

**Recommendation of the University Committee to
Revise the Post-Tenure Review Policy**

Post-Tenure Review Policy

I. RATIONALE

The UWS Board of Regents adopted its Guidelines covering the review and development of tenured faculty on March 10, 2016. Each UWS institution has been directed to develop its own policy consistent with the Board's policy that includes the following elements:

- A. Provision for a review, at least once every five years, of each tenured faculty member's activities and performance, in accordance with the mission of the department, college, and institution.
- B. Effective criteria against which to measure progress and accomplishments of faculty during this review and a description of the methods for conducting the evaluation.
- C. Delineation of responsibilities for conducting reviews.
- D. Means by which the merit process and faculty review and development process may be linked and used to facilitate, enhance and reward outstanding performance.
- E. Procedures defining means for remedying problems in cases where deficiencies are revealed.
- F. Provision for a written record of each faculty review; designation of the location for the written record of post-tenure review.
- G. Nothing in this policy is intended to alter the existing rules dealing with tenure determination.

II. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Given the mission of UWM and the currently codified expectations of the faculty role, three general principles are operative, namely tenured faculty review and development activities are designed (1) to develop the talents of the faculty member, (2) to enhance the academic program(s) to which the faculty member contributes, and (3) to protect the right of open and free inquiry (academic freedom).^{*} Strong academic programs housed within equally strong departments (or equivalent units) are the sure and demonstrable measure of UWM's accountability to the citizens of the State of Wisconsin. With the general tenets of academic freedom as its basis, the strength of academic programs depends on the right of open inquiry and maximum use of faculty talent in teaching, research, outreach and service. The UWM faculty envision the review of tenured faculty as one that focuses on collegial assessment and provides an opportunity for faculty to review past performance and develop future plans.

Appendix I contains examples of characteristics of effective departmental review procedures. Appendix II contains recommendations for departments on guidelines they should consider adopting regarding annual and post-tenure reviews. Appendix III contains a timeline for actions and their corresponding deadlines.

III. PROCEDURES

A. In keeping with the principles stated above, all tenured faculty members will develop a written 5-year development plan within the context of the overall mission of the Department and consistent with the department's criteria for post-tenure reviews. As annual reviews are conducted and appropriate modifications made, these plans may be modified while still maintaining a 5-year prospective timeline. Specifically:

1. The Faculty Development Plan will include planned activities in teaching, research and service/outreach. The Plan should not ordinarily exceed five pages.
2. The Department Executive Committee will ensure that the collective Faculty Development Plans for its Department meet the overall mission of the Department and that they provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities.
3. Faculty Development Plans and any modifications resulting from regular reviews must be filed with the department's dean.¹ These modifications resulting from regular reviews shall not ordinarily exceed two pages.

B. Comprehensive post-tenure reviews shall occur at least once every five years. The post-tenure review period begins in the academic year following the granting of tenure. Deferral of the review may be requested by the faculty member scheduled to be reviewed. Reasons for such a request include, but are not limited to, the review coinciding with approved leave, other appointments, and pending announced retirement. A deferral request must be approved by the department executive committee(s), dean(s), and provost, except in the case of a faculty member holding a full-time administrative appointment. For such a case, the deferral request needs only approval by the provost. If a deferral is granted, the provost will specify the new review cycle that applies to the faculty member. The periodic post-tenure review may substitute for annual review in the year a faculty member is scheduled for such review.

C. A review for promotion consideration may be considered as a comprehensive post-tenure review. An individual receiving a positive recommendation for promotion consideration will be considered as having met expectations in the post-tenure review. If the individual receives a negative recommendation for promotion consideration, the executive committee will subsequently vote on the post-tenure review determination as specified in Section III.F.5 below.

D. The department chair will provide written notice of the post-tenure review to the faculty member at least 3 months prior to the commencement of the review. If a post-tenure review is to be conducted during the first month of an academic year's contractual period, the faculty member should receive written notification of the post-tenure review no later than April 1 of the previous academic year.

E. The department's executive committee shall form a review committee consisting of at least two tenured faculty members of the department to conduct the review. The entire executive committee, excluding the faculty member being reviewed, may serve as the review committee if the executive committee so chooses. ^{ews}If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty members in the department, the executive committee of the department may be augmented following UWM Faculty P&P 4.08. In the case of a faculty member with appointments in more than one department, the department chairs of the involved departments shall agree on procedures for the conduct of the review.

F. Department Rreview procedures performed by the review committee shall include

1. A review of the 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 vitae, 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 review committeeers should be provided with the faculty member's Faculty Development Plan, and their review should be based on the department's post-tenure review criteria and the faculty member's performance with respect to their Plan. The review committeeers shall examine materials to the degree needed to accomplish the purposes of the review.
2. Discussion with the faculty member about his or her contributions to the profession, the department, and the university if either the review committeeers or the faculty member so desire.
3. Appropriate consideration of a faculty member's contributions outside the department to interdisciplinary and other programs, governance, administration, and other forms of service to the university and the community.
4. Other steps the executive-review committee considers 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.
- ~~4.~~
5. ~~In the cases where the review committee is a subset of the executive committee, T~~The review committee will prepare will result in a report addressing the question commendation by the review committee of whether the faculty member "Mmeets eExpectations," or "dDoes Nnot Mmeet Eexpectations." The result of the review will be communicated to both the executive committee and the faculty member being reviewed within 140 working days of the commencement of the review.
5. The faculty member may provide a written response to the review to the executive committee prior to the executive committee voting on the recommendation.
- ~~6. G.~~ Within 10 working days of receiving the recommendation, tThe executive committee will meet to assess the findings of the review committee, ~~and within 10 days of receiving the~~
7. ~~findings~~The executive committee will vote by written ballot whether the faculty member "mMeets Eexpectations," or "Ddoes Nnot mMeet Eexpectations." ~~The Executive Committee members who were part of the review committee can take part in the deliberations but will not take part in the executive committee vote.~~ The result of the vote shall be recorded in the minutes of the executive committee.

GH. For executive committee reviews resulting in "meets expectations"~~For reviews resulting in an executive committee determination of "meets expectations,"~~

1. ~~t~~The chair of the executive committee shall provide the faculty member with a written statement of the review within ~~125 0~~ working~~30~~ days of the determination. The faculty member shall have the right to submit a written response within 150 working days of receipt of the statement from the chair of the executive committee. The chair of the executive committee will forward the written statement of the review and the faculty member's response, if received, within 5 working days of the deadline for receiving the faculty member's response to the dean(s), provost, and chancellor.

~~2.I.~~ The dean(s) shall conduct a sufficiency review to ensure that the executive committee's review was conducted according to the criteria and procedures established by the executive committee and that the results of the review are within reasonable expectations for a faculty member. In the event that the dean(s) considers that the review was insufficient, he/she shall provide the reasons to the executive committee in writing why the review was insufficient within 5~~five~~ working days of receiving the report. The executive committee may provide a response addressing the dean's concerns about the sufficiency of the review within 10 ~~working-working~~ days. The dean(s) may conduct an independent review of the submitted materials. As part of the independent review, the dean(s) shall request advice from the appropriate divisional executive committee which shall be provided with all submitted materials for the review. The dean(s) shall request advice from the divisional committee within 5 working days of receiving the report, and the divisional committee will provide their advice within 20 working+4 days of receiving the request from the dean(s). The divisional committee's advice should address/include whether the faculty member "meets expectations" or "does not meet expectations" along with rationale. The dean will then make a recommendation to the Chancellor on whether or not the faculty member "meets expectations" or "does not meet expectations".

~~J.~~ When executive committee and dean reviews result in "meets expectations," a copy of the summary shall be placed in the department's file of post-tenure reviews. The department shall also preserve in this file all documents that played a substantive role in the review (other than documents such as publications that are readily accessible elsewhere). The dean(s) shall make every effort to offer tangible recognition to those faculty identified as "meets expectations", including but not limited to increased monetary compensation and nomination for university, national and international awards.

~~K.H.~~ For executive committee reviews resulting in "does not meet expectations,"

1. ~~†~~The executive committee shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review within 5 ~~working-working~~ days of the decision. The faculty member shall have the right to prepare a written response to the summary within 10 ~~working-working~~ days after receipt of the summary.

~~L.~~ 2. ~~For reviews resulting in "does not meet expectations,"~~The executive committee decision, along with any additional response from the faculty member, will be transmitted to the dean(s), within 5 ~~working-working~~ days after the faculty member's written response deadline. The dean(s) will perform their own review, including a request for advice from the appropriate divisional executive committee, which also will be provided with the executive committee decision and any additional faculty response. (See UWM P&P, Ch.3 Sec 3.20 "Advice on other Personnel Matters.") The dean(s) shall request advice from the divisional committee within 5 working days of receiving the report, and the divisional committee will provide their advice within 20 working+4 days of receiving the request from the dean(s). The divisional committee's advice should include whether the faculty member "meets expectations" or "does not meet expectations" along with rationale.

I. For dean reviews resulting in

1. "Meets expectations," a copy of the summary shall be placed in the department's file of post-tenure reviews. The department shall also preserve in this file all documents that played a substantive role in the review (other than documents such as publications that are readily accessible elsewhere). The dean(s) shall make every effort to offer tangible recognition to those faculty identified as

“meets expectations”, including but not limited to increased monetary compensation and nomination for university, national and international awards.

~~M.~~ If the dean(s) finds that the faculty member’s performance ~~2.~~ “does not meet expectations,” the dean(s) must provide written reasons to the faculty member for the decision, within 10 working ~~working~~ days of receiving advice from the divisional committee. The faculty member may provide a written response to the dean(s) within 10 working days upon notification of the decision. This statement can include new documentation on the faculty member’s ~~accomplishments~~ activities.

~~NJ.~~ Within 5 working ~~working~~ days of the end of the faculty member written response deadline, the dean(s) will forward their review, which includes the advice from the divisional committee, the executive committee’s review, and any written response statements from the faculty member, to the provost and the chancellor (or designee). The chancellor (or designee) will review the case, and following the chancellor’s (or designee’s) review, the faculty member will be informed by the chancellor (or designee) of the final determination of the review. This result shall be provided to the faculty member in writing no later than ~~30~~ 20 working days prior to the end of the academic year during which the post-tenure review is conducted.

~~OK.~~ In the event that the chancellor’s (or designee’s) review results in a “does not meet expectations” designation ~~for the faculty member~~, the faculty member and the department chair on behalf of the executive committee, ~~in consultation with the dean, department chair and the faculty member~~ shall develop a written plan for mentoring and professional development to address all issues identified in the review, ~~in consultation with the appropriate dean(s).~~ While the goal is for the plan to be developed collaboratively, if that is not obtainable, the dean has the responsibility to select the plan that will be implemented. This plan shall be completed no later than ~~20 working~~ 30 days after the chancellor (or designee) has informed the faculty member of decision. This plan ~~should~~ all be the product of mutual discussion between the faculty member, the chair, and the dean(s), shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and shall be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration. ~~The plan should be reviewed by the executive committee, but does not need to be approved by the entire executive committee.~~ Such a plan could include review and adjustment of the faculty member’s responsibilities, development of a new research program 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.

~~LP.~~ A faculty member who has received a “does not meet expectations” review will have three academic semesters to fully satisfy all the elements of the remediation plan. If the remediation plan includes performance shortfall in research, an extension of one academic semester may be granted by the chancellor (or designee). In such a case, the chancellor (or designee) will notify the UW System Administration Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs of the extension.

~~MQ.~~ The process for determination of the successful completion of the remediation is as follows.

1. The faculty member will submit documentation of his or her activities that address issues identified in the remediation plan to the faculty member’s executive committee. This documentation will include any information that the faculty member deems relevant. This documentation can be provided at any time during the remediation period, but must be provided no later than 4 weeks before the end of the remediation plan period.
2. Within ~~120 working~~ 30 days, the executive committee will review the materials submitted, and will make a determination as to whether all elements of the remediation plan have been satisfied. The executive

committee will formulate a written explanation for their determination. The executive committee will then submit the faculty member's documentation along with their determination to the dean(s).

3. The dean(s) will review the materials submitted and the executive committee's determination. If the dean(s) determine that all elements of the remediation plan have been satisfied, the faculty member's performance is to be considered to "meet expectations."
4. The next post-tenure review evaluation of a faculty member who has satisfied all the elements of the remediation plan will be no later than 5 years after the previous post-tenure review.
5. If the dean(s) determines that the faculty member has not satisfied all elements of the remediation plan, then within 10 ~~working-working~~ days the decision and written reasons for this decision are provided to the faculty member, the provost and the chancellor, or designee. Within 5 ~~working-working~~ days of receiving the notification from the dean(s), the faculty member can submit to the chancellor (or designee) an additional written statement addressing the decisions made by the executive committee and the dean(s).
6. If the dean(s) determines that the faculty member has failed to meet the expectations set forth in the remediation plan, discipline may be imposed (as listed in UWM P&P 5.43), ~~as appropriate, up to and including dismissal for cause under Chapter UWS-4~~. The chancellor will notify the University Committee of the intention to pursue disciplinary action of a faculty member prior to the initiation of the process. If discipline other than dismissal for cause is to be pursued, the procedures outlined in UWM P&P 5.41-5.47 will be followed. If dismissal for cause is to be pursued, the procedures outlined in UWM P&P 5.23-5.29 will be followed.

IV. ACCOUNTABILITY

- A. 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 university.
- B. At the beginning of each academic year, the chair shall identify faculty to be reviewed during the academic year, and the executive committee shall establish a calendar for reviews.
- C. Departments shall maintain a record of review completed, including the names of all reviewers.
- D. At the end of each academic year, department chairs shall send a report to the appropriate deans listing the names of faculty members reviewed during that academic year and summarizing the outcomes of those reviews. The dean(s) will submit these reports to the provost.
- E. If a department fails to conduct requisite reviews by the end of the academic year, the dean shall appoint reviewers to conduct reviews based on the department's specified criteria.

(*Open and free inquire provides for the freedom to pursue novel, unpopular, or unfashionable lines of inquiry.)

¹ Development plans are subject to the routine review by respective school or college deans.

DRAFT

UWM Tenured Faculty Review and Development Policy

Appendix I

Some characteristics of departments with effective tenured faculty review and development procedures

General Principles

An effective, supportive tenured faculty review and development program:

1. acknowledges that a faculty career can evolve over time, can have different emphases at different periods, and is best evaluated over periods longer than one year.
2. formulates and communicates clear expectations of faculty work within the context of the department mission,
3. recognizes the need to improve regularly the procedures and documentation used to evaluate faculty work.
4. includes procedures that encourage individuals to work and review each other collaboratively.
5. provides incentives for faculty members to do better what they already do well and to pursue professional development and curricular innovation.
6. has a prospective as well as a retrospective component, that is, encourages the individuals to outline future activities in the context of department, unit, and campus needs.
7. includes qualitative and quantitative measures of performance.

Teaching

An effective, supportive tenured faculty review and development program:

1. recognizes that reviewing teaching involves **not only** the evaluation of classroom technique and the use of standardized student evaluation forms **but also** regular, direct peer review of teaching through classroom observation, syllabus and test review, etc.
2. uses student evaluation instruments that are reliable and valid, and that members have confidence in.
3. makes regular and consistent attempts to harmonize individual teaching interests and the needs of the program/department.
4. encourages individuals wishing to develop new expertise, new courses, and new ways to organize curriculum.
5. clearly distinguishes between adequate and inadequate performance.

6. includes actual student results as one measure of individual effectiveness.
7. recognizes and rewards other forms of teaching such as advising, directing theses, coordinating multi-section courses, directing faculty development and curriculum workshops, etc.

Scholarship

An effective, supportive tenured faculty review and development program:

1. understands that scholarship can be expressed in a variety of appropriate ways (e.g., advancing knowledge; synthesizing and integrating knowledge; applying knowledge; crafting knowledge by engaging with community and the public; generating knowledge through creative and imaginative work; and representing knowledge through teaching. cf. Scholarship Reconsidered, Boyer Report)
2. encourages each of these scholarly activities appropriately within the context of the department's mission and that of the institution.
3. clearly distinguishes between adequate and inadequate work.
4. encourages innovative directions.
5. encourages the **application** of scholarly expertise as well as its **publication**.

Service

An effective, supportive tenured faculty review and development program:

1. encourages faculty members to use their expertise on campus and in the larger community.
2. lays out clear expectations for all members of the department.
3. clearly distinguishes between adequate and inadequate work.
4. encourages and rewards faculty members for appropriate service to the profession.

UWM TENURED FACULTY REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY

APPENDIX II

Guidelines for Conducting Faculty Review and Development Activities within Departments

Departments and their respective schools/colleges are strongly encouraged to consider using these guidelines:

1. Departments will develop a statement of criteria for annual compensation and comprehensive post-tenure reviews that is based upon the Department Mission Statement, that is sensitive to strengths of individual faculty, and clearly tied to Faculty Development Plans. It is suggested that the five-year post-tenure review criteria be based on the department's annual solid performer criteria. This statement and the procedures listed below will be sent to all department faculty and filed with the unit's dean.
2. Executive Committees will use Faculty Development Plans and appropriate supporting evidence in their annual reviews for compensation and comprehensive post-tenure reviews. These reviews will incorporate the progress made by a faculty member and the quality of his/her contributions in meeting the expectations outlined in the plan. Faculty will be rewarded accordingly.
3. For annual reviews, each reviewed faculty member will be provided with a written statement of assessment and compensation recommendations. This statement will use the Faculty Development Plan as its basis.
4. For annual reviews, chairs (or designee) will go over the written statement with each faculty member. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to provide additional written comments, which must be attached to the written statement.
5. Annual written statements of review and confirmation of the personal interview will be placed in each faculty member's personnel file in the school/college dean's office.
6. Department Chairs and Executive Committees are strongly encouraged to discuss developmental expectations with individual faculty members throughout the year.
7. Department Executive Committees are strongly encouraged to pursue formal training in personnel evaluation.
8. Campus administrators are strongly encouraged to work with faculty bodies to provide adequate financial support for faculty development activities.

UWM TENURED FACULTY REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY

APPENDIX III

Post-Tenure Review Timelines

For all post-tenure review designations:

Action	Deadline
Notification of faculty member of post-tenure review – case’s initial consideration date	3 months prior to the review committee’s meeting on the case (or April 1 of prior academic year if the case is scheduled to be heard in the first month of the academic year)
Review Committee recommendation to Executive Committee	10 working 4 days after the date of the commencement of the review
Executive Committee vote	10 working days after receiving Review Committee recommendation

For designations by the executive committee of “Meets Expectations:”

Action	Deadline
Executive Committee informs the faculty member, provost, and chancellor of the decision	30-5 working days after the Executive Committee vote
Faculty response to report	10 working 5 days after receipt of report for designation
Executive Committee transmittal of report to dean, provost, and chancellor	5 working days after the faculty response to the executive committee deadline
Dean’s written feedback to Executive Committee on sufficiency	5 working days after receiving report from the Executive Committee
Executive Committee response to Dean regarding sufficiency	10 working days after receiving Dean’s feedback
Dean request for divisional committee advice	5 working days after Executive Committee response to Dean’s feedback on sufficiency
Divisional Committee advice to dean	20 working 14 days after committee’s receipt of the request
Dean decision	10 working days after receiving advice from divisional committee

Note: If the dean accepts the Executive Committee designation of “Meets Expectations”, the review process ends at that point, and the report is placed in the department files.

For designations by the executive committee of “Does Not Meet Expectations:”

Action	Deadline
Delivery of written summary to faculty	5 working days after executive committee vote

member	
Faculty response to report	10 working days after receipt of report for designation
Executive Committee transmittal of report to dean	5 working days after the faculty response to the executive committee deadline
Dean request for divisional committee advice	5 <u>working</u> days after receiving report
Divisional Committee advice to dean	<u>20 working</u> 14 days after committee's receipt of the request
Dean decision	10 working days after receiving advice from divisional committee
Faculty response to dean decision	10 <u>working</u> days after notification
Dean submission of report to chancellor, provost, and faculty member	5 working days after the end of the faculty response to the dean deadline
Chancellor notification of faculty member of "Does Not Meet Expectations" designation	<u>320 working</u> days prior to end of academic year
Creation of remediation plan	End of academic year <u>20 working days after the chancellor has informed the faculty member of the decision.</u>

Consideration of Remediation Actions:

Action	Deadline
Faculty submission of documentation of completed remediation	4 weeks prior to the end of the remediation plan period
Executive Committee determination of whether the remediation plan is satisfied / transmission of materials to dean(s)	<u>130 working</u> days after the receipt of documentation from faculty member (no later than the end of the remediation plan period)
Dean transmission of decision to faculty member, provost, and chancellor	10 working days after receipt of executive committee decision
Faculty member response to chancellor	5 working days after receiving dean decision