



**Minutes:** September 28, 2022 (12:30-1:45)

Meeting called to order at 12:30 p.m.

**Present In Person:** Ciera Edwards, Tatiana Fadeeva, Michael Gorman, Christine Hoover, Brenda Johansen, Becky Jones, Becky Mueller, Rick Pues, Huckleberry Rahr, David Reinhart, Terry Tumbarello, Jessica Walz, Abbie Windsor

**Present Virtually:** Brian Schanen, JP Villavicencio (partial)

**Absent:** Jessica Berge, Nina Denis, Nicholas French, JP Villavicencio (partial)

**Previous Meeting Minutes:** Huckleberry Rahr moved and Mike Gorman seconded to approve the minutes from the 9/14/22. A friendly amendment was made to correct the version of the Faculty Senate Liaison Report included as an appendix. No objections were made to consent and the motion was carried.

Christine welcomes Kristin Plessel (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs) to the meeting to provide some clarification around questions on the instructional academic staff promotions resolution.

Christine begins by noting that this resolution was drafted by a working task force over the summer, composed of Mike Gorman, Jessica Walz, David Reinhart, Kristin Plessel, Christine Hoover, HR representatives, a department chair, and a dean. This ensured that stakeholders were a part of this working group. At the end of the last meeting, in the midst of discussing this resolution, Brian Schanen had asked how this would impact people with split appointments, and Huckleberry Rahr had noted concerns about the criteria for distinguished lecturer in relation to terminal degrees.

**Resolution on Instructional Academic Staff Promotions Process:** Mike moves and Ciera seconds to take up the tabled motion from 9/14/22 to approve the resolution on instructional academic staff promotion. Christine summarizes the motion, the stakeholders involved in drafting the resolution over the summer, and the purpose behind it.

Unanimous consent to take up the tabled motion.

Discussion follows.

Kristin summarizes the way to get the equivalent experience as an instructor for those who are less than 1.0 FTE. Brian asks- if they had .5 as a coach and .5 as an instructor, whether that would count as promotions. Kristin notes that the part that is instructional will go through one process, and the part that is outside of the instructional area will be treated separately. Brian notes that, if they also have another point .5 as a coach, it seems inequitable to not get any credit, even though it takes up as much time as teaching a class would take. Kristin notes that the part that is not instructional will go through the other side of the promotions process. Kristin notes that in the past, it was assumed that only full-time instructors were eligible for promotions.

Mike notes that, if there is a split appointment and you are .5 across two positions, it will effectively put you twice as far out from promotions eligibility, even though you work full time – meaning that one person would have to wait 6 years to be eligible for 2 promotions, rather than being eligible for 1 at 3 years.



**Minutes:** September 28, 2022 (12:30-1:45)

Christine notes that Terry's Ad-Hoc committee on promotions for academic staff will look at this issue, because there is no current process for promotions outside of the instructional academic staff process.

Brian notes that, from a retention standpoint, this is a very low incentive to have staff members stick around.

Terry notes that, for example, there are staff who have been in the same academic staff position for 25 years with no route to promotion at all, and that this particular issue will specifically be reviewed by his committee.

David asks Brian what the current practice has been for his position or those like it. Brian notes that, up to this point, he has had slowly increasing instructional FTE on his contract, but he also coaches Forensics and is paid with a stipend. So, although he works full time for the university, he only receives credit for service toward promotion for the instructional portion.

Kristin notes that there are also people who are lecturers teaching .1 FTE (1 credit once a year), and eventually they would also be eligible for promotions. Kristin goes on to pose the question whether a person in that situation should also be eligible for promotion after 3 years of service, noting that there is a wide variety of use cases that should be carefully considered.

David notes that it seems like a much more reasonable request to consider from someone who is split half and half, versus Kristin's example. Kristin notes that any policy change or language should be carefully considered. Terry notes that, when considering these split appointments, it is also important not to give more weight to the academic staff role that isn't instructional for those who do have instructional status until all academic staff have that privilege. David notes that splitting instructional versus not instructional is difficult, when considering whether things like forensics coaching is teaching. Kristin and Terry give other examples of what may be considered education on campus. A discussion of what could or could not be considered teaching follows.

Rick notes several other examples of split appointments. A discussion of the definition of terminal degrees as defined by disciplines followed. Rick notes that it is helpful that this creates a process for notification of eligibility, and he is pleased to see that addition, as it was frequently unclear in the past.

Christine notes that the task force this summer was adamant about including the statement of equivalent service, in order to make sure that adjuncts can be included in the process.

Huckleberry asks how we came to the point where only instructional academic staff could be promoted. Mike notes that, it appeared during the merger of 2-year institutions, that at some point UW-Whitewater decided in the past not to make re-titling a part of the promotions process, and that this current promotion structure for instructional staff seems to be unusual across the system.

Kristin notes that it may also be a function of the fact that instructional academic staff being a part of academic departments, and that the process for promotion in that area should mimic that of faculty.

Terry notes that for academic staff, you could only get a new title if you could demonstrate a significant change in the position.



**Minutes:** September 28, 2022 (12:30-1:45)

Christine notes that the current motion on the table is to review and update the currently in place promotions process for instructional academic staff, because that system exists and no system exists for the remainder of academic staff. Christine states that ASA is committed to tackling that issue this year.

Huckleberry reiterates that she believes the “Terminal Degree” portion of the amendment should be taken out, and provides her position as an example, because a terminal degree in mathematics or education (currently has masters in both), would remove her from the current department. Since obtaining a PhD in those fields would not be helpful, Huckleberry notes that it seems inequitable to make promotion contingent on a terminal degree in the field.

Huckleberry moves and David seconds a friendly amendment to this section of the resolution on the table:

*13.01(a)(iii) Senior Lecturer to Distinguished Lecturer • Possess a recognized terminal degree, by the time of Promotion. • Meet all requirements for promotion to Senior Lecturer. • Be in at least the third year of full-time equivalent service with the business title of Senior Lecturer at UW-Whitewater.*

to remove the “*possess a recognized terminal degree by the time of Promotion*” bullet point

Rick and Brenda accept the amendment as the original sponsors of the motion. Brenda suggests updating the bullet point to make it specifically recognized by the department. Mike and Huckleberry note that the current “terminal degree” is defined by the department, so that would be redundant. Rick notes that “Distinguished” seems to be something that should be a high bar to meet. Mike notes that this is only the minimum eligibility for promotions- criteria will still be set by the committee. Huckleberry notes that getting a PhD will not make them a better instructor or better able to do their job. Jessica W notes that a piece of this to review are the descriptions- that a distinguished lecturer typically possesses advanced knowledge and skills, and that a metric of that distinguished status is a terminal degree. David notes that he doesn’t believe that reading of the word distinguished coincides with the way the work group discussed it over the summer- the feeling of the work group was that distinguished lecturers are currently too rare on this campus. David also notes that he agrees with Huckleberry’s point- a PhD would not necessarily make anyone a better lecturer or instructor, but that a lot of departments and programs look at their own credentialing and curriculum systems differently.

Ciera asks about the difference between senior and distinguished in pay increases. Kristin notes that pay plan increases would still happen, but no pay increase by promotion. Mike notes that with the terminal degree requirement, even if you have 25 years of experience, someone who is in their first year of instruction but who has a terminal degree appears to be considered superior. Brian asks whether striking this in favor of “demonstrating contributions outside of the department” would make sense. Kristin notes that this is currently in 14.01c of the proposed resolution, and that the criteria could be modified to say something like terminal degree or some sort of demonstration of significant contribution. Brenda notes that removing the terminal degree from the eligibility criteria, the academic staff member will have the opportunity to demonstrate those things that distinguish them. Jessica notes that it is important to recognize the work done by individuals to attain their terminal degree. Huckleberry notes that, there are people with PhDs who are amazing instructors, but that is not



**Minutes:** September 28, 2022 (12:30-1:45)

necessarily an artifact of gaining a content area PhD- pedagogical sciences are very different and effective education is different. Huckleberry continues and notes that reviews and accolades from students could be one metric of distinguished service.

Tatiana notes that, for the sake of policy, clear criteria make sense, and that including things like student reviews might be unclear or difficult to measure. Becky M notes that, if the goal is to mimic tenure standards, each department has the ability to create their own tenure standards. Kristin notes that this is different, because departments are part of the recommending process and this is an ASA policy. Rick notes that, if this is just for the application process, but the criteria are robust, then he is in favor of this. Huckleberry notes that completing the promotions application process is a huge process, and people put a lot of themselves into their application. She goes on to state that demonstrating the way that one is distinguished, which may include the attainment of a terminal degree, can and should be a part of the application.

Brenda calls the question. Huckleberry objects. Huckleberry strikes her original amendment and offers a revised amendment-

to update the bullet point to *“Possess a recognized terminal degree or can show how their contributions on campus have affected students in a distinguished way”*.

Brenda calls the question on the offered amendment. Mike seconds. Roll call vote result is 6 no, 1 abstain, 5 yes, 4 absent, and the amendment is defeated.

Becky J calls the question on the full resolution. David objects. Discussion resumes.

David asks for clarification on the alignment of the lecturer 1, 2, 3, and 4 titles in the original and the lecturer 2 in the proposed levels in the resolution. David asks what happens to people who are currently lecturer 3 or 4, as it seems that they go back to lecturer 2.

Jessica W states that there was no lecturer 3 or 4 in the past- they were always lecturer – level 1, lecturer – level 2, and that you always remained a lecturer, but through the promotions process, you received a level. David asks if that means that those who got to that level never received anything for their efforts. Christine notes that, under the TTC project, previous titles disappeared, and all move to the title of lecturer, and reminds the group that this resolution is meant to merge the two distinct processes- the ASA promotions process which oversaw levels, and the promotions process that oversaw titles, and notes that there were “senior lecturers” who were at level 1, and others who were at level 3. Christine notes that the task force wanted to ensure that no one lost out on the opportunity to apply for a pay increase. Kristin notes that someone who previously got to the level of lecturer 3, that title would change to lecturer 2, and is now eligible to apply for promotion to senior lecturer. Kristin notes that, hypothetically, if she was a “level 3 lecturer” as of 3 years ago, this process will mean that her hypothetical title would change to “Lecturer 2,” and she would be eligible to apply for promotion to “senior lecturer”, as a result of this mapping process from old to new titles/levels. This ensures that no one would start over from zero. David notes that he is hearing that this creates opportunities for people to come back after a period of time to apply for promotion repeatedly, but that he views the promotions process as not a way to get a pay raise, but as a way to recognize where he is at professionally, and in that sense, “going backwards” does not seem to make sense to him. He gives the



**Minutes:** September 28, 2022 (12:30-1:45)

example that if he had been a “housekeeper 3” for years and was being moved back to “housekeeper 2”, it would seem to have been taken away. Kristin responds by saying that, while your title may seem to be mapping downwards, there is no pay decrease associated with that- only further opportunities to apply for promotion. David notes that he is not looking for additional opportunities to do paperwork. Kristin notes that the numbers in the old system and the numbers in the new system are unrelated- there is no backwards process. The new system could have used letters instead of numbers. Christine notes that the criteria is different. David asks why you couldn’t call senior lecturers “level 3” and distinguished lecturers “level 4” in the new system. Rick responds that the criteria for level 4 on the old system was to be a senior lecturer. Huckleberry notes that this should be sent out to everyone once passed, because she did not understand that she would have an additional opportunity to apply for promotion. Christine notes that she has such an email drafted. Jessica W notes that the task force was also trying to align titling with other schools, which may be why David’s question has come up, and that we should think of this as attaining new titles through this process, which are business titles and can be used. Christine notes to David that while he may not be interested in the pay bump, others are. David notes that not all staff will look at it in the same way. Christine notes that the task force did not want to take any opportunities away from people.

Jessica W calls the question. David objects. Christine notes that this process is meant to open next week, and a lack of a vote will delay people’s ability to get this process started. David notes that he would like someone somewhere to be considering this resolution in the coming weeks. Rick asks whether it is possible to use a continuous improvement mindset, move forward with the resolution, and go back and address the concerns raised in the meantime. Christine notes that anything can be reviewed, and that Jessica W is currently the chair of the Promotions committee.

More discussion follows.

Mike calls to end debate. Becky J seconds the call to end debate. With 10 votes yes, the call to end debate passes.

A vote on the resolution takes place, with 3 votes no and 9 votes yes. The resolution passes as presented.

Christine will send out updates and notes as an email. Shared governance leaders have met and created and drafted proposed resolutions. Volunteers are needed to work with the Provost’s Office on shared course evaluation questions, search committees, pay progression, telecommuting process and policy- let Christine know if interested.

If you have an update from a committee or shared governance, please send to Brenda for inclusion in minutes.

Jessica notes committee members are still needed for Promotions. David notes volunteers are also needed for Rewards/Recognition and Governing Documents Review Committees- especially anyone who has served previously on those committees.

Meeting adjourns at 1:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



University of Wisconsin  
**Whitewater**

Academic Staff Assembly

**Minutes:** September 28, 2022 (12:30-1:45)

Brenda Johansen (ASA Communications Director)



## Instructional Academic Staff Promotions

WHEREAS, the TTC project assigned all instructional academic staff into one title of record of “lecturer” (<https://www.wisconsin.edu/ohrwd/title-and-total-compensation-study/standard-job-description-library/?jobID=30561>) eliminating promotional titles including associate, no prefix, senior and distinguished (page 12 - [https://www.wisconsin.edu/uw-policies/download/Appendix-1A-Unclassified-Definitions\\_updated-04-14-2021.pdf](https://www.wisconsin.edu/uw-policies/download/Appendix-1A-Unclassified-Definitions_updated-04-14-2021.pdf));

WHEREAS, Academic Staff Assembly (ASA) oversees the levels 1-4 promotions process to the business title of lecturer (<https://www.uww.edu/asa/grants-and-awards/academic-staff-promotions>);

WHEREAS, having two promotions process (one for title through the provost’s office and one for level through ASA) created confusion;

WHEREAS, neither of the current promotions processes for title or level have a reconsideration process if an applicant is denied;

WHEREAS, the TTC project provides the opportunity to align the two instructional academic staff promotional processes into one comprehensive promotional process;

WHEREAS, an Instructional Academic Staff Working Group met over the summer including ASA Members Michael Gorman, Christine Hoover, David Reinhart, and Jessica Walz as well as Kristine Plessel (Provost’s Office), Patricia Clasen (Dean of College of Integrated Studies), John Ejnik (Chemistry Department Chair), Connie Putland (Human Resources & Diversity), and Hermie Snorek (Provost’s Office) to evaluate the current process;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the following changes be made to the academic staff personnel rules sections 13 and 14 (current sections provided in the appendix).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that these updates will go into effect for the 2022-2023 instructional academic staff promotions process.

### Clarifying Note related to TTC:

- The business (working) title will be **Lecturer** as of November 7, 2021. UW-Whitewater will be using business title in our directory.
- As is current practice, the title of record and business title have equal weight in the Human Resources Information System (HRS) and serve two different purposes; both together represent the work performed.
  - Title of record – serves as a market comparison tool and broad title classification
  - Business title – serves to add more specificity about the individual role within the organization
- **Clarification: Adjunct instructors are given the title of Lecturers under TTC**
- **This proposal relates to the “business title” of instructional academic staff with the title of record of “lecturer”.**





## Proposed Changes to Section 13 of the Academic Staff Personnel Rules

### Section 13: Promotion

#### 13.01 Instructional Academic Staff Promotion

UW-W maintains a promotion process for academic staff with the position title of lecturer. All lecturers will become eligible for promotion based on years of service [eligibility and criteria including years of service, degree as well as activities including teaching, professional development, service, and scholarship]. Any questions regarding whether the years of service requirement has been met should be referred to the Office of Human Resources and Diversity.

Per the ASA By-Laws, the ASA Promotions Committee structures and administers the promotions process for academic staff. Promotion is a privilege, based upon qualifications exceeding established minimal criteria and is recommended by an informed collective peer judgment. All candidates should understand clearly that eligibility status and departmental and college recommendation does not assure or imply that a promotion will be made. Members of the ASA Promotions Committee will evaluate each promotion candidate on their activities including teaching, professional development, service, and scholarship. The primary promotions evaluation emphasis will be placed on teaching, however, increased activities beyond teaching are expected at the highest levels of promotion. Refer to the Instructional Academic Staff Promotions website (<https://www.uww.edu/asa/grants-and-awards/academic-staff-promotions>) for the Promotions Committee Evaluation Rubric.

Applications for promotion are considered annually and, if successful, go into effect at the start of the applicant's next academic year contract. The monetary amount of the salary increase for promotion to each level will be determined annually by the chancellor and is based upon the amount of promotion funds available. Promotion increases are a permanent base salary adjustment. The promotion application process is established by the Promotions Committee in conjunction with the Academic Staff Assembly, the Provost's Office and the Office of Human Resources and Diversity.

#### 13.01(a) Promotion Eligibility

##### 13.01(a)(i) Lecturer 1 to Lecturer 2

- Possess a completed master's degree OR a bachelor's degree plus a professional credential recognized in the field as an advanced level of competence.
- Be in at least the third year of full-time equivalent service with the business title of Lecturer 1 at UW-Whitewater.
- There is no minimum service time in Lecturer 1 for Lecturers holding a recognized terminal degree at the time of hire.

##### 13.01(a)(ii) Lecturer 2 to Senior Lecturer

- Meet all requirements for promotion to Lecturer 2.
- Be in at least the third year of full-time equivalent service with the business title of Lecturer 2 at UW-Whitewater.





- There is no minimum service time in Lecturer 2 for Lecturers holding a recognized terminal degree at the time of promotion. However, that applicant must have at least three continuous years of full-time, or the equivalent, service as a Lecturer 1 at UW-Whitewater before being eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

13.01(a)(iii) Senior Lecturer to Distinguished Lecturer

- Possess a recognized terminal degree, by the time of Promotion.
- Meet all requirements for promotion to Senior Lecturer.
- Be in at least the third year of full-time equivalent service with the business title of Senior Lecturer at UW-Whitewater.

13.01 (b) Promotions Timetable

Promotion Timetable for Instructional Academic Staff Promotions

Action by	Action to Take	Action Given to	Typical Timeline*
Department Chairs	Alerts Instructional Academic Staff of eligibility for promotion	Instructional Academic Staff	First Wednesday in October
Academic Staff Member	Submit portfolio to Personal Application Folder	Department chair	Second Wednesday in December
Department/Chair	Submits recommendation to Personal Application Folder	Dean	Second Wednesday in January
Dean	Submits recommendation to Personal Application Folder	Provost	Fourth Wednesday in January
Chancellor	Approves promotion/business title change and notifies candidates via letter (including base salary increase if applicable) and cc's Human Resources & Diversity, Department Chair, Dean and Provost, and sends spreadsheet of approved candidates	Applicant Human Resources & Diversity	Late March/early April
Academic Staff Assembly Promotions Chair	Announcement of Promotions to ASA		First ASA meeting in April
Human Resources & Diversity	Human Resources & Diversity updates Directory with new business title and title and base salary in HRS		Prior to Fall semester



\*The ASA Promotions Committee will publish the actual due dates for each academic year on the promotions web page.

### 13.02 Promotions Decision Appeal Process

Each promotion candidate has the right to appeal a negative decision of their promotion application. Within seven days of receiving the written reasons for a negative decision from the ASA Promotions Committee, the candidate may, by writing to the ASA Chair, appeal the recommendation per Section 15.02 (d) through the Academic Staff Review Committee. The promotions appeals process does not allow the inclusion of new materials either in the promotion application or in the appeals document.

See Also:

- [Section 2: Personnel Files](#)
- [Section 14: Titling](#): Refer to Section 14 for more information regarding the business titles associated with the Lecturer 1, Lecturer 2, Senior Lecturer, and Distinguished Lecturer business titles.
- Section 15: Complaints & Grievances

### Proposed Changes to Section 13 of the Academic Staff Personnel Rules

#### 14.01(c) Business Title

14.01(c) (i) Lecturer 1: A lecturer 1 is one who independently teaches a course(s) subject to broad guidelines describing the scope of the subject matter to be taught and the topics to be covered. Effective classroom delivery, assessment and grading are the primary duties expected of lecturers at this level. Lecturer 1 is the usual initial rank for new instructional academic staff hires.

14.01(c) (ii) Lecturer 2: At this level, a lecturer 2 has the experience and academic qualifications needed to develop and teach a course(s) subject to broad guidelines describing the scope of the subject matter to be covered. At this level, a Lecturer 2 may be involved in various instructional related activities. These may include undergraduate advising, assisting in developing lab safety protocols, course scheduling, curriculum development, participating in departmental outreach programs or instructional activities.

14.01(c) (iii) Senior Lecturer: A Senior Lecturer has extensive teaching experience and subject matter expertise in an academic discipline. A lecturer at this level has gained a reputation among their peers for demonstrably sustained superior contributions to teaching within a department or division. Involvement with committees engaged in supporting this development is typical. However, the direct delivery of instruction is the primary responsibility of this title.

14.01(c) (iv) Distinguished Lecturer: A Distinguished Lecturer performs at a level of proficiency typically requiring extensive experience and advanced knowledge and skills. The expertise of an academic staff member at this level is commonly recognized by their peers and through a reputation that extends beyond their work unit. A Distinguished academic staff member is expected to develop new approaches, methods or techniques to resolve problems with little or no expert guidance and to cope independently with new, unexpected or complex situations. At this level, an academic staff member can be expected to guide or train other academic staff or to oversee their work.



<b>Action Date</b>	9/14/2022			
<b>Action</b>	Approved	Rejected	Tabled - <b>X</b>	Other
<b>Vote Detail</b>	Ayes - Unanimous	Nays	Abstentions	Other

<b>Action Date</b>	9/28/2022			
<b>Action</b>	Approved - <b>X</b>	Rejected	Tabled	Other
<b>Vote Detail</b>	Ayes – 9	Nays - 3	Abstentions - 0	Other – 3 Absent

DRAFT



## Appendix

**Current AS Personnel Rules:** <https://www.uww.edu/asa/get-acquainted/as-personnel-rules>

### Section 13: Promotion

#### 13.01 Promotion

UW-W maintains a promotion process for academic staff with the position title of Lecturer. All Lecturers are initially hired at the Level 1 and will become eligible for promotion based on years of service. Any questions regarding whether the years of service requirement has been met should be referred to the Office of Human Resources and Diversity.

Applications for promotion are considered annually and, if successful, go into effect at the start of the applicant's next academic year contract. The monetary amount of the salary increase for promotion to each level will be determined annually by the Chancellor and is based upon the amount of promotion funds available. Promotion increases are a permanent base salary adjustment. The Promotion application process is established by the Promotions Committee in conjunction with the Academic Staff Assembly, the Provost's Office and the Office of Human Resources and Diversity

#### 13.01(a) Promotion Criteria

##### 13.01(a)(i) Level 1 to Level 2

- Possess a completed master's degree OR a bachelor's degree plus a professional credential recognized in the field as an advanced level of competence.
- Be in at least the third year of full-time equivalent service as instructional academic staff at UW-Whitewater.
- There is no minimum service time in Level 1 for Lecturers holding a recognized terminal degree at the time of hire.

##### 13.01(a)(ii) Level 2 to Level 3

- Meet all requirements for promotion to Level 2.
- Be in at least the sixth year of full-time equivalent service as instructional academic staff at UW-Whitewater, with a minimum of three full-time equivalent years having been served in Level 2.
- There is no minimum service time in Level 2 for Lecturers holding a recognized terminal degree at the time of hire. However, that applicant must have at least three continuous years of full-time, or the equivalent, service as a Lecturer at UW-Whitewater before being eligible for promotion to Level 3.

##### 13.01(a)(iii) Level 3 to Level 4

- Possess a recognized terminal degree, by the time of Promotion.
- Meet all requirements for promotion to Level 3.
- Be in at least the ninth year of continuous full-time, or equivalent, service as a Lecturer at UW-Whitewater, with a minimum of three full-time equivalent years having been served in Level 3.

See Also:

- [Section 2: Personnel Files](#)



- [Section 14: Titling](#)

Last Ratified: 4/13/2022

## Section 14: Titling

### 14.01 Titling

All academic staff positions are assigned an official title prior to being recruited and hired. This title places the position within the [UW System Job Titles & Standard Job Description](#) and corresponds with the type of work and duties executed. Academic staff titles can vary greatly but most Instructional Academic Staff are assigned the Lecturer title. In either case the title assigned to a position controls the salary range for the position. Note that in some cases a position may also have a separate “Business” title to help correlate the position to jobs outside of higher education.

When new academic staff positions are created or if duties and responsibilities of an existing position change by more than 50%, the position must be reviewed by the Titling Committee. The purpose of this review is to ensure that all positions align fairly and accurately with the UW System Job Titles & Standard Job Description. If the proposed changes to an existing position are considered by the Titling Committee to warrant a new title, one will be assigned at that time. All title assignment decisions are the responsibility of the Titling Committee.

#### 14.01(a) New / Vacant Positions

Given the changing nature of higher education, it is not uncommon for vacant positions to be redesigned before being re-hired. In these situations, the Dean, Director or Division Head will initiate a position review with the Office of Human Resources and Diversity. This review will include a comparison of similar positions at UW-W to ensure consistency and parity of title assignment. Following the completion of this review, the new position will be submitted to the Titling Committee for review.

#### 14.01(b) Occupied Positions

Titling reviews for occupied positions can be requested by either the supervisor or the incumbent staff. If the supervisor initiates the request, it must be forwarded to the Dean/Division Head for review and comment before being sent to the Provost’s Office for consideration.

Titling review is initiated by the occupant of the position, it must be first submitted to the immediate supervisor for review and comment, and then forwarded to the Dean/Division Head for review and comment. All employee-initiated Titling Review requests must be forwarded to the Provost’s Office for consideration by the Titling Committee, regardless of supervisor and/or Dean/Division Head approval. Academic staff members of the Titling Committee in conjunction with the Office of Human Resources and Diversity will establish procedures for titling or re-titling vacant positions.

#### 14.01(c) Business Title

*to be added following finalization of University procedures*

See Also:

- [Section 2: Personnel Files](#)
- [Section 13: Promotion](#)

Last Ratified: 4/13/2022



**Mapping: old promotions mapped to new promotions**

<b>Pre-TTC Title (Provost Process)/Level (ASA Process)</b>	<b>Business Title with new promotions process</b>
Adjunct	Lecturer 1
Associate Lecturer (regardless of level)	Lecturer 1
Lecturer Level 1	Lecturer 1
Lecturer Level 2-4	Lecturer 2
Senior Lecturer (any level)	Senior Lecturer
Distinguished Lecturer (any level)	Distinguished Lecturer

DRAFT