

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 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.