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Amended version

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. 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. 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 assign two or more tenured faculty members of the department to conduct the review. 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. Review procedures 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 reviewers should be provided with the faculty member’s Faculty Development Plan, and their review should be based on the faculty member’s performance with respect to their Plan. The reviewers 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 reviewers 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 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.
5. The review will result in a recommendation by the committee of whether the faculty member “Meets Expectations,” or “Does Not Meet Expectations.” The result of the review will be communicated to the executive committee within 14 days of the commencement of the review.

G. The executive committee will assess the findings of the review committee, and within 10 days of receiving the findings vote by written ballot whether the faculty member “Meets Expectations,” or “Does Not Meet Expectations.” The result of the vote shall be recorded in the minutes of the executive committee.

H. For reviews resulting in an executive committee determination of “meets expectations,” the chair of the executive committee shall provide the faculty member with a written statement of the review within 30 days of the determination. The chair of the executive committee will inform the dean(s), provost, and chancellor of the decision within 30 days of the determination of “meets expectations.”

I. For reviews resulting 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).

J. For reviews resulting in “does not meet expectations,” the executive committee shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review within 5 working days of the decision. The faculty member shall
have the right to prepare a written response to the summary within 10 working days after receipt of the summary.

K. 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 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 days of receiving the report, and the divisional committee will provide their advice within 14 days of receiving the request from the dean(s). If the dean(s) find that the faculty member’s performance “does not meet expectations,” the dean(s) must provide written reasons to the faculty member for the decision, within 10 working days of receiving advice from the divisional committee. The faculty member may provide a written response to the dean(s) within 10 days upon notification of the decision. This statement can include new documentation on the faculty member’s accomplishments.

L. Within 5 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 days prior to the end of the academic year during which the post-tenure review is conducted.

M. In the event that the chancellor’s (or designee’s) review results in a “does not meet expectations” designation for the faculty member, the 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). This plan shall be completed no later than 30 days after the chancellor (or designee) has informed the faculty member of decision. This plan shall 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. 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.

N. 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.

O. 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 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 “meet expectations.”

4. If the dean(s) determines that the faculty member has not satisfied all elements of the remediation plan, then within 10 working days the decision is transmitted to the provost and the chancellor (or designee), and written reasons for this decision are provided to the faculty member. Within 5 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). The chancellor (or designee) will then conduct an evaluation of the faculty member’s documentation. If the chancellor (or designee) determines that all elements of the remediation plan have been satisfied, the faculty member’s performance is to be considered “meets expectations.”

5. 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.

If the chancellor (or designee) 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 his/her intention to pursue disciplinary action of a faculty member prior to initiating 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 inquir 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.
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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.
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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. 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.
APPENDIX III

Post-Tenure Review Timelines

For all post-tenure review designations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notification of faculty member of post-tenure review – case’s initial consideration date</td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Committee recommendation to Executive Committee</td>
<td>14 days after the date of the commencement of the review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee vote</td>
<td>10 days after receiving Review Committee recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee informs the faculty member, provost, and chancellor of the decision</td>
<td>30 days after the Executive Committee vote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of written summary to faculty member</td>
<td>5 working days after executive committee vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty response to report</td>
<td>10 working days after receipt of report for designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee transmittal of report to dean</td>
<td>5 working days after the faculty response to the executive committee deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean request for divisional committee advice</td>
<td>5 days after receiving report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional Committee advice to dean</td>
<td>14 days after committee’s receipt of the request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean decision</td>
<td>10 working days after receiving advice from divisional committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty response to dean decision</td>
<td>10 days after notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean submission of report to chancellor, provost, and faculty member</td>
<td>5 working days after the end of the faculty response to the dean deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor notification of faculty member of “Does Not Meet Expectations” designation</td>
<td>30 days prior to end of academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of remediation plan</td>
<td>End of academic year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consideration of Remediation Actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty submission of documentation of completed remediation</td>
<td>4 weeks prior to the end of the remediation plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee determination of whether the remediation plan is</td>
<td>30 days after the receipt of documentation from faculty member (no later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfied / transmission of materials to dean(s)</td>
<td>than the end of the remediation plan period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean transmission of decision to faculty member, provost, and chancellor</td>
<td>10 working days after receipt of executive committee decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member response to chancellor</td>
<td>5 working days after receiving dean decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tracked version

**TENURED FACULTY REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT**

No: S-52.75

Date: May 1993

Authority: Board of Regents Policy 92-5 and UWM Faculty Document 1877

**Post-Tenure Review Policy**

I. RATIONALE

The UWS Board of Regents adopted its Guidelines covering the review and development of tenured faculty on May 8, 1992. Each UWS institution has been directed to develop its own procedures around these guidelines, 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 will may be linked and used to facilitate, enhance and reward outstanding performance.

E. Procedures defining means forremedying problems in cases where deficiencies are revealed.

F. Provision for a written record of each faculty review; designation of the location for the personnel file written record of post-tenure review.

G. Description of the accountability measures the institution will use to ensure full implementation of the institutional plan. Nothing in this policy.

H. Nothing in these guidelines 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: (1), 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. Within 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. Beginning Fall Semester of 1993 and in keeping with the principles stated above, all tenured faculty members will develop a written 3-5-year development plan within the context of the overall mission of the Department. As annual reviews are conducted and appropriate modifications, made, these plans will maintain may be modified while still maintaining a 3-5-year prospective timeline. Specifically:

4. The Faculty Development Plan will include all planned activities in teaching, research and service/outreach. The Plan should not ordinarily exceed five pages.

5. 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.
1. The Department Executive Committee will regularly review the Faculty Development Plan with each faculty member for the (1) assessment of the individual's progress and (2) modification of individual plans as needed.

6. Faculty Development Plans and any modifications resulting from regular reviews must be filed with the Department's Dean. 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 assign two or more tenured faculty members of the department to conduct the review. 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. Review procedures shall include

6. 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 reviewers should be provided with the faculty member’s Faculty Development Plan, and their review should be based on the faculty member’s performance with respect to their Plan. The reviewers shall examine materials to the degree needed to accomplish the purposes of the review.

7. Discussion with the faculty member about his or her contributions to the profession, the department, and the university if either the reviewers or the faculty member so desire.
8. 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.

9. Other steps the executive 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.

10. The review will result in a recommendation by the committee of whether the faculty member “Meets Expectations,” or “Does Not Meet Expectations.” The result of the review will be communicated to the executive committee within 14 days of the commencement of the review.

G. The executive committee will assess the findings of the review committee, and within 10 days of receiving the findings vote by written ballot whether the faculty member “Meets Expectations,” or “Does Not Meet Expectations.” The result of the vote shall be recorded in the minutes of the executive committee.

2. Items #1-4 above do not require a separate formal review at the end of the 3-5 year timeline.

H. Departments will take into account Faculty Development Plans when conducting annual compensation reviews.

For reviews resulting in an executive committee determination of “meets expectations,” the chair of the executive committee shall provide the faculty member with a written statement of the review within 30 days of the determination. The chair of the executive committee will inform the dean(s), provost, and chancellor of the decision within 30 days of the determination of “meets expectations.”

I. For reviews resulting 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).

J. For reviews resulting in “does not meet expectations,” the executive committee shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review within 5 working days of the decision. The faculty member shall have the right to prepare a written response to the summary within 10 working days after receipt of the summary.

K. 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 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 days of receiving the report, and the divisional committee will provide their advice within 14 days of receiving the request from the dean(s). If the dean(s) find that the faculty member’s performance “does not meet expectations,” the dean(s) must provide written reasons to the faculty member for the decision, within 10 working days of receiving advice from the divisional committee. The faculty member may provide a written response to the
dean(s) within 10 days upon notification of the decision. This statement can include new documentation on the faculty member’s accomplishments.

L. Within 5 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 days prior to the end of the academic year during which the post-tenure review is conducted.

M. In the event that the chancellor’s (or designee’s) review results in a “does not meet expectations” designation for the faculty member, the 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). This plan shall be completed no later than 30 days after the chancellor (or designee) has informed the faculty member of decision. This plan shall 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. 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.

N. 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.

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

6. 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.

7. Within 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).

8. 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.”

9. If the dean(s) determines that the faculty member has not satisfied all elements of the remediation plan, then within 10 working days the decision is transmitted to the provost and the chancellor (or designee), and written reasons for this decision are provided to the faculty member. Within 5 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). The chancellor (or designee) will then conduct an evaluation of the faculty member’s documentation. If the chancellor (or designee) determines that all elements of the remediation plan have been satisfied, the faculty member’s performance is to be considered “meets expectations.”

10. 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.

If the chancellor (or designee) 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 his/her intention to pursue disciplinary action of a faculty member prior to initiating the dismissal 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. 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.

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.)

² Development plans are subject to the routine review by respective school or college deans with respect to individual faculty workloads and program assignments.)
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Some characteristics of departments with effective tenured faculty review and development procedures

General Principles

An effective, supportive tenured faculty review and development program:

8. 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.

9. formulates and communicates clear expectations of faculty work within the context of the department mission,

10. recognizes the need to improve regularly the procedures and documentation used to evaluate faculty work.

11. includes procedures that encourage individuals to work and review each other collaboratively.

12. provides incentives for faculty members to do better what they already do well and to pursue professional development and curricular innovation.

13. 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.

14. includes qualitative and quantitative measures of performance.

Teaching

An effective, supportive tenured faculty review and development program:

8. 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.

9. uses student evaluation instruments that are reliable and valid, and that members have confidence in.

10. makes regular and consistent attempts to harmonize individual teaching interests and the needs of the program/department.

11. encourages individuals wishing to develop new expertise, new courses, and new ways to organize curriculum.
12. clearly distinguishes between adequate and meritorious inadequate performance.

13. includes actual student results as one measure of individual effectiveness.

14. 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:

6. 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)

7. encourages and rewards each of these scholarly activities appropriately within the context of the department's mission and that of the institution.

8. clearly distinguishes between adequate and meritorious inadequate work.

9. encourages innovative directions.

10. encourages and rewards the application of scholarly expertise as well as its publication.

Service

An effective, supportive tenured faculty review and development program:

5. encourages and rewards faculty members to use their expertise on campus and in the larger community.

6. lays out clear expectations for all members of the department.

7. clearly distinguishes between adequate and meritorious inadequate work.

8. encourages and rewards faculty members for appropriate service to the profession.
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Guidelines for Conducting Faculty Review and Development Activities within Departments

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

9. Departments will develop a statement of criteria for annual compensation and Faculty Development 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. This statement and the procedures listed below will be sent to all department faculty and filed with the unit's dean.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. Department Chairs and Executive Committees are strongly encouraged to discuss developmental expectations with individual faculty members throughout the year.

15. Department Executive Committees are strongly encouraged to pursue formal training in personnel evaluation. These training options will be developed during the Summer of 1993 and made available during the 1993/94 academic year.

16. Campus administrators are strongly encouraged to work with faculty bodies to provide adequate financial support for faculty development activities.
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### Post-Tenure Review Timelines

For all post-tenure review designations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notification of faculty member of post-tenure review – case’s initial consideration date</td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Committee recommendation to Executive Committee</td>
<td>14 days after the date of the commencement of the review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee vote</td>
<td>10 days after receiving Review Committee recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee informs the faculty member, provost, and chancellor of the decision</td>
<td>30 days after the Executive Committee vote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of written summary to faculty member</td>
<td>5 working days after executive committee vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty response to report</td>
<td>10 working days after receipt of report for designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee transmittal of report to dean</td>
<td>5 working days after the faculty response to the executive committee deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean request for divisional committee advice</td>
<td>5 days after receiving report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional Committee advice to dean</td>
<td>14 days after committee’s receipt of the request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean decision</td>
<td>10 working days after receiving advice from divisional committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty response to dean decision</td>
<td>10 days after notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean submission of report to chancellor, provost, and faculty member</td>
<td>5 working days after the end of the faculty response to the dean deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor notification of faculty member of “Does Not Meet Expectations” designation</td>
<td>30 days prior to end of academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of remediation plan</td>
<td>End of academic year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consideration of Remediation Actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty submission of documentation of completed remediation</td>
<td>4 weeks prior to the end of the remediation plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee determination of whether the remediation plan is</td>
<td>30 days after the receipt of documentation from faculty member (no later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfied / transmission of materials to dean(s)</td>
<td>than the end of the remediation plan period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean transmission of decision to faculty member, provost, and chancellor</td>
<td>10 working days after receipt of executive committee decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member response to chancellor</td>
<td>5 working days after receiving dean decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TENURED FACULTY REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT

No: S-52.75
Date: May 1993

Authority: Board of Regents Policy 92-5 and
UWM Faculty Document 1877

I. RATIONALE

The UWS Board of Regents adopted its Guidelines covering the review and development of tenured faculty on May 8, 1992. Each UWS institution has been asked to develop its own procedures around these guidelines:

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 will 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 personnel file.

G. Description of the accountability measures the institution will use to ensure full implementation of the institutional plan.

H. Nothing in these guidelines 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: (1) tenured faculty review and development activities are designed to develop the talents of the faculty member, (2) enhance the academic program(s) to which the faculty member contributes, and (3) 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. Within the general tenets of academic freedom, 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.

III. PROCEDURES

A. Beginning Fall Semester of 1993 and in keeping with the principles stated above, all tenured faculty members will develop a written 3-5 year plan within the context of the overall mission of the Department. As annual reviews are conducted and appropriate modifications, made, these plans will maintain a 3-5 year prospective timeline. Specifically:

1. The Faculty Development Plan will include all 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. The Department Executive Committee will regularly review the Faculty Development Plan with each faculty member for the (1) assessment of the individual's progress and (2) modification of individual plans as needed.
4. Faculty Development Plans and any modifications resulting from regular reviews must be filed with the Department's Dean. Modifications resulting from regular reviews shall not ordinarily exceed two pages.

5. Items #1-4 above do not require a separate formal review at the end of the 3-5 year timeline.

B. Departments will take into account Faculty Development Plans when conducting annual compensation reviews.

(*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 with respect school or college deans with respect to individual faculty workloads and program assignments.
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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 meritorious 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; and representing knowledge through teaching. cf. Scholarship Reconsidered, Boyer Report)

2. encourages and rewards 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 meritorious work.

4. encourages innovative directions.

5. encourages and rewards the application of scholarly expertise as well as its publication.

Service

An effective, supportive tenured faculty review and development program:

1. encourages and rewards 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 meritorious work.

4. encourages and rewards faculty members for appropriate service to the profession.
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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 Faculty Development reviews that is based upon the Department Mission Statement, that is sensitive to strengths of individual faculty, and clearly tied to Faculty Development Plans. 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. 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. 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. 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. These training options will be developed during the Summer of 1993 and made available during the 1993/94 academic year.

8. Campus administrators are strongly encouraged to work with faculty bodies to provide adequate financial support for faculty development activities.