FACULTY SENATE MEETING AGENDA MATERIALS for

20 April 2020

The University Committee encourages senators to discuss the agenda with their departmental faculty prior to meeting.
AGENDA

1. Memorial Resolutions for:
   Professor Emeritus Neil Ford (Fac doc 2881)
   Professor Emeritus Louis Maher (Fac doc 2882)
   Professor Emeritus Crawford Young (Fac doc 2883)

2. Announcements/Information Items.

3. State of Diversity and Inclusion. (Chief Diversity Officer Patrick Sims)

4. Question period.

5. Minutes of March 2 meeting. (consent)

Reports


7. Immigration & International Issues Committee Report. (Professor Alfonso Morales) (Fac doc 2885)

8. Information Technology Committee Report for 2018-2019. (Professor Joe Salmons) (Fac doc 2886)

Old business

9. Proposed Change to Faculty Policies and Procedures: the Addition of a New Section, 7.18., Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor. (Fac doc 2879 Rev.) (for vote)

New business

10. Proposal to Change Faculty Legislation II-105, Summary Period for Academic Semester: Adjust the Deadline to Submit Grades to 72 Hours After the Final Exam Day (Fac doc 2887) (1st reading)

Upcoming Faculty Senate Meetings – 3:30 p.m.,
   May 4 via Blackboard
   272 Bascom: October 5, November 2, December 7, 2020
Memorial Resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison
On the Death of Professor Emeritus Neil M. Ford

Neil M. Ford, Emeritus Professor of Marketing in the Wisconsin School of Business, passed away on October 14th at the Columbia Health Care Center in Wyocena, Wisconsin, at the age of 88. He received his Bachelor’s degree from Southern Illinois University, his Master’s degree from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1961, and his Ph.D. from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1966.

Neil accepted a position as an Assistant Professor of Marketing in the Wisconsin School of Business in 1966, and was subsequently promoted to Associate Professor with tenure and Full Professor. He was Chair of the Marketing Department for several years, and served the School of Business and the University in many other capacities. For instance, he worked closely for many years with Mu Kappa Tau, the undergraduate marketing society. In this role, he helped introduce students to the marketing profession and gave them exposure to industry experts. As an educator, Neil was deeply committed to his students, not only by imparting marketing knowledge, but also by finding ways to enhance their employment opportunities.

Within the marketing area, Neil’s research was focused on different aspects of sales management. It would not be an exaggeration to say that Neil, together with his co-authors Gilbert Churchill and Orville Walker, developed this research area more or less from scratch. While sales management had always been a key part of many firms’ marketing programs, the area historically lacked a systematic empirical foundation and well-grounded conceptual frameworks. Neil and his colleagues, through a series of impactful articles and a highly acclaimed textbook, brought rigor and focus to the sales management area. In doing so, they opened up research opportunities for generations of younger scholars who followed in their footsteps. His work continues to be used extensively and it is highly cited. An example of this is his Journal of Marketing Research article (1985) on “The Determinants of Salesperson Performance: A Meta-Analysis” which has received 1688 Google Scholar citations.

In addition to his substantive work, his research made several methodological contributions to the area of survey research. This line of work reflected his doctoral training; in particular his work with Professor Robert Ferber in the Survey Research Center at the University of Illinois.

Neil was an impactful and popular classroom instructor. He taught Sales Management and Marketing Strategy in the School’s undergraduate, masters, and doctoral programs, and his teaching had a profound impact on many students’ lives and careers. A strong testimony to his impact is the large number of students that kept in touch with him over the years.

In the marketing department, Neil was a cherished colleague and a highly effective department chair. His sense of humor was legendary, and he was always available to offer his colleagues advice and support. He was an enormously positive influence and a great contributor to departmental morale.

Neil retired from the Wisconsin School of Business in 1996, but remained active in his community, among others as a member of the Columbia County Board of Supervisors. He also served on the board of directors of the Wisconsin Council of the Blind and Visually Impaired. In everything he did, Neil was a selfless contributor to the greater good. He touched a lot of people, and he will be deeply missed.

Memorial Resolution Committee:
Jack Nevin
Craig Thompson
Jan Heide
Memorial Resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison
On the Death of Professor Emeritus Louis James Maher, Jr.

Longtime Geoscience Department faculty member and Quaternary palynologist Lou Maher died on August 22, 2018, after a long illness. Lou was born in Iowa City on December 18, 1933, and grew up there, attending University High School from 1948 to 1952. He did his undergraduate studies in geology at the University of Iowa, where he received several awards, including a Danforth Fellowship, and was a member of Phi Beta Kappa. Lou married Elizabeth Jane Crawford in 1956, and they ultimately had 3 children.

After finishing his MS degree at the University of Iowa, Lou was drafted and trained as a clerk in the Counter Intelligence Corps. He and Jane spent much of his military career in La Rochelle, France. He then studied palynology with Professor H.E. Wright, Jr. at the University of Minnesota for his Ph.D.

Lou and Jane moved to the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1962 following a NATO-supported post-doctoral year in Cambridge, England. At UW, Lou began a long career of lecturing in Introductory Geology classes (usually Geology 101) in which he taught thousands of students. This class was the introduction for geology majors, and there are many of our majors who were attracted to the field by Lou’s dynamic lectures. He also regularly taught Quaternary Palynology, his primary field of interest. He was especially intrigued by methods of data analysis and embraced personal computers very early. He purchased one well before many other faculty members took the plunge into using primitive computers.

Lou served on several campus committees, including many in the College of Letters & Science, including the Planning Council. On the campus level, he served on the Library Committee and the Campus Planning Committee. He was President of the Wisconsin Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa in the mid-1970s.

He gave lectures illustrated with breathtaking geologic scenery, and that was an important component of his popular class. Many of these photos he took on a Western U.S flying expedition with grad student Charles Mansfield in 1966. Lou had started flying when he was 15, but didn’t get his pilot’s license until 1964. Lou earned his license in a University of Wisconsin-owned Cessna 170 that had been purchased by the geophysics group to fly aeromagnetism surveys. The story of the western flight in 1966 with some photos can be viewed at: http://geoscience.wisc.edu/~maher/air/gedbl.htm. A map of the route and more photos with explanations are at: http://geoscience.wisc.edu/~maher/air/air00.htm.

Lou was active with many professional societies in Geology, Botany, and Ecology. He was a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the Geological Society of America. He was a member of the American Association of Stratigraphic Palynologists, the American Quaternary Association, the Ecological Society of America, the Paleobotanical Section of the Botanical Society of America; Sigma Xi, and the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters. He was a member of the Editorial Board of Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology from 1985-1991. He served on the Advisory Board of the North American Pollen Database beginning in 1990 and worked on the Global Pollen Database beginning in 1999. He also served on the Board of the International Quaternary Association (INQUA) Holocene Sub-commission Working Group on Data-Handling Methods from 1987 to 2002 and was editor from 1990 to 1997.
Lou is most remembered by Quaternary colleagues for his work on mathematical methods for estimating uncertainty in pollen assemblages, for his generosity in sharing programs he wrote for data analysis through the INQUA file boutique, and for his contributions to the Quaternary history of Colorado, New Mexico, and the Great Lakes region, including his classic study of the Holocene history of Devil’s Lake, Wisconsin. His research often employed innovative and creative approaches, including using *Ephedra* pollen to document long-distance dispersal and analyzing pollen in deposits of bat guano in caves.

Lou served on the building committee for the original Weeks Hall, which was completed in 1974. That committee was responsible for the building design that features a courtyard, trees, and a fountain that Lou continued to maintain until his retirement. He chaired the building committee during the development of Weeks II and Weeks III additions. He had a great ability to pay attention to detail, which was essential for the building committee duties, as it was for interpretation of paleo environments. It was also essential to piloting a small plane most of his adult life without serious mishap! We are fortunate that he recorded the history of Weeks Hall and much of the UW Madison campus from the air: [http://geoscience.wisc.edu/~maher/deptpix/UWpix.htm](http://geoscience.wisc.edu/~maher/deptpix/UWpix.htm)

After his retirement he co-authored *Geology of the Ice Age National Scenic Trail* (2011) with David Mickelson and Susan Simpson. Lou is remembered as a great friend as well as scientist by his colleagues. Even after his retirement in 2003, Lou’s cheerful attention to detail and ready laugh continued to remind us that we are lucky to have known him and worked with him.

**Memorial Committee:**
David Mickelson (Chair)
Sara Hotchkiss
Charles Byers
Memorial Resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison
On the Death of Professor Emeritus M. Crawford Young

Professor Emeritus M. Crawford Young, of the political science department, died on January 21, 2020, in Madison, WI.

He was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on 7 November 1931. He lived there until high school, when his family moved to Washington, DC, where his father was appointed to the Federal Reserve during the Eisenhower administration. His mother, Louise Young, an English professor at American University, had a strong influence on his interest in the study of politics, having written a book on the League of Women Voters and its vital post suffrage role.

He graduated from Woodrow Wilson High School in 1949. After completing his bachelor’s degree at the University of Michigan in 1953, he joined the army for two years, first in the infantry and then as the aide-de-camp of a major general. He then worked for two years with the International Students Association in Paris. There he met and married Rebecca (Becky) Young (1934-2008) on 17 August 1957. After completing his doctorate at Harvard, he joined the political science department at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1963. Young was tenured only three years after being hired at a time when the tenure requirements were not as stringent as they are today. He became chair of the department in 1969, only six years after receiving his doctorate.

Young was also a visiting professor at Makerere University in Kampala, Uganda (1965-66), Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Université Nationale du Zaire, Lubumbashi, (Democratic Republic of Congo, known then as Zaire) from 1973 to 1975 and visiting professor in the Faculty of Law at Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar (Senegal), 1987-88, where he held a Fulbright Fellowship. He was also invited as a fellow at the Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton), (1980-81), and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (1983-84).

At UW-Madison, Professor Young helped get the African Studies Program off the ground after its inception in 1961 and served as its chair from 1964-65 and 1966-68. He chaired the Department of Political Science (1969-72, 1984-87) and served as Associate Dean of the Graduate School (1968-71) and acting dean of the College of Letters & Science (1991-92). Over the years he served on a wide range of committees across campus, chairing the Search and Screen Committee for the Chancellor, which hired Donna Shalala, and chairing the Transportation Demand Management Committee, where his strong advocacy for greater bus use earned him the affectionate appellation from colleagues as “The Pol Pot of Parking.” This amused him to no end.

Beyond UW-Madison, he also served as President of the African Studies Association (1982-83) and won the ASA Distinguished Africanist Award (1990). He was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences 1998 and earned an Honorary Degree from Florida International University that same year.

Crawford Young’s productivity throughout his career and even after retirement was remarkable. He published numerous influential monographs, establishing himself as a leading scholar of African politics and the preeminent scholar of the African state. Crawford Young’s first book, Politics in the Congo (Princeton University Press, 1965), based on his PhD thesis, was a study in federalism in the context of ethnic politics. Ideology and Development in Africa (Yale University Press, 1982), identified three major ideological streams in Africa (Afromarxism, populist socialism and African capitalism) and looked at the different policy consequences of the various ideological preferences. The book was widely adopted by African politics classes until the breakup of the Soviet Union led to a decline in the Afromarxist orientation. His return to Zaire in 1973-75 allowed him to work on his manuscript with a former student, Thomas Turner, The Rise and Decline of the Zairian State, (University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), which became the authoritative study of the Mobutu regime. The Politics of Cultural Pluralism (University of Wisconsin Press, 1976) won the Herskovits Prize (best book in African Studies, African Studies Association, 1977), and was co-winner of the Ralph Bunche Prize (best book in comparative ethnicity
over past five years, of the American Political Science Association, 1979).

Young’s ability to synthesize the work of others, led to two masterful, far reaching volumes, *The African Colonial State in Comparative Perspective* (Yale University Press, 1994) and his tour de force, *The Postcolonial State in Africa* (University of Wisconsin Press, 2012). These volumes established Professor Young as the preeminent scholar of the African state. *The African Colonial State* explores the logic and pathologies of European colonialism in Africa the structural requirements of imperial domination. This book won him the Gregory Luebbert Prize, American Political Science Association 1995. In the second book, *The Postcolonial State in Africa*, Crawford Young provides a breathtakingly comprehensive overview of the fifty years following independence, drawing on the perspectives he obtained while working in Africa and his broad global points of reference. He identified three cycles of hope and disappointment, starting with the euphoria at the time of independence in the 1960s, followed by the emergence of single party autocracies and military rule. The second period was one of state expansion in the 1970s leading to state crisis and state collapse in the 1980s. And finally, there was the third wave of democratization, starting in the 1990s and the proliferation of civil wars. His nuanced magnum opus shows how the African states increasingly diverged from one another over the half century in ways that would have been difficult to predict from the outset of independence. This book won the African Politics Conference Group award as the best book on Africa in 2012. Throughout his career Young also contributed numerous articles to professional journals and anthology chapters arising from many conference volumes.

Professor Young’s oeuvre also includes numerous other books: notable among them is a 695-page history of the Department of Political Science at UW-Madison, *Political Science at the University of Wisconsin-Madison: A Centennial History* (University of Wisconsin Press, 2006) and his last labor of love, a self-published book honoring the pioneering efforts of his late wife as a prominent figure in Wisconsin politics, *Rebecca Young, a Life of Civic Engagement and Progressive Electoral Politics* (2019). She served in the Wisconsin State Assembly from 1985 to 1997. Young was devoted to his wife for their entire life together.

His outstanding reputation as a scholar of African politics naturally drew many PhD students to Madison to study with him. One of his students, Linda Thomas Greenfield, became Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, and had a long and an illustrious career in the foreign service, including holding positions as Director General of the Foreign Service and Ambassador to Liberia. Another PhD student, Steven Morrison, is senior vice president at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and director of its Global Health Policy Center. Young trained an entire generation of prominent Africa scholars, among them Michael Schatzberg, Georges Nzongola-Ntalaja, Catharine Newbury, Ed Keller, Gretchen Bauer, and Timothy Longman.

Professor Young retired from the university in 2001, remaining in Madison and living in a wing of Capitol Lakes, appropriately named “North Hall.” Young is preceded in death by his wife, Becky, and is survived by his daughters, Eva Young, Estelle Young, Emily Young, and Louise Young, who like her father, is a distinguished professor in the Department of History at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

M. Crawford Young’s career was part of the rise of the Wisconsin political science department to national recognition. He will be dearly missed by those who knew him and those who benefited from his lifelong contributions.

Memorial Committee:
Aili Mari Tripp, chair
Scott Straus
Michael Schatzberg
Chancellor Rebecca Blank called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. with 133 voting members present (112 needed for quorum). Memorial resolutions were offered for Professor Emeritus Richard Allen Askey (Faculty Document 2871), Professor Emeritus Glenn Barquest (Faculty Document 2872), Professor Emeritus Edward Fadell (Faculty Document 2873), Professor Emeritus Sufian Husseini (Faculty Document 2874) and Professor Emeritus Richard Walker (Faculty Document 2875). Chancellor Blank provided the latest information about COVID-19 (coronavirus). UW-Madison is monitoring the situation and has suspended university-sponsored study abroad programs in China, South Korea, and Italy. Students from these programs are being advised to return to their home address and self-monitor for 14 days. A number of these programs are offering distance learning options for the rest of the semester. Faculty considering international travel this spring should consult travel advisories via the U.S. State Department and CDC. She encouraged attendees to participate in the 2020 census and reminded attendees about the guidelines for political activity on campus. Chancellor Blank announced that UW-Madison is once again number 1 in Peace Corps volunteers. Spring commencement for bachelors, masters, and law degrees will take place on May 9 featuring author James Patterson, and John Felder, an organizer of the Black Student Strike of 1969. Finally, she shared that Steve Ackerman has been named the new Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education and Derek Kindle has been named the new Vice Provost for Enrollment Management.

University Committee chair Terry Warfield (University Committee, District 120, Business) continued the practice to take a moment to reflect on one sentence of the Our Shared Future plaque at each senate meeting. There were no questions for either the chancellor or the UC chair.

Steve Ackerman, Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education, presented the State of the Research Enterprise, which focused on the annual NSF research expenditure rankings, internal grant programs, WARF resources, and graduate student recruitment.

The minutes of the meeting of February 3, 2020, were approved.

Professor Corinna Burger (Neurology), chair of the Kemper K. Knapp Bequest Committee, presented their annual report (Faculty Document 2876). Associate Dean Karen Wassarman (Bacteriology), presented, for informational purposes, the report on the creation of the Department of Animal and Dairy Sciences and the discontinuation of the Department of Animal Sciences and the Department of Dairy Science (Faculty Document 2877).

Professor Warfield presented the preliminary slates for the elections to Divisional Executive Committees and the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee and announced that the elections will be held in early April (Faculty Document 2878); there is still an opportunity for nominations. There were no questions or comments on any of these reports.

Professor Warfield moved adoption of a resolution creating the academic staff “Professor of
Practice” (Faculty Document 2870). The motion was seconded and there were several comments. The motion passed by voice vote. Professor Warfield presented Faculty Document 2879 for a first reading to create section in 7.18 in Faculty Policies and Procedures titled “Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor”. There were several comments; the senators were encouraged to send other comments to the University Committee to be incorporated into the document as it is brought forward for vote in April. Professor Warfield moved adoption of a resolution calling for emergency and helpline numbers to be added to newly issued faculty/staff Wiscards (Faculty Document 2880). The motion was seconded. The motion passed by voice vote without dissent.

The meeting adjourned at 4:48 pm.

Heather Daniels
Secretary of the Faculty
Dear Provost Scholz,

We are pleased to submit the Annual Report of the UW-Madison Ombuds Office for the Academic Year 2018-19. It has been a busy year as we continue to serve the campus as a confidential, informal, impartial and independent resource for all university employees and graduate students.

The Ombuds Office saw 220 cases in 2018-19. This number was slightly lower than the previous year although it is consistent with the overall rise for the previous 5 years. The percentages for the “Who Was Served?” categories (Faculty, Academic Staff, University Staff, Graduate Students, etc.) are similar to last year. We are intensifying our outreach efforts aimed at University staff since we feel that this group has been underserved.

Our reports are somewhat modified in the way we are reporting “What were the issues.” Most of our visitors indicate concerns with multiple - 2 to 4 - different issues. We now report the number (and percentages) of our visitors who had an issue in the given major categories enumerated by the “Uniform Reporting Categories” from the International Ombudsman Association. The patterns for 2018-19 are generally similar to those from the previous year, although there appears to be a slight increase in the proportion of visitors concerned with “Career Progression and Development.”

About 30% of our visitors reported that Hostile and Intimidating Behavior -HIB- was an issue and this percentage was similar to the previous year. Nearly half of the visitors who reported HIB issues were Academic Staff, which again, was similar to last year and the breakdown by position or “Who Was Served” parallels the breakdown for the total cohort.

The entire Ombuds team looks forward to meeting with you in October for you to get to know us and to discuss this report and the continuing work of the Ombuds Office.

Respectfully submitted, The Ombuds Team

Jean Petersen, Ann Hoyt, Mike Ashmore, Rick Nordheim, Gery Essenmacher

UW Ombuds Office
223-225 Lowell Hall, 610Langdon Street
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53703
Phone: 608/265-9992
email: uwombuds@mailplus.wisc.edu
website: ombuds.wisc.edu
Ombuds Visitors and Issues

Total Cases 220
Total Contacts 246
(includes visitor non-response)

Years Employed Total (%)
> 5 107 (49)
<= 5 80 (36)
Unknown 33 (15)

Primary Topics
more than one topic can be noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIB</td>
<td>67 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>17 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>13 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action/Impact
more than one topic can be noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide information, feedback, and perspective</td>
<td>192 (87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to campus / community resources</td>
<td>121 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with other parties</td>
<td>18 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information only</td>
<td>8 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10 (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who Was Served?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Staff</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (tenured)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty non-tenured</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoc</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Graduate and undergrad students are employees
## What Were the Issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative Relationships</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer and Colleague Relationships</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression and Development</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal, Regulatory, Financial and Compliance</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational, Strategic, and Mission Related</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, Health, and Physical Environment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services/Administrative Issues</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values, Ethics, and Standards</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the distribution of issues among visitors.](chart)
Each of the Uniform Reporting Categories from the International Ombudsman Association has a number of subcategories.

Below are listed some frequently recorded subcategories:

2. Evaluative Relationships  
(subcategories recorded for 20 or more visitors)  
• Respect / Treatment 32  
• Communication 31  
• Assignments / Schedules 24  
• Departmental Climate 23  
• Supervisory Effectiveness 25

3. Peer and Colleague Relationships:  
(subcategories recorded for 20 or more visitors)  
• Respect / Treatment 27  
• Communication 24

4. Career Progression and Development:  
(subcategories recorded for 10 or more visitors)  
• Tenure / Position Security / Ambiguity 13  
• Termination / Non-Renewal 17

Annual Number of Visitors History

![Bar chart showing annual number of visitors history from AY08 to AY19. The chart shows a significant increase in visitors from AY17 onwards, with N/A for AY10.](chart)
For Those Visitors Who Reported HIB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Cases</th>
<th>67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Employed</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>35 (52)</td>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>32 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=5</td>
<td>28 (42)</td>
<td>University Staff</td>
<td>11 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>Faculty (tenured)</td>
<td>7 (10+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty non-tenured</td>
<td>7 (10+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student Employee</td>
<td>7 (10+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Postdoc</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary Topics** --- other than HIB
more than one topic can be noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ombuds Reporting Categories** (based on International Ombudsman Association)
More than one category can be noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer and Colleague Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal, Regulatory, Financial and Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, Health, and Physical Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services/Administrative Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values, Ethics, and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation &amp; Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational, Strategic, and Mission Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd &amp; 3rd Shift Univ. Staff Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Assistance Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning &amp; Talent Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming graduate student fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb Lanser, Disabilities Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New chairs&quot; boot camp&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;S Chairs &amp; Directors orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Grad Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs' &amp; Directors' lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Kovalaske - Fully Prepared to Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Grad Assistant E and D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Grad Assistant E and D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad School Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Faust, Office of Strategic Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Daniels, Secretary Academic Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Gassen, Campus Supervisors Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Sheehan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Mekschun, Med School HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Students Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Golden, SMPH Chief of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imogen Hurley, Office of Post Doc Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Schrimpf, UW Career Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Hubbel, Workforce Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lease, Secretary, University Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Smith, Secretary of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomasin Propson, Campus HR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Maintain and expand Ombud’s service to Campus**
   - Provide high quality consulting to individual employee Visitors (Faculty, Academic Staff, University Staff, postdocs, and graduate students) as a confidential resource to address workplace challenges and to encourage fairness, equity, and a respectful work environment.
   - Continue policy of responding to Visitors’ initial contact within 24 hours.
   - Empower Visitors with strategies for them to address challenges.
   - Use all available means to make ourselves known to those on Campus currently unfamiliar with our office, especially University Staff.
   - Interact with other units on Campus --- e.g. Employee Assistance Office, Diversity Affairs, Compliance, HR, Workforce Relations, Sec Faculty, Sec Acad Staff, Sec University Staff, VCFS --- to ensure that all university employees needing assistance are provided with it.

2. **Plan for outreach to campus / governance leaders, resource partners, and employees**
   - Continue opportunities for conversations with Deans and Chairs, organizations representing Faculty, Academic Staff, and University Staff, and other leaders across campus about Ombuds services and workplace/employment concerns.
   - Participate in professional development opportunities such as UW Employees Benefits Fair; Engagement, Inclusion and Diversity Retreat; and Graduate Assistants' Equity Workshops.
   - Make a concerted effort at outreach towards University Staff--who appear to be underserved.
   - Work with leaders and student advisors in the Graduate School on outreach to students.
   - As appropriate, report on perceived “problem areas” and/or trends on Campus that generate an unusually high Visitor traffic.

3. **Build Ombuds team’s capacity to serve the campus**
   - Continue a recruitment plan for new Ombuds with the goal of bringing in a diverse representation of highly qualified individuals. Also, maintain procedures for orderly transitions of Ombuds appointments for 2020 and beyond.
   - Ensure maintenance of an ongoing database of key characteristics of visitors and their issues, concerns, and proposed actions while ensuring confidentiality of visitors.
   - Participate in select professional activities of Ombuds organizations, including the Academic Ombuds Summer Meeting for 2020 and maintain membership in the International Ombudsman Association.
   - Coordinate meetings with campus leaders and programs, Sec Fac, Sec Acad Staff, Sec University Staff, HR, UW Legal, etc. to help educate and make connections for new and experienced Ombudsman in order to foster collaboration in providing service to all employees.

4. **Monitor issues related to hostile and intimidating behaviors and sexual harassment**
   - Evaluate concerns garnered from employee Visitors, campus contacts, and Ombuds review. (Please note that our role regarding HIB has been far more pronounced since we are not a primary stop for sexual harassment.)
   - Report to the Provost any trends that may be concerning.
   - Continue to participate with VCFS in development of the campus resources and education to address HIB.
Immigration and International Issues Committee  
*(Faculty Policies & Procedures 6.61.)*  
Annual Report, 2018-2019

I. Statement of Committee Functions

The Immigration and International Issues Committee in the University:

1. Provides general advice and recommendations to the administration and all governance bodies on immigration and international student, faculty, and staff issues.
2. Considers how immigration policy impacts UW-Madison students, faculty, and staff and then provides guidance to campus leadership, especially offices working with immigration issues.
3. Considers how international policies impact UW-Madison students, faculty, and staff and then provides guidance to campus leadership, especially offices working with international issues.

The committee’s “Operating Procedures” (18 September 2018) are available upon request from the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty.

Professor Alfonso Morales (DPLA) Chaired the committee and Assistant Professor Jerome Camal (Anthropology) co-chaired the committee in 2018-2019.

Committee members for 2018-19 included:

**Faculty**
- JEROME CAMAL, Co-chair, L&S/ANTHROPOLOGY
- ALEXANDRA HUNEEUS, LAW/; L&S/CTR LAW SOCIETY & JUSTICE
- ALFONSO MORALES, Chair, L&S/PLANNING & LANDSCAPE ARCH

**Academic Staff**
- KRISTIN DALBY, Secretary, L&S/ENGLISH
- WEIJIA LI, EDUC/ELPA; L&S/GERMAN NORDIC & SLAVIC

**University Staff**
- KORY BREUER, VCRGE/WID
- KIM BESTA, CALS/BACTERIOLOGY

**Students**
- TATIANA SHIRASAKI
- JANELLE PEREZ MARTINEZ
- ANA GRECIA

**Ex Officio**
- JASON JONELY, Designee (VP/Dean of the International Div)
II. Activities
The committee is new and in its first year engaged in fact finding and discovery. Due to the broad nature of our charge, we devoted the first year of our mandate to educating the committee and sharing knowledge about the many different issues having to do with international or immigrant status that impact our faculty, staff, students, and our research mission. Thus, we spent time bringing in different actors from around campus specially charged with immigration and international status matters, as well as sharing our own expertise with each other. We learned the broad nature of our charge and how international and immigration issues (III) are among those impacted by national and international political-economy. For instance, in the two years after September 11, 2001, federal regulations regarding the F and J visas were substantially revised and the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) came on-line. Out of these geopolitical concerns, International Student Services (ISS) and International Faculty and Staff Services (IFSS) experienced increased workloads and significant changes in their business processes. The federal government also levied the I-901 fee on these visa holders to support SEVIS, while campus needed to allocate additional funds to support international services. This exemplifies the complex nature of III that the campus faces.

The committee hears concerns about III generally, as they are associated with different schools, colleges, institutes, and divisions as well as different demographic groups. For instance, engineering and laboratory science disciplines share a particular concern with securing visas for interested applicants.

The committee learned of the activities of the previously constituted ad hoc Advisory Council on Immigration and International Student Issues and set forth to establish a broad understanding of III across campus. We learned of the deep and diverse mental health concerns among international students and students without visas as well as their extraordinary interest in attending the UW despite difficulties in achieving their aspirations. We learned of the persistent inability to compete with peer institutions for students, faculty, postdocs, and staff. We also distinguished between legal and administrative understandings of III situations.

In this regard III committee members face a steep learning curve when it comes to understanding the different immigration categories and the various processes international students, faculty, and staff must engage. The committee was particularly thankful to members Jason Jonely and Katie Tollefson who briefed members on distinct aspects of immigration and acted as “institutional memory” on these matters.

Ongoing Parallel Processes
The committee acknowledges the related work being conducted by two committees, a Chancellor constituted ad hoc committee on visas and the AVP Working Group on Faculty of Color. The III
committee discussed how the nature of such overlaps varies by the definition of “Faculty of Color” and the approach that the Division of Diversity, Equity, and Educational Achievement takes to immigration and international issues. Additionally, and of more salience, the committee learned of the Chancellor’s interest in visas and anticipates learning more from the Chancellor’s ad hoc committee on visas that will be constituted in the Summer of 2019.

**Research Findings**

Committee members brought substantial experience with III concerns from many parts of campus and in these peer-peer discussions among members we came to a better understanding of the scope and scale of the III charge. We also solicited presentations by ex officio and other members of the UW. We collected resources from campus and community and researched other institutions’ efforts in the area of III.

Highlights of data collected:

- **Gerry Pelanek, Internal Consultant from the Office of Strategic Consulting,** reported on on-going work on the visa support processes that visa holders (students, visiting scholars, faculty and staff) go through. The goal is to benchmark our services with peer institutions in order to identify service gaps. The Office of Strategic Consulting has been involved in two phases of a project related to providing support to those who come to UW-Madison from abroad (as students, faculty, staff, interns, and visiting scholars). Initially, they provided a report on the current state of affairs on campus (which offices serve which constituencies, etc.) as well as a benchmarking study of Big Ten peers. They were then asked to facilitate a work group tasked with making recommendations on appropriate organizational structure for international services office(s) to better serve the campus.

- **Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Task force on mental health issues:**
  
  
  [https://studentaffairs.wisc.edu/updates/mental-health-task-force-report/](https://studentaffairs.wisc.edu/updates/mental-health-task-force-report/)

- **Dr. Theresa Duello (SMPH) presented to the committee on her efforts at equalizing tuition expenses for DACA students.** Her professional interest follows from her work directing the UW’s participation in the Consortium on the Inclusion and Care of the Underrepresented in Clinical Research, a nine-institution consortium which addresses culturally responsive curricula, community outreach tools and strategies for addressing health disparities in clinical research, and recruitment/retention strategies for the underrepresented populations in clinical research.
  
  o We were reminded that data on DACA employees / students is not collected.

- **International students pay extra fees/charges.**
  
  o **International Student Fee:** F and J visa holders whose Visa Permit Issuing Authority is listed as “University of Wisconsin-Madison” in SIS are charged $100 per semester of enrollment, including Summer. The International Student Fee is the sole source of funding for ISS personnel, services, programs, and events. Exchange students are exempt from the fee due to articulation agreements; exchange offices do not supplement the cost of the fee to ISS. International services offices at UW System institutions may not be financial supported through the collection of segregated fees per current Board of Regents policy.
o **Tuition Differential**: All non-resident students pay higher tuition rates, which “will fund critical new faculty and staff positions, as well as provide funds for high quality programs and experiences for students,” (Blank’s Slate, https://chancellor.wisc.edu/blog/our-tuition-proposals-to-the-board-of-regents/). While all students with an F-1 or J-1 visa pay non-resident tuition, those at the undergraduate and special level pay an additional $500 per Fall and Spring term, and $250 for Summer term.

o At times, there has been confusion on campus that the university charges (or wanted to charge) a SEVIS fee. While F-1 and J-1 visa holders do pay the I-901 fee directly to the US federal government to support SEVIS, there is no SEVIS fee charged by campus.

- Char Horsfall (staff in Chemistry) explained difficulties in hiring top post-doctoral job candidates following from not being able to employ individuals on the OPT-Stem extension (for F-1 visa holders). Students, faculty, and staff of various visa statuses face many and distinct concerns with joining and participating in campus life.

It is in this diverse context that the committee took up its charge.

**III. Recommendations**

As a result of III discussions we make the following recommendation:

We recommend that the University pursues recognition from USCIS as an “American Institution of Research” to enable any naturalization applicants to work and conduct research outside the United States for extended periods of time, (unanimous April 18, 2019).

**IV. Agenda for 2019-20**

The committee anticipates selecting, researching, and making recommendations on III concerns in the 2019-20 academic year.

The committee will seek a presentation from the Office of Strategic Consulting) for a follow up on the visa support process and on the Chancellor’s *ad hoc* committee on visas.

In conclusion, the committee Chair and Co-Chair commend Jason Jonely and Katie Tollefson for their efforts educating the committee and Kristin Dalby in her service as committee admin.
Information Technology Committee Annual Report for 2018-2019

I. Structure and function.
The Information Technology Committee is the faculty advisory body for policy and planning for information technology throughout the university. The committee reviews and makes recommendations on strategic planning for the university's information technology resources; reviews the performance of information technology facilities and services in supporting and assisting scholarly activities; receives reports from and provides general direction to committees formed to address specific information technology issues; monitors technical developments; consults with and advises appropriate administrative officers on budget and resource allocation matters including charges and funding sources for information technology services; receives recommendations from departments, deans, and the Division of Information Technology regarding the establishment, abolition or merger of information technology services and facilities supported by university funds, and makes recommendations regarding these actions to the appropriate administrative officers.

II. Activities.
The ITC naturally continues to approve policies, including, for example, an IT Assets Inventory Management Policy, and we continue to receive and discuss reports, such as on the “Next Generation Network” project. We are also responding to pressing new concerns, like the new and still-provisional “Policy for Recording Online Collaboration”. Beyond that kind of routine activity, much of our effort over the last year has been focused on establishing optimal processes to ensure the fullest ITC input in shaping IT policies and planning rather than simply approving policies and plans (or not) after they have been developed. The fundamental idea is that the ITC needs to monitor and weigh in on policies and plans as they begin to emerge and are developed and that this can shape the most effective IT on campus. This report brief report illustrates that work.

1. We have now established, approved as a change to Faculty Policies & Procedures 6.42 on February 4, 2019, a rotation where the most recent past chair stays on for a year to work with the current chair and the next year’s incoming chair joins them in a three-person leadership team. The ITC sees this as a stable and sustainable way to manage ITC leadership into the future. C. Shawn Green (Psychology) is incoming chair and will be followed by Catherine Arnott Smith (iSchool).

2. Much basic IT policy is initially developed by the Policy Planning and Analysis Team, known as PAT, and then brought to the full ITC. The PAT is formally a subcommittee of the ITC and includes representation from the ITC, the CIO’s office and both central and distributed IT from across campus. This year, we have overhauled the PAT’s Charter and its Vision statement. In addition to that, the PAT has established a year-long work flow, so that ITC members are aware of what issues will be coming and when. This allows ITC members to ask questions well before something comes to the committee formally.

3. We are pursuing new kinds of cooperation and collaboration with the CIO’s office. Lois Brooks, CIO, is setting up initiatives led by working groups on a range of issues and ITC
members are part of those working groups and reporting back to the ITC. These include the Administrative Transformation Program (ATP) and an effort to address dramatic cost increases coming for Box.

4. For some other issues, we have discussed and approved proposals to develop policy in order to have the earliest possible input. We did this, for example, for an IT Credentials Policy, which is now being drafted and will eventually come to the ITC for approval.

5. A key part of IT on campus is the TAGs (Technology Advisory Groups) with broad representation but faculty chairs. With a recent re-organization, there are only two TAGs, one for Research and one for Teaching & Learning. We have revived an earlier tradition of regular meetings of the ITC chairs group with TAG chairs, along with the Chief Technology Officer. This is aimed at ensuring clear lines of communication about IT issues generally and avoiding repetition of effort.

III. Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Curtin</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Shawn Green</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Newton</td>
<td>Biostat &amp; Med</td>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Rosenberg</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Salmons, Chair</td>
<td>Language Sciences</td>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine A. Smith</td>
<td>iSchool</td>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar Spalding</td>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rand Valentine</td>
<td>Language Sciences</td>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun Zhu</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Zinn</td>
<td>Mechanical Engr</td>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Harris</td>
<td>Acad Affairs</td>
<td>academic staff</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Hoonakker</td>
<td>CQPI</td>
<td>academic staff</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Nguyen</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>academic staff</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Fisher</td>
<td>Theater &amp; Drama</td>
<td>university staff</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Hubing</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>university staff</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesha Weber</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>university staff</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrin Bechtel</td>
<td>Engr Physics</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan Simonen</td>
<td></td>
<td>student</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Gomez</td>
<td></td>
<td>admin</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Brooks</td>
<td></td>
<td>ex officio</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Cramer</td>
<td></td>
<td>ex officio</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Huhn</td>
<td></td>
<td>ex officio</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Konrad</td>
<td></td>
<td>ex officio</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Change to *Faculty Policies and Procedures*: the Addition of a New Section, 7.18, Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

The promotion of a faculty member from associate professor to full professor is a significant milestone in one’s academic career, and is a sign that the person who holds this status is recognized by their peers as having achieved national and international recognition for excellence in the scholar’s field. Unlike promotion from assistant professor to associate professor with tenure, the process for promotion to full varies – sometimes widely – from school to school, and from department to department. While some variation is entirely understandable, the lack of clear and consistent processes across the university – or even within schools and colleges – causes confusion among associate professors, and raises questions as to the “standard” for achieving the rank of full professor.

On October 17, 2016, Michael Bernard-Donals, Vice Provost for Faculty and Staff, and Steve Smith, Secretary of the Faculty, issued a memo providing guidance to deans and chairs on promotion to full program. In July 2019, an Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion to Full Professor was created and charged by the University Committee to recommend changes to *Faculty Policies and Procedures* addressing promotion to full professor that address both faculty and administration (dean) concerns and needs. The committee consisted of Michael Bernard-Donals; Paul Campagnola, Professor, Department of Biomedical Engineering; Jane Collins, Professor, Department of Community and Environmental Sociology, and Steve Smith. The committee recommends adding a new section in Chapter 7 of FPP titled “Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor.”

On March 2, 2020, an earlier draft of this document was presented for a first reading at the Faculty Senate. The current version incorporates suggestions received by the University Committee.

**New Section:**

7.18. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF FULL PROFESSOR

A. GUIDANCE

Promotion from the rank of associate professor to that of full professor should be guided by a clear, written policy on the criteria and process for promotion within each college. While the policy should not establish absolute metrics of scholarship, it should define types of scholarly work (research, teaching, and service/outreach) that are expected for promotion. Copies of these policies should be sent to the appropriate dean’s office, the Office of the Provost, and the secretary of the faculty.

All departmental Executive Committees shall establish procedures for promotion to full professor (see 7.18.B. below). The articulated standards in each department should be consistent with the criteria for excellence held by peer institutions and with disciplinary conventions. In general, promotion should be based on the record of scholarly work, and should not be taken for
reasons of salary, status, retention, or perceived inequity. Promotion is not acquired solely because of the number of years of service.

B. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

1. Promotion to the rank of full professor is granted following an affirmative recommendation of a subset of the departmental Executive Committee, consisting of the full professors on the Executive Committee (hereafter referred to as the “Council of Full Professors”), to that effect. In lieu of a Council of Full Professors, departments may instead use or create a smaller subset of the Executive Committee to vote on promotion cases, so long as that sub-committee is comprised of tenured full professors.

A minimum of three full professors is required for a Council of Full Professors in any department. Any department that does not have at least three full professors must appoint, by a vote of its Executive Committee, a full professor (or full professors) to bring the complement of full professors on the Council to three. The appointed full professor (or professors) will serve until there are enough full professors in the department to bring the number in the Council to three or more.

2. In applying its professional judgment to the decision of whether to recommend promotion, the Council of Full Professors has the obligation to exercise its discretion in the interest of improving the academic and professional quality of the department; departmental executive committees may not decline to recommend promotion for any reasons which are legally impermissible or which violate principles of academic freedom. The basic standard for review shall be whether the faculty member under review has met criteria consistent with the rank of full professor as established in its guidelines (see B.3 below). Special care should be taken to ensure that the scholarly productivity of jointly appointed and interdisciplinary faculty is appropriately evaluated.

3. Each departmental executive committee shall establish written criteria and standards it will employ in recommending promotion. These criteria and standards shall assure that promotion is based on evidence of (1) teaching excellence; (2) a record of professional creativity, such as research or other accomplishments appropriate to the discipline; and (3) service to the university, to the faculty member’s profession, or professional service to the public appropriate to the rank of full professor. These criteria and standards shall be consistent with, and indeed may be a subset of, those established under section 7.17.B. of these policies (“Post-Tenure Review: Criteria”).

4. A copy of the criteria and standards described in the preceding paragraph shall be furnished to all persons hired into the rank of associate professor and to all newly tenured faculty members, in accordance with FPP 5.21.D.1, and shall be filed with the appropriate dean(s), the vice chancellor for academic affairs and provost, and the secretary of the faculty. A copy of the departmental criteria along with a statement showing how they were applied to the candidate shall be forwarded with a departmental recommendation for promotion.
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5. Notwithstanding the responsibility of departmental Executive Committees to provide for the guidance and mentoring of all faculty members, it is the faculty member’s responsibility to meet the criteria for promotion as determined by the department.

6. These criteria and standards shall be periodically reviewed by the executive committee of each department and the relevant school or college APC(s).

C. PROCEDURES

1. Each year, all tenured faculty will be evaluated by their Executive Committees (or a subcommittee thereof) in order to be considered for merit pay, equity, awards, mentoring, and to be considered for promotion in rank.

2. If an associate professor being considered for promotion has a joint appointment, the department designated as the primary sponsor of tenure will take the primary role in the evaluation process. The other department(s) should vote to approve following the action of the lead department or otherwise follow the process outlined in the faculty member’s appointment letter.

3. Department chairs should ensure that the Executive Committee discuss the timing of consideration for promotion to full professor for each associate professor no later than the occasion of their first post-tenure review (performed in the fifth year) under section 7.17. of these rules. Once the chair has determined, with the advice of the Executive Committee, that an associate professor should be considered for promotion, the chair should notify them that this is the case and provide them with the guidance they need to prepare their dossiers; the contents of the dossier should be established by the departmental Executive Committee.

4. An associate professor can ask to be considered for promotion to full professor at any time. The request for consideration for promotion should be followed by a conversation between the chair and the associate professor about the criteria for promotion, the associate professor’s record of achievement since promotion to associate professor, and the relative strengths of the case in the context of the department’s criteria for promotion. Should there be a disagreement between the chair and the associate professor about the appropriateness of undergoing a promotion review, the Executive Committee should make the ultimate decision.

Should the chair or the Executive Committee decide that the associate professor should not move forward to be promoted, and the associate professor disagrees because they believe they have been treated unfairly or because their due process rights have been violated, the associate professor may file a complaint with the University Committee under FPP 8.15.

5. Once the chair, in consultation with the Executive Committee, decides that it is appropriate to move forward with consideration for promotion, the chair will appoint a small subcommittee of
full professors – ideally from a scholarly area in or adjacent to the associate professor’s – to solicit outside letters, evaluate the research or creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach work, and to make a recommendation to the council of full professors. (In the event that the faculty member is working across disciplinary areas, or in hybrid fields, it may be worth considering the inclusion of a faculty member from outside the department in the subcommittee.)

6. The associate professor will provide this subcommittee with a dossier of their work, including all publications, grant proposals, and other scholarship; evaluations of teaching from students and peers; and evidence of service (both at UW-Madison and to the profession more broadly), outreach, governance, and administrative work.

7. At least three outside letters of evaluation are required as part of the process of evaluating the scholarly work (in research or creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach) of associate professors being considered for promotion. The Executive Committee should determine whether and if so, how many letters beyond three will be required for the promotion of full professors, whether the letters will be confidential, and how the referees will be selected. In doing so, the Executive Committee should balance departmental culture, disciplinary norms, best practice, and peer institutions’ practices. Solicited letters should be written by faculty members within or adjacent to the scholarly area of the person being considered for promotion. In the event that the faculty member being considered for promotion is working across disciplinary areas, or in hybrid fields, letters may be solicited from faculty member from disciplines or departments other than the one in which the promotion candidate resides.

Faculty members who were promoted to associate professor with tenure between 1 July 2016 and {insert date this chapter goes into effect}, and whose departments did not previously require outside letters prior to the adoption of this chapter, may opt to prepare their cases without outside letters. All other associate professors must include outside letters in their promotion dossiers.

8. The subcommittee will prepare a written evaluation of the associate professor’s work across all areas of scholarship (research and creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach), and submit it for consideration to the Council of Full Professors so that the report – along with a selection of the work, the outside letters of evaluation, and the record of teaching and service/outreach – can be read before a vote is taken.

9. The Council of Full Professors will meet to discuss and vote on the advancement of associate professors to the rank of full professor. After reading the report of the subcommittee and evaluating the associate professor’s work and the outside letters, the Council of Full Professors will vote on whether or not to promote. The vote should then be based on the record of scholarly work, and should not be taken for reasons of salary, status, or perceived inequity. The department’s policy should specify whether a 2/3 or simple majority is required for a positive vote, and should specify whether it is a majority of all full professors or of those full professors present.

______________________________
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10. Once the vote has been taken, the faculty member shall be notified of the decision by the department chair in writing within five business days of the decision. If the decision is negative, this notification shall include the reasons for that decision.

11. If the vote is positive, the chair shall write a letter recommending promotion to the dean of the appropriate college or school. The dean will then follow the process for approval or denial of promotion recommendations as outlined by school/college policies and procedures.

12. In the event of a negative vote that the faculty member chooses not to appeal (see section D), the chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss how to create a stronger case for promotion at some later date.

D. DUE PROCESS, RECONSIDERATIONS AND APPEALS

1. If the faculty member disagrees with a negative decision, they have ten business days from the date of the written decision to request a reconsideration of the decision in writing to the department chair. The department’s Council of Full Professors has twenty days from the date of the faculty member’s request to re-consider its decision.

2. Once the vote on reconsideration has been taken, the faculty member shall be notified by the chair in writing of the reconsideration decision within five days of the decision. If the decision is negative, the faculty member may appeal to the office of the dean. The dean’s office will have fifteen days, from the date of the appeal, to consider the faculty member’s appeal and render a decision. In cases of a negative decision that is upheld by the dean, that decision may be appealed to CFRR (see 4 below).

3. Should a departmental decision on promotion be positive, and that decision is reversed by the office of the dean, the faculty member will be notified in writing of the dean’s decision within five days of that decision, and the reasons for that decision. The faculty member may appeal the dean’s decision (see 4 below).

4. In the event of a negative decision at the departmental level or by the office of the dean, the faculty member will have twenty days from the date of the dean’s decision to appeal that decision to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (CFRR). The CFRR will decide on the validity of the appeal of the faculty member – basing its assessment on whether or not the decision on promotion was based on impermissible factors (see UWS 3.08[1][a], [b], and [c]) -- and will make its report to the faculty member, the department chair and the department’s Council of Full Professors, the appropriate dean, and the provost.

If CFRR finds that a decision in 7.18.D.2 or 7.18.D.3 (that is, at the departmental or decanal level) was based on impermissible factors, it will ask the provost, in consultation with the DCRC (see FPP 7.17.C.7) to make the final decision on promotion. That decision will be rendered within 30 days of the date of the CFRR report. The provost’s decision will be final.

5. A negative decision on promotion does not preclude consideration in subsequent years.
This redline version shows the changes that were made from the version presented at the March Senate meeting on March 2, 2020 and the current version, which will be presented at the April Senate meeting on April 20, 2020. The entire section 7.18 Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor is proposed as an addition to Faculty Policies and Procedures.

7.18. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF FULL PROFESSOR

A. GUIDANCE

Promotion from the rank of associate professor to that of full professor should be guided by a clear, written policy on the criteria and process for promotion within each college. While the policy should not establish absolute metrics of scholarship, it should define types of scholarly work (research, teaching, and service/outreach) that are expected for promotion. Each dean’s office should decide if these policies will be created solely at the departmental level or if there will be a school/college policy that covers all departments. Copies of these policies should be sent to the appropriate dean’s office, the Office of the Provost, and the secretary of the faculty.

All departmental Executive Committees shall establish procedures for promotion to full professor (see 7.18.B. below). The articulated standards in each department should be consistent with the guidance provided by the dean and the College. They should also be consistent with the criteria for excellence held by peer institutions and with disciplinary conventions. In general, promotion should be based on the record of scholarly work, and should not be taken for reasons of salary, status, retention, or perceived inequity. Promotion is not acquired solely because of the number of years of service.

B. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

1. Promotion to the rank of full professor is granted only following an affirmative recommendation of a subset of the departmental Executive Committee, consisting of the full professors on the Executive Committee (hereafter referred to as the “Council of Full Professors”), to that effect. In lieu of a Council of Full Professors, departments may instead use or create a smaller subset of the Executive Committee to vote on promotion cases, so long as that subcommittee is comprised of tenured full professors. Promotion is not acquired solely because of the number of years of service.

A minimum of three full professors is required for a Council of Full Professors in any department. Any department that does not have at least three full professors must appoint, by a vote of its Executive Committee, a full professor (or full professors) to bring the complement of full professors on the Council to three. The appointed full professor (or professors) will serve until there are enough full professors in the department to bring the number in the Council to three or more.
2. In applying its professional judgment to the decision of whether to recommend promotion, the Council of Full Professors has the obligation to exercise its discretion in the interest of improving the academic and professional quality of the department; departmental executive committees may not decline to recommend promotion for any reasons which are legally impermissible or which violate principles of academic freedom. The basic standard for review shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member’s position rank of full professor as established in its guidelines (see B.3 below). Special care should be taken to ensure that the scholarly productivity of jointly appointed and interdisciplinary faculty is appropriately evaluated.

3. Each departmental executive committee shall establish written criteria and standards it will employ in recommending promotion. These criteria and standards shall assure that promotion is based on evidence of (1) teaching excellence; (2) a record of professional creativity, such as research or other accomplishments appropriate to the discipline; and (3) service to the university, to the faculty member’s profession, or professional service to the public appropriate to the rank of full professor. These criteria and standards shall be consistent with, and indeed may be a subset of, those established under section 7.17.B. of these policies (“Post-Tenure Review: Criteria”).

4. A copy of the criteria and standards described in the preceding paragraph shall be furnished to all persons hired into the rank of associate professor and to all newly tenured faculty members, in accordance with FPP 5.21.D.1, and shall be filed with the appropriate dean(s), the vice chancellor for academic affairs and provost, and the secretary of the faculty. A copy of the departmental criteria along with a statement showing how they were applied to the candidate shall be forwarded with a departmental recommendation for promotion.

5. Notwithstanding the responsibility of departmental Executive Committees to provide for the guidance and mentoring of all faculty members, it is the faculty member’s responsibility to meet the criteria for promotion as determined by the department.

6. These criteria and standards shall be periodically reviewed by the executive committee of each department and the relevant school or college APC(s).

C. PROCEDURES

1. Each year, the department chair, in consultation with the Council of Full Professors) should evaluate ALL tenured associate professors’ research or creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach work. This purpose of this review is to consider, among other things, whether there are faculty members who should be nominated for awards, determine whether any faculty members need mentoring or guidance, and to decide which faculty members should be considered for promotion to full professor. Each year, all tenured faculty will be evaluated by their Executive Committees (or a subcommittee thereof) in order to be considered for merit pay, equity, awards, mentoring, and to be considered for promotion in rank. Each year, all tenured
faculty will be evaluated by their Executive Committees (or a subcommittee thereof) in order to be considered for merit pay, equity, awards, mentoring, and to be considered for promotion in rank.

2. If an associate professor being considered for promotion has a joint appointment, the department designated as the primary sponsor of tenure will take the primary role in the evaluation process. The other department(s) should vote to approve following the action of the lead department or otherwise follow the process outlined in the faculty member’s appointment letter.

3. Department chairs should ensure that the Council of Full Professors Executive Committee discuss the timing of consideration for promotion to full professor for each associate professor no later than the occasion of their first post-tenure review (performed in the fifth year) under section 7.17 of these rules. Once the Council of Full Professors decides chair has determined, with the advice of the Executive Committee, that an associate professor should be considered for promotion, the chair should notify them that this is the case and provide them with the guidance they need to prepare their dossiers; the contents of the dossier should be established by the departmental Executive Committee.

4. An associate professor can ask their chair to be considered for promotion to full professor at any time. The request for consideration for promotion should be followed by a conversation between the chair and the associate professor about the criteria for promotion, the associate professor’s record of achievement since promotion to associate professor, and the relative strengths of the case in the context of the department’s criteria for promotion. Should there be a disagreement between the chair and the associate professor about the appropriateness of undergoing a promotion review, the Council of Full Professors Executive Committee should make the ultimate decision.

Should the chair or the Council of Full Professors Executive Committee decide that the associate professor should not move forward to be promoted, and the associate professor disagrees, because they believe they have been treated unfairly or because their due process rights have been violated, the associate professor may file a complaint with the University Committee under FPP 8.15.

5. Once the Council of Full Professors chair, in consultation with the Executive Committee, decides that it is appropriate to move forward with consideration for promotion, the chair will appoint a small subcommittee of full professors – ideally from a scholarly area in or adjacent to the associate professor’s – to solicit outside letters, evaluate the research or creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach work, and to make a recommendation to the council of full professors. (In the event that the faculty member is working across disciplinary areas, or in hybrid fields, it may be worth considering the inclusion of a faculty member from outside the department in the subcommittee.)
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6. The associate professor will provide this subcommittee with a dossier of their work, including all publications, grant proposals, and other scholarship; evaluations of teaching from students and peers; and evidence of service (both at UW-Madison and to the profession more broadly), outreach, governance, and administrative work.

7. At least three Outside letters of evaluation are required as part of the process of evaluating the scholarly work (in research or creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach) of associate professors being considered for promotion. The full professors Executive Committee should determine whether and if so, how many letters beyond three will be required for the promotion of full professors, which letter will be confidential, and how the referees will be selected. In doing so, the full professors Executive Committee should balance departmental culture, disciplinary norms, best practice, and peer institutions’ practices. Solicited letters should ideally be solicited from department members or faculty members(s) within or adjacent to the scholarly area of the person being considered for promotion. In the event that the faculty member being considered for promotion is working across disciplinary areas, or in hybrid fields, suggestions for letters may be solicited from a faculty member from disciplines or departments other than the one in which the promotion candidate resides outside the department.

Faculty members who were promoted to associate professor with tenure between 1 July 2016 and {insert date this chapter goes into effect}, and whose departments did not previously require outside letters prior to the adoption of this chapter, may opt to prepare their cases without outside letters. All other associate professors must include outside letters in their promotion dossiers.

8. The subcommittee will prepare a written evaluation of the associate professor’s work across all areas of scholarship (research and creative activity, teaching, and service/outreach), and submit it for consideration to the Council of Full Professors so that the report – along with a selection of the work, the outside letters of evaluation, and the record of teaching and service/outreach – can be read before a vote is taken.

9. The Council of Full Professors will meet to discuss and vote on the advancement of associate professors to the rank of full professor. After reading the report of the subcommittee and evaluating the associate professor’s work and the outside letters, the Council of Full Professors will vote on whether or not to promote. The vote should then be based on the record of scholarly work, and should not be taken for reasons of salary, status, or perceived inequity. The department’s policy should specify whether a 2/3 or simple majority is required for a positive vote, and should specify whether it is a majority of all full professors or of those full professors present.

10. Once the vote has been taken, the faculty member shall be notified of the decision by the department chair in writing within five business days of the decision. If the decision is negative, this notification shall include the reasons for that decision.
11. If the vote is positive, the chair shall write a letter recommending promotion to the dean of the appropriate college or school. The dean will then follow the process for approval or denial of promotion recommendations as outlined by school/college policies and procedures.

12. In the event of a negative vote that the faculty member chooses not to appeal (see section D), the chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss how to create a stronger case for promotion at some later date.

D. DUE PROCESS, RECONSIDERATIONS AND APPEALS

1. If the faculty member disagrees with a negative decision, they have ten business days from the date of the written decision to request a reconsideration of the decision in writing to the department chair. The department’s Council of Full Professors has twenty days from the date of the faculty member’s request to re-consider its decision.

2. Once the vote on reconsideration has been taken, the faculty member shall be notified by the chair in writing of the reconsideration decision within five days of the decision. If the decision is negative, the faculty member may appeal to the office of the dean. The dean’s office will have fifteen days, from the date of the appeal, to consider the faculty member’s appeal and render a decision. In cases of a negative decision that is upheld by the dean, that decision may be appealed to CFRR (see 4 below).

3. Should a departmental decision on promotion be positive, and that decision is reversed by the office of the dean, the faculty member will be notified in writing of the dean’s decision within five days of that decision, and the reasons for that decision. The faculty member may appeal the dean’s decision (see 4 below).

4. In the event of a negative decision at the departmental level or by the office of the dean, the faculty member will have twenty days from the date of the dean’s decision to appeal that decision to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (CFRR). The CFRR will decide on the validity of the appeal of the faculty member – basing its assessment on whether or not the decision on promotion was based on impermissible factors (see UWS 3.08[1][a], [b], and [c]) -- and will make its report to the faculty member, the department chair and the department’s Council of Full Professors, the appropriate dean, and the provost.

If CFRR finds that a decision in 7.18.D.2 or 7.18.D.3 (that is, at the departmental or decanal level) was based on impermissible factors, it will ask the provost, in consultation with the DCRC (see FPP 7.17.C.7) to make the final decision on promotion. That decision will be rendered within 30 days of the date of the CFRR report. The provost’s decision will be final.

5. A negative decision on promotion does not preclude consideration in subsequent years.
Proposal to change Faculty Legislation II-105, Summary Period for Academic Semester: Adjust the Deadline to Submit Grades to 72 Hours After the Final Exam Day

Current UW-Madison policy (Faculty Legislation II-105) is that grades must be submitted within 144 hours of the assigned final exam block. Until recently, current practice has interpreted this as 144 hours from the last final exam. This lengthy grade submission period delays the processing of grades and end-of-semester academic standing actions and associated appeals, Dean’s List, and satisfactory academic progress calculations for federal student financial aid reporting and eligibility. These delays compress the timeframe advisors and academic dean’s offices have to assist students in making informed decisions about academic standing appeals, future course enrollment, course preparedness and requisites, and degree clearance status. It also delays a student’s ability to request a transcript with final grades following a term and many such requests are necessary not only for degree clearance, but also for tuition reimbursement, internships, field experiences, and scholarship, veteran’s benefits and financial assistance eligibility. The processing time between semesters is a significant concern for students, advisors and academic dean’s offices. The University Committee asks that the Faculty Senate adopt the recommendation that the deadline to summit grades be adjusted to 72 hours after the last final exam day. If needed, faculty and instructors with final exams on the last three days of the exam block may file for an extension of 72 additional hours to submit grades.

With mark-up

Faculty Legislation
II 105: SUMMARY PERIOD FOR ACADEMIC SEMESTER
1. The academic semester consists of a regularly scheduled instructional period, and no more than a 7-day summary period. The first day of the summary period is for individual study and review, and no classes or exams are to be scheduled then. The other days are prescheduled to include one two hour summary block for each course of two or more credits. This two hour block shall be used for an examination or for other instructional activities as deemed appropriate by the instructor and as approved by the instructional unit offering the course. Final examinations or other summary period activities cannot be scheduled during the two weeks preceding the summary period. Take home final examinations are due at the scheduled two hour block.

2. The summary period block schedule must be published and must be adhered to by all faculty in accordance with faculty legislation requirements. The Office of the Registrar is authorized to prepare the summary period block schedule without submitting it to the faculty for approval, except that any college or school may prepare its own summary block schedule.

3. The time of a two hour block for a class and/or the due date for the take home examination may be changed only with the prior approval of the dean. Where a student has more than two summary blocks scheduled within a period of 24 hours, the instructor may, within guidelines adopted by the college or school faculty, reschedule a final exam to avoid hardship. Rescheduled summary blocks shall be of the same general nature and quality as the activities of the regular two hour summary block.

(continued)
4. Special hours within the prescribed summary period shall be assigned by the Office of the Registrar, in consultation with the dean, for combined summary periods in multiple section courses that have no common meeting hour.

5. Undergraduate seminar courses, independent study, and directed study courses are exempted from the above rules. Also, the rules apply only to courses numbered 699 or below.

6. Course All course grades must be completed by each instructor and submitted to the Office of the Registrar within six calendar days (144 hours) from the date and hour of the two hour block scheduled during the summary period. three days (72 hours) after the last final exam day, regardless of whether or not a two-hour summary block exam was held.

   If needed, classes where the exam is scheduled for the last three exam days, the instructor may file for an extension of an additional 72 hours.

Without mark-up

Faculty Legislation
II 105: SUMMARY PERIOD FOR ACADEMIC SEMESTER

1. The academic semester consists of a regularly scheduled instructional period, and no more than a 7-day summary period. The first day of the summary period is for individual study and review, and no classes or exams are to be scheduled then. The other days are prescheduled to include one two hour summary block for each course of two or more credits. This two hour block shall be used for an examination or for other instructional activities as deemed appropriate by the instructor and as approved by the instructional unit offering the course. Final examinations or other summary period activities cannot be scheduled during the two weeks preceding the summary period. Take home final examinations are due at the scheduled two hour block.

2. The summary period block schedule must be published and must be adhered to by all faculty in accordance with faculty legislation requirements. The Office of the Registrar is authorized to prepare the summary period block schedule without submitting it to the faculty for approval, except that any college or school may prepare its own summary block schedule.

3. The time of a two hour block for a class and/or the due date for the take home examination may be changed only with the prior approval of the dean. Where a student has more than two summary blocks scheduled within a period of 24 hours, the instructor may, within guidelines adopted by the college or school faculty, reschedule a final exam to avoid hardship. Rescheduled summary blocks shall be of the same general nature and quality as the activities of the regular two hour summary block.

4. Special hours within the prescribed summary period shall be assigned by the Office of the Registrar, in consultation with the dean, for combined summary periods in multiple section courses that have no common meeting hour.

5. Undergraduate seminar courses, independent study, and directed study courses are exempted from the above rules. Also, the rules apply only to courses numbered 699 or below.
6. All course grades must be completed by each instructor and submitted to the Office of the Registrar three days (72 hours) after the last final exam day, regardless of whether or not a two-hour summary block exam was held.

If needed, classes where the exam is scheduled for the last three exam days, the instructor may file for an extension of an additional 72 hours.