

3/1/2017

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

I.1. Education Committee

Thursday, March 9, 2017
9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.
Gordon Dining & Event Center
770 W. Dayton Street, 2nd Floor
Symphony Room
Madison, Wisconsin

- a. Approval of the Minutes of the February 2, 2017 meeting of the Education Committee;
- b. UW-Stout: Approval of Post-Tenure Review Policy;
[Resolution I.1.b]
- c. UW-Extension: Approval of Post-Tenure Review Policy; and
[Resolution I.1.c]
- d. UW-Parkside: Approval of Post-Tenure Review Policy.
[Resolution I.1.d]

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Resolution I.1.b:

That, upon the recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Stout and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Chancellor is authorized to implement the University's Post-Tenure Review Policy.

UW-STOUT POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Section UWS 2.02, Wis. Admin. Code (“Faculty Rules: Coverage and Delegation”), requires that rules, policies, and procedures developed by each institution in the UW System pursuant to Chapters UWS 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 be approved by the Board of Regents prior to taking effect.

On March 10, 2016, the UW System Board of Regents adopted revised Regent Policy Document (RPD) 20-9, "Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development," available at <https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/policies/periodic-post-tenure-review-in-support-of-tenured-faculty-development>). RPD 20-9 states that “[w]ithin nine (9) months of the effective date of this Regent policy each institution shall submit an institutional policy to the Board of Regents. Once the institutional policy has been approved, the chancellor, with the advice and counsel of the faculty, is responsible for implementing the policy and operating the institution consistent with its provisions.”

A memo from Chancellor Meyer requesting approval of the UW-Stout post-tenure review policy by the Board of Regents is attached to this document. The UW System Office of General Counsel and the Office of Academic and Student Affairs reviewed the proposed policy. The President recommends approval of the UW-Stout post-tenure review policy.

Attached to this document is Appendix A, containing the new UW-Stout post-tenure review policy as it would read if approved by the Board of Regents.

REQUESTED ACTION

Adoption of Resolution I.1.b, approving the UW-Stout Post-Tenure Review Policy.

DISCUSSION

On February 14, 2017, the UW-Stout Faculty Senate approved the university’s new post-tenure review policy, attached to this document as Appendix A. For comparison, Appendix B shows the original post-tenure review policy document. As the original post-tenure policy document was completely rewritten, there is no appendix item showing changes to the original.

RELATED REGENT POLICIES AND LAWS

Section 36, Wis. Stats.
Chapters UWS 3 and 5, Wis. Admin. Code
Regent Policy Document 20-23

APPENDIX A
New Post-Tenure Review Policy

UW-STOUT POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

Scope

This policy applies to tenured faculty members at UW-Stout and is to be implemented starting Fall 2017.

Definitions:

FASLAH: UW Stout Faculty, Academic Staff, and Limited Appointees Handbook.

In this document, the definitions of teaching, research and service are as per FASLAH, Chapter IIIA: "Personnel Rules for All Unclassified Personnel." (See Page 60 of the current edition.)

Purpose

UW-Stout is committed to providing support for the professional development of all faculty members at any time in their careers.

The purposes of the review of tenured faculty are:

- a. to recognize achievement;
- b. to help identify and remedy, from a developmental point of view, any deficiencies and to provide opportunities for mentoring and professional development.

The process of post-tenure review is the periodic assessment of each faculty member's activities and performance, in accordance with the mission of the department, college, and institution, and the responsibilities of the faculty as described in FASLAH. The review is to be appropriately linked to the merit process. Post-tenure review is not a reevaluation of tenure and is not undertaken for the purposes of discipline or dismissal. Faculty members shall be subject to dismissal only for just cause. Departments, schools, colleges, and the university may not use post-tenure reviews as the basis for budgetary decisions or for program modification or redirection.

Policy Statement (Regent Policy Document 20-9)

Tenure is an essential part of the guarantee of academic freedom that is necessary for university-based intellectual life to flourish. The grant of indeterminate tenure to faculty members represents an enormous investment of university and societal resources, and those who receive this investment do so only after rigorous review which established that their scholarship, research, teaching, and service met the highest standards and are congruent with the needs of the university.

It is the policy of the Board of Regents that a periodic, post-tenure review of tenured faculty members is essential to promoting faculty development, including recognizing innovation and creativity; enhancing the educational environment for students; and identifying and redressing

deficiencies in overall performance of duties through a supportive and developmental remediation process.

Nothing in this policy shall be interpreted to alter or to infringe upon existing tenure rights, as set forth in UW System Board of Regents or UW System policies, nor shall this policy diminish the important guarantees of academic freedom. Specifically, this policy does not supersede administrative rules providing for termination for cause set forth in Chapter UWS 4 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

Post-tenure review process

The post-tenure review period begins in the academic year following the granting of tenure. The review may be deferred, only with the approval of the provost, for unusual circumstances such as when it may coincide with an approved leave, promotion review, or other appointment. In such cases, the provost will specify the new review cycle that applies to the faculty member. The periodic, post-tenure review may substitute for the annual review in the year a faculty member is scheduled for post-tenure review, with the consent of the faculty member.

CRITERIA

The basic standard for review shall be whether the faculty member under review performs conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member's position, as stated in the job description and the post-tenure professional development plan. These duties encompass teaching, scholarly activity and service.

Each department shall develop criteria to measure progress in scholarly activity as appropriate to the field(s). The criteria for review shall be periodically reviewed by the personnel committee of each department. Each department must make these criteria available to each faculty member being reviewed, and the criteria document must be included with the written summary of the post-tenure review, filed by the reviewers.

The criteria for review should reflect the overall mission of the department, college, and institution, be sufficiently flexible to accommodate faculty members with differing responsibilities, and recognize that careers and levels of productivity may change over time. In developing such criteria, departments may draw on statements used in other faculty review procedures, such as merit or promotion review. The criteria must take into account that UW Stout is an institution primarily oriented toward teaching, and the research/scholarship/service expectations must be appropriately scaled to reflect the teaching load of UW Stout faculty. Special care should be taken to ensure that the scholarly productivity of jointly appointed and interdisciplinary faculty members is appropriately evaluated.

The personnel committee of each department shall ensure that the criteria governing faculty review do not infringe on the accepted standards of academic freedom of faculty, including the freedom to pursue novel, unpopular, or unfashionable lines of inquiry, or innovative methods of teaching, and recognize that scholarly projects take varying amounts of time to come to fruition.

Nothing in the criteria or application of these policies shall allow the review to be prejudiced by factors proscribed by applicable state or federal law, such as race, color, religion, creed, marital status, sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, and disability.

PROCEDURES

Reviews shall occur once every five years or earlier if requested by the faculty member reviewed. These post-tenure reviews may be incorporated into the annual merit review.

Notice of the intent to review should be provided at least three months before the review is conducted. However, failure to meet this notice deadline does not obviate the requirement to conduct and participate in the review. Each review, as determined by each department's personnel committee, shall be carried out by three or more tenured faculty members at the same rank or above as the faculty reviewed, who may be drawn from outside the department if there are not sufficient members in the department to serve on the committee. There must be an odd number, not an even number, of reviewers. If the faculty member under review formally objects to one reviewer, the chair, in consultation with the relevant dean, shall identify another appropriate reviewer. Such formal objections should be kept confidential to the extent permissible by law. In the case of a faculty member with appointments in more than one department, the tenured faculty members of the departments shall jointly conduct the review.

Each review must be conducted in accordance with the criteria developed by the department, as required by the section "Criteria" above. Review procedures shall include

- a. A review of qualitative and quantitative evidence of the faculty member's performance over at least the previous five-year period. The evidence should include a current curriculum vita, annual activity reports, teaching evaluations or summaries of evaluations, and other materials providing evidence of the faculty member's accomplishments and contributions that the department or the faculty member feel are relevant to the review. The faculty member should provide the reviewers with a brief summary of career plans for the future. Letters from outside the university would not ordinarily be a part of the review process. The faculty member under review, however, may submit appropriate letters if she or he so chooses. The reviewers shall examine materials to the degree needed to accomplish the purposes of this review.
- b. Discussion with the faculty member about her or his contributions to the profession, the department, and the university if either the reviewers or the faculty member so desire.
- c. Appropriate consideration of a faculty member's contributions outside the department to interdisciplinary and other programs, governance, and administration.
- d. Other steps the reviewers consider useful in making a fair and informed judgment, including, but not limited to consultation with individuals who have knowledge of the faculty member's work.

The reviewers will identify one of the following categories reflecting the overall results of the review. In determining the category, the review will consider whether the faculty member under review has conscientiously and with professional competence performed the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member's position, as stated in the job description and the faculty

member's post-tenure professional development plan. A rating of does not meet expectations is to be given only if a majority of the committee members find the faculty member to have not met her/his expectations.

Meets expectations. This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment.

Does not meet expectations. This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment below the expected level and which requires correction. All reviews resulting in "does not meet expectations," unless overturned upon further review, will result in a remediation plan as described below.

The reviewers shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review by the last business day in January. The faculty member shall have the right to prepare a written response to the summary within 30 days after receipt.

In the event a review leads to a rating of "meets expectations," the Chancellor shall review the report. In the course of the review, the Chancellor may consult and seek input from the faculty reviewers and any other tenured faculty as appropriate. Following the Chancellor's review, the faculty member shall be informed by the Chancellor that the faculty member has received a result of "meets expectations" or "does not meet expectations." If the Chancellor assigns a "does not meet expectations rating", the Chancellor must provide a carefully considered written explanation of why such a rating was assigned, including specific evidence of deficiencies in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, or service. As required by Regent Policy Document 20-9, the deficiencies at issue must be described in writing and in detail (as part of the summary) whenever a "does not meet expectations" result is given. If a "does not meet expectations" rating is assigned by the Chancellor a remediation plan will be developed.

In the event the Chancellor assigns a rating of "meets expectations" a copy of the summary and any written response to it shall be given to the department chair, dean, as applicable, and the Provost and shall be placed in the personnel file of the faculty member. The department shall also preserve in the faculty member's personnel file all documents that played a substantive role in the review (other than documents such as publications that are readily accessible elsewhere), and a record of any action taken as a result of the review. The summary and outcome of the review shall remain confidential, that is, confined to the appropriate departmental, college, or university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated, released otherwise only at the discretion, or with the explicit consent of, the faculty member, or as otherwise required by law.

Faculty members who receive a review in the category of "meets expectations" should be considered for additional base compensation, subject to the availability of resources.

In the event the initial review by the faculty committee leads to a rating of "does not meet expectations," the Dean shall review the committee's report. As required by Regent Policy Document 20-9, the deficiencies at issue must be described in writing and in detail (as part of the report) whenever a "does not meet expectations" result is given. The faculty member may provide a written statement to accompany the Dean's

review. In the course of her or his review, the Dean should consult and seek input from tenured faculty members in the College or another College of UW Stout if there is a cognate discipline. The Dean's review will be followed by the chancellor's review, no sooner than 30 days after the Dean's review. The faculty member may provide a written statement to accompany the Chancellor's review. In the course of her or his review, the Chancellor may consult and seek input from tenured faculty. Following the chancellor's review, the faculty member shall be informed by the chancellor that the faculty member has received a result of "meets expectations" or that a "does not meet expectations" rating was assigned and a remediation plan will be developed.

For faculty members needing to develop a remediation plan, support from institutional resources for professional development shall be proffered. The department chair and the faculty member, in consultation with the dean, shall develop a written plan for mentoring and professional development to address all the deficiencies identified in the review. This plan shall be the product of mutual discussion between the faculty member, the department chair(s) and dean(s), shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and shall be flexible enough to allow for multiple paths for success. Such a plan could include review and adjustment of the faculty member's responsibilities, development of a new program for scholarly activity/research engagement, or teaching strategy, referral to campus resources, assignment of a mentoring committee, institution of mandatory annual reviews for a specified period, written performance expectations, and/or other elements. The faculty member shall have the right to provide a written response regarding the manner in which any written development plan is formulated, the plan's content, and any resulting evaluation, including metrics to be used. The written response will accompany the plan as a permanent appendix.

The remediation plan should clearly indicate a deadline (not to exceed three academic semesters starting the Fall subsequent to the development of remediation plan) by which time all elements of the plan must be satisfied. The plan shall include a description of what constitutes satisfactory completion of each element.

In those few remediation plans related to a performance shortfall in research where more than three academic semesters may be necessary to correct identified deficiencies, an extension of one academic semester shall be permitted only with the approval of the Chancellor, which shall trigger a notification of that extension to the UW System Administration Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.

The remediation plan should indicate that 1) a progress meeting will be scheduled with the Dean, the chair and the faculty member approximately one semester into the plan to help determine progress and identify additional improvement resources that may aid the faculty member and 2) that a final remediation follow-up meeting will occur between the Dean, the chair, and the faculty member after the deadline, but before the start of the next academic semester, and not to exceed 30 calendar days past the deadline (e.g., if three semesters, limited to 18 months in total are provided, within 30 calendar days of the close of the 3rd semester). At the meeting, the Dean will consult with the chair and the faculty member about the evidence indicating that the faculty member has met or not met the obligations of the remediation plan. The Dean may request evidence from the department, the faculty member, and/or other sources prior to the meeting.

The remediation plan should indicate the actions to be taken for failing to satisfy the remediation plan by the deadline. Consequences can range from informal actions such as workload assignments, to disciplinary measures. In extremely egregious situations, dismissal for cause under the category of “non-performance of duties” shall be a possible sanction, provided that the policies in FASLAH are followed, including the procedures of the termination of employment committee.

Meeting the expectations of the remediation plan is defined as satisfying all the elements of the remediation plan. The dean, in consultation with the chancellor and the faculty member, makes the determination whether the elements of the plan have been successfully completed. The remediation follow-up meeting will result in a letter from the Dean to the faculty member and the Chancellor (with a copy to the department Chair, the Provost, and HR) indicating that the faculty member has

- 1 Met the conditions of the remediation plan, with a statement stating that the next formal post-tenure review by the department will occur 5 years from the date of the review that triggered the remediation plan.

OR

- 2 Not met the conditions of the remediation plan. If the remediation plan has not been met, the letter will include information regarding the potential sanctions or disciplinary procedures. The dean cannot unilaterally impose sanctions or disciplinary procedures.

The standard for dismissal remains that of just cause as outlined in FASLAH. The fact of successive negative reviews does not diminish the obligation of the institution to show such cause in a separate forum, following the procedures outlined in FASLAH. Records from post-tenure review may be relied upon and are admissible, but are rebuttable as to accuracy. The administration bears the ultimate burden of proof on the issue of just cause for dismissal.

The faculty member retains all protections guaranteed in FASLAH, including, but not limited to, the rights to appeal specified above and the right to appeal disciplinary and dismissal action to the Positive Action Committee as described in FASLAH.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Copies of the departmental criteria and procedures for reviews of tenured faculty shall be filed with the appropriate dean, the provost, and the secretary of the faculty.

At the beginning of each academic year, the chair shall identify faculty to be reviewed by the end of that year. In consultation with the Faculty Senate, the Provost’s Office will develop a yearly timeline for the review and plan development (if needed).

Departments shall maintain a record of reviews completed, including the names of all reviewers.

If a department fails to conduct requisite reviews by the specified deadline, the dean shall appoint reviewers to conduct reviews based on the department’s specified criteria.

The periodic review of each department, in which the department's mission, personnel, and

development are now evaluated, shall include review of the process for review of tenured faculty in the department.

A full, written record is to be created containing the results of a faculty member's periodic, post-tenure review and any ensuing actions, as described above. The written record is to be provided to the dean and chancellor. Information and documentation relating to the review shall be maintained by the appropriate department, college or school, or university personnel or bodies, and disclosed otherwise only at the discretion, or with the explicit consent, of the faculty member, unless required by business necessity or by law.

Department chairs are required to report annually to the dean and chancellor that all periodic, post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty in that annual cycle have been completed. The chancellor has responsibility for ensuring the reviews are completed on schedule.

The reviews conducted and remediation plans developed in accordance with this policy are not subject to the grievance process set forth in Chapter UWS 6.02, Wis. Admin. Code.

APPENDIX B
Existing Post-Tenure Review Policy

Chapter 3B: Personnel Rules for Faculty- p 106-109; Faculty, Academic Staff, and Limited Appointees Handbook; available at:

<https://www.uwstout.edu/hr/upload/Unclassified-Handbook-Master.pdf>

Tenured Faculty Principles to be Followed – Performance Objectives/Review

1. Each tenured faculty member will be responsible for developing his/her individual performance objectives in collaboration with the immediate supervisor at least once every five years, and submit them to his/her immediate supervisor in writing by the last contractual day of May, of the year the individual is recommended for tenure and every five years thereafter. The performance objectives should be developed in alignment with department, college/school, and university goals.
2. The faculty member's performance objectives should be developed and written so as to give a clear understanding of how and on what basis his/her supervisor will judge performance at his/her next evaluation review period. Since performance objectives may be accomplished over a longer time span than the performance evaluation period, it may be necessary to evaluate the partial completion of the performance objective at the faculty member's performance review meeting.
3. Performance objectives for tenured faculty will give appropriate weight to the importance of teaching within the tripartite faculty members' responsibilities of teaching, research, and service. In addition, performance objectives for faculty members in the area of academic advising, when assigned, should also be specified.
4. The faculty member's immediate supervisor will explain to the faculty member that his/her performance rating and compensation will be based upon the satisfactory accomplishment of those agreed upon performance objectives.
5. Performance objectives should include expectations for any or all of the following key activity areas:
 - Individual-based activities
 - Department/unit-based activities
 - College/School-based activities (including program director)

Tenured Faculty Members Performance Objectives Administration of Evaluations – Performance Evaluations/Review

1. Major emphasis should be placed upon performance objectives and their degree of completion as opposed to past merit ratings when considering performance over time.
2. At the tenured faculty member's five-year evaluation meeting, the immediate supervisor will review and evaluate (the last contractual day in May and the first contractual day in August) the faculty member's performance and assign a performance rating. In addition, the faculty member's immediate supervisor will review with his/her supervisor the faculty member's performance and performance rating. The faculty's immediate supervisor will conduct a performance objective review meeting (during the first two contractual weeks in August) with the faculty member to review his/her performance and assigned rating over the past evaluation period. Final approval of performance objectives will occur by September 20.

Administration of Evaluations – Performance Evaluations/Review

1. It is expected that there will be an evaluation of each tenured faculty member at least every five years. All input specified by the system devised will be considered and a rating assigned by the faculty member's immediate supervisor. Evaluations should be characterized as professional judgments based on appropriate data. Where a split assignment gives a person two immediate supervisors, each will make an evaluation.
2. Each evaluation, including data on which the rating was based, will be reviewed by the next broader level supervisor. If the rating is confirmed at this level, there will generally be no further review.

3. Support data, on which the rating is assigned, will be retained by the department chairperson for a seven-year period.

4. A standard evaluation form, distributed by the human resources office to deans, will be used to report evaluations to that office. Each person evaluated will be asked to sign the form in recognition of the fact that he/she has seen the rating.

5. The faculty member's immediate supervisor will be responsible for assigning the faculty member a performance rating. In relation to the accepted definition of meritorious performance and the uses to be made of the ratings assigned, the following three ratings will be used:

a. Meritorious Performance (above): Performance is judged to be above expectations acceptable to the position.

b. Adequate Performance (within): Performance is judged within expectations acceptable for this position.

c. Inadequate Performance (below): Performance is judged below expectations acceptable for this position.

The faculty member's immediate supervisor will be responsible for meeting with their immediate supervisor to review the faculty member's performance and assigned performance rating.

No percentages of each rating are specified, either by unit or for the total university. The attempt is to produce a valid assessment of each faculty member's performance

To simplify the process and to provide consistency of approach, it may be well to assume the following point of view: In using data to determine a performance rating, the supervisor should look for exceptional aspects of performance (either good or poor). If the data do not contain evidence of such, it may be assumed that the person is performing within an acceptable range for his/her position.

6. Where a faculty member is on leave of absence, then a leave of absence rating will be assigned by the human resources office based on the actual performance ratings of the person from their previous evaluations.

7. Tenured faculty members' evaluations must be in the human resources office by December 1. With this deadline, the tenured faculty member's performance evaluation will include data from the last four years.

Thus, the following schedule applies:

a. The tenured faculty member's immediate supervisor will assign a rating to each tenured faculty member and give it to the dean on or before November 1st.

b. The dean or administrator will review and approve the rating of the tenured faculty member and give it to the division administrator (provost) by November 15, who will forward it to the human resources office on or before December 1.

The role of the provost is to review each tenured faculty member's performance ratings to determine: (1) that each faculty member has been evaluated fairly and (2) that there has been a proper performance rating assigned in relationship to faculty in other units/schools.


In the event a performance rating is evaluated as improper and/or changed by the provost, he/she will notify (in writing) the affected faculty member as to the revision. In addition, the rationale used in reaching the decision will be revealed.



OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
325 Administration Building

715.232.2441
715.232.1416 fax

TO: Jim Henderson *via electronic mail*
Tom Stafford

FROM: Bob Meyer 
Chancellor

DATE: February 17, 2017

RE: UW-Stout Post-Tenure Review Policy

As requested, please see the attached revised documents related to UW-Stout's post tenure review policy. This revision was reviewed by the Faculty Senate and was forwarded to the administration following an affirmative vote of that governance body on February 14, 2017. This policy has my full endorsement and I ask that it be forwarded to the Board of Regents for approval.

Thank you.



UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
P.O. Box 790 | Menomonie, WI 54751
www.uwstout.edu

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Resolution I.1.c:

That, upon the recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Extension and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Chancellor is authorized to implement the University's Post-Tenure Review Policy.

UW-EXTENSION POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Section UWS 2.02, Wis. Admin. Code (“Faculty Rules: Coverage and Delegation”), requires that rules, policies, and procedures developed by each institution in the UW System pursuant to Chapters UWS 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 be approved by the Board of Regents prior to taking effect.

On March 10, 2016, the UW System Board of Regents adopted revised Regent Policy Document (RPD) 20-9, "Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development," available at <https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/policies/periodic-post-tenure-review-in-support-of-tenured-faculty-development>. RPD 20-9 states that “[w]ithin nine (9) months of the effective date of this Regent policy each institution shall submit an institutional policy to the Board of Regents. Once the institutional policy has been approved, the chancellor, with the advice and counsel of the faculty, is responsible for implementing the policy and operating the institution consistent with its provisions.”

A memo from Chancellor Sandeen requesting approval of the UW-Extension post-tenure review policy by the Board of Regents is attached to this document. The UW System Office of General Counsel and the Office of Academic and Student Affairs reviewed the proposed policy. The President recommends approval of the UW-Extension post-tenure review policy.

Attached to this document is Appendix A, containing the new UW-Extension post-tenure review policy as it would read if approved by the Board of Regents.

REQUESTED ACTION

Adoption of Resolution I.1.c, approving the UW-Extension Post-Tenure Review Policy.

DISCUSSION

On March 7, 2017, the UW-Extension Faculty Senate approved the university’s new post-tenure review policy. Attached to this document is Appendix A, containing the new UW-Extension post-tenure review policy as it would read if approved by the Board of Regents, followed by Appendix B containing the existing post-tenure policy with tracked changes. For comparison, Appendix C contains the original post-tenure review policy document.

RELATED REGENT POLICIES AND LAWS

Section 36, Wis. Stats.
Chapters UWS 3 and 5, Wis. Admin. Code
Regent Policy Document 20-23

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EXTENSION UNCLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
GUIDELINES (UPG)**

UPG #12

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EXTENSION POST-TENURE REVIEW AND
DEVELOPMENT POLICY**

12.01 Introduction

This document describes UW-Extension's Post-Tenure Review and Development Policy as adopted by its Faculty Senate on February 7, 2017 accordance with the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System Policy Document 20-9.

Tenure is an essential part of the guarantee of academic freedom that is necessary for university-based intellectual life to flourish. The granting of a tenure appointment to faculty members represents an enormous investment of university and societal resources, and those who receive this investment do so only after rigorous review by the faculty member's academic department which established that their scholarship, research, teaching, and service met the highest standards and are congruent with the needs of UW-Extension.

It is the policy of the Board of Regents that a periodic, post-tenure review of tenured faculty members is essential to promoting faculty development, which includes recognizing innovation and creativity; enhancing the educational environment for students and clientele; and identifying and redressing deficiencies in overall performance of duties through a supportive and developmental remediation process.

Nothing in this policy shall be interpreted to alter or to infringe upon existing tenure rights, as set forth in UW System Board of Regents or UW System policies, nor shall this policy diminish the important guarantees of academic freedom. Specifically, this policy does not supersede administrative rules providing for termination for cause set forth in Chapter UWS 4 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code. The purpose of Post-Tenure Reviews is specific to the academic substance of the faculty member's scholarship, research, teaching, and service.

The UW-Extension post-tenure review process is separate and distinct from the annual faculty merit review process. The faculty annual merit review process includes a peer review and is specified in institutional faculty policy UWEX Chapter 3.21 and UPG #1.

12.02 Purpose

The purposes of the University of Wisconsin-Extension Post-Tenure Review and Development Policy are:

- to recognize and foster the scholarly work of its faculty. Scholarship includes teaching, research, outreach and integration. (Boyer, 1990)

UW-Extension defines scholarship as:

- creative, intellectual work;
- reviewed by the scholar's peers who affirm its value;
- added to our intellectual history through its communication; and
- valued by those for whom it was intended.
- to assure that faculty members commit their talents to best serve the interests of students, colleagues, and clients, the institution, the academic discipline, and their own intellectual growth;
- to assist tenured faculty in their continuing professional development; and
- to provide guidance and support for addressing any deficiencies identified in the current review.

12.03 Guidelines for Post-Tenured Review and Development

Each UW-Extension Academic Department shall develop and implement a Post-Tenure Review and Development Policy. Departmental policies must be approved by the Faculty Senate, and copies kept on file with the Secretary of the Faculty. Each policy must include the following statement in its introduction:

The Post-Tenure Review and Development Policy reflects the University of Wisconsin-Extension's commitment of promoting the continued high-quality teaching, research/scholarship, and service of its tenured faculty; thereby, enhancing the educational environment for its students, clients and the larger community. The primary purpose of the periodic, post-tenure review of tenured faculty is to support tenured faculty development.

Each Academic Department's policy may also contain specific details and criteria appropriate to the mission of that department, but all departmental policies must adhere to the following:

(1) Frequency and period of review

The post-tenure review period begins in the academic year following the granting of tenure. A review shall be conducted every five years of each tenured faculty member's activities and performance. A faculty member may request a new

review after two years. This new review provides the faculty member with the opportunity to share their most recent scholarly work, reflect upon the impact of their work on students, clients, colleagues, communities and their profession as well as inform their peers of how their professional growth has contributed to these accomplishments. This review also provides the opportunity for further support of tenured faculty development.

The review may be deferred, only with the approval of the provost in consultation with the academic department chair and the dean, for unusual circumstances such as when it may coincide with an approved leave, promotion review, or other appointment. In such cases, the provost will specify the new review cycle that applies to the faculty member. The periodic, post-tenure review may substitute for the annual review in the year a faculty member is scheduled for such review.

The notice of the intent to review must be given by the academic department chair or designee at least three months before the review is conducted.

(2) Criteria and methods for review

(a) Criteria

It is essential that the review process includes fair, reliable, and valid measures to assess performance. The review and methods shall fully respect academic freedom. The review process will also consider the specific missions of UW-Extension divisions and academic departments.

Each faculty member's scholarly growth and professional development shall be evaluated on the criteria appropriate for the individual job description and the division's and/or academic department's mission, such as:

Scholarship is the foundational concept of faculty work. Scholarly activity and behavior is demonstrated throughout a faculty member's academic career including teaching, research, service and outreach. UW-Extension's definition of scholarship and guidelines for its assessment are detailed in Appendix-IC of the Articles of Faculty Governance.

Scholarship shall be demonstrated by the faculty member and evaluated by the department's review committee in addition to the criteria below:

- Education and experience
- Continuing professional development and growth
- Leadership in program development
- Effective working relationships with colleagues and clientele
- Contributions to the profession, department and university

The review shall include student, colleague, and client evaluations as appropriate.

(b) Methods

UW-Extension comprises a diverse grouping of divisions, units, and academic departments with differing functions and missions. Recognizing this diversity and the need to allow for flexibility, it is anticipated that Post-Tenure Review and Development Policies from different academic departments will not be exactly alike. In addition, each departmental policy, however, must require the following be part of an individual faculty member's Post-Tenure Review and Development Plan evaluation:

- a concise report, reflective of accomplishments, impacts, challenges, and future directions, written by the faculty member, and consisting of no more than eight pages, stating progress on the criteria listed above, as appropriate to the faculty position. Existing reports may be included within the eight-page report. The faculty member will prepare, in addition to the report, a proposed plan for scholarly growth and professional development (not to exceed one page) which identifies his/her preferred professional development activities for the next five years;
- review and assessment by a departmental review committee, consistent with department guidelines that specify that a review committee is appointed or elected and composed of department members;
- a meeting of the departmental review committee and the faculty member to review progress, accomplishments, and proposed scholarly growth and professional development activities;
- determination of the level of performance during the review period reflecting the overall results of the review:
 - Meets expectations: tenured faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment.
 - Does not meet expectations: tenured faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment below the expected level and which requires correction. All reviews resulting in “does not meet expectations,” unless overturned upon further review, will result in a remediation plan as described below.
 - Exceeds expectations: tenured faculty members whose performance reflects a significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the institution, college or school, or

department, and

- written feedback, in the form of a summary report prepared by the departmental review committee that includes a mutually agreed-upon plan for scholarly growth and professional development. Included in the report is the provision the tenured faculty member has the opportunity to provide a written response to the report.

(3) Responsibilities

Section 36.09(3)(a) Wis. Stats. gives chancellors of the institutions, in consultation with their faculties, the responsibility for defining and administering institutional standards for faculty peer evaluation, promotion and tenure, and recommending individual merit increases.

The review shall be initiated by the academic department chair/designee and/or a departmental review committee which:

- may solicit input from administrators, county partners, students/clients and other partner agencies, as appropriate;
- may seek input from the faculty member's peers and the faculty member; and
- shall summarize the review and transmit a summary report to the faculty member and the department chair.

In consultation with the Department Review Committee, the Department Chair shall prepare a letter recommending that the faculty member be assigned to one of the three categories of “meets expectations,” “does not meet expectations,” or “exceeds expectations,” as outlined above. The Department Chair shall inform the faculty of his/her right to discuss the recommendation and of his/her right to submit a written response to the review committee’s recommendation within seven days of the issuance of the summary report. At the conclusion of the seven days, the Department Chair shall submit to the Dean the faculty member’s post tenure review materials, including the summary report, the recommendation letter from the Department Chair, and any response letter from the faculty member.

After reviewing the submitted materials, the Dean shall submit to the Provost or designee a letter of recommendation based on an administrative review of the submitted materials. The Dean’s letter shall recommend that the faculty member be assigned to one of the three categories of “meets expectations,” “does not meet expectations,” or “exceeds expectations,” as outlined above. If the Dean changes the performance rating recommended by the Department Chair, the Dean shall include in the letter credible rationale and evidence for the change in

the performance rating. The Dean shall provide the faculty member with a copy of the letter of recommendation and inform the faculty member of his/her right to discuss the recommendation and of his/her right to submit a written response to the Dean's recommendation within seven days of the issuance of the Dean's letter. At the conclusion of the seven days, the Dean shall forward to the Provost or designee the faculty member's post-tenure review materials, including the Dean's recommendation letter, the summary report, the letter from the Department Chair, and any response letters from the faculty member.

After reviewing the submitted materials, The Provost or designee shall submit to the Chancellor a letter of recommendation based on an administrative review of the submitted materials. The Provost's or designee's letter shall recommend that the faculty member be assigned to one of the three categories of "meets expectations," "does not meet expectations," or "exceeds expectations," as outlined above. The Provost or designee shall provide the faculty member with a copy of the recommendation and inform the faculty member of his/her right to discuss the recommendation and of his/her right to submit a written response to the Provost's or designee's recommendation within seven days of the issuance of the Provost/designee's letter. At the conclusion of the seven days, the Provost or designee shall forward to the Chancellor the faculty member's post-tenure review materials, including the Provost/designee's recommendation letter, the summary report, the letters from the Department Chair and the Dean, and any response letters from the faculty member.

After reviewing the submitted materials, the Chancellor shall make a determination that assigns the faculty member to one of the three categories of "meets expectations," "does not meet expectations," or "exceeds expectations," as outlined above. The Chancellor shall forward this determination in a letter to the faculty member, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost. A letter indicating a faculty member's performance "does not meet expectations" shall include information on the remediation procedures as indicated in (5)(b) below. The letter from the Chancellor is to be issued no later than March 31.

The academic department chair or designee and departmental review committee shall share responsibility for keeping a written record of the review process.

An individual faculty member's completed Post-Tenure Review (including the summary report; any letters from the faculty member; recommendation letters from the Department Chair, Dean, Provost/designee, and Chancellor; a remediation plan, if appropriate; and letters regarding the outcome of the remediation process) shall be placed

by the Dean in that faculty member's official divisional personnel file. The Dean may furnish copies to appropriate administrators.

(4) Linkage with merit process

In the year of a tenured faculty member's review, the results of the review as described in the summary report will be the primary basis for consideration for merit during the annual pay plan distribution. Tenured faculty receiving exceeds expectations rating shall be considered for merit. In years between post-tenure reviews, the results of the most recent post-tenure review must be considered along with annual performance review information in the annual merit process. The specific annual salary changes will depend on the UW System and UW-Extension guidelines for merit salary determinations, post-tenure review results, and the specific context of the faculty member's appointment. Faculty receiving a rating of exceeds expectations could be rewarded in ways other than and/or in addition to merit salary increase. Unique opportunities for professional growth and scholarship may be made available. These may include, but are not limited to, professional development funding, sabbatical leave or other opportunities consistent with institutional policies.

(5) Enhancement of Scholarly Growth and Professional Development

(a) Growth and Development opportunities

Upon completion of a tenured faculty member's review, the department will, in collaboration with the Dean, identify opportunities for and sources of support for continuing scholarly growth and professional development. However, it is the faculty member's responsibility to carry out the summary report's recommendations for scholarly growth and professional development with the cooperation of the University and any other contributing bodies.

(b) Remediation responsibility

When a faculty member receives a review in the category of "does not meet expectations" the following procedures are required:

The Chancellor's letter informing the faculty member they received a performance rating of "does not meet expectations" shall include information on the remediation procedures described below.

- i. The primary focus of the remediation plan shall be developmental and provide the faculty member with appropriate support from the academic department or Dean as

- applicable.
- ii. A remediation plan will be developed by the faculty member, in consultation with the faculty member's academic department and Dean, to assist the faculty member in addressing deficiencies identified in the review.
 - iii. The plan shall include a provision for a mechanism for determining how and when the faculty member will have satisfied the expectations of the remediation plan as determined by the Dean in consultation with the Chancellor and faculty member; however, all elements of the plan must be satisfied within a reasonable time period, commensurate with the identified deficiencies determined by the Dean and academic department, not to be fewer than 12 months and within 18 months from the date the remediation process is initiated. In remediation plans related to a performance shortfall in research where more than eighteen months may be necessary to correct identified deficiencies, an extension of four months shall be permitted only with the approval of the Chancellor, which shall trigger a notification of that extension to the UW System Administration Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs. At the conclusion of the remediation time frame, the faculty member's academic department shall submit a letter to the Dean indicating if the faculty member has satisfied the expectations of the remediation plan. This letter and any follow-up communication shall be placed by the Dean in the faculty member's official divisional personnel file.
 - iv. The plan shall include a provision for possible actions to be taken if the faculty member fails to meet the expectations set forth in the remediation plan, in accordance with existing policies found in UWEX Faculty Policies and Procedures Chapter 4, <http://www.uwex.edu/human-resources/policies/UW-Extension-Faculty-Chapter4.pdf> and Chapter 6, <http://www.uwex.edu/human-resources/policies/UW-Extension-Faculty-Chapter6.pdf>.

(6) Accountability measures

UW-Extension ensures full implementation of the Post-Tenure Review and Development Plan. The Dean will have the responsibility to assure fairness and equity in the review process.

The academic department chairs are required to report annually to the dean and provost that all periodic, post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty in that annual cycle have been completed.

The provost has responsibility for ensuring the reviews are completed on schedule.

Evidence of accountability will be accomplished by the responsible Dean submitting a report on an annual basis to the Provost. The report shall contain the following elements:

- (a) identification of post-tenure reviews conducted during the review period
- (b) brief description of the results of the reviews to include:
 - identification of faculty members whose performance exceeds expectations;
 - plans for professional growth and development including monitoring; and
 - remediation plans.
- (c) reviews scheduled for the next year.

The reviews conducted and remediation plans developed in accordance with this policy are not subject to the grievance process set forth in UWS 6.02.

Boyer, E.L. (1990). Scholarship Reconsideration: Priorities of the Professorate. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Adopted May 1993
Revised February 1994
Revised October 1997
Revised June 2004
Revised February 2017

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EXTENSION UNCLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
GUIDELINES (UPG)**

UPG #12

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EXTENSION ~~POST-TENURED~~ REVIEW AND
FACULTY REVIEW AND
DEVELOPMENT POLICY**

12.01 Introduction

This document describes UW-Extension's ~~Post-Tenured Faculty~~ Review and Development Policy as adopted by its Faculty Senate ~~on February 7, 2017~~ on February 7, 2017 ~~November 1, 2016~~ in accordance with the following the guidelines of the University of Wisconsin System Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System Policy Document 20-9:

Tenure is an essential part of the guarantee of academic freedom that is necessary for university-based intellectual life to flourish. The granting of a tenure appointment to faculty members represents an enormous investment of university and societal resources, and those who receive this investment do so only after rigorous review by the faculty member's academic department which established that their scholarship, research, teaching, and service met the highest standards and are congruent with the needs of the UW-Extension university.

It is the policy of the Board of Regents that a periodic, post-tenure review of tenured faculty members is essential to promoting faculty development, which includes including recognizing innovation and creativity; enhancing the educational environment for students and clientele; and identifying and redressing deficiencies in overall performance of duties through a supportive and developmental remediation process.

Nothing in this policy shall be interpreted to alter or to infringe upon existing tenure rights, as set forth in UW System Board of Regents or UW System policies, nor shall this policy diminish the important guarantees of academic freedom. Specifically, this policy does not supersede administrative rules providing for termination for cause set forth in Chapter UWS 4 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code. The purpose of Post-Tenure Reviews is specific to the academic substance of the faculty member's scholarship, research, teaching, and service.

The UW-Extension post-tenure review process is separate and distinct from the annual faculty review process. The faculty annual merit review process includes a peer review and is specified in institutional faculty policy UWEX Chapter 3.21 and UPG #1.

~~The UW-Extension faculty and administration recognize that the periodic review of tenured faculty is necessary to ensure that individual faculty continue to demonstrate scholarship, grow professionally, and effectively share their expertise with students, clients, and colleagues throughout their university career.~~

12.02 Purpose

The purposes of the University of Wisconsin-Extension ~~Post-Tenured Faculty~~ Review and Development Policy ~~are~~ are:

- to recognize and foster the scholarly work of its faculty. Scholarship includes teaching, research, outreach and integration. (Boyer, 1990)¹;

UW-Extension defines scholarship as:

- creative, intellectual work;
- reviewed by the scholar's peers who affirm its value;
- added to our intellectual history through its communication; and
valued by those for whom it was intended.

~~Scholarship in UW Extension is:~~

- ~~• creative, intellectual work;~~
 - ~~• reviewed by the scholar's peers who affirm its value;~~
 - ~~• added to our intellectual history through its communication; and~~
 - ~~• valued by those for whom it was intended.~~
- ~~• **NOTE:** UW Extension's definition of scholarship and guidelines for its assessment are detailed in Appendix I.B of the Articles of Faculty~~

- to assure that faculty members commit their talents to best serve the interests of students, colleagues, and clients, the institution, the academic discipline, and their own intellectual growth;
- to assist tenured faculty in their continuing professional development; and
- to provide guidance and support for addressing any deficiencies identified in the current review.
- ~~The tenured faculty review and development process shall respect all aspects of academic freedom.~~

12.03 Guidelines for ~~Post-Tenured Faculty~~ Review and Development

~~The goal of the Tenured Faculty Review and Development process is to:~~

- ~~• ensure continuing scholarly growth and development of faculty professional skills;~~
- ~~• encourage faculty exploration of new ways to promote academic excellence;~~
- ~~• identify areas for improvement; and~~

- ~~provide support for that improvement.~~

Each UW-Extension Academic Department shall develop and implement a Post-Tenured Faculty Review and Development Policy. Departmental policies must be approved by the Faculty Senate, and copies kept on file with the Secretary of the Faculty. Each policy must include the following statement in its introduction:

~~The UW-Extension Post-Tenured Faculty Review and Development Policy reflects the University of Wisconsin-Extension's commitment of promoting the continued high-quality teaching, research/scholarship, and service of its tenured faculty; thereby, enhancing ; thereby, enhancing and thereby to enhance the educational environment for its students, clients and the larger community. The primary purpose of the periodic, post-tenure review of tenured faculty is to support tenured faculty development, was created with the idea that the collegial review should provide an opportunity for long-term reflection on the accomplishments, scholarship, and aspirations of the faculty member being reviewed. The review of the tenured faculty serves as a continuation of the evaluation process that initially led to the granting of tenure.~~

Each Academic Department's policy may also contain specific details and criteria appropriate to the mission of that department, but all departmental policies should adhere to the following general guidelines:

(1) Frequency and period of review

The post-tenure review period begins in the academic year following the granting of tenure. A review shall be conducted every five years of each tenured faculty member's activities and performance.

~~Tenured faculty performance shall be reviewed once every five years. The review shall cover performance for the previous five years.~~—A faculty member may request a new review after two years. This new review provides the faculty member with the opportunity to share their most recent scholarly work, reflect upon the impact of their work on students, clients, colleagues, communities, and their profession as well as inform their peers of how their professional growth has contributed to these accomplishments. This review also provides the opportunity for further support of tenured faculty development.

~~The post-tenure review period begins in the academic year following the granting of tenure.~~—The review may be deferred, only with the approval of the provost in consultation with the academic department chair and the dean, for unusual circumstances such as when it may coincide with an approved leave, promotion review, or other appointment. In such cases, the provost will specify the new review cycle that applies to the faculty member. The periodic, post-tenure review may substitute for the annual review in the year a faculty member is scheduled for such review.

The notice of the intent to review must be given by the academic department

chair or designee at least three months before the review is conducted.

(2) Criteria and methods for review

(a) Criteria

It is essential that the review process includes fair, reliable, and valid measures to assess performance. The review and methods shall fully respect academic freedom. ~~Progress and accomplishments shall support the mission of UW-Extension.~~ The review process will also consider the specific missions of UW-Extension divisions and academic departments.

Each faculty member's scholarly growth and professional development shall be evaluated on the criteria appropriate for the individual job description and the division's and/or academic department's mission, such as:

Scholarship is the foundational concept of faculty work. [See 12.02 Purpose]. Scholarly activity and behavior is demonstrated throughout a faculty member's academic career including teaching, research, service and outreach. UW-Extension's definition of scholarship and guidelines for its assessment are detailed in Appendix-IC of the Articles of Faculty Governance. Scholarship shall~~Documentation of scholarship should be demonstrated by the faculty member and evaluated by the department's review committee with the criteria below:~~

- ~~evidence of continuing scholarship in:~~
 - ✓—~~research,~~
 - ✓—~~integration,~~
 - ✓—~~outreach/engagement, and~~
 - ✓—~~teaching;~~
 - ~~continuing professional development as demonstrated by:~~
 - Leadership in program development
 - Effective working relationships with colleagues and clientele
 - Contributions to the profession, department and university
- ✓—~~personal intellectual growth—acquisition of new job-related skills, ideas, experiences,~~
- ✓—~~contributions to the profession,~~
- ✓—~~contributions to the university—including faculty governance,~~
- ✓—~~program development and implementation, and~~
- ✓—~~administration/leadership of educational and/or research programs.~~

NOTE: UW-Extension's definition of scholarship and guidelines for its assessment are detailed in Appendix-IC of the Articles of Faculty Governance.

The review shall include student, colleague, and client evaluations as appropriate.

(b) Methods

UW-Extension comprises a diverse grouping of divisions, units, and academic departments with differing functions and missions. Recognizing this diversity and the need to allow for flexibility, it is anticipated that ~~Post-Tenured Faculty~~ Review and Development Policies from different academic departments will not be exactly alike. ~~In addition~~~~However~~, each departmental policy; ~~however~~, must require the following be part of an individual faculty member's ~~Post-Tenured Faculty~~ Review and Development Plan evaluation:

- a concise report, reflective of accomplishments, impacts, challenges, and future directions, written by the faculty member, and consisting of no more than eight pages, stating progress on the criteria listed above, as appropriate to the faculty position. Existing reports may be included within the eight-page report. The faculty member will prepare, in addition to the report, a proposed plan for scholarly growth and professional development (not to exceed one page) which identifies his/her preferred professional development activities for the next five years;
- ~~input from sources external to the department but within UW-Extension, and external to UW-Extension (clients, partner agencies, etc.);~~
- review and assessment by a departmental review committee, consistent with department guidelines that specify that a review committee is appointed or elected and composed of department members;
- a meeting of the departmental review committee and the faculty member to review progress, accomplishments, and proposed scholarly growth and professional development activities;
- determination of the level of performance during the review period reflecting the overall results of the review:
 - Meets Expectations: tenured faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment.
 - Does Not Meet Expectations: tenured faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment below the expected level and which requires correction. All reviews resulting in “does not meet expectations”, unless overturned upon further review, will result in a remediation plan as described below.
 - Exceeds Expectations: tenured faculty members whose performance reflects a significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the institution, college or school, or department, and
- and
- written feedback, in the form of a summary report prepared by the departmental review committee that includes a mutually agreed-upon

plan for scholarly growth and professional development. Included in the report is the provision the tenured faculty member has the opportunity to provide a written response to the report within 30 days of the report being issued. This written response is provided to the academic department chair, dean and provost. Such responses are filed with the committee's summary report in the faculty member's personnel file.

(3) Responsibilities

Section 36.09(3)(a) Wis. Stats. gives chancellors of the institutions, in consultation with their faculties, the responsibility for defining and administering institutional standards for faculty peer evaluation, promotion and tenure, and recommending individual merit increases.

~~The academic department chair/designee and departmental review committee shall share responsibility for tenured faculty review and shall also jointly be responsible for keeping a written record of the review process. This record, including a summary report, will provide documentation for the review and assure external constituents that there is appropriate accountability.~~

The review shall be initiated by the academic department chair/designee and/or a departmental review committee ~~which: who shall:~~

- ~~may~~shall solicit input from the ~~appropriate~~ administrative unit chair/head (office chair/department head), state program leader/designee, district director, county partners, students/clients, and other partner agencies, as appropriate;
- may seek input from the faculty member's peers, and the faculty member; and
- shall summarize the review and transmit a summary report to the faculty member and, the department chair, and the dean and provost. The dean and provost each may provide a written response to the summary report.

In consultation with the Department Review Committee, the Department Chair shall prepare a letter recommending that the faculty member be assigned to one of the three categories of "meets expectations", "does not meet expectations", or "exceeds expectations", as outlined above. The Department Chair shall inform the faculty of his/her right to discuss the recommendation and of his/her right to submit a written response to the review committee's recommendation within seven days of the issuance of the summary report. At the conclusion of the seven days, the Department Chair shall submit to the Dean the faculty member's post tenure review materials, including the summary report, the recommendation letter from the Department Chair, and any response letter from the faculty member.

After reviewing the submitted materials, the Dean shall submit to the Provost or designee a letter of recommendation based on an administrative review of the submitted materials. The Dean's letter shall recommend that the faculty member be assigned to one of the three categories of "meets expectations", "does not meet expectations", or "exceeds expectations," as outlined above. If the Dean changes

the performance rating recommended by the Department Chair, the Dean shall include in the letter credible rationale and evidence for the change in the performance rating. The Dean shall provide the faculty member with a copy of the letter of recommendation and inform the faculty member of his/her right to discuss the recommendation and of his/her right to submit a written response to the Dean's recommendation within seven days of the issuance of the Dean's letter. At the conclusion of the seven days, the Dean shall forward to the Provost or designee the faculty member's post-tenure review materials, including the Dean's recommendation letter, the summary report, the letter from the Department Chair, and any response letters from the faculty member.

After reviewing the submitted materials, the Provost or designee will submit to the Chancellor a letter of recommendation based on an administrative review of the submitted materials. The Provost's or designee's letter shall recommend that the faculty member be assigned to one of the three categories of "meets expectations", "does not meet expectations, or "exceeds expectations," as outlined above. The Provost or designee shall provide the faculty member with a copy of the recommendation and inform the faculty member of his/her right to discuss the recommendation and of his/her right to submit a written response to the Provost's or designee's recommendation within seven days of issuance of the Provost/designee's letter. At the conclusion of the seven days, the Provost or designee shall forward to the Chancellor the faculty member's post-tenure review materials, including the Provost/designee's recommendation letter, the summary report, the letters from the Department Chair and the Dean, and any response letters from the faculty member.

After reviewing the submitted materials, the Chancellor shall make a determination that assigns the faculty member to one of the three categories of "meets expectations", does not meet expectations", or "exceeds expectations," as outlined above. The Chancellor shall forward this determination in a letter to the faculty member, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost. A letter indicating a faculty member's performance "does not meet expectations" shall include information on the remediation procedures as indicated in (5)(b) below. The letter from the Chancellor is to be issued no later than March 31.

The academic department chair or designee and departmental review committee shall share responsibility for keeping a written record of the review process

An individual faculty member's completed Post-Tenure Review (including the summary report; any letters from the faculty member; recommendation letters from the Department Chair, Dean, Provost/designee, and Chancellor; a remediation plan, if appropriate; and letters regarding the outcome of the remediation process) shall be placed by the Dean in that faculty member's official divisional personnel file. The Dean may furnish copies to appropriate administrators.

■ _____

■ The academic department chair or designee and departmental review committee shall share responsibility for keeping a written record of the review process. This record, including a summary report and the written response(s) of the faculty member, dean and

~~provost, will provide documentation for the review and assure external constituents that there is appropriate accountability. The summary report is to be submitted to the faculty member, the dean and the provost not later than March 31.~~

~~The summary report on an individual faculty member's completed Post-Tenured Faculty Review and Development Plan and any letters from the faculty member, dean or provost in response to the summary report shall be placed by the dean in that faculty member's official divisional personnel file. The dean may furnish a copies to appropriate administrators y of the report to any of the following individuals as appropriate:~~

- ~~▪—academic department chair;~~
- ~~▪—program leader;~~
- ~~▪—administrative unit chair/head; and~~
- ~~▪——district director.~~

(4) Linkage with merit process

In the year of a tenured faculty member's review, the results of the review as described in the summary report will be the primary basis for consideration for merit during the annual pay plan distribution. Tenured faculty receiving a exceeds expectations rating shall be considered for merit. review (annual pay plan distribution). In years between ~~post-tenured faculty~~ reviews, the results of the most recent ~~post-tenure d faculty~~ review must be considered along with annual performance review information in the annual merit process. The specific annual salary changes will depend on the UW System and UW-Extension guidelines for merit salary determinations, ~~post-tenured faculty~~ review results, and the specific context of the faculty member's appointment. Faculty receiving a rating of "exceeds expectations" could be rewarded in ways other than and/or in addition to merit salary increase. Unique opportunities for professional growth and scholarship may be made available. These may include, but are not limited to, including, but not limited to, professional development funding, sabbatical leave or other opportunities consistent with institutional policies may be made available.

(5) Enhancement of Scholarly Growth and Professional Development

(a) Growth and Development opportunities

Upon completion of a tenured faculty member's review, the department will, in collaboration with the dean ~~or dean's designee~~, identify opportunities for and sources of support for continuing scholarly growth and professional development. However, it is the faculty member's responsibility to carry out the summary report's recommendations for scholarly growth and professional development with the cooperation of the University and any other contributing bodies.

(b) Remediation responsibility

When a faculty member receives a review in the category of “does not meet expectations” the following procedures are required:

The Chancellor’s letter informing the faculty member they received a performance rating of “does not meet expectations” shall include information on the remediation procedures described below.

- ~~— The identification of any deficiencies by the committee must be described in writing and provided to the faculty member within 30 days of the date of the review;~~
 - ~~— The faculty member may provide a written statement to accompany the review within 30 days of receipt of the report.~~
 - ~~— The dean and the chancellor (or designee) shall review the committee’s summary report within 30 days of receipt of the report.~~
 - ~~— Following the chancellor’s or designee’s review, the faculty member will be informed by the chancellor or designee that the faculty member has received a result of “meets expectations”, or that a remediation plan will be developed; and~~
 - ~~— Provisions for a remediation plan to be developed by the faculty member, after consultation with the faculty member’s academic department and dean, to assist the faculty member in addressing those deficiencies identified in the review.~~
- i. The primary focus of the remediation plan shall be developmental and provide the faculty member with appropriate support from the department or dean as applicable.
 - ii. A remediation plan will be developed by the faculty member, in consultation with the faculty member’s academic department and Dean, to assist the faculty member in addressing deficiencies identified in the review.
 - iii. The plan shall include a provision for a mechanism for determining how and when the faculty member will have satisfied the expectations of the remediation plan as determined by the Dean in consultation with the Chancellor or designee and faculty member; however, all elements of the plan must be satisfied within a reasonable time period, commensurate with the identified deficiencies determined by the Dean and academic department, not to be fewer than 12 months and within 18 months from the date the remediation process is initiated. In remediation plans related to a performance shortfall in research where more than eighteen months may be necessary to correct identified deficiencies, and extension of four months shall be permitted only with the approval of the Chancellor, which shall trigger a notification of that extension to the UW System Administration Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs. At the conclusion of the remediation time frame, the faculty member’s academic department shall submit a letter to the Dean indicating if the faculty member has satisfied the expectations of the remediation plan. This letter

and any follow up communication shall be placed by the Dean in the faculty member's official divisional personnel file.~~initiated.~~

- iv. The plan shall include a provision for possible actions to be taken if ~~when~~ the faculty member fails to meet the expectations set forth in the remediation plan, in accordance with ~~which includes reference to existing faculty complaint processes~~ policies found in UWEX Faculty Policies and Procedures Chapter 4 <http://www.uwex.edu/human-resources/policies/UW-Extension-Faculty-Chapter4.pdf> and Chapter 6 <http://www.uwex.edu/human-resources/policies/UW-Extension-Faculty-Chapter6.pdf>, ~~and which permits the imposition of discipline, as appropriate, up to and including dismissal for cause under Wisconsin Administrative Code UWS 4.~~

~~in faculty performance identified in the Tenured Faculty Review and Development Plan summary report must be addressed to ensure the quality of the academic program. Responsibility for remedying performance problems is shared with the individual faculty member, the academic department, and the administration.~~

~~For a faculty member whose review reveals significant developmental needs in performance, a remediation review team shall be appointed by the dean based on recommendations from the department chair. The remediation review team shall work with the faculty member and the dean in determining a mutually agreed upon action plan for the next 12 months. At the conclusion of the 12-month-long remediation period, the remediation review team shall prepare a report on the outcome(s) of the remediation effort and forward that report to the dean.~~

~~If an individual does not meet the requirements of the action plan, the institution may proceed with discipline short of dismissal for cause, under Chapters UWS and UWEX 6, or, in extreme instances where the facts warrant it, with dismissal for cause, under Chapters UWS and UWEX 4.~~

(6) Accountability measures

UW-Extension ensures full implementation of the Post-Tenured Faculty Review and Development Plan. The ~~divisional~~ Dean will have the responsibility to assure fairness and equity in the review process.

The academic department chairs are required to report annually to the dean and provost that all periodic, post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty in that annual cycle have been completed.

The provost has responsibility for ensuring the reviews are completed on schedule.

Evidence of accountability will be accomplished by ~~the responsible each~~ divisional Dean submitting a report on an annual basis to the ~~Provost~~ Vice

~~Chancellor~~. The report shall contain the following elements:

~~(a)~~ ~~(a)~~ identification of post-tenure reviews conducted during the review period

~~(b)~~ ~~(b)~~ a brief description of the results of the reviews to include:

- identification of faculty members whose performance exceeds expectations; meritorious performance;
 - plans for professional growth and development including monitoring; and
 - remediation plans.
 - ~~▪ procedures; and~~
 - ~~▪ remediation plans.~~
 - ~~▪ plans for professional growth and development including monitoring;~~
 - ~~▪ procedures; and~~
 - remediation plans.
- ~~(c)~~ ~~(c)~~ reviews scheduled for the next year.

The reviews conducted and remediation plans developed in accordance with this policy are not subject to the grievance process set forth in ~~Chapter UWS 6.02, Wis. Admin. Code.~~

Adopted May 1993

Revised February 1994

Revised October 1997

Revised June 2004

Revised November 2016

Revised February 2017

¹ Boyer, E.L. (1990). Scholarship Reconsideration: Priorities of the Professorate. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

APPENDIX C
Existing Post-Tenure Review Policy

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EXTENSION UNCLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
GUIDELINES (UPG)**

UPG #12

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EXTENSION TENURED FACULTY REVIEW AND
DEVELOPMENT POLICY**

12.01 Introduction

This document describes UW-Extension's Tenured Faculty Review and Development Policy as adopted by its Faculty Senate following the guidelines of the University of Wisconsin System Board of Regents.

The UW-Extension faculty and administration recognize that the periodic review of tenured faculty is necessary to ensure that individual faculty continue to demonstrate scholarship, grow professionally, and effectively share their expertise with students, clients, and colleagues throughout their university career.

12.02 Purpose

The purposes of the University of Wisconsin-Extension Tenured Faculty Review and Development Policy are:

- to recognize and foster the scholarly work of its faculty;

Scholarship in UW-Extension is:

- creative, intellectual work;
- reviewed by the scholar's peers who affirm its value;
- added to our intellectual history through its communication; and
- valued by those for whom it was intended.

NOTE: UW-Extension's definition of scholarship and guidelines for its assessment are detailed in Appendix I.B of the Articles of Faculty Governance.

- to assure that faculty members commit their talents to best serve the interests of students, colleagues, and clients, the institution, the academic discipline, and their own intellectual growth;
- to assist tenured faculty in their continuing professional development; and
- to provide guidance and support for addressing any deficiencies identified in the current review.

The tenured faculty review and development process shall respect all aspects of academic freedom.

12.03 Guidelines for Tenured Faculty Review and Development

The goal of the Tenured Faculty Review and Development process is to:

- ensure continuing scholarly growth and development of faculty professional skills;
- encourage faculty exploration of new ways to promote academic excellence;
- identify areas for improvement; and
- provide support for that improvement.

Each UW-Extension Academic Department shall develop and implement a Tenured Faculty Review and Development policy. Departmental policies must be approved by the Faculty Senate, and copies kept on file with the Secretary of the Faculty. Each policy must include the following statement in its introduction:

The UW-Extension Tenured Faculty Review and Development Policy was created with the idea that the collegial review should provide an opportunity for long-term reflection on the accomplishments, scholarship, and aspirations of the faculty member being reviewed. The review of the tenured faculty serves as a continuation of the evaluation process that initially led to the granting of tenure.

Each Academic Department's policy may also contain specific details and criteria appropriate to the mission of that department, but all departmental policies should adhere to the following general guidelines:

(1) Frequency and period of review

Tenured faculty performance shall be reviewed once every five years. The review shall cover performance for the previous five years. A faculty member may request a new review after two years.

(2) Criteria and methods for review

(a) Criteria

It is essential that the review process includes fair, reliable, and valid measures to assess performance. The review and methods shall fully respect academic freedom. Progress and accomplishments shall support the mission of UW-Extension. The review process will also consider the specific missions of UW-Extension divisions and academic departments.

Each faculty member's scholarly growth and professional development shall be evaluated on the criteria appropriate for the individual job description and the division's and/or academic department's mission, such as:

- evidence of continuing scholarship in:
 - ✓ research,
 - ✓ integration,
 - ✓ outreach/engagement, and
 - ✓ teaching;
- continuing professional development as demonstrated by:

- ✓ personal intellectual growth – acquisition of new job-related skills, ideas, experiences,
- ✓ contributions to the profession,
- ✓ contributions to the university – including faculty governance,
- ✓ program development and implementation, and
- ✓ administration/leadership of educational and/or research programs.

The review shall include student, colleague, and client evaluations as appropriate.

(b) Methods

UW-Extension comprises a diverse grouping of divisions, units, and academic departments with differing functions and missions. Recognizing this diversity and the need to allow for flexibility, it is anticipated that Tenured Faculty Review and Development Policies from different academic departments will not be exactly alike. However, each departmental policy must require the following be part of an individual faculty member's Tenured Faculty Review and Development Plan evaluation:

- a concise report, reflective of accomplishments, impacts, challenges, and future directions, written by the faculty member, and consisting of no more than eight pages, stating progress on the criteria listed above, as appropriate to the faculty position. Existing reports may be included within the eight-page report. The faculty member will prepare, in addition to the report, a proposed plan for scholarly growth and professional development (not to exceed one page) which identifies his/her preferred professional development activities for the next five years;
- input from sources external to the department but within UW-Extension, and external to UW-Extension (clients, partner agencies, etc.);
- review and assessment by a departmental review committee, consistent with department guidelines;
- a meeting of the departmental review committee and the faculty member to review progress, accomplishments, and proposed scholarly growth and professional development activities; and
- written feedback, in the form of a summary report prepared by the departmental review committee that includes a mutually agreed-upon plan for scholarly growth and professional development.

(3) Responsibilities

Section 36.09(3)(a) Wis. Stats. gives chancellors of the institutions, in consultation with their faculties, the responsibility for defining and administering institutional standards for faculty peer evaluation, promotion and tenure, and recommending individual merit increases. The academic department chair/designee and departmental review committee shall share responsibility for tenured faculty review and shall also jointly be responsible for keeping a written record of the review process. This record, including a summary report, will provide documentation for the review and assure external constituents that there is appropriate accountability.

The review shall be initiated by the academic department chair/designee and/or a departmental review committee who shall:

- solicit input from the administrative unit chair/head (office chair/department head), state program leader/designee, district director, county partners, students/clients, and other partner agencies, as appropriate;
- seek input from the faculty member's peers, and the faculty member; and
- summarize the review and transmit a summary report to the faculty member and the dean.

The summary report on an individual faculty member's completed Tenured Faculty Review and Development Plan shall be placed by the dean in that faculty member's official divisional personnel file. The dean may furnish a copy of the report to any of the following individuals as appropriate:

- academic department chair;
- program leader;
- administrative unit chair/head; and
- district director.

(4) Linkage with merit process

In the year of a tenured faculty member's review, the results of the review as described in the summary report will be the primary basis for merit review (annual pay plan distribution). In years between tenured faculty reviews, the results of the most recent tenured faculty review must be considered along with annual performance review information in the annual merit process. The specific annual salary changes will depend on the UW System and UW-Extension guidelines for merit salary determinations, tenured faculty review results, and the specific context of the faculty member's appointment.

(5) Enhancement of Scholarly Growth and Professional Development

(a) Growth and Development opportunities

Upon completion of a tenured faculty member's review, the department will, in collaboration with the dean or dean's designee, identify opportunities for and sources of support for continuing scholarly growth and professional development. However, it is the faculty member's responsibility to carry out the summary report's recommendations for scholarly growth and professional development with the cooperation of the University and any other contributing bodies.

(b) Remediation responsibility

Deficiencies in faculty performance identified in the Tenured Faculty Review and Development Plan summary report must be addressed to ensure the quality of the academic program. Responsibility for remedying performance problems is shared with the individual faculty member, the academic department, and the administration.

For a faculty member whose review reveals significant developmental needs in performance, a remediation review team shall be appointed by the dean based on recommendations from the department chair. The remediation review team shall work with the faculty member and the dean in determining a mutually agreed-upon action plan for the next 12 months. At the conclusion of the 12-month-long remediation period, the remediation review team shall prepare a report on the outcome(s) of the remediation effort and forward that report to the dean.

If an individual does not meet the requirements of the action plan, the institution may proceed with discipline short of dismissal for cause, under Chapters UWS and UWEX 6, or, in extreme instances where the facts warrant it, with dismissal for cause, under Chapters UWS and UWEX 4.

(6) Accountability measures

UW-Extension ensures full implementation of the Tenured Faculty Review and Development Plan. The divisional dean will have the responsibility to assure fairness and equity in the review process.

Evidence of accountability will be accomplished by each divisional dean submitting a report on an annual basis to the Vice Chancellor. The report shall contain the following elements:

- (a) identification of reviews conducted during the review period
- (b) a brief description of the results of the reviews to include:
 - identification of meritorious performance;
 - plans for professional growth and development including monitoring;
 - procedures; and
 - remediation plans.
- (c) reviews scheduled for the next year.

Adopted May 1993

Revised February 1994

Revised October 1997

Revised June 2004

March 7, 2017

James Henderson
Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs
University of Wisconsin System

RE: Support for UW-Extension's UPG12/Post-Tenure Review Policy

Dear Jim:

I fully support the UW-Extension UPG12/Post-Tenure Review policy that was approved by our Faculty Senate on March 7, 2017. It is my understanding that this version has incorporated all suggestions from UW System Legal Affairs and UW System Academic and Student Affairs.

Thank you for including review and approval of UW-Extension's UPG12 in the earliest Education Committee's agenda. Please contact me or Provost Aaron Brower if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Cathy Sandeen
Chancellor

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Resolution I.1.d:

That, upon the recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Parkside and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Chancellor is authorized to implement the University's Post-Tenure Review Policy.

UW-PARKSIDE POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Section UWS 2.02, Wis. Admin. Code (“Faculty Rules: Coverage and Delegation”), requires that rules, policies, and procedures developed by each institution in the UW System pursuant to Chapters UWS 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 be approved by the Board of Regents prior to taking effect.

On March 10, 2016, the UW System Board of Regents adopted revised Regent Policy Document (RPD) 20-9, "Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development," available at <https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/policies/periodic-post-tenure-review-in-support-of-tenured-faculty-development>). RPD 20-9 states that “[w]ithin nine (9) months of the effective date of this Regent policy each institution shall submit an institutional policy to the Board of Regents. Once the institutional policy has been approved, the chancellor, with the advice and counsel of the faculty, is responsible for implementing the policy and operating the institution consistent with its provisions.”

A memo from Chancellor Ford requesting approval of the UW-Parkside post-tenure review policy by the Board of Regents is attached to this document. The UW System Office of General Counsel and the Office of Academic and Student Affairs reviewed the proposed policy. The President recommends approval of the UW-Parkside post-tenure review policy.

Attached to this document is Appendix A, containing the new UW-Parkside post-tenure review policy as it would read if approved by the Board of Regents.

REQUESTED ACTION

Adoption of Resolution I.1.d approving the UW-Parkside Post-Tenure Review Policy.

DISCUSSION

On February 7, 2017, the UW-Parkside Faculty Senate approved the university’s new post-tenure review policy. Attached to this document is Appendix A, containing the new UW-Parkside post-tenure review policy as it would read if approved by the Board of Regents, followed by Appendix B containing the existing post-tenure policy with tracked changes.

RELATED REGENT POLICIES AND LAWS

Section 36, Wis. Stats.
Chapters UWS 3 and 5, Wis. Admin. Code
Regent Policy Document 20-23

APPENDIX A
New Post-Tenure Review Policy

6.10 Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development [Version 6]

The overriding purpose of the periodic, post-tenure review is tenured faculty development. This review shall not infringe on existing faculty rights and protections, including those of academic freedom. The review and its consequences are not subject to the grievance process set forth in UWS 6.02.

(1) Results of Review

The review will consider whether the faculty member under review has discharged conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member's position. The outcome of the review shall be one of the following:

- (a) Meets expectations. This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment.
- (b) Does not meet expectations. This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment below the expected level and which requires correction.

(2) Criteria of Evaluation

The criteria of evaluation shall be within the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service, and shall be as established by UWPF 6.01 (1-4, 6), PSF 56/13-14, and department policies adopted pursuant to the foregoing.

(3) Process

- (a) Each tenured faculty member's activities and performance shall be reviewed every five years. The post-tenure review period begins in the academic year following the granting of tenure. The review may be deferred, only with the approval of the provost, for unusual circumstances such as when it may coincide with an approved leave, promotion review, or other appointment. In such cases, the provost will specify the new review cycle that applies to the faculty member.
- (b) The post-tenure review shall be conducted in the spring semester, coincident with, but distinct from, the annual review. The annual review, including the awarding of merit scores, shall occur in the post-tenure review year, following established policies.
- (c) The tenured faculty member under review shall be notified at least three months prior to the commencement of the review. However, failure to meet this notice deadline does not obviate the requirement to conduct and participate in the review.
- (d) The review will be conducted by the department executive committee, utilizing the criteria specified in UWPF 6.10(2). The materials considered by the executive committee shall include a current curriculum vitae and annual summaries for the period since the last review or since

tenure. Additional evidence of accomplishments in teaching, research/creative activity, and service may be considered as deemed appropriate.

(e) The executive committee shall provide a draft written report of its findings, including whether the reviewed faculty member meets expectations or does not meet expectations, to the reviewed faculty member and the dean. The reviewed faculty member and the dean may provide written responses to the executive committee. The executive committee shall then provide a final written report of its findings to the reviewed faculty member, who may give a written response. The final written report of the executive committee, along with the written response of the reviewed faculty member, if any, shall be provided to the dean and the provost, coincident with the provision of annual reviews to the dean.

(f) If the result of the review contained in the final written report of the executive committee is that the reviewed faculty member “does not meet expectations”, the procedures in UWPF 6.10 (4) shall be followed.

(g) The written report of a review resulting in a finding of “meets expectations” by the executive committee shall be submitted to the chancellor or designee, along with written responses of the faculty member and dean. The chancellor or designee may overturn the finding, in doing so providing a written explanation, including specific evidence of deficiencies, as to why the finding was overturned. The faculty member may provide a written response to the chancellor or designee’s finding. Upon the overturning of the finding of “meets expectations” by the chancellor or designee, the procedures in UWPF 6.10 (5) shall be followed.

(4) Procedures That Apply When a Faculty Member is Found Not to Meet Expectations by the Executive Committee

(a) When a reviewed faculty member is found by the executive committee not to meet expectations, the written report of the executive committee shall identify and describe the deficiencies.

(b) A finding of “does not meet expectations” shall be reviewed by the dean, and then by the chancellor or designee. The reviewed faculty member may provide a written statement to accompany these reviews. Following the chancellor or designee’s review, the faculty member will be informed in writing by the chancellor or designee that the faculty member has received a result of “meets expectations,” or that a remediation plan will be developed. If the chancellor or designee concurs with the finding of “does not meet expectations”, the procedures in UWPF 6.10 (5) shall be followed.

(5) Remediation Plans

(a) When a finding of “does not meet expectations” has been made or confirmed by the chancellor or designee, then a remediation plan shall be developed by the faculty member in consultation with the dean, in order to assist the faculty member in addressing the deficiencies identified in the review.

i. The primary focus of the remediation plan shall be developmental and provide the faculty member with appropriate support from the department or dean as applicable.

ii The dean, faculty member, and chancellor shall establish a mechanism for determining how and when the faculty member will have satisfied the expectations of the remediation plan. The dean, in consultation with the chancellor and faculty member, shall make a written determination in accord with the mechanism established, and shall provide copies to the faculty member, department executive committee, and chancellor or designee. All elements of the plan must be satisfied within three academic semesters following the establishment of the plan, with summer and winter sessions not counting as semesters. In those few remediation plans related to a performance shortfall in research where more than three academic semesters may be necessary to correct identified deficiencies, an extension of one academic semester shall be permitted only with the approval of the chancellor, which shall trigger a notification of that extension to the UW System Administration Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.

iii. If the reviewed faculty member is determined to have failed to meet the expectations set forth in the remediation plan, action may be taken under UWPF 7.02 through 7.06, including, if dismissal proceedings are warranted, the provisions of UWS 4, as provided for by UWPF 7.02.

(6) Opportunities and Compensation

(a) Regardless of the results of a faculty member's post-tenure review, a faculty member may take advantage, both prior to and following the review, of the opportunities for assistance that may be made available by the University to all faculty members to support their professional development at any time in their careers.

(b) Faculty members who receive a review resulting in the determination that they meet expectations, are entitled to take advantage of those opportunities, including additional compensation that the University may make available, subject to the availability of resources.

(7) Annual Reporting and Record Keeping

(a) Department chairs shall report annually to the dean and chancellor or designee that all periodic, post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty in that annual cycle have been completed, and the chancellor or designee shall ensure the reviews are completed on schedule.

(b) A full written record consisting of the executive committee's report, the reviewed faculty member's and dean's responses and statements, the chancellor or designee's review under UWPF 6.10(3)(g) and (4)(b), the remediation plan, the mechanism for determining satisfaction of expectations under the plan, and the dean's determination under UWPF 6.10(5)(a)(ii), shall be maintained by the department, the dean, and the chancellor or designee. This record shall otherwise be disclosed only at the discretion, or with the explicit consent, of the faculty member, unless required by business necessity or by law. Copies of all reports, responses and determinations shall also be provided to the faculty member.

APPENDIX B
Existing Post-Tenure Review Policy with Tracked Changes

6.10 Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development

The overriding purpose of the periodic, post-tenure review is tenured faculty development. This review shall not infringe on existing faculty rights and protections, including those of academic freedom. The review and its consequences are not subject to the grievance process set forth in UWS 6.02.

(1) Results of Review

The review will consider whether the faculty member under review has discharged conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member's position. The outcome of the review shall be one of the following:

- (a) Meets expectations. This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment.
- (b) Does not meet expectations. This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment below the expected level and which requires correction.

(2) Criteria of Evaluation

The criteria of evaluation shall be within the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service, and shall be as established by UWPF 6.01 (1-4, 6), PSF 56/13-14, and department policies adopted pursuant to the foregoing.

(3) Process

- (a) Each tenured faculty member's activities and performance shall be reviewed every five years. The post-tenure review period begins in the academic year following the granting of tenure. The review may be deferred, only with the approval of the provost, for unusual circumstances such as when it may coincide with an approved leave, promotion review, or other appointment. In such cases, the provost will specify the new review cycle that applies to the faculty member.
- (b) The post-tenure review shall be conducted in the spring semester, coincident with, but distinct from, the annual review. The annual review, including the awarding of merit scores, shall occur in the post-tenure review year, following established policies.
- (c) The tenured faculty member under review shall be notified at least three months prior to the commencement of the review. However, failure to meet this if notice deadline is does not obviate the requirement to conduct and participate in the review. timely given, the process shall continue as though it had been given.
- (d) The review will be conducted by the department executive committee, utilizing the criteria specified in UWPF 6.10(2). The materials considered by the executive committee ~~may shall~~ include a current curriculum vitae, ~~and~~ annual summaries for the period since the last review or since tenure, ~~and~~ Additional evidence of accomplishments in teaching, research/creative activity, and service, may be considered as deemed appropriate.
- (e) The executive committee shall provide a draft written report of its findings, including

whether the reviewed faculty member meets expectations or does not meet expectations, to the reviewed faculty member and the dean, and the chancellor or designee. The reviewed faculty member and the dean, and the chancellor or designee may provide a written responses to the executive committee. The executive committee shall then provide a final written report of its findings to the reviewed faculty member, who may give a written response. The final written report of the executive committee, along with the written response of the reviewed faculty member, if any, shall be provided to the dean and the provost, coincident with the provision of annual reviews to the dean. Copies shall be retained by the department, the dean, and the chancellor or designee.

~~(f) If the result of the review contained in the final written report of the executive committee is that the reviewed faculty member meets expectations, the review has concluded, and copies of the executive committee report and reviewed faculty response, if any, shall be retained by the department, the dean, and the chancellor or designee. If the result of the review contained in the final written report of the executive committee is that the reviewed faculty member does not meet expectations, the procedures in UWPF 6.10 (4) shall be followed.~~

(g) The written report of a review resulting in a finding of "meets expectations" by the executive committee shall be submitted to the chancellor or designee, along with written responses of the faculty member and dean. The chancellor or designee may overturn the finding, in doing so providing a written explanation, including substantial specific evidence of deficiencies, as to why the finding was overturned. The faculty member may provide a written response to the chancellor or designee's finding. Upon the overturning of the finding of "meets expectations" by the chancellor or designee, the procedures in UWPF 6.10 (5) shall be followed.

(4) Procedures That Apply When a Faculty Member is Found Does-Not to Meet Expectations by the Executive Committee

(a) When a reviewed faculty member is found by the executive committee to-not to meet expectations, the written report of the executive committee shall identify and describe the deficiencies.

(b) A finding of "does not meet expectations" shall be reviewed by the dean, and then by the chancellor or designee. The reviewed faculty member may provide a written statement to accompany these reviews. Following the chancellor or designee's review, the faculty member will be informed in writing by the chancellor or designee that the faculty member has received a result of "meets expectations," or that a remediation plan will be developed. If the chancellor or designee concurs with the finding of "does not meet expectations", the procedures in UWPF 6.10 (5) shall be followed.

~~(c) If the chancellor or designee concurs with the finding of "does not meet expectations", then a remediation plan shall be developed by the faculty member in consultation with the dean, in order to assist the faculty member in addressing the deficiencies identified in the review.~~

(5) Remediation Plans

(a) When a finding of "does not meet expectations" has been made or confirmed by the chancellor or designee, then a remediation plan shall be developed by the faculty member in consultation with the dean, in order to assist the faculty member in addressing the deficiencies identified in the review.

i. The primary focus of the remediation plan shall be developmental and provide the faculty member with appropriate support from the department or dean as applicable.

ii. The dean, faculty member, and chancellor shall establish a mechanism for determining how and when the faculty member will have satisfied the expectations of the remediation plan. The dean, in consultation with the chancellor and faculty member, shall make a written determination in accord with the mechanism established, and shall provide copies to the faculty member, department executive committee, and chancellor or designee. All elements of the plan must be satisfied within three academic semesters following the establishment of the plan, with summer and winter sessions not counting as semesters. In those few remediation plans related to a performance shortfall in research where more than three academic semesters may be necessary to correct identified deficiencies, an extension of one academic semester shall be permitted only with the approval of the chancellor, which shall trigger a notification of that extension to the UW System Administration Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.

iii. If the reviewed faculty member is determined to have failed to meet the expectations set forth in the remediation plan, action may be taken under UWPF 7.02 through 7.06, including, if dismissal proceedings are warranted, the provisions of UWS 4, as provided for by UWPF 7.02.

~~(d) A full written record consisting of the executive committee's report, the reviewed faculty member's responses and statements, the chancellor's review under UWPF 6.10(4)(b), the remediation plan, the mechanism for determining satisfaction of expectations under the plan, and the dean's determination under UWPF 6.10(4)(c)(ii), shall be maintained by the department, the dean, and the chancellor or designee. This record shall otherwise be disclosed only at the discretion, or with the explicit consent, of the faculty member, unless required by business necessity or by law.~~

(65) Opportunities and Compensation

(a) Regardless of the results of a faculty member's post-tenure review, a faculty member may take advantage, both prior to and following the review, of the opportunities for assistance that may be made available by the University to all faculty members to support their professional development at any time in their careers.

(b) Faculty members who receive a review resulting in the determination that they meet expectations, are entitled to take advantage of those opportunities, including additional compensation, that the University may make available, subject to the availability of resources.

(76) Annual Reporting and Record Keeping

(a) Department chairs shall report annually to the dean and chancellor or designee that all periodic, post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty in that annual cycle have been completed, and the chancellor or designee shall ensure the reviews are completed on schedule.

(b) A full written record consisting of the executive committee's report, the reviewed faculty member's and dean's responses and statements, the chancellor or designee's review under UWPF 6.10 (3)(g) and (4)(b), the remediation plan, the mechanism for determining satisfaction of expectations under the plan, and the dean's determination under UWPF 6.10(5)(a)(ii), shall be maintained by the department, the dean, and the chancellor or designee. This record shall otherwise be disclosed only at the discretion, or

with the explicit consent, of the faculty member, unless required by business necessity or by law. Copies of all reports, responses and determinations shall also be provided to the faculty member.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

PARKSIDE

Office of the Chancellor
900 Wood Road | P.O. Box 2000
Kenosha, WI 53141-2000
Telephone: 262-595-2211
www.uwp.edu

March 2, 2017

Ray Cross
President
University of Wisconsin System
1720 Van Hise Hall
1220 Linden Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 65706

RE: UWPF 6.10 Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty
Development

Dear President Cross,

At the recommendation of the Provost and in collaboration with the University Committee and Faculty Senate, I fully support and recommend approval of the University of Wisconsin-Parkside's post tenure review policy.

Considerable consultation with faculty leadership has allowed the University of Wisconsin-Parkside faculty to understand and reach consensus for the post tenure review policy and process. I appreciate the guidance and hard work of Helen Rosenberg, University Committee Chair, and Greg Mayer, Secretary to the Faculty, for their expertise and efforts in presenting this policy for approval.

President Cross, I submit this policy to you and am requesting that this item be placed on the agenda for the Board of Regents Education Committee Meeting on March 9. The policy, and a copy of the supporting redlined version, is attached and has been vetted through the UW System Office of Academic and Student Affairs and UW System Legal.

If you have any questions, please contact my office at 262/595-2211.

Sincerely,



Deborah L. Ford
Chancellor