Chapter IV: Faculty Personnel Rules and Procedures of UW-River Falls

4.5 Periodic Review-Faculty Personnel Rules

Post tenure review of tenured faculty members is essential to promoting faculty development, including recognizing innovation and creativity; enhancing the educational environment for students; and identifying and readdressing deficiencies in overall performance of duties through a supportive and developmental remediation process.

To support the developmental role of post-tenure reviews, the Faculty Senate and/or each College will identify and maintain a list of opportunities available to all faculty.

Post tenure reviews do not infringe on existing faculty rights and protections, including those of academic freedom, as noted in the Faculty Handbook, by the UW System Board of Regents, or the UW System Policies.

Post tenure reviews are separate and distinct from more frequent reviews of tenured faculty as noted in 4.5.1 (course evaluations, peer evaluations, or other reviews as determined by the Department or College).

Post tenure reviews and remediation plans are not subject to the grievance process set forth in Chapter UWS 6.02, Wis. Admin. Code. This policy adaptation is a directive from UW System.

4.5.1 Post-tenure Review of Professional Activities of Faculty

The post tenure review period begins in the academic year following the granting of tenure. Every five years the professional activities of tenured faculty will be reviewed to inform each faculty member of his or her performance. The review may be conducted simultaneously with merit review or with promotion review. For the purpose of this review the criteria used are those found in the Faculty and Staff Handbook under Section 4.3.2.1c [1, 2, and 3], the appropriate department’s criteria and expectations, and additional College criteria and expectations. The criteria used in the review must fall within the three categories of teaching, scholarship/research/creative activities, and service as stated in RPD 20-9(6). Such department and college statements are to be communicated to faculty in writing and be on file in the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The post-tenure review may be deferred, only with the approval of the provost, for unusual circumstances such as when it may coincide with an approved leave or other appointment. In such cases, the provost will specify the new review cycle that applies to the faculty member.

4.5.2 Conducting the Review

The departmental academic unit will determine whether a committee of its tenured faculty or the chair will conduct the review. The reviewers must not have a lower academic rank than the person being reviewed. In the case of a tie, the Dean will be consulted. The reviewer(s) shall:

a. Review the teaching portfolio, the personal reflective statement (see Section 4.3.2.3 above) and other pertinent data submitted by the faculty member. The faculty member has primary responsibility for assembling the data for review. The faculty member will include an inventory of the data submitted, and the chair will verify the inventory contents. The faculty member is responsible for promptly submitting the information for his or her review. The reviewer(s) will prepare a summary of their findings.

The summary of the reviewer(s) findings must reflect the overall results of the review by determining the category that:
reflects the faculty member's professional competency and their discharging of the duties associated with the faculty
member's position.

- Exceeds Expectations: Performance reflects a significant level of accomplishment beyond what is expected by
the faculty member's department.
- Meets Expectations: Performance reflects the expectations of accomplishment established by the faculty
member's department.
- Does Not Meet Expectations: Performance reflects a level of accomplishment below the expected level
established by the faculty member's department and which requires correction.

b. Discuss with the faculty member his or her performance in continuing to meet the criteria under Section 4.3.2.1.c.
Following this discussion the reviewer(s) will prepare a final summary of findings and recommendations which will be
signed by the chair and any other reviewers, and by the faculty member reviewed to acknowledge that the review was
completed.

c. Enter into the faculty member’s departmental professional file the inventory, the final summary report, and any other
pertinent information used in the review. The faculty member reviewed will be given a copy of the final summary report.

The faculty member may provide a written response to the report. The summary report needs to be provided to the
dean and provost.

d. If the faculty member's performance is deemed to exceed expectations,

- The department chair will recommend to the Dean an appropriate recognition for achieving an 'exceeds
  expectations.'
- Recognition should be significant, up to and including an adjustment to base pay.
- If approved by the Dean, the recommendation will be forwarded to the Provost.

e. If the faculty member's performance is deemed to meet expectations,

- The department chair will recommend to the Dean an appropriate recognition for achieving a 'meets
  expectations.'
- Recognition may be in the form of a one-time additional compensation, reassigned time for professional
development, or another appropriate recognition.
- If approved by the Dean, the recommendation will be forwarded to the Provost.

f. If the faculty member's review [4.5.2.c] reveals a "does not meet expectations" need for significant improvement in
performance, the chair will report this, in writing, to the academic Dean for review. Following the Dean's
review the report will be submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for review. The
faculty member may provide a written statement to accompany these reviews. Following the Provost and Vice
Chancellor for Academic Affairs' review, the faculty member will be informed by the Provost and Vice
Chancellor for Academic Affairs that the faculty member has received a result of at least a "meets
expectations," or that a remediation plan will be developed.

The Dean and the faculty member, in consultation with the chair, will develop the remediation plan according to
RPD 20-9(12)(c). chair, in consultation with the faculty member will develop a remediation plan to address the
deficiencies identified in the review.

- The primary focus of the remediation plan shall be developmental and provide the faculty member with
appropriate support from the department or dean as applicable.
- The remediation plan must identify the criteria that will be used to show that the faculty member has satisfied the
expectations of the remediation plan.

Comment [TS3]: Note that the summary report needs to be provided to the dean and provost. This is stated later in the policy, but
it probably would be good to note it here as well.

Comment [AB4]: I'm not sure if this is the same as a "does not meet expectations" above

Comment [TS5]: Agree with Anne's comment above. Please use the "does not meet expectations" language to avoid
confusion.

Comment [TS6]: RPD 20-9(12)(c) states that the faculty member in consultation with the dean develops the remediation plan, so this
should probably be rephrased. Adding the chair to the consultation process seems appropriate as well.

Comment [AB7]: The rules only require a remediation plan if there is a finding of "does not meet expectations"; I'm a little confused as
to whether there may be another category created here under the need for "significant improvement in performance" (see above)
The remediation plan must identify any required changes to collection of student course evaluations [if the tenured faculty member had been electing an every three semesters cycle], required changes to teaching schedule, research expectations, or service expectations.

- The remediation plan must contain explicit narrative that identifies how all deficiencies will be satisfied.
- The remediation plan must contain a timeline for each deficiency identified.
- The time line must identify progress checkpoints and required documentation of progress [e.g. scholarly work, teaching evaluations, etc.].
- The timeline must reflect scheduled meetings with the Dean, Department Chair and/or other peer mentors identified in the remediation plan chosen by the faculty member under remediation.

- The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall assist the Dean to find resources to fund such a program. This program may include, but is not limited to, additional coursework, referral to the Employee Assistance Program, participation in professional meetings in the discipline, and/or appointment of a peer mentor.
- Resources should not be removed from existing faculty development programs for programs to remedy deficiencies.

- All elements of the remediation plan must be satisfied within a reasonable time period, commensurate with the identified deficiencies as determined by the Dean. The time period may not exceed three academic semesters, with the following exception:
  - If a performance shortfall is related to research where more than three academic semesters may be necessary to correct the identified deficiencies, an extension of one academic semester shall be permitted only with the permission of the Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Notification of the extension will be submitted to the UW System Administration Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.
  - Adjustments to the above three-four academic semesters may be requested consistent with UWRF 4.4.1.5 ‘Other Criteria that may Delay Tenure.’

- If the faculty member successfully fulfills the remediation plan, the Dean will notify the Provost and the faculty member’s post-tenure review timeframe will be adjusted to reflect the new five year post-tenure review period effective with the start of the next academic year.

- If the faculty member fails to meet the expectations established in the remediation plan:
  - The Dean may recommend to the Provost that additional time be provided if significant progress has been made towards achieving the original remediation plan; and if the reason for non-achievement is due to a) promised Department, College, or University support has not been provided or b) a medical emergency, family medical leave, pregnancy, or other state/federal law. The request must identify the remaining areas for improvement, the action timeline, and how progress will be measured.
  - If the recommendation is not approved or if the additional time fails to achieve at least a ‘meets expectations’ in all of the deficiencies, the Dean will follow the existing complaint process and will take disciplinary action as appropriate up to and including dismissal for cause under Chapter UWS 4.
  - The faculty member may provide a written statement to accompany these actions.

- Unless noted elsewhere in this section, all information related to the post-tenure review and remediation plans, if
relevant, will be disclosed only at the discretion, or with the explicit consent, of the faculty member, unless required by business necessity or by law.

4.5.3 Challenging the Review [section removed]

4.5.3.1 Procedures: Post-tenure Review

a. Names of faculty members subject to post-tenure review are forwarded to heads of academic units no later than May 1 of the academic year preceding review.
b. Head of academic unit notifies faculty member no later than May 15 of the academic year preceding review.
c. Department sets post-tenure review dates and decides whether post-tenure review will be conducted by the chair or by committee no later than September 30
d. Selection of committee, if necessary, is completed by October 15
e. Head of academic unit notifies faculty member and post-tenure review committee (if committee option is in effect) of review dates by October 30
f. Faculty member compiles portfolio and other pertinent data of previous five years' contributions no later than January 30
g. Chair or committee reviews portfolio during one-week review period between January 30 and April 15 (Post-tenure review dates set by department no later than September 30 - see (c) above.)
h. Chair or committee meets with faculty member to discuss performance. Following this meeting, final written summary of findings and recommendations is prepared and signed, with faculty member receiving copy of post-tenure review report no later than two weeks after post-tenure review period. (Post-tenure review dates set by department no later than September 30 - see (c) above.)
i. Post-tenure review report is forwarded to Dean for review by one week after the faculty member receives a copy of the post-tenure review report.
j. Dean forwards post-tenure review report and any response to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by one week after post-tenure review report forwarded to Dean.
k. Within one week of receiving a ‘does not meet’ recommendation, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will inform the Dean and faculty member that the review has resulted in a ‘meets expectation’ or that a remediation plan will need to be developed.
l. Within one month of receiving notification that a remediation plan will need to be developed, the Dean, department chair, and faculty member will develop a remediation plan.
m. Each department chair must report annually to the Dean that all post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty in that annual cycle have been completed. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for ensuring that reviews are completed on schedule.

4.5.3.2 Table: Post-tenure Review Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names forwarded to heads of academic units</td>
<td>By May 1 of the academic year preceding review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of academic unit notifies faculty member</td>
<td>By May 15 of the academic year preceding review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department sets post-tenure review dates and method</td>
<td>By September 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of committee, if necessary</td>
<td>By October 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of academic unit notifies faculty member and committee of review dates</td>
<td>By October 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member completes portfolio</td>
<td>By January 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or committee reviews portfolio</td>
<td>One-week review period between January 30 and April 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or committee member meets with faculty member and final summary is sent to faculty member</td>
<td>No later than two weeks after the post-tenure review period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-tenure review report forwarded to Dean</td>
<td>By one week after meeting with faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean forwards report and any response to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>By one week after post-tenure review report is forwarded to Dean. If meets or exceeds is recommended, the procedure stops here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs reviews reports. For those that 'do not meet expectations' the Dean will be notified that a remediation plan needs to be developed</td>
<td>By one week after post-tenure review report is forwarded to the Provost if it does not meet or exceed expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Department Chair and Faculty member develops a remediation plan to address deficiencies</td>
<td>By one month after notification is received from the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean notifies faculty member in writing that the remediation plan has not addressed all of the deficiencies.</td>
<td>By one week after the ending date of the remediation plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If appropriate, the Dean requests in writing that the Chancellor Provost extends the remediation completion date. A revised remediation plan must accompany the request.</td>
<td>By one month after a negative notification, the result is received from the Dean, following any faculty member appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chancellor Provost accepts/rejects the request for an extension of the remediation plan to a fourth academic semester RPD 20-9(1)(c)(ii).</td>
<td>Within one week of receiving the written request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dean makes a written recommendation for discipline for remediation plans that fail to address all deficiencies noted in the post-tenure review</td>
<td>To the appropriate Senate Committee and Provost within one month of the non-fulfillment of the remediation plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment [TS14]**: Only the chancellor has authority to extend the remediation timeline to a fourth academic semester and only where the performance shortfall being addressed involves research. See RPD 20-9(1)(c)(ii).

**Comment [TS15]**: The appeal section ("challenging the review") was removed, so this reference also should be removed.