**Post-Tenure Review Procedures**

**(clarifications and emphasis of specific policy points)**

* The Dean must receive a separate letter regarding post-tenure review even if the review coincided with another form of review such as merit review.
* Composition of the departmental post-tenure review committee
	+ Department chair is the chair of the post-tenure review committee UNLESS
		- The department chair holds tenure in another department
		- The department chair is being reviewed
		- The department chair needs to recuse themselves via UWL’s nepotism policy.
		- In any of these cases, the chair is elected from the membership of the committee.
	+ The committee must be comprised of a minimum of three members
		- If the Department Chair is tenured outside the department but votes on other personnel matters (e.g., retention/promotion), then they are a voting member of the Post-Tenure Review Committee. If they do NOT vote on other personnel matters, they are NOT a voting member of the committee.
		- If there are not three tenured members of the department
			* Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean and the faculty member, meet to select outside member(s)
				+ If there is disagreement, the Dean has final say.
* **Meeting Process**
	+ 21 calendar days notification of the date/time/place of the meeting and of the 7 day prior deadline to turn in materials must be provided to the candidate via email or hard copy.
	+ Faculty member does not need to be present. Meeting should be in closed session with appropriate open meetings law notifications. If multiple faculty are being reviewed, separate meetings (e.g., 15 minutes apart) should be set up with official notices for each meeting.
	+ 7 calendar days prior to the meeting, the candidate turns in a 5-year annual activity report with hyperlinks.
	+ Department chair provides 5-year TAI to the committee.
	+ For SOE faculty- SOE Dean receives a copy of materials when content-area dean receives a copy.
	+ Move into closed session under WI Statute 19.85(1)(c).
	+ Motion that candidate X meets expectations for post-tenure review.
		- Discussion as to whether or not faculty member meets or does not meet expectations. Each category- teaching, scholarship, and service is reviewed.
		- Vote- majority as defined by departmental by-laws.
	+ Committee reports on performance in each of the three areas using the criteria for review defined in departmental by-laws.
	+ Department may also draw on foundational expectations related to professional ethics.
	+ School of Education dean provides input via an evaluative letter.

**Faculty who “Meet Expectations”**

* + Committee chair sends a letter to the Dean (or Deans if SOE) and the faculty member within 14 calendar days (but no later than December 15th).
	+ Letter must include date of the vote and numerical result of the vote that clearly indicates that the faculty member “meets expectations”. Letter must include the **NAMES of all the tenured faculty members who voted** and the Committee Chair’s signature. Letter includes a brief description of consensus points on strengths in each area that are the basis of the determination of “meets expectations”.
* **Dean’s Responsibility**
	+ Dean reviews letter and faculty post-tenure review file (if necessary).
	+ If the Dean is in agreement with the department, the Dean writes a brief “I concur” letter, forwards both letters to HR and posts the letters to the Provost’s repository site for post-tenure review materials prior to February 1st. CC’s to SOE Dean if SOE affiliated faculty member.
	+ If the Dean (includes SOE Dean if SOE) is NOT in agreement with the department:
		- Dean writes a separate letter with their appraisal of the faculty member’s work in context within department by-laws.
		- Dean must provide letter to candidate so that the candidate has 7 calendar days to respond in writing.

**Faculty Who Do Not “Meet Expectations”**

* + Committee chair sends a letter to the Dean (or Deans if SOE) and the faculty member within 14 calendar days (but no later than December 15th).
	+ Letter must include date of the vote and numerical result of the vote that clearly indicates that the faculty member does not “meet expectations” and that the committee recommends the development of a remediation plan. Letter must include the **NAMES of all the tenured faculty members who voted** and the Committee Chair’s signature. Letter must include a description of consensus points of the committee regarding the faculty member’s work in teaching, scholarship, and service with clear identification of deficiencies.
	+ Department forwards the letter, electronic portfolio and TAI with composite SEI scores to the Dean(s).
* **Dean Responsibilities**
	+ Dean reviews file and materials and if the faculty member is SOE affiliated, SOE Dean should provide written commentary and recommendations that are included in the content Dean’s letter.
	+ Dean submits a letter to the Provost and the faculty member, cc’ing Department Chair, and the SOE Dean if there is SOE affiliation, by February 1st of the same academic year of the review.
	+ Dean’s letter contains:
		- Clear indication of whether or not the Dean concurs with the department recommendation.
	+ Faculty member has 7 days to respond in writing.
	+ If Provost concurs, that letter indicates the process and timeline for developing a remediation plan.
	+ After Provost’s letter is received by Dean and faculty member, **Dean initiates a face-to-face meeting within 21 calendar days of the date of the Provost’s letter** with the faculty member and the chair of the post-tenure review committee. If the faculty member refuses, the Dean proceeds alone.
	+ Committee chair and faculty member develop a written plan that clearly indicates the links between the deficiencies and the operationalized goals and outcomes.
	+ The Dean meets with the faculty member and Committee Chair. Faculty member may bring one other tenured faculty member. Dean brings someone in if Committee Chair cannot be present.
	+ At the meeting, through mutual discussion, a development plan is constructed. The plan must include:
		- A detailed list of resources that will be provided or that are to be used to meet the goals of the plan.
		- A deadline no later than three academic semesters from the fall of the academic year following the review (deadline can be earlier upon request).
		- The date of a progress meeting near the end of the first semester of the plan.
		- The date of a final meeting at the completion of the plan or within 21 calendar days of the final date of the plan.
		- The specific consequences of not meeting the goals of the plan (workload assignments, other discipline or dismissal for cause).
	+ Within 7 calendar days of the meeting, the Post-tenure Review Committee Chair provides the finalized remediation plan to the Dean. Letter must include signature/space for signatures of the faculty member, PTR Committee Chair, Department Chair, Dean (s), and Provost.
	+ Dean forwards finalized plan to the Provost and HR.
* 7 days PRIOR to the FINAL remediation follow-up meeting the committee sends a letter to the Dean indicating whether or not the faculty member met the goals of the remediation plan, with evidence.
* AFTER the final meeting, the DEAN writes a letter to the faculty member and the Provost (cc to Department Chair and HR) indicating that the faculty member:
	+ Met the conditions and a statement regarding when the next formal post-tenure review will occur (can be sooner than the 5 years from the original review).
	+ Did NOT meet the conditions. Letter includes information regarding sanctions.