

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Resolution I.1.g:

That, upon the recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Chancellor is authorized to implement the University's Post-Tenure Review Policy.

## **UW-MADISON POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### **BACKGROUND**

Section UWS 2.02, Wis. Admin. Code (“Faculty Rules: Coverage and Delegation”), requires that rules, policies, and procedures developed by each institution in the UW System pursuant to Chapters UWS 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 be approved by the Board of Regents prior to taking effect.

On March 10, 2016, the UW System Board of Regents adopted revised Regent Policy Document (RPD) 20-9, "Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development," available at <https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/policies/periodic-post-tenure-review-in-support-of-tenured-faculty-development>). RPD 20-9 states that “[w]ithin nine (9) months of the effective date of this Regent policy each institution shall submit an institutional policy to the Board of Regents. Once the institutional policy has been approved, the chancellor, with the advice and counsel of the faculty, is responsible for implementing the policy and operating the institution consistent with its provisions.”

A memo from Chancellor Blank requesting approval of the UW-Madison post-tenure review policy by the Board of Regents is attached to this document. The UW System Office of General Counsel and the Office of Academic and Student Affairs reviewed the proposed policy. The President recommends approval of the UW-Madison post-tenure review policy.

#### **REQUESTED ACTION**

Adoption of Resolution I.1.g, approving the UW-Madison Post-Tenure Review Policy.

#### **DISCUSSION**

On March 6, 2017, the UW-Madison Faculty Senate approved the university’s new post-tenure review policy. Attached to this document is Appendix A, containing the new UW-Madison post-tenure review policy as it would read if approved by the Board of Regents, followed by Appendix B containing the former policy on review of tenured faculty.

#### **RELATED REGENT POLICIES AND LAWS**

Section 36, Wis. Stats.  
Chapters UWS 3 and 5, Wis. Admin. Code  
Regent Policy Document 20-23

**APPENDIX A**  
**New UW-Madison Post-Tenure Review Policy**



***Post-Tenure Review Policy***  
*Faculty Policies and Procedures 7.17*  
Approved by the Faculty Senate, March 6, 2017

**A. PURPOSE**

The purposes of the review of tenured faculty are:

- a. to recognize outstanding achievement;
- b. to provide opportunities for mentoring and professional development;
- c. to help identify and remedy, from a developmental point of view, any deficiencies in teaching, service, outreach/extension, and research/scholarly productivity.

The process of post-tenure review is the periodic assessment of each faculty member's activities and performance, in accordance with the mission of the department, college, and institution, and the responsibilities of the faculty as described in *FPP* 8.02. The review is to be appropriately linked to the merit process, and should not involve the creation of unnecessary additional bureaucracy. Review of tenured faculty builds on and complements other aspects of the tenure process in order to develop faculty capacity and strengthen and promote the public benefits of tenure. Post-tenure review is not a reevaluation of tenure and is not undertaken for the purposes of discipline or dismissal. Faculty shall be subject to discipline or dismissal only for just cause (see *FPP* 9.). Departments, schools, and colleges may not use post-tenure reviews as the basis for budgetary decisions or for decisions regarding program discontinuance, curtailment, modification, or redirection.

**B. CRITERIA**

1. The basic standard for review shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member's position.
2. Each department shall develop criteria to measure progress in teaching, service, outreach/extension, and research/scholarly productivity as appropriate to the field and consistent with *FPP* 8.02. Each department shall develop criteria to measure progress in scholarly productivity as appropriate to the field. The criteria for review shall be periodically reviewed by the executive committee of each department and the school or college APC.
3. The criteria for review should reflect the overall mission of the department, be sufficiently flexible to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities, and recognize that careers and levels of productivity may change over time. In developing such criteria, departments may draw on statements used in other faculty review procedures, such as merit or promotion review. Special care should be taken to ensure that the scholarly productivity of jointly appointed and interdisciplinary faculty is appropriately evaluated.
4. The executive committee of each department shall ensure that the criteria governing faculty review do not infringe on the accepted standards of academic freedom of faculty, including the freedom to pursue novel, unpopular, or unfashionable lines of inquiry or innovative methods of teaching, and recognize that scholarly projects take varying amounts of time to come to fruition. Nothing in the criteria or application of these policies shall allow the review to be prejudiced by factors proscribed by applicable state or federal law, such as race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, and handicap.

5. For the purposes of this chapter, the following definitions shall apply:
  - a. A review resulting in an indication of “exceptionally good” performance shall constitute a rating of “exceeds expectations” for the purposes of Regent Policy Document (RPD) 20-9 sec. 9.b.
  - b. A review indicating “substantial deficiencies” in performance shall constitute a rating of “does not meet expectations” for the purposes of RPD 20-9 sec. 9.b.
  - c. All other review results under this chapter shall constitute a rating of “meets expectations” for the purposes of RPD 20-9 sec. 9.a. Discharging conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member's position shall serve as the standard for “expected level of accomplishment” as described in the RPD.
  - d. For schools and colleges that are not officially divided into departments, all references to “department” or “chair” in this policy shall be understood to refer to the equivalent unit and its corresponding chair or equivalent.
  - e. An initial review indicating substantial deficiencies shall not constitute a disciplinary action under FPP 9.

### C. PROCEDURES

1. Reviews shall occur at least once every five years. These reviews may incorporate the annual merit review process and may encompass promotion, retention, salary, or other reviews, including but not limited to nominations for named chairs and professorships, major teaching awards, and national professional honors or awards. In the case of combined reviews, the department may require supplementary documentation from the faculty member, which meets the criteria below, that would not otherwise be required for the other review. The review may be deferred, by approval of the provost, for unusual circumstances such as when it may coincide with an approved leave, significant life event, promotion review, or other appointment, and the provost may then determine a new review schedule. Each review, as determined by each department's executive committee, shall be carried out by two or more tenured faculty members, who may be drawn from outside the department. Upon notification of the reviewers selected by the committee, if the faculty member under review formally objects to a reviewer, the chair, in consultation with the relevant dean, shall identify other appropriate reviewers. Such formal objections should be kept confidential. In the case of a faculty member with appointments in more than one department, the department chairs of the affected departments shall agree in writing on procedures for the conduct of the review.
2. Review procedures shall include:
  - a. A review of 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, and student 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 faculty member should provide the reviewers with a brief summary of career plans for the future. Letters from outside the university would not ordinarily be a part of the review process. The faculty member under review, however, may submit appropriate letters if she or he so chooses. The reviewers shall examine materials to the degree needed to accomplish the purposes of this review.
  - b. 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.

- c. Appropriate consideration of a faculty member's contributions outside the department to interdisciplinary and other programs, governance, and administration.
  - d. Other steps the reviewers consider 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
3. The reviewers shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review. The faculty member shall have the right to prepare a written response to the summary within 30 days after receipt.
4. A copy of the summary and any written response to it shall be given to the department chair and shall be placed in the personnel file of the faculty member. A copy shall also be provided to the appropriate dean for sufficiency review. The department shall also preserve in the faculty member's personnel file all documents that played a substantive role in the review (other than documents such as publications that are readily accessible elsewhere), and a record of any action taken as a result of the review. The summary and outcome of the review shall remain confidential, that is, confined to the appropriate departmental, college, or university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated, released otherwise only at the discretion, or with the explicit consent of, the faculty member, or as otherwise required by business necessity or law.
5. Every effort should be made to offer tangible recognition to those faculty identified as exceptionally good, including but not limited to, nomination for university, national, and international awards and relevant merit and other benefits.
6. Following the initial departmental review and faculty member's response, if any, the dean shall conduct a sufficiency review. In the event that the dean considers that the review was insufficient, he/she shall provide the reasons to the executive committee in writing why the review was insufficient within 14 days of receiving the departmental report. The executive committee may provide a response addressing the dean's concerns about the sufficiency of the review within 14 days. The dean will then make a recommendation to the provost on whether or not the faculty member "meets expectations."
  - a. If neither the departmental review nor the dean's review indicate substantial deficiencies, the post-tenure review process is concluded.
  - b. If both the departmental review and the dean's review indicate substantial deficiencies, the remediation process described in 7.b. shall commence immediately.
  - c. In the event the dean's review indicates substantial deficiencies not identified in the departmental review, the dean must provide written reasons within 14 days to the faculty member for the recommendation and the faculty member may provide a written response to the dean within 14 days. This statement can include new documentation on the faculty member's accomplishments. Within 5 days of the end of the faculty member's written response deadline, the dean will forward their review and the departmental review, along with any written response statements from the faculty member, to the provost.
  - d. In the event the departmental review indicates substantial deficiencies but the dean dissents, the dean will forward their recommendation, along with the departmental review and any written response statement from the faculty member, to the provost.
7. If the post-tenure review is not concluded at the dean's level per 6.a. or 6.b. above, upon receipt of the dean's recommendation, the provost will perform their own review, including consultation with the divisional committee review council (DCRC), which also will be provided with the executive committee recommendation, the dean's recommendation, and any faculty responses. The provost shall request advice from the DCRC within 5 days of receiving

the dean's recommendation and the council will provide their advice within 30 days of receiving the request from the provost.

- a. Review by the provost, or review by the dean which is not submitted for the provost's review, shall be the final review.
  - b. If after the reviews the substantial deficiencies are confirmed by the provost, support from institutional resources for professional development shall be proffered. 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), who shall resolve any disagreements as to the creation of the remediation plan. This plan shall be the product of mutual negotiation and discussion between the faculty member and the chair and/or 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. The faculty member shall have the right to provide a written response regarding the manner in which any written development plan is formulated, the plan's content, and any resulting evaluation. This plan shall be completed no later than 30 days after the provost has informed the faculty member of the decision. The faculty member shall have three academic semesters to fully satisfy all of the elements of the remediation plan. If the remediation plan includes performance deficiencies in research, an extension of one academic semester may be granted by the chancellor.
8. The process for determination of the successful completion of the remediation is as follows.
- a. The faculty member will submit documentation of their 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 and 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.
  - b. Within 30 days of receipt, the executive committee will review the materials submitted, and will make a determination as to whether all the elements of the remediation plan have been satisfied. The executive committee will then submit the faculty member's documentation along with their determination to the dean.
  - c. The dean shall review the faculty member's performance and determine, in consultation with the faculty member, their department chair, and the chancellor, whether the remediation plan and criteria have been satisfied or whether further action to address the substantial deficiencies must be taken.
  - d. If the dean determines that the faculty member has not satisfied all the elements of the remediation plan, then within 14 days the decision and written reasons for this decision shall be provided to the faculty member and to the provost. Within 14 days of receiving the notification from the dean, the faculty member can submit to the provost an additional written statement addressing the decisions made by the executive committee and the dean.
  - e. Consistent with the provisions of RPD 20-9 sec. 12.c.ii., in the event that the review conducted per 9.c. reveals continuing and persistent problems with a faculty member's performance that do not lend themselves to improvement by the end of the remediation period, and that call into question the faculty member's ability to function in that position, then other possibilities, such as a mutually agreeable reassignment to other

duties or separation, should be explored. If these are not practicable, or no other solution acceptable to the parties can be found, then the University Committee must appoint an ad hoc committee of faculty to review proposed sanctions consistent with *FPP*.

9. The standard for discipline or dismissal remains that of just cause as outlined in *FPP* 9.02. and 9.03. The fact of successive negative reviews does not diminish the obligation of the institution to show such cause in a separate forum, following the procedures outlined in *FPP* 9. Records from post-tenure review may be relied upon and are admissible, but rebuttable as to accuracy. The administration bears the ultimate burden of proof on the issue of just cause for discipline and dismissal.
10. The faculty member retains all protections guaranteed in *FPP*, including, but not limited to, the rights to appeal and the right to appeal disciplinary action to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities as described in *FPP* 9.07.

#### D. ACCOUNTABILITY

1. Copies of the departmental criteria and procedures for reviews of tenured faculty (including procedures to be used for individual tenured faculty with shared appointments in several departments) shall be filed with the appropriate chairs, deans, the provost, and the secretary of the faculty.
2. At the end of each academic year, the chair shall identify faculty to be reviewed by the end of the following academic year and the executive committee shall establish a calendar for reviews and provide notice to the identified faculty consistent with RPD 20-9 sec. 5. Department chairs shall coordinate with their deans to schedule all initial departmental reviews to be conducted during the fall semester, ensuring that all reviews and responses are completed and reported to the dean no later than March 1.
3. Departments shall maintain a record of reviews completed, including the names of all reviewers.
4. At the end of each academic year, department chairs shall send a report to the appropriate dean(s) listing the names of faculty members reviewed during that academic year and summarizing the outcomes of those reviews
5. 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
6. The periodic review of each department, in which the department's mission, personnel, and development are now evaluated, shall include review of the process for review of tenured faculty in the department.
7. Pursuant to RPD 20-9 sec. 16, reviews and remediation plans are not subject to grievance processes. Faculty retain all protections and rights to grievances and appeals provided elsewhere in these chapters, including but not limited to *FPP* chapters 8 and 9, unrelated to post-tenure review.

**APPENDIX B**  
**Existing UW-Madison Post-Tenure Review Policy**

**UW-Madison Faculty Legislation II-106**  
**POLICY ON REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY**

Each departmental executive committee shall establish written criteria and procedures governing the periodic review of each tenured faculty member.

**I. PURPOSE**

The purpose of the review of tenured faculty is to assess periodically each faculty member's activities and performance, in accordance with the mission of the department, college, and institution in such a way as to determine that the faculty member is meeting his or her obligations to the university and the State of Wisconsin. The review is to be appropriately linked to the merit process, and "should not involve the creation of unnecessary additional bureaucracy."

**II. CRITERIA**

- A. The criteria should reflect the overall mission of the department and should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities. In developing such criteria, departments may draw on statements used in their current faculty review procedures, such as merit or promotion review.
- B. The executive committee of each department shall ensure that the criteria governing faculty review do not infringe on the accepted standards of academic freedom of faculty, including the freedom to pursue novel, unpopular, or unfashionable lines of inquiry. Nothing in the criteria or application of these policies shall allow the review to be prejudiced by factors proscribed by applicable state or federal law, such as race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, and handicap.

**III. PROCEDURES**

- A. Reviews shall occur at least once every five years unless delayed because the faculty member is on leave or because his or her promotion to full professor is anticipated for the following year. These reviews may be incorporated into the annual merit review process or combined with promotion or other reviews including but not limited to nominations for chaired professorships, major teaching awards, and national professional honors or awards. In the case of combined reviews, the department may require supplementary documentation from the faculty member, which meets the criteria of C.1. below, that would not otherwise be required for the other review.
- B. Each review, as determined by each department's executive committee, shall be carried out by one or more tenured faculty members. No individual shall serve as a reviewer if the faculty member under review formally objects to his or her service in that capacity. Such formal objections should be kept confidential. In the case of a faculty member with appointments in more than one department, the department chairs of the affected departments shall agree on procedures for the conduct of the review.
- C. Review procedures shall include
  - 1. A review of 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 faculty member should provide the reviewer(s) with a brief summary of career plans for the future. Letters from outside the university would not



- ordinarily be a part of the review process. The faculty member under review, however, may submit appropriate letters if she or he so chooses. The reviewer(s) shall examine materials to the degree needed to accomplish the purposes of this review, which are to assess whether the faculty member is satisfactorily performing his or her duties to the university and the State of Wisconsin, and to encourage the improvement of faculty skills.
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, and administration.
  4. Other steps the reviewers consider 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.
- D. The reviewer(s) shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to prepare a written response to the summary. A copy of the summary and any written response to it shall be given to the department chair and shall be placed in the personnel file of the faculty member for uses deemed appropriate by the departmental executive committee. Any recommendations for action in response to the results of the review should be forwarded by the department chair to the appropriate individuals or bodies.
- E. The department shall also preserve in the faculty member's personnel file all documents that played a substantive role in the review (other than documents such as publications that are readily accessible elsewhere), and a record of any action taken as a result of the review.

#### IV. ACCOUNTABILITY

- A. Copies of the departmental criteria and procedures for reviews of tenured faculty shall be filed with the appropriate dean.
- B. Departments shall maintain a record of reviews completed, including the names of all reviewers.
- C. At the end of each academic year, the appropriate dean shall receive a report from the department chair listing the names of faculty members reviewed during that academic year and summarizing the outcomes of those reviews.
- D. Any exceptions to this review process must be approved by the appropriate dean.
- E. The periodic review of each department, in which the department's mission, personnel, and development are now evaluated, shall include review of the process for review of tenured faculty in the department.

#### V. IMPLEMENTATION

The executive committee of each department shall prepare a plan for scheduling reviews of tenured faculty. This plan shall provide for the first five year cycle of reviews to begin during the 1993-94 academic year.

*[UW-Madison Faculty Document 1001b - 19 April 1993]*



March 27, 2017

TO: Ray Cross, President, UW System  
Regina Millner, President, UW Board of Regents

FROM: Rebecca Blank, Chancellor, UW-Madison *Rebecca Blank*

CC: Steven K. Smith, Secretary of the Faculty  
Amy Wendt, Chair, UW-Madison University Committee

Per the attached memo dated March 20, 2017, and consistent with UWS 2.02 and RPD 20-9, the University Committee has formally requested that I forward to you for consideration by the Board of the Regents the proposed new language for UW-Madison's Faculty Policies and Procedures (FPP) on post-tenure review of tenured faculty. It is our hope that the Education Committee will consider this language for approval at its April meeting, and send it to the full Board for approval at the same meeting.

As the memo from the University Committee notes, the UW-Madison Faculty Senate revisited the modified post-tenure review policies that it submitted to the Board of Regents in November 2016 after the Board of Regents modified RPD 20-9 at its meeting in December 2016. UW-Madison faculty reviewed and revised the modified campus policies to conform to the additional changes to the RPD. The enclosed policies were subsequently vetted with UW System Administration officials including UW System Vice President James Henderson and UW System Legal Counsel Tom Stafford, both of whom provided feedback indicating that the enclosed revisions were fully in keeping with the revised RPD. Subsequently, the updated campus policies were approved by the UW-Madison Faculty Senate on 6 March 2017, by a vote of 77-2, with 51 abstaining.

As requested by Vice President Henderson, an outline of the major changes and points discussed relating to the changes made since our November 2016 submission is enclosed herewith.

Accordingly, I endorse the revisions to the UW-Madison post-tenure review policies as submitted and respectfully request their approval by the Board of Regents at its April 2017 meeting.

Attachments

Chancellor Rebecca M. Blank  
Morgridge Friends Distinguished Chair of Leadership  
Bascom Hall University of Wisconsin-Madison 500 Lincoln Drive Madison, Wisconsin 53706  
608-262-9946 Fax: 608-262-8333 TTY 608-263-2473



March 20, 2017

TO: Rebecca Blank, Chancellor

FROM: University Committee (Amy Wendt, chair; Tom Broman; Anja Wanner; Ruth Litovsky; Barbara Bowers; Richard Amasino)

CC: Sarah Mangelsdorf, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
Ray Taffora, Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs  
Steven K. Smith, Secretary of the Faculty

Per UWS 2.02 (“Delegation”), all rules and procedures developed by the faculty of each institution related to faculty appointments are to be forwarded by the Chancellor of the institution to the President and by the President to the Board for its approval. The UW-Madison University Committee hereby submits for approval by the Board of Regents the proposed new language for UW-Madison’s Faculty Policies and Procedures (FPP) relating to faculty post-tenure review. These policies were approved by the UW-Madison Faculty Senate on 6 March 2017, by a vote of 77-2, with 51 abstaining. We hereby ask that you submit this to President Ray Cross per UWS 2.02 and RPD 20-9. We hope that the Board of Regents will approve this addition to FPP at its April 2017 meeting.

As you know, UW-Madison submitted an earlier version of this policy in November 2016 for consideration at the December 2016 Board meeting. While that version was, in our belief, fully compliant with the terms of RPD 20-9, at the December 2016 meeting, the Board of Regents revised the RPD such that additional revisions to the Madison policy were required. This current version was reviewed by UW System Vice President James Henderson and UW System Legal Counsel Tom Stafford, among others, and we have been told that it is fully in keeping with the revised RPD. Following the above-mentioned review, Vice President Henderson requested that we submit, along with this transmittal, an outline of the major changes and points discussed relating to the changes made since our November 2016 submission. We have included that information below.

Changes since November 2016 version of UW-Madison PTR policy

- “Outreach/extension” has been added to teaching, research, and service in the listing of faculty professional responsibilities (A.c and B.2).
- Wording has been modified in C.1 to more clearly reflect that the post-tenure review is distinct from annual merit and other reviews. (Requested by System)
- Removed: Statement granting automatic exemption from post tenure review for faculty with 100% administrative appointments. (Requested by System)

- A set of changes were made in the procedures for the steps following the completion of the peer review. (Requested by System)
  - The faculty member under review will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the review summary within 30 days of receipt (C.3).
  - The opportunity to request a second peer review with a new committee following a negative peer review has been deleted.
  - Subsequent to the peer review, the review summary and response (if provided) from the faculty member under review is forwarded to the dean for their review (C.4).
  - The description of the dean's review has been changed, and explicit procedures resulting from the four possible combinations of review committee and dean recommendations have been added (C.6).
  - For cases in which the dean's recommendation and that of the peer review committee do not concur, a Provost review has been added (procedures described in C.7). In these cases, after consultation with the Divisional Committee Review Council, the Provost makes the final decision.
- For cases that proceed to a remediation plan, the following changes have been made:
  - UW System review noted that the portion of section C relating to the development of a remediation plan did not provide for cases where the department chair and the faculty member disagreed. This has been addressed by indicating that the dean shall resolve any differences (C.7.b).
  - Procedures for review of progress and successful completion of the remediation period by the dean, in consultation with the department chair and chancellor have been added (C.8.a-d). (Requested by System)
- The determination of unsuccessful remediation will now be made "at the end of the remediation period," rather than "after several efforts" (C.8.e). (Requested by System)
- The annual timeline for post tenure reviews has been edited (D.2 and elsewhere) to ensure that reviews are completed within a single academic year. (Requested by System)
- In section B.5., the Madison PTR policy explains how the categories included in the RPD (exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations) relate to the categories used in the Madison policy (exceptionally good, substantial deficiencies, and other). The Madison categories are based on past practice and campus standards and are used for convenience, completely mapping onto the categories required under the RPD. (Clarification requested by System)
- "Significant life event" has been added to the list of reasons for which a review may be deferred with approval of the Provost (C.1). (Requested by Senate at "first reading.")
- Extension of research-related remediation periods by one semester must be approved by the Chancellor (C.7b; previous version had "Provost" here and was not in compliance with Board of Regents policy). (Identified by Madison staff.)