



UW-Madison and College of Agricultural and Life Sciences

Integrated Post-Tenure Review Policy

Faculty Policies and Procedures [7.17](#)

Approved by the Faculty Senate, March 6, 2017

College additions approved by the CALS Dean's Office May 8, 2017;

Revised August 4, 2017, September 19, 2018; June 4, 2019; April 10, 2026

College revisions approved by the CALS Dean's Office April 13, 2026

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 indicating “substantial deficiencies” in performance shall constitute a rating of “does not meet expectations” for the purposes of the Regent Policy Document (RPD) 20-9 sec. 9.b.
 - b. 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.
 - c. 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.
 - d. An initial review indicating substantial deficiencies shall not constitute a disciplinary action under FPP 9.
 - e. Note: Effective with the 2024-25 academic year, the College will no longer utilize the rating of “exceeds expectations” as defined by RPD 20-9 sec. 9.b.

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.
 - i. **Regent policy:** Departments shall provide a notice of intent to review to faculty members at least three months before the review is conducted. However, failure to meet this notice deadline does not obviate the requirement to conduct and participate in the review.
 - ii. **CALS policy:** For faculty members with an appointment in more than one department, input is required from both departments.
 - iii. **CALS policy:** The department shall send deferral requests to the CALS Dean’s Office for review and approval. Deferral requests will include the reason for and timeframe of the deferral. Upon approval, the CALS Dean’s Office will forward the request to the provost for approval and a new review schedule.
 - iv. **CALS policy:** Written input from the Dean of Extension or their delegates assessing performance should be provided to the dean as part of the post-tenure review. The CALS Dean’s office will request a letter from the Dean of Extension or their delegates upon receipt of a PTR.
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 vita, 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
 - i. **CALS policy:** For department chairs and faculty members with substantial administrative appointments, the review should take into account the impact of these responsibilities on the normal faculty responsibilities.
 - ii. **CALS policy:** Faculty members who are partially funded by the Division of Extension should include impacts that the faculty member's work has made, such as changed practices, changes in financial impacts/productivity, changes in environmental impacts, new technology, etc. See the "Excellence in Extension for College of Agricultural and Life Sciences Faculty" document for more details.
 - iii. **CALS policy:** The review of graduate student training should be included in the 1) teaching section of the report when related to classroom instruction or 2) the research or outreach/extension section(s) of the report when related to mentoring and advising.
 - iv. **CALS policy:** For teaching, describe the quality of teaching by reviewing all student course evaluations and including a summary of the teaching evaluations (narrative or tabular) and/or other evidence used to support that description (i.e. peer teaching evaluations), and explain the faculty member's contributions to each course.
 - v. **CALS policy:** The reviewers will draft a combined, concise report describing and evaluating the performance of the faculty member. The report will include professional accomplishments and recommendations for growth and development. If deficiencies are noted, the report should include specific recommendations on ways of improving performance.
 - vi. **CALS policy:** The report shall include a rating of 1) meets expectations, or 2) does not meet expectations in each of the following categories: a) research/scholarly productivity, b) teaching, c) outreach/extension (when applicable), and d) service.
 - a. A rating of meets expectations or does not meet expectations in any one category does not preclude an overall rating (see below) of meets or does not meet expectations.
 - vii. **CALS policy:** The report shall indicate the overall results of the review by indicating one of the categories in section B.5. of this document: 1) meets expectations, or 2) does not meet expectations.
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.
- i. **CALS policy:** After acceptance of the report by the executive committee, the report will be given to the faculty member for comment, with the right to a written response described in C.3. The comments of the faculty member will be

- considered by the executive committee.
- ii. **CALS policy:** For faculty members with a tenure home in more than one department, acceptance of the report from each department executive committee is required.
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.
 - i. **CALS policy:** CALS departments shall forward revised department post-tenure review criteria to the CALS Dean's Office. The CALS Dean's Office shall forward department criteria and procedures to the provost and 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.
 - i. **CALS policy:** By the end of each academic year, the CALS Dean's Office will send each department chair a post-tenure review roster, with faculty names and designated review years. Upon agreement of the data, the department chair and/or executive committee shall establish a calendar of reviews to be conducted and file it with the CALS Dean's Office by the given deadline.
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.
 - i. **CALS policy:** The CALS Dean's Office will maintain this list. Departments do not need to act on this.
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.

CALS Policy: Post-Tenure Review Submission Requirements

Note: When a faculty member is being considered for a promotion and is scheduled for a post-tenure review in the same academic year, separate and complete documentation should be submitted for both the promotion and post-tenure review. The documentation should be submitted to CALS Human Resources per current college guidelines and policies.

Beginning with the 2024-25 academic year, combined documentation supporting a faculty member's promotion and post-tenure review will no longer be accepted by the CALS Dean's office.

Submission requirements for Post-Tenure Reviews: The following should be forwarded to CALS Human Resources, in one combined file, by each year's given deadline.

1. Cover letter which includes the following:
 - a. Executive committee acceptance of the report, including the date and results of the vote (including exact vote numbers). For faculty members with more than one tenure home, include both executive committee votes.
 - b. Statement verifying that faculty activity reports have been filed by the faculty member for the previous five years.
 - c. Statement of any known deficiencies in research-related or Extension-related reporting

- requirements, if applicable¹
2. Final draft of the report. The report shall include:
 - a. Names of the reviewers
 - b. Review of the faculty member's work in the areas of research/scholarly productivity, teaching, outreach/extension (when applicable), and service²
 - c. Rating of 1) meets expectations, or 2) does not meet expectations in each of the following categories: a) research/scholarly productivity, b) teaching, c) outreach/extension (when applicable), and d) service.
 - d. Overall results of the review by indicating one of the categories in section B.5. of this document: 1) meets expectations, or 2) does not meet expectations.
 3. Brief summary of future career plans from the faculty member
 4. Comments of the faculty member
 5. Comprehensive (full faculty career) CV of the faculty member, which shall at minimum include:
 - a. Employment history
 - b. Academic training
 - c. Honors and awards
 - d. Grants and funding (for shared grants, indicate the co-PIs and the funding amount for the faculty member) should be clearly laid out in a table that identifies the following information.
 - Grant title
 - Funding source, type of grant, extramural vs. intramural funding type
 - Total amount and percentage of grant awarded to the candidate
 - Description of the candidate's contribution (for example, there could be a critical contribution but small percentage of funding)
 - Funding periods for grants either incorporated into the table or as a Gantt chart
 - Grant proposals pending or in progress
 - e. Publications and related factors such as citations, if applicable
 - f. Courses taught (for shared instruction, indicate the percentage of responsibility for the faculty member)
 - g. Service (department, college, university, professional)
 - h. Extension and outreach programs
 - i. Graduate student training
 6. **New for 2026-27 submissions, an appendix containing complete student evaluation reports for all course instruction that was completed since the last PTR should be included.**

Post-tenure reviews will be reviewed by the deans' executive team. For sufficient reviews, an acknowledgment letter will be sent to the department chair (or designee). If the deans' executive team considers a review insufficient, a written response will be provided to the executive committee within 14 days of receipt of the review. The executive committee may provide a response addressing those concerns with the review within 14 days. A recommendation will then be made to the provost, pursuant to Faculty Policies and Procedures 7.17.C.6.

¹Reporting is generally tracked at the college level and faculty members are generally notified when reports are not received; however, please note any known issues by the review committee. Upon review of the post-tenure review report by the deans' executive team, any other known issues with reporting will be addressed at that time.

²The nature and relative weighting of responsibilities for individual faculty vary according to disciplinary area, career stage and relative role played in fulfilling the mission of the employing unit, college and university.