

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

UPG #12

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

12.01 Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

12.02 Purpose

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

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

UW-Extension defines scholarship as:

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

12.03 Guidelines for Post-Tenured Review and Development

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

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

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

(1) Frequency and period of review

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

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

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

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

(2) Criteria and methods for review

(a) Criteria

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) Methods

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

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

department, and

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

(3) Responsibilities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(4) Linkage with merit process

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

(5) Enhancement of Scholarly Growth and Professional Development

(a) Growth and Development opportunities

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

(b) Remediation responsibility

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

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

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

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

(6) Accountability measures

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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