>Policy Statement</p> <p>The Board of Regents shall provide tenure appointments within the following parameters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. APPOINTMENTS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Except as provided under par. (b), the board may grant a tenure appointment only upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate chancellor and the appropriate academic department or its functional equivalent. Neither the chancellor nor the academic department or its functional equivalent may base a tenure recommendation upon impermissible factors, as defined by the board by rule. 	

POLICY	NOTES
<p>(b) The board may grant a tenure appointment without the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic department or its functional equivalent if all of the following apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The board has the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate chancellor. 2. A faculty committee authorized by the board by rule to review the negative recommendation of the academic department or its functional equivalent finds that the decision of the academic department or its functional equivalent was based upon impermissible factors, as defined by the board by rule. 3. The board has the affirmative recommendation of a committee appointed according to the policies and procedures of the appropriate institution to review the individual's record with reference to criteria for tenure published by the institution under procedures established by the board by rule. No person may be appointed to the committee under this subdivision unless the person is knowledgeable or experienced in the individual's academic field or in a substantially similar academic field. No member of the committee appointed under this subdivision may be a member of the academic department, or its functional equivalent, that made the negative recommendation. The committee appointed under this subdivision may not base its tenure recommendation upon impermissible factors, as defined by the board by rule. <p>(c) A tenure appointment may be granted to any ranked faculty member who holds or will hold a half-time appointment or more. The proportion of time provided for in the appointment may not be diminished nor increased without the mutual consent of the faculty member and the institution subject only to Section 4, "Procedural Guarantees," and <u>s. 36.21, ss. 36.21 and 36.22, Wis. Stats.</u></p> <p>(d) A probationary appointment shall not exceed 7 consecutive academic years in a full-time position in an institution. A leave of absence, sabbatical or a teacher improvement assignment does not constitute a break in continuous service and shall not be included in the 7-year period. The board may promulgate rules specifying additional circumstances that do not constitute a break in continuous service and that shall not be included in the 7-year period.</p> <p>2. RULES</p> <p>The board and its several faculties after consultation with appropriate students shall promulgate rules for tenure and probationary appointments, for the review of faculty performance and for the</p>	<p>Change adds reference to the newly created statutory section.</p>

POLICY	NOTES
<p>nonretention and dismissal of faculty members. Such rules shall be promulgated under ch. 227, Wis. Stats.</p> <p>3. CONTINUATION OF APPOINTMENT</p> <p>(a) Any person who holds a tenure appointment under ch. 36, 1971 Stats. and ch. 37, 1971 Stats., and related rules on July 9, 1974 shall continue to hold tenure as defined under those chapters and related rules.</p> <p>(b) Any person who holds the equivalent of a probationary appointment under ch. 36, 1971 Stats., and ch. 37, 1971 Stats., and related rules on July 9, 1974 shall continue to enjoy the contractual rights and guarantees as defined under those chapters and related rules, and may elect to be considered for tenure according to the procedures existing under that appointment or under Section 1, "Appointments."</p> <p>(c) Any person who is not a ranked faculty member on August 15, 1991, and who is also described under subd. 1. or 2. shall be treated as a faculty member with the rank of associate professor for all purposes:</p> <p>1. Any person who held an unranked faculty tenure appointment or unranked faculty concurrent tenure appointment under ch. 37, 1971 Stats., prior to July 10, 1974.</p> <p>2. Any person who held an unranked probationary appointment under ch. 37, 1971 Stats., prior to July 10, 1974, and who subsequently received an unranked faculty tenure appointment or unranked faculty concurrent tenure appointment.</p> <p>4. PROCEDURAL GUARANTEES</p> <p>Any person having tenure may be dismissed only for just cause and only after due notice and hearing. Any person having a probationary appointment may be dismissed prior to the end of the person's contract term only for just cause and only after due notice and hearing. The action and decision of the board in such matters shall be final, subject to judicial review under ch. 227, Wis. Stats. The board and its several faculties shall develop procedures for the notice and hearing which shall be promulgated by rule under ch. 227.</p> <p>5. LIMITATION</p> <p>Tenure and probationary appointments are in a particular institution. A tenure appointment is limited to the institution in which the appointment is held.</p>	<p>Provision is no longer relevant.</p>

POLICY	NOTES
<p>Oversight, Roles, and Responsibilities</p> <p>The Board of Regents delegates to the President of the UW System or his or her designee the authority to issue operational policies to implement and administer this policy. The Board further authorizes the President to delegate to individual chancellors the authority to implement this policy at their respective institutions within the parameters established by Regent Policy Documents, Wisconsin Administrative Code provisions, and University of Wisconsin System policies.</p> <p>Related Regent Policies and Applicable Laws</p> <p>Chapter 36, Wis. Stats. Chapters UWS 3, 4, 5, and 7, Wis. Admin. Code</p> <p>History</p> <p><i>History: Res. 10516, adopted 06/05/2015, created Regent Policy Document 20-23.</i></p>	

UW INSTITUTIONS' PROCESSES AND CRITERIA FOR FACULTY MERIT PAY
as of October 22, 2015

INSTITUTION AND POLICIES REVIEWED	MERIT EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS	MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA	SUMMARY VERIFIED BY INSTITUTION
<p>UW-Eau Claire</p> <p>Comprehensive Salary Pay Plan for 2015-17, https://www.uwec.edu/Usenate/SalaryPlan/150428CompensationPlan2015_2017Attachment.pdf, section 5.</p> <p>Faculty: Review of Performance (in Academic Staff Rules and Procedures, 9th Edition), http://www.uwec.edu/AcadAff/upload/FASRP.pdf, page 53.</p>	<p>Salary adjustment review is conducted annually by the department chair. The faculty member's department chair assigns salary ratings ranging from 0 (Unsatisfactory Performance) to 4 (Meritorious Performance). The department chair is required to define the criteria for each salary rating.</p> <p>Faculty members receiving a rating score of higher than 1 are eligible for merit. In consultation with the affected faculty, the department chair can select one of the four merit models for use in distribution of the merit pool – Flat Dollar, Fixed Dollar, Percentage, and Flat/Percentage Combination.</p> <p>Faculty members are also eligible for a compression salary adjustment based on the outcomes of their post-tenure review – Meritorious (\$1,000), Outstanding (\$1,400), and Exemplary (\$2,000).</p>	<p>Salary adjustment review is to be conducted using criteria for periodic review, which include, but are not limited to, consideration of teaching effectiveness; academic advising ability; scholarly activity; and service to the university, profession, and the public.</p> <p>Teaching effectiveness means the success of the instructor in securing interest, effort, and progress on the part of students. The primary consideration is that students are stimulated to better standards of scholarship, to keener interest in learning, to greater professional understanding, and to more effective effort toward self-improvement.</p> <p>Academic advising ability means the effectiveness of the instructor in providing ongoing consultation for the student; in referring students to appropriate sources of assistance when necessary; in assisting the student in the development of a comprehensive, long-range academic and career plan and the selection of each semester's courses; and in monitoring the student's progress towards the fulfillment of all applicable degree requirements.</p> <p>Scholarly activity means scholarship of a live and progressive character, manifested by continued study, scholarly interests, research, productive and creative work, and professional participation and performance. The essential test of such growth is the teacher's success in holding the respect and esteem of students and colleagues within his or her special field of study and in maintaining professional standards in keeping with those generally approved by the teaching profession.</p> <p>Service to the university, the profession, and the public means the acceptance and fulfillment of the responsibility to serve the university, the profession, and the public through various activities which take place outside the classroom.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

INSTITUTION AND POLICIES REVIEWED	MERIT EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS	MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA	SUMMARY VERIFIED BY INSTITUTION
<p>UW-Green Bay</p> <p>UWGB Chapter 3.10 – Review Procedures (Merit, Promotion, and Renewal) (in Faculty Handbook), http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/rules/facultyhandbook.pdf, page 38.</p> <p>Pay Plan and Compensation Principles and Guidelines – Faculty and Academic Staff, http://www.uwgb.edu/budget/Documents/PayPlanDistributionPrinciples.pdf.</p>	<p>Performance review of faculty members varies. Tenured faculty members are reviewed at least once every five years by the faculty member's interdisciplinary unit executive committee. Non-tenured faculty members are reviewed annually by the executive committee, or the review may be combined with a retention review in a given year.</p> <p>Each curricular unit in which the faculty member serves participates in the merit review process. Each unit other than the interdisciplinary unit in which the faculty member votes prepares an evaluation based on the faculty member's participation in that unit and forwards this evaluation to the chairperson, with a copy to the appropriate Dean(s).</p> <p>UW-Green Bay's Compensation Distribution Plan stipulates that a minimum amount must be allocated to recognize satisfactory performance (currently at least one-third of the annual Pay Plan), an additional amount (one-third of the annual Pay Plan) must be allocated to recognize meritorious performance, and the remaining pay plan (up to one-third) may be distributed based on meritorious performance or the market.</p> <p>The Department Chair assigns a rating to each faculty member ranging from 0 to 4. Faculty members receiving a rating of 2 or above are eligible for merit.</p> <p>Methods of pay plan <i>distribution within the university</i> will be based on the method of <i>allocation to the university</i>. For example, if the pay plan allocation to the campus is phased, all distributions of pay plan dollars will likewise be phased.</p> <p>In accordance with the Board of Regent's guidelines, the Chancellor has the discretion to use</p>	<p>Professional Activities Report form (http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/forms/performance/professional_activities.pdf) lists three areas to report for performance review: Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service.</p> <p>Activities pertaining to teaching are to include (a) courses taught each semester, (b) individualized and extended degree instruction, (c) new course development, innovations, or special techniques of instruction, and (d) methods used for evaluating teaching.</p> <p>Activities pertaining to scholarly and creative activity are to include: (a) publications, manuscripts, reports, performances, recitals, exhibitions, manuals, films, videotapes, etc., (b) grants solicited and outcome; awards, honors, (c) professional contribution at regional, national, and international levels, and (d) activities in progress.</p> <p>Activities pertaining to service are to include: (a) institutional development, such as service on elected and appointed committees, student advising, and (b) outreach, such as activities which utilize professional expertise, non-creating teaching and presentations.</p> <p>Recommendations for merit increases must be supported by evidence of teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to data from a student feedback process. The executive committee of each academic unit is to establish guidelines for the use of student feedback of teachings for merit purposes.</p>	<p>Awaiting response.</p>

INSTITUTION AND POLICIES REVIEWED	MERIT EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS	MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA	SUMMARY VERIFIED BY INSTITUTION
	<p>10% of the pay plan to meet special compensation needs such as market shortfall by faculty rank; innovative, collaborative program delivery; and exceptional performance in support of institutional goals. These discretionary funds are distributed based on consultation with campus governance groups (the University Committee and Academic Staff Committee).</p> <p>Pay plan dollars, less the chancellor discretionary portion – if used, are distributed to the units based on eligible salaries.</p>		
<p>UW-La Crosse</p> <p>UWL 3.05, Periodic Review, http://www.uwlax.edu/Human-Resources/Unclassified-Personnel-Rules/.</p> <p>Guide to Faculty Promotions and Portfolio Development, http://www.uwlax.edu/uploadedFiles/Offices-Services/Human_Resources/Faculty-Promotion-Guide%20.pdf. Merit is addressed in section 5.2.3.2.</p>	<p>Performance of faculty members is reviewed annually. Results of the review are used in making recommendations for salary adjustments, retention, tenure, promotion, tenured faculty review and development, and for other considerations. Departments are required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establish bylaws specifying the review procedures and criteria used in the review. • provide the merit ranking (or categorization) for the candidate along with departmental data (such as ranges and averages). • describe the merit evaluation procedure • explain any relative weighting of teaching, scholarship and service used in the merit process used by the department. 		Yes.
<p>UW-La Crosse History Department</p> <p>Article IV -- Merit Evaluation (in Department Bylaws), http://www.uwlax.edu/uploadedFiles/Academics/Colleges_Schools/CLS/HIS%20Bylaws%2020140430.pdf.</p>	<p>Merit review for all ranked faculty members is conducted annually. Merit reviews reflect activities during the prior year.</p> <p>Faculty members are to prepare the Annual Individual Professional Activity Report and submit it to the Department Chair. The Promotion and Merit Pay Committee reviews the report submitted and assigns a merit ranking – Excellent, Special Merit, Meritorious, or Non-Meritorious.</p>	<p>The Professional Activity Report is to address three categories of activities: teaching, scholarly activity, and professional and public service.</p> <p>A report of teaching effectiveness is to include honors and awards; assignments and exams; student evaluation of instruction ratings and peer evaluation; academic standard and integrity; student advising; and direction of undergraduate research or creative work.</p> <p>A report of scholarly activity is to include published articles,</p>	

INSTITUTION AND POLICIES REVIEWED	MERIT EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS	MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA	SUMMARY VERIFIED BY INSTITUTION
	<p>Merit pay increases for members judged Excellent shall be nominal, as recommended by the Merit Pay Committee and decided by majority vote of the Department.</p> <p>The Special Merit category shall be available to any faculty member, and is intended to reward very special and specific effort. Persons who wish to be considered for Special Merit must nominate themselves when they submit their Individual Professional Activity Report.</p> <p>The category Meritorious shall be the general ranking given to most members of the faculty.</p>	<p>books readings, edited journals, and refereed publications in electronic media; professional conference participation; historical consulting; production of films/exhibits/new media; oral history; grants awarded; grants applied for; and publications related to undergraduate research or creative work.</p> <p>A report of professional and public service is to include organization memberships; offices in organizations; community organizations; service to schools; building library resources; speeches; consulting; and other service.</p>	
<p>UW-Madison</p> <p>UW-Madison Pay Adjustment Policy, https://kb.wisc.edu/ohr/policies/page.php?id=53379.</p> <p>Under state statute prior to 1 July 2015, pay for reasons of meritorious performance could only be provided through the annual pay plan process. The Office of Human Resources has added "Performance" to the reasons for faculty increases with the change of statute beginning 1 July 2015.</p>	<p>Each faculty member's salary is evaluated periodically – usually each year, but for tenure faculty at least every five years, in alignment with post-tenure review, as per Faculty Legislation II-106 (https://www.secfac.wisc.edu/FacLeg100_299.htm#106) – for equity, compression, market reasons, compression-equity, and promotion (along with other reasons listed in UPPP). In addition, salaries must be evaluated in response to a request from the faculty member.</p> <p>Salary evaluations are conducted by the tenure-home departments. The Dean must review and approve all salary decisions to ensure that they are fair and supported by adequate documentation.</p> <p>The following criteria were used when the most recent merit/pay plan exercise occurred:</p> <p>Colleges, schools, departments, and programs, as appropriate to their respective missions, should allocate at least 20% of the annual merit pool to reward excellence in teaching (Faculty Document 976a dated February 1, 1993). In addition, each</p>	<p>Factors to be considered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • performance in research, publication, teaching, outreach, service, and professional practice; • record of obtaining grants or other outside additional funding for programs; • market/demands for particular skills and specialties, including a record suitable for attracting offers of employment from other universities or research institutions; • assumption of administrative or supervisory duties that normally merits additional salary; • actual outside offers; • additional factors (other than sex) that normally determine merit pay in the unit. 	<p>Yes.</p>

INSTITUTION AND POLICIES REVIEWED	MERIT EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS	MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA	SUMMARY VERIFIED BY INSTITUTION
	<p>college should allocate a portion of the Dean's special merit pool to faculty members who have maintained a record of teaching excellence.</p> <p>The merit requirements are for appointments that have received a base salary adjustment. The requirement for at least an average percent increase includes all faculty promotions, academic staff promotions, market, high demand faculty and individual equity adjustments. Merit of at least 1.0% is required for proposed major change in duties.</p>		
<p>UW-Milwaukee</p> <p>Chapter 4.05 – Department Executive Committee: Functions (in UW-Milwaukee Policies and Procedures), http://www4.uwm.edu/secu/policies/faculty/upload/May2015P-P.pdf.</p> <p>S-39 -- Merit Salary Recommendations – Information to Faculty Members, http://www4.uwm.edu/secu/policies/saap/upload/S39.htm.</p>	<p>The Departmental Executive Committee makes recommendations concerning appointments, dismissals, promotions, salaries, merit allocations, and other personnel and budget matters, which are transmitted through the chairperson to the dean.</p>	<p>Decisions relating to renewal of appointments, recommending of tenure, and merit salary recommendations require an evaluation of the following functions: teaching, research, creative activity and/or accomplishments, professional and public service, and contribution to the University.</p> <p>The Departmental Executive Committee is required to establish criteria, which shall conform to the affirmative action policies and procedures of the university, for renewal and tenure, as well as for merit increases, by determining the relative importance of the above functions in the evaluation processes. Consideration is to be given to all work and accomplishments that express a faculty member's academic interest. Criteria for renewal and tenure recommendations and for merit salary recommendations are to be written and distributed to all members of the Department and to the appropriate dean.</p>	<p>Awaiting response.</p>
<p>UW-Milwaukee Department of Curriculum and Instruction</p> <p>Policies and Procedures, http://www4.uwm.edu/secu/faculty/standing/aafec/minutes/upload/Departmental-Policies-and-Procedures-082913-1.pdf.</p>	<p>Merit review is conducted by the Personnel Committee. In advance of the merit review, a faculty member submits a report of activities.</p>	<p>The Department values the areas of research and scholarship, teaching and program development, and professional and departmental-based (internal and external) service in tenure/promotion and annual review.</p> <p>Criteria for research and scholarship include published articles and papers; published books and monographs; published book chapters; proprietary and non-proprietary reports; training</p>	

INSTITUTION AND POLICIES REVIEWED	MERIT EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS	MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA	SUMMARY VERIFIED BY INSTITUTION
<p>Allocation of Merit is covered on page 7.</p> <p>Tenure/Promotion and Annual Review Criteria is covered on page 9.</p>		<p>manuals; computer software; instructional aids; psychometric and evaluative instruments; research projects conducted; grants submitted; grants received; book reviews; etc.</p> <p>Criteria for professional development include significant continuing education.</p> <p>Criteria for teaching include courses taught; student supervision; and teaching awards or other teaching honors.</p> <p>Criteria for program development include programs offered and organizing colloquia, institutes, or workshops.</p> <p>Criteria for service include membership or leadership in department, school, college, university, or system committees and/or task forces; service, membership, or leadership in a professional organization; major responsibility for coordination of programs, departments, or centers; special assignments for professional organizations; participation at professional meetings; and involvement in student activities.</p>	
<p>UW-Oshkosh</p> <p>Gen 2.1. Administration of Merit; and Gen 2.2. Salary Adjustments Guidelines, (in Faculty/Staff Handbook), http://www.uwosh.edu/provost/Main%20Highlight/handbooks/online-faculty-staff-handbook.</p>	<p>Merit review is conducted once every two years by the department or unit. The policy directs each college or department to establish a process. The process must include:</p> <p>(a) development and distribution to faculty and teaching academic staff of evaluation criteria which reflect department, college and university goals.</p> <p>(b) criteria for evaluation of instruction which include guidelines for the consistent use of student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other evidence in judging teaching performance.</p> <p>(c) a written feedback process that will be given to each faculty and teaching academic staff member; the feedback process will include face-to-face feedback with the unit head and/or unit personnel</p>	<p>The policy directs each college or department to develop a review process that includes evaluation of teaching, professional and scholarly growth, and institutional and extra-institutional service.</p>	<p>Awaiting response.</p>

INSTITUTION AND POLICIES REVIEWED	MERIT EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS	MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA	SUMMARY VERIFIED BY INSTITUTION
<p>UW-Oshkosh College of Business</p> <p>Appendix A, Section III -- Merit Guidelines -- College of Business Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Renewal, Promotion, Tenure and Merit (in Faculty/Staff Handbook), http://www.uwosh.edu/provost/Main%20Highlight/handbooks/online-faculty-staff-handbook/appendices/appendix-a-college-materials/college-of-business.</p>	<p>committee representative as part of the salary evaluation process.</p> <p>Merit review is conducted once every two years by the department or unit. For the review, faculty members are required to submit documentation which best describes their achievements in Teaching, Scholarly and Professional Development, and Service. For each of the performance categories, the faculty members are assigned a merit rating which carries specific weight.</p>	<p>Since quality research and scholarly activity can often take longer than two years, a four-year time frame is used for research while two-year time frames are used for teaching and service.</p> <p>Factors to be considered in evaluating teaching include what is taught (currency, relevance, meets ultimate customers' needs, depth and breadth, theory and application, creation of new course) and how it is taught (lecture and discussions, assignments, examinations).</p> <p>Factor to be considered in evaluating intellectual contribution is the number of scholarly works.</p> <p>Factors to be considered in evaluating service include attendance at team and college meetings and making value-added contributions.</p>	
<p>UW-Parkside</p> <p>Chapter 6.04 – Periodic Reviews and Salary Recommendations (in Faculty Handbook), http://www.uwp.edu/explore/offices/governance/uwpfchapter6.cfm#Chp604.</p>	<p>Review of faculty performance for salary adjustment purposes is conducted annually or on a two-year cycle by the Department Executive Committee, Department Chair, or a special committee.</p>	<p>The review is based on written reports from faculty members describing their activities during the preceding calendar year in the areas of teaching, creative activity and service, and results of student evaluations of faculty and peer evaluation.</p>	<p>Awaiting response.</p>
<p>UW-Platteville</p> <p>6.3.9 Recommendations Concerning Merit Awards and Inequity Adjustments (in Faculty Handbook), http://www.uwplatt.edu/files/faculty-senate/files/10_8_13_chap6.pdf.</p> <p>Form 5 – Salary Review,</p>	<p>Policy directs each department's Salary and Promotion Committee to annually review each faculty member for the purpose of identifying those faculty deserving merit awards and/or inequity and/or compression adjustments.</p> <p>To be considered for a salary adjustment, the faculty member must receive a simple majority of the committee members' votes.</p>	<p>Policy directs each department to establish criteria to serve as the basis of faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness; professional, scholarly, and creative activities; and university and public service activities. The criteria must be consistent with current University Rank, Salary, Tenure and Promotion Commission policies.</p> <p>For faculty members who have teaching appointments, teaching effectiveness must receive top priority. For faculty</p>	<p>Awaiting response.</p>

INSTITUTION AND POLICIES REVIEWED	MERIT EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS	MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA	SUMMARY VERIFIED BY INSTITUTION
http://www.uwplatt.edu/files/faculty-senate/files/10-22-2013-08-draft-of-form-5-salary-review.pdf	<p>Merit assignments can include high merit (request based on previous calendar year); inequity (request based on cumulative record and regression analysis of salary); and compression adjustment (request based on cumulative record and salary data).</p>	<p>with non-teaching assignments, job performance, professional/scholarly/creative activity, and university and public service activities are weighted.</p>	
<p>UW-River Falls</p> <p>Chapter 5.2, Procedures to Be Used in Awarding Merit Salary Increases; and Chapter 5.3, Merit Rating – Procedures, (in Faculty and Staff Handbook, 25th Edition), https://www.uwrf.edu/FacultySenate/upload/Faculty-Senate-Handbook-2015.pdf.</p>	<p>Academic departments have an annual option of (a) using a departmental merit committee, (b) allowing the chair to distribute the merit increase funds, or (c) developing their own merit distribution plan, subject to approval of the dean of the college.</p> <p>The Chair or Committee rates each faculty member using one of the seven merit groups and weights: A (Excellent; 4.0); AB (Very Good; 3.5); B (Good; 3.0); BC (Fair; 2.5); C (Adequate; 2.0); D (Poor; 1.0); or F (Unmeritorious; 0). The faculty member's merit amount is based on his/her calculated normalized merit weight and the total merit pool for the unit.</p> <p>At least once every five years the professional activities of tenured faculty will be reviewed to inform each faculty member of his or her performance. The review may be conducted simultaneously with merit review or with promotion review. If the faculty member's performance is deemed outstanding, a copy of the report shall be entered into the peer merit file as evidence to support a high merit ranking, and the chair shall consider the faculty member in the recommendations to the Dean for special merit awards (p. 210).</p>	<p>The Chair or Committee bases the rating on the professional achievement sheet provided by the faculty member and other data, such as student evaluations, peer evaluations, teaching loads, advising loads, graduate courses, and other relevant information.</p>	<p>Awaiting response.</p>
<p>UW-Stevens Point</p> <p>Faculty Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policies,</p>	<p>Each faculty member in a department generates 14 merit points. Ten points are distributed by the department according to departmental procedures. The remaining 4 points are distributed among the</p>	<p>It is expected that faculty achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service are considered in making personnel decisions. Since teaching is the primary faculty responsibility at UW-Stevens Point, the Chancellor and Provost normally</p>	<p>Awaiting response.</p>

INSTITUTION AND POLICIES REVIEWED	MERIT EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS	MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA	SUMMARY VERIFIED BY INSTITUTION
<p>http://www.uwsp.edu/acadaff/Pages/facultyPersonnelDecisions.aspx.</p> <p>Chapter 4B, Section 3, Merit Distribution (in University Handbook), http://www.uwsp.edu/acadaff/Pages/facultyPersonnelDecisions.aspx, page 22.</p> <p>Teaching Scholarship Service – Descriptions, Expectations and Peer Evaluation for Retention, Promotion, Tenure, and Merit, http://www.uwsp.edu/acadaff/Orientation/Teaching%20Scholarship%20Service%202015-16.pdf.</p>	<p>Department Chair (1 point), the Dean (2 points), and the Vice Chancellor (1 point). To receive the full pay plan increase, a faculty member must earn 14 merit points.</p> <p>Policy directs each department to establish criteria upon which merit recognition will be based and procedures for recommending merit.</p>	<p>put greatest importance on this performance area in personnel reviews. The next most important area is scholarship. Exceptions can be made to the relative importance given to each of these three performance areas.</p> <p>Evaluation of a faculty member's teaching performance is to include peer examination of the faculty member's teaching materials, peer observation of teaching, and responses to the Student Evaluation of Course Instruction form.</p> <p>Each academic department is expected to work with its respective dean to identify activities which its faculty may present as evidence of scholarship. For each activity identified, the department is to determine how its quality will be assessed before any faculty engage in the activity.</p> <p>Criteria for evaluating a faculty member's service contributions are to include quality of the service work; impact of the service work; dissemination of the service contribution as expressed through scholarship; interaction with a community of scholars; and integration of teaching, scholarship and service.</p>	
<p>UW-Stout</p> <p>Chapter 3B: Personnel Rules for Faculty (in Faculty, Academic Staff, Limited Appointees Handbook), https://www.uwstout.edu/hr/upload/Unclassified-Handbook-Master.pdf.</p>	<p>The faculty member's immediate supervisor is responsible for assigning the faculty member a performance rating. The three ratings available are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Meritorious Performance (above): Performance is judged to be above expectations acceptable to the position. Adequate Performance (within): Performance is judged to be within expectations acceptable to the position. Inadequate Performance (below): Performance is judged to be below expectations acceptable to the position. 	<p>Each faculty member is responsible for developing his/her individual performance activity in collaboration with the immediate supervisor. Appropriate weight is given to the importance of teaching within the tripartite faculty member's responsibilities of teaching, research, and service.</p> <p>Results from student evaluation of instruction are also to be used in merit salary increase decisions.</p>	Yes.
<p>UW-Superior</p> <p>7.4.2 – Annual Performance</p>	<p>Faculty performance is evaluated each year. The process and procedure for faculty performance is determined by each department, in consultation with</p>	<p>The areas of faculty performance evaluation are teaching, scholarship, and service. The evaluation is to include peer and student evaluation.</p>	Awaiting response.

INSTITUTION AND POLICIES REVIEWED	MERIT EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS	MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA	SUMMARY VERIFIED BY INSTITUTION
<p>Evaluation (in Unclassified Staff Handbook), https://www.uwsuper.edu/hr/unclassified-staff/handbook/upload/Chapter-7-Personnel-Policies.pdf.</p>	<p>the Dean, and is subject to Faculty Senate approval. Results of the annual review are to be used for salary increase.</p>	<p>Evaluation is to be based on the performance expectations established for each faculty rank.</p>	
<p>UW-Whitewater</p> <p>Faculty Personnel Rules (in University Handbook), http://www.uww.edu/Documents/facsenate/rulesrev.pdf</p> <p>Faculty Salary Committee, http://www.uww.edu/university-committees/faculty-committees/faculty-salary-committee.</p>	<p>Under the Rules, each Department has the responsibility for making recommendations and decisions related to merit.</p> <p>UW-Whitewater has a faculty salary committee, which recommends to the Senate procedures and policies relating to faculty compensation and serves as a source of information for the faculty on faculty compensation.</p>		<p>Yes.</p>
<p>UW-Whitewater College of Business and Economics</p> <p>Merit Policy, http://www.uww.edu/Documents/colleges/cobe/Faculty%20Staff/Documents/COBE%20Faculty%20Handbook%20December%202014.pdf, page 16.</p>	<p>The faculty member provides typewritten documentation of each area of faculty activity under review. Five categories of merit ratings (Outstanding, Excellent, Good, Acceptable, and No Merit) and a point system are used in the evaluation. The rating is determined at the Department level and subject to review by the Dean.</p> <p>Merit funds are distributed on the basis of specific weights given to each rating: 2.0 for Outstanding; 1.5 for Excellent; 1.0 for Good; 0.5 for Acceptable; and 0 for No Merit.</p>	<p>Evaluation for merit is based on Teaching Effectiveness, Research and Service, and Meritorious Research and Service Activities.</p> <p>Each department is to develop standards for evaluating teaching effectiveness based on the teaching effectiveness report adopted by the College. Measures for evaluating teaching effectiveness contained in the report include a mandatory student evaluation that shows student ratings on five college-wide core questions. A full teaching portfolio is required in those cases where student evaluation ratings are less than outstanding.</p> <p>Criteria for evaluating meritorious research and service activities include publication of a book, refereed journal article, professional journal article, chapter in a book, study guide or instructor's manual; paper or research presentations;</p>	

INSTITUTION AND POLICIES REVIEWED	MERIT EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS	MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA	SUMMARY VERIFIED BY INSTITUTION
		successful submission and receipt of a grant of \$1,000 or more; major faculty advising role to a student organization; holding an officer position in a community organization or active membership in a public advisory committee; and professional consulting.	
<p>UW Colleges</p> <p>Faculty Personnel Policy #503, Faculty Merit Policy and Procedures, http://uwc.edu/sites/uwc.edu/files/mce-uploads/employees/senate/policies/pp503_faculty_merit_policy_and_procedures_2014-03-14.pdf.</p>	<p>Merit evaluation is conducted annually. Evaluation is conducted by a committee of peers. The committee reviews Activity Reports, student evaluations, and any other evidence of achievement over a two-year period.</p> <p>Faculty members performing satisfactorily are separated into three categories: Meritorious, Highly Meritorious, and Exceptionally Meritorious.</p> <p>Each year, the merit evaluation process rotates between academic departments and campuses. In departmental years, the written evaluation will be provided by the department chair, in consultation with the department merit evaluation committee. In campus years, the written evaluation may be provided by the campus dean or the merit committee, as the campus merit committee determines.</p>	<p>Review is based on evidence of teaching effectiveness, professional development, and professional service to the university and/or the wider community.</p> <p>Teaching effectiveness is given primary consideration. Other areas to be considered may include professional growth, non-teaching university service, and public service.</p> <p>Department Chairs and Campus Deans may include additional specific criteria.</p>	Yes.
<p>UW-Extension</p> <p>UPG #1 – Annual Review and Payplan Distribution, http://www.uwex.edu/human-resources/policies/UW-Extension-UPG1.pdf.</p> <p>UPG#12 -- University of Wisconsin-Extension Tenured Faculty Review and Development Policy, http://www.uwex.edu/human-resources/policies/UW-Extension-UPG12.pdf.</p>	<p>Review of faculty performance is conducted annually and merit distribution depends on annual reviews.</p> <p>In the year of a tenured faculty member's review, the results of the post-tenure review are the primary basis for merit review. In years between tenured faculty reviews, the results of the most recent tenured faculty review must be considered along with the annual performance review information in the annual merit process.</p>	<p>Annual faculty performance reviews should, at a minimum, include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A review of key objectives established for the past year, such as an assessment of progress in attaining objectives and an examination of reasons for not attaining objectives; and 2. An agreement upon a set of key objectives for the coming year. <p>Each tenured faculty member's scholarly growth and professional development must be evaluated on the criteria appropriate for the individual job description and the division</p>	Awaiting response.

INSTITUTION AND POLICIES REVIEWED	MERIT EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS	MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA	SUMMARY VERIFIED BY INSTITUTION
resources/policies/UW-Extension-UPG12.pdf . Linkage with merit process is addressed in section 12.03(4).		and/or academic department's mission, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of continual scholarship in research, integration, outreach/engagement, and teaching. • Continuing professional development as demonstrated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ personal intellectual growth – acquisition of new job-related skills, ideas, experiences; ✓ contributions to the profession; ✓ contributions to the university – including faculty governance; ✓ program development and implementation; and ✓ administration/leadership of educational and/or research programs. 	

Office of the Board of Regents, 10/22/2015.