

DRAFT: FOR CONSIDERATION BY UW SYSTEM TENURE POLICY TASK FORCE
AT ITS NOVEMBER 30, 2015 MEETING: DRAFT

**Recommendations Relating to Revised Regent Policy Document 20-9, Tenured Faculty
Review and Development¹**

Introduction

Recommend including an introduction stating that the purpose and scope of post-tenure review is to recognize and to reward a sustained level of solid performance, and to identify and to remedy deficiencies through a supportive and developmental process.

Recommend that the introduction state that tenured faculty currently are reviewed annually, that the annual review process will continue, and that post-tenure review may substitute for the annual review in the year a faculty member is up for post-tenure review.

Recommend that the introduction also specifically state that this policy is not intended to change the current rules addressing faculty termination for cause as set forth in Chapter UWS 4 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, and that Chapter UWS 4 remains the exclusive procedure to effect for cause termination of faculty for performance reasons.

Definitions

Recommend including definitions of “post-tenure review,” “merit review,” and other applicable terms.

Elements of the Review

1. Recommend that post-tenure review be required at a set interval, and at least every five years after the granting of tenure, with exceptions for faculty undergoing evaluation for promotion that falls within the cycle. Post-tenure review may substitute for annual review.
2. Recommend that the criteria applied to conduct the review shall be teaching, research, and service. The relative importance of these criteria shall be established at the institutional level, and shall reflect the mission of the institution, as well as the mission of various units within an institution, such as departments, schools, and colleges. The criteria shall be sufficiently flexible to allow for shifts in the professional emphasis of faculty.
3. Recommend that the process for conducting the review be developed at each campus, and that the process shall describe how the review will be conducted, who will conduct the review, and what will constitute the review file.

¹ Note that many of these recommendations already are reflected in part by language in the current RPD 20-9, and it is likely that much of that language, somewhat reworked, will remain in the RPD.

4. Recommend that the review shall include both peer and student evaluations, shall provide for review by the department and may provide for review by other appropriate groups.
5. Recommend that language be included stating that the review shall respect the First Amendment rights and academic freedom of tenured faculty.
6. Recommend that review designations of “unsatisfactory,” “satisfactory,” and “excellent” be used by the department and any other reviewing group.
7. Recommend that tenured faculty receiving “satisfactory” and “excellent” reviews from the department, and from any other reviewing group, be eligible for a merit reward that can include a base salary adjustment, a non-base (one time) pay adjustment, reassigned time for professional activities, provision of equipment or other tangible forms of support for professional activities, or a combination of the foregoing. The availability, magnitude, and distribution of merit awards may vary by institution as determined by the chancellor in consultation with faculty shared governance.
8. Recommend that tenured faculty receiving an “unsatisfactory” review from the department be provided an opportunity to file a written response to the review with the dean and be provided an opportunity for a meeting with the dean and a faculty member(s) representing the department to discuss any concerns the faculty member may have relating to the review.
9. Recommend that if the dean concurs with the department’s “unsatisfactory” review of the faculty member, the dean shall forward to the provost a recommendation to implement performance remediation to assist the faculty member to improve his or her performance. The provost (or designee) shall make the decision on whether to implement performance remediation for a tenured faculty member under this policy. This decision shall be final and not subject to institutional grievance processes.

Remediation/Development Process

1. Recommend that a faculty member receiving an unsatisfactory review for whom performance remediation is to be implemented be informed in writing of the area(s) of underperformance and of performance expectations. In consultation with the department, the faculty member must develop a written remediation plan to address the area(s) of underperformance and submit that plan for approval by the department and the dean.
2. Recommend that performance remediation be a developmental process and that the faculty member receive appropriate support from the department, dean, and other university units to address area(s) of underperformance.
3. Recommend that the dean, in consultation with the department and the faculty member, review the written remediation plan and determine progress at least once each semester. The dean will document progress, or lack thereof, through a letter to be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file.

4. Recommend that a remediation plan must be successfully completed within a reasonable time as determined by the dean in consultation with the department or by institutional policy.
5. Recommend that if the dean, after consultation with the faculty member and the department, determines the faculty member has successfully completed the remediation plan, the faculty member shall be notified of this decision, and the remediation plan shall be considered concluded.
6. Recommend that a provision be included referencing appropriate disciplinary processes under Chapters UWS 4 and UWS 6 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, and related campus policies, in the event that a tenured faculty member fails to improve his or her performance following an unsatisfactory review.

Recordkeeping and Accountability Measures

1. Recommend that a written record be created containing the results of an individual faculty member's post-tenure review, and that the written record be provided to the dean and the provost.
2. Recommend that department chairs be required to report annually to the dean and provost to confirm that all tenured faculty in that annual cycle have been reviewed.