



Division of Professions
Executive Committee

LUBAR 450
414 229-5998 phone

**Division of Professions
2017-18 Annual Report**

DATE: May 2018
TO: Faculty of the Division of Professions
FROM: Laura Otto-Salaj, Chair
Division of Professions Executive Committee
RE: 2017-18 Annual Report

In accordance with Chapter 3, Sections 3.07 and 3.15(2) and 6.12 of the UWM Policies and Procedures, we are submitting a report of the activities of the Executive Committee of the Division of Professions.

I. MEMBERSHIP

A. 2017-18

Associate Professor Kimberly Hassell	Criminal Justice	2020
Associate Professor Karl Wallick	Architecture	2020
Associate Nidal Abu-Zahra ¹	Materials	2019
Associate Kevin Keenan	Human Movement Science	2019
Professor Konstantin Sobolev ²	Civil Engr & Mechanics	2019
Associate Laura Otto-Salaj (Chair)	Social Work	2018
Associate Gary Williams ³	Educational Policy & Comm Studies	2018

¹Repl B. Bales (2019-E) ²Repl J Stagg (2019-E) ³Repl B. Zhang (2018-E)

The Committee acknowledges its appreciation to the following past members for their service as alternate members during the 2016-17 academic year: Steve Brandl (2), Janis Eells (3), Nancy File (4), Donald Hanlon (4), Dietmar Wilhelm (1), Bo Zhang (1).

B. 2018-19

< >		2021
Professor Teresa Johnson	Nursing	2021
Associate Professor Kimberly Hassell	Criminal Justice	2020
Associate Professor Karl Wallick	Architecture	2020
Associate Nidal Abu-Zahra ¹	Materials	2019
Associate Kevin Keenan	Human Movement Science	2019
Professor Konstantin Sobolev ² (Chair)	Civil Engr & Mechanics	2019

< > Yet to be appointed ¹Repl B. Bales (2019-E) ²Repl J Stagg (2019-E)

C. 2017-18 Alternate Members

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

Associate Laura Otto-Salaj	Social Work	2023
Associate Gary Williams	Educational Policy & Comm Studies	2023
Professor Steven Brandl	Criminal Justice	2022
Professor Janis Eells	Biomedical Sciences	2022
Associate Nancy File	Curriculum & Instruction	2022
Professor Simone Conceição	Administrative Leadership	2021
Associate Habib Tabatabai	Civil & Environmental Engineering	2021
Professor Dietmar Wolfram	School of Information Studies	2021
Professor Ethan Munson	Electrical Eng/Computer Sciences	2020
Associate Nancy Rice	Exceptional Education	2020
Associate Alexandra Dimitroff	Information Studies	2018
Associate Kristian O'Connor	Kinesiology	2018

II. COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee and Subcommittee scheduled 14 meetings for the 2017-18 academic year.

September 19, 2017	Trudy Turner, Sec of the Univ/ Schedule meetings/ Review criteria
November 7, 2017	<i>Cancelled (no business)</i>
November 14, 2017	Personnel considerations
December 5, 2017	Personnel considerations
December 12, 2017	Personnel considerations
February 8, 2018	Personnel considerations
February 22, 2018	Personnel considerations (mtg #1 Tenure cases)
February 22, 2018	Personnel considerations (mtg #2 Full Professor cases)
March 8, 2018	Personnel considerations
March 29, 2018	Personnel considerations
April 5, 2018	Post-Tenure Review Discussion
April 19, 2018	Post-Tenure Review Discussion
May 3, 2018	Personnel considerations/review criteria/elect 2017-18 chair/final PTR
May 10, 2018	Personnel considerations

III. RECOMMENDATION ON PERSONNEL CASES

A. Recommendations by the Entire Executive Committee	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Total</u>
Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure	9	0	9
Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure	1	0	1
B. Recommendations by the Subcommittee of Full Professors	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Total</u>
Promotion to the rank of Professor	8	0	8
Appointment to the rank of Professor with Tenure	0	0	0
C. Total Recommendations Forwarded	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Total</u>
	18	0	18

IV. CRITERIA

There were no revisions to the Professions *Criteria for Procedures and Evaluative Criteria for Reviewing Departmental Recommendations for Appointment to Tenure and/or Promotion* document.

V. POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

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

PROCEDURES FOR RESPONDING TO A NEGATIVE POST TENURE REVIEW

May 2018

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

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

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

1. The materials forwarded to the Divisional Executive Committee should include: 1) the Primary File, 2) the Appendix, and 3) the transmittal letter from the Dean, requesting advice from the Division of Professions Executive Committee on the extent to which sufficient reasons are provided for the judgment of the Department that the faculty member “Does Not Meet Expectations.” A checklist of the content to be included in the Primary File and Appendix is located in Appendix X.
2. Once the Dean has requested advice from the Divisional Executive Committee and electronically transmitted the materials described above, the Committee will review the materials and set a meeting date and time.
3. At the meeting of the Division of Professions Executive Committee, a representative of the Departmental Executive Committee will make a presentation to the Divisional Committee, answering their questions about the documentation provided. Discussion will center on the extent to which the Department adhered to their criteria and policies for post tenure review, and not on the qualities of the faculty member.
4. The faculty member will have the opportunity to make a presentation and answer questions from the Divisional Executive Committee at the same meeting, without the representatives of the department EC present.

5. Following review of materials and discussion, the Divisional Executive Committee members will discuss and vote on whether or not sufficient reasons are provided for the judgment of the Department that the faculty member “Does Not Meet Expectations.” A vote of “sufficient” means the Divisional Executive Committee assesses the process followed by the Department as adhering to the policies outlined in UWM Faculty Document 3083 and finds that the decision made by the Department is supported by the provided documentation and description of process. A vote of “insufficient” means the reasons for the Department’s decision are not sufficiently supported by processes and/or documentation.

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

APPENDIX X

Checklist for Post-Tenure Review Files Submitted for Review to the Division of Professions Executive Committee

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

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

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

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