

# Post-Tenure Review Form (online)

*Instruction for form creator: Notice shall be sent to the appropriate parties each time a section/review is completed and saved.*

Faculty Name \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_

Date of last Post-Tenure Review (PTR), Tenure, or applicable review \_\_\_\_\_

## **Instruction to faculty member:**

By three (3) business days prior to the first Friday in September, the faculty member under review shall prepare and submit a copy of the materials indicated below.

First, at a minimum, the faculty member shall include their CV and student evaluations of instruction or summaries of student evaluations of instruction for at least one semester per academic year for the period under review, with exceptions explained – there is no expectation that the faculty member will provide additional documents. The faculty member may include, but is not required to include, reference documents or other materials as determined by the faculty member that support the faculty member's accomplishments and contributions to the department, or that are relevant to the review criteria.

Second, for each of the performance subcategories (TS1-4; RS1-2; and SS1-3), the faculty member shall check one performance indicator that the faculty member feels best demonstrates their competence in each subcategory. Faculty members may have multiple achievements they could select from for each performance subcategory but for the purposes of post-tenure review, for each subcategory they should focus on the one item they believe best demonstrates their competence and that best showcases their professional accomplishments during the review period.

- Note: Faculty with significant reassignment from teaching may select tasks from a teaching reassignment that demonstrate competency in the overall Teaching performance category, which are comparable in scope to the other items listed.

Third, in each designated text box for each main performance-category section (Teaching, Research/Creative Activity/Scholarship, and Service) of the Performance Indicator Checklist, the faculty member should, in less than a page, briefly describe how they have demonstrated overall professional competence in that performance category during the review period.

**Faculty member shall upload a current *curriculum vitae* (C.V.). [Link to upload]**

**Faculty member shall provide a sample of at least four semesters of student teaching evaluations or summaries of student teaching evaluations. [Link to upload]**

---

**Criteria:** According to Regent Policy Document 20-9 ([RPD 20-9](#)), “*In determining the category, the review will consider whether the faculty member under review has discharged conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member’s position*” (#9).

PTR criteria are different than the multiple standards UW-Whitewater faculty are asked to meet: standards of excellence, whether that be for promotion to associate professor with tenure, promotion to professor, or a myriad of other requirements for accreditation, grant applications, fellowships and much more. These demands for excellence are appropriate in these cases; however, in accordance with RPD 20-9, the purpose of post-tenure review is to **demonstrate professional competence as a UW-Whitewater faculty member.**

The use of these criteria shall not infringe on a faculty member’s academic freedom in regard to teaching, research or service, and the review shall not infringe on Academic Freedom as defined by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* statement. Nor shall it be conducted in an unfair, biased and discriminatory manner.

The criteria for “meets expectations” must allow for the unique variations of faculty and the faculty member’s career trajectory, and consequently, the faculty member under review must be permitted latitude in demonstrating professional competence. Moreover, all student evaluation data should be considered in context and are to be interpreted in light of course load, required v. elective courses, class size, attempts at innovative practice, percentage of responders, unusual circumstances, and other special considerations. In addition, refer to Regent Policy Document 20-2, *Student Evaluation of Instruction* ([RPD 20-2](#)).

# FACULTY REVIEW

## PRIMARY PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE (PPRC) REVIEW

Date Conducted \_\_\_\_\_

### Instruction to Department Chair:

Post a written Notice of Intent to conduct a PTR and provide the faculty member with such notice by no later than **April 1** preceding the academic semester in which the PTR shall occur. (The Notice of Intent example is posted here [[Form Creator - Make URL with document posted on Faculty Senate Page](#)].) The meetings conducted under this policy shall be subject to the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law.

*Formation of the Primary Peer Review Committee (PPRC):* By the **second Friday in May of the academic year preceding the review**, and in no event fewer than ninety calendar days prior to the date the review shall begin, the PPRC shall be formed. The PPRC shall be comprised of three tenured faculty members who shall be selected by a majority of the tenured faculty members within the department. A majority of the tenured faculty members in the department may select one or more tenured faculty members from another department within the college to complete the PPRC committee, in consultation with the dean.

Once the three tenured faculty members have been selected, the department chair will notify via email those faculty members of their appointments to the PPRC and provide the list of PPRC members to the faculty member under review. **Within three business days** from receipt of the names of those who have been selected for the PPRC, the faculty member under review may request that a member be removed due to a conflict of interest. In such cases, if the department chair concurs that a conflict of interest exists, the department chair will select a replacement from any remaining tenured faculty members within the department or from another department within the college as noted above.

Within **five (5) business days** from the date of receipt of the faculty member's submitted review materials (which should be submitted by the faculty member no later than the three business days prior to the first Friday in September), the department chair shall make available the submitted materials to the PPRC members. *Note: The Post-Tenure Review Form, including the CV, student evaluations or summaries of evaluation, additional materials submitted by the faculty member, recommendations from each level of the review, and any response that the faculty member submits at each level of review is the PTR File and/or PTR record identified in the UW-Whitewater Post-Tenure Review Policy (FSEC 1617-06).*

**On or before the fourth Friday in September**, the PPRC shall meet to conduct its review. The department chair shall schedule the meeting on behalf of the PPRC and provide the faculty member under review with a minimum **of ten business** days' notice prior to the meeting.

The PPRC Rating must be **completed prior to the first day in October**.

## Teaching

*Conscientious faculty members teach assigned courses, hold office hours or their equivalent, and/or, if applicable, perform assigned administrative duties.*

**Teaching Subcategory #1 (TS1):** Responds effectively and appropriately to classroom needs and modifies courses accordingly. CHECK THE ONE ITEM THAT YOU FEEL BEST DEMONSTRATES YOUR COMPETENCE IN THIS SUBCATEGORY

- ☐ A. Revised course content in response to a need or to student feedback/performance.
- ☐ B. Utilized sound, new, or alternative methods of assessing/evaluating student achievement and/or progress.
- ☐ C. Incorporated appropriate technology, a change in pedagogy, or revised support materials or assignments.
- ☐ D. Maintained innovative course syllabi or course management system according to best practices.
- ☐ E. Utilized assessment data to improve instruction.
- ☐ F. Redesigned an existing course or created a new course.
- ☐ G. Addressed a department, college, or university need via curriculum redesign, modification, or program change, such as the creation of a new course or significant course modification.
- ☐ H. Incorporated High Impact Practice(s) in one or more courses.
- ☐ I. For faculty with significant reassignment from teaching, identify a task from a teaching reassignment that demonstrates competency in this performance subcategory, which is comparable in scope to the other items listed above: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ J. Other: Identify another item that demonstrates competency in this performance subcategory that is comparable in scope to those items above. \_\_\_\_\_

**Teaching Subcategory #2 (TS2):** Demonstrates positive student outcomes and/or learning experiences. CHECK THE ONE ITEM THAT YOU FEEL BEST DEMONSTRATES YOUR COMPETENCE IN THIS SUBCATEGORY

- ☐ A. Demonstrated positive student outcomes or learning experiences through student evaluations.
- ☐ B. Encouraged student achievement through High Impact Practices, undergraduate research, travel study, or extra-curricular activities.
- ☐ C. Enhanced student learning experiences and development by providing co-curricular opportunities.
- ☐ D. Supported underrepresented, first-generation college, non-traditional, veteran, transfer, differently abled, or other diverse students.
- ☐ E. Linked the classroom to the community through service learning, community outreach, guest lectures, experiential learning, or other like activities.
- ☐ F. Participated in curriculum development, textbook selection, assessment activities, or other curriculum-improvement activities.
- ☐ G. Provided supplemental instructional opportunities or materials that accommodate or support students.
- ☐ H. Demonstrated a record of effectiveness in advising.
- ☐ I. Provided individualized opportunity for student growth or learning.
- ☐ J. Nominated for teaching or advising award or publicly recognized for teaching or advising effectiveness.
- ☐ K. For faculty with significant reassignment from teaching, identify a task from a teaching reassignment that demonstrates competency in this performance subcategory, which is comparable in scope to the other items listed above: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ L. Other: Identify another item that demonstrates competency in this performance subcategory that is comparable in scope to those items above. \_\_\_\_\_

**Teaching Subcategory #3 (TS3): Engages in activities that enhance content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and/or pedagogical content knowledge. CHECK THE ONE ITEM THAT YOU FEEL BEST DEMONSTRATES YOUR COMPETENCE IN THIS SUBCATEGORY**

- ☐ A. Participated in professional organization(s) or attended professional conference(s).
- ☐ B. Acquired knowledge resulting in the dissemination of scholarly work related to content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and/or pedagogical content knowledge.
- ☐ C. Attended professional development opportunities to enhance or develop skills and knowledge relevant to teaching responsibilities.
- ☐ D. Demonstrated a history of attendance at LEARN Center workshops or other university professional development initiatives and/or participated in Faculty College, other OPID event, or other pedagogical enhancement activity.
- ☐ E. Served as a UW-Whitewater Peer Mentor, conducted peer observations, or supported faculty development.
- ☐ F. For faculty with significant reassignment from teaching, identify a task from a teaching reassignment that demonstrates competency in this performance subcategory, which is comparable in scope to the other items listed above: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ G. Other: Identify another item that demonstrates competency in this performance subcategory that is comparable in scope to those items above. \_\_\_\_\_

**Teaching Subcategory #4 (TS4): Uses appropriate teaching/administrative methodologies. CHECK THE ONE ITEM THAT YOU FEEL BEST DEMONSTRATES YOUR COMPETENCE IN THIS SUBCATEGORY**

- ☐ A. Used effective teaching strategies documented in professional or disciplinary literature.
- ☐ B. Applied active learning teaching methodologies (e.g. community based, service learning, or experiential, etc.).
- ☐ C. Appropriately used technology to enhance planning, instruction, or assessment.
- ☐ D. Aligned course content with AAC&U LEAP Fundamental Principles, Principles of Excellence, Essential Learning Outcomes, VALUE Rubrics, or similar initiatives.
- ☐ E. Used High-Impact Practice(s) to enhance student learning.
- ☐ F. Recognized by fellow scholars or community organization for teaching skill or expertise.
- ☐ G. For faculty with significant reassignment from teaching, identify a task from a teaching reassignment that demonstrates competency in this performance subcategory, which is comparable in scope to the other items listed above: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ H. Other: Identify another item that demonstrates competency in this performance subcategory that is comparable in scope to those items above. \_\_\_\_\_

Instruction to Faculty Member: Briefly describe, in 3,000 characters or less, how you have demonstrated overall professional competence in this performance category during the review period. **Note to online form creator: this text box should be limited to 3,000 characters**

## Research/Creative Activity/Scholarship

**Research/Creative Activity/Scholarship Subcategory #1 (RS1):** Maintains disciplinary knowledge. CHECK THE ONE ITEM THAT YOU FEEL BEST DEMONSTRATES YOUR COMPETENCE IN THIS SUBCATEGORY

- ☐ A. Attended local, regional, national or international professional conference(s) related to the discipline or specialty.
- ☐ B. Recognized as a disciplinary consultant.
- ☐ C. Attended professional development (e.g. class, professional training, etc.) to enhance or acquire skills and knowledge relevant to research/creative activity/scholarship.
- ☐ D. Advanced work on a long-term scholarship project (e.g. book, script, musical score, patent, data collection, longitudinal study).
- ☐ E. Cited by other scholars.
- ☐ F. Received invitation to contribute to a scholarly/creative event or work.
- ☐ G. Other: Identify another item that demonstrates competency in this performance subcategory that is comparable in scope to those items above. \_\_\_\_\_

**Research/Creative Activity/Scholarship Subcategory #2 (RS2):** Participates in the broader scholarly and/or creative community: contribute to academic, professional, and/or community service related to one's area of expertise. CHECK THE ONE ITEM THAT YOU FEEL BEST DEMONSTRATES YOUR COMPETENCE IN THIS SUBCATEGORY

- ☐ A. Worked collaboratively with professionals in the area to share knowledge.
- ☐ B. Offered professional expertise through consultation, supervision, or volunteer work.
- ☐ C. Served as a resource for journalists, media representatives, or other community members.
- ☐ D. Served as a reviewer, referee or jurist for a journal, conference, creative project/show, etc.
- ☐ E. Served as editor or editorial board for a journal or book volume, etc.
- ☐ F. Produced a significant scholarly/creative work.
- ☐ G. Nominated for research, creative, or scholarly award or publicly recognized in the discipline/specialty.
- ☐ H. Presented at local, regional, national, and/or international professional conference(s).
- ☐ I. Produced a review, textbook entry, or reference book entry related to the discipline/specialty.
- ☐ J. Produced a work related to the discipline/specialty intended for a non-academic audience.
- ☐ K. Served as PI co-PI or consultant on a submitted external grant application.
- ☐ L. Other: Identify another item that demonstrates competency in this performance subcategory that is comparable in scope to those items above. \_\_\_\_\_

Instruction to Faculty Member: Briefly describe, in 3,000 characters or less, how you have demonstrated overall professional competence in this performance category during the review period. **Note to online form creator: this text box should be limited to 3,000 characters**

## Service

*Conscientious faculty members regularly attend department meetings.*

**Service Activity Subcategory #1 (SS1):** Participates satisfactorily in departmental functions, activities, and meetings. CHECK THE ONE ITEM THAT YOU FEEL BEST DEMONSTRATES YOUR COMPETENCE IN THIS SUBCATEGORY

- ☐ A. Served on or chaired one or more departmental committees.
- ☐ B. Participated in department initiative(s).
- ☐ C. Participated in departmental or program assessment, self-studies, policy development, mission statement, etc.
- ☐ D. Served as a faculty advisor or facilitator for department-level student organization.
- ☐ E. Served as a mentor to/lead reviewer for a junior faculty or academic staff member.
- ☐ F. Served as a coordinator for a major, program, minor, or certificate.
- ☐ G. Served the department through significant advising responsibilities (e.g. Master Advisor, increased advising load).
- ☐ H. Devised/revised department or program curriculum.
- ☐ I. Nominated for department service award.
- ☐ J. Other: Identify another item that demonstrates competency in this performance subcategory that is comparable in scope to those items above. \_\_\_\_\_

**Service Activity Subcategory #2 (SS2):** Participates in committees and/or equivalent service at the college, university, and/or UW-System levels. CHECK THE ONE ITEM THAT YOU FEEL BEST DEMONSTRATES YOUR COMPETENCE IN THIS SUBCATEGORY

- ☐ A. Served on or chaired one or more college-level committees.
- ☐ B. Served on or chaired one or more university-level committees.
- ☐ C. Served on or chaired one or more System-level committees.
- ☐ D. Served on Faculty Senate.
- ☐ E. Presented at faculty governance or Faculty Meeting.
- ☐ F. Advised a college or university-level student organization.
- ☐ G. Recognized for service contributions at the college, university and/or UW-System level.
- ☐ H. Coordinated a significant event for the department, college, or university.
- ☐ I. Nominated for college, university or UW System-level award.
- ☐ J. Other: Identify another item that demonstrates competency in this performance subcategory that is comparable in scope to those items above. \_\_\_\_\_

**Service Activity Subcategory #3 (SS3):** Participates in professional, public, and/or community service related to one's area of expertise. CHECK THE ONE ITEM THAT YOU FEEL BEST DEMONSTRATES YOUR COMPETENCE IN THIS SUBCATEGORY

- ☐ A. Served as a guest lecturer, evaluator, officer, etc. for a professional, public, or community organization.
- ☐ B. Served as a facilitator, respondent, session chair, etc. for professional conference.
- ☐ C. Served as editor, division chair, web administrator, etc. for professional, public, or community organization in one's area of expertise.
- ☐ D. Served as peer reviewer for professional articles, books, conferences, juried shows, grant applications, etc.
- ☐ E. Participated on a professional, public, or community board.
- ☐ F. Coordinated a professional, public, or community event related to specialty.
- ☐ G. Recognized for professional, public, or community service related to one's area of expertise.

- ☐ **H. Nominated for professional or community service award.**
- ☐ **I. Other: Identify another item that demonstrates competency in this performance subcategory that is comparable in scope to those items above.** \_\_\_\_\_

Instruction to Faculty Member: Briefly describe, in 3,000 characters or less, how you have demonstrated overall professional competence in this performance category during the review period. **Note to online form creator: this text box should be limited to 3,000 characters**



**Upload as needed any supplementary documents.**

**(Note: To form creator: this should be on the upper left corner of the form when it is created electronically.)**

\*\*\*\*\*



PPRC RATING

Instruction to Reviewers:

The PPRC members shall designate a PPRC member to serve as the chairperson of the PPRC.

During the review, the PPRC shall consider the PTR Record and, as applicable, discussions with the faculty member.

The faculty member may attend the meeting, but shall not be required to do so. If the faculty member attends the review meeting, the faculty member may issue a brief verbal statement and/or discuss any relevant materials. The PPRC may also ask the faculty member questions.

At the conclusion of its review, the PPRC shall deliberate in closed session and determine, by a simple majority vote, whether to rate the faculty member “meets expectations” or “does not meet expectations.” The PPRC chair or designee shall provide the rationale in support of the rating, considering the criteria for demonstrating professional competence.

The PPRC Rating must be completed prior to the first day in October.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

PPRC Members:

1) \_\_\_\_\_ (Chair) 2) \_\_\_\_\_ 3) \_\_\_\_\_

Note: Decision requires a majority vote of the Primary Peer Review Committee (PPRC).

- ☐ Meets Expectations
- ☐ Does Not Meet Expectations

Instructions to PPRC Chair or designee: Provide the rationale in support of the rating, considering the criteria for demonstrating professional competence. Reference each of the three performance categories (Teaching; Research/Creative Activity/Scholarship; and Service). (Box allows for a maximum of 300 words.)

The faculty member under review may write a response to the PPRC’s recommendation within five business days of receipt of the PPRC Rating. The faculty member’s response, as applicable, shall be uploaded here.

## DEPARTMENT REVIEW WAIVER

### Instruction to Faculty Member:

The Faculty Member under review may waive the Department Review Committee (DRC) Review by checking the appropriate box below **no more than five business days** after the PPRC has completed its review. (Failure to check one of the items below in said time period will result in a DRC-level review.)

- ☐ I waive the DRC-level review.
- ☐ I request a DRC-level review.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_(Electronic Signature)\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## DEPARTMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) REVIEW

Date Conducted \_\_\_\_\_

### Instructions to Department Chair:

As indicated in the previous section, the DRC review will occur unless the faculty member, **within five business days after the PPRC has completed its review**, checks the box “I waive the DRC-level review.”

*Formation of Department Review Committee (DRC):* Prior to the **second Friday in October**, the department chair shall identify eligible tenured faculty members in the department who may serve on the DRC. The chair shall preside over the meeting of the department’s tenured faculty in which they (excluding the faculty member under review) determine the membership of each DRC. The DRC shall be comprised of more than one-half the tenured faculty members in the department who remain eligible to serve on the DRC (excluding the faculty member under review and the faculty member’s PPRC). In any case, the minimum size of the DRC must be at least three tenured members.

As soon as possible and in no case **later than the second Friday in October**, the department chair shall make available to the DRC and the faculty member under review the PTR record.

On or before the **second Friday in October**, the department chair shall convene (as applicable) the DRC to conduct its review, and the department chair may designate a chair to serve as the chair of the DRC committee.

The department chair shall provide the faculty member with a minimum **of five business days’ notice prior to the DRC meeting**.

The DRC shall meet to conduct its review no later than the **second Friday in November**.

The DRC rating must be **completed by the second Friday in December**.

### **Faculty member present at DRC review:**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

\*\*\*\*\*

### **DRC RATING**

#### Instruction to Reviewers:

**During the review, the DRC** shall consider the PTR Record and, as applicable, discussions with the faculty member.

The faculty member may attend the meeting, but shall not be required to do so. If the faculty member attends the review meeting, the faculty member may offer a statement and explain the contents of the PTR record. The DRC may also ask the faculty member questions.

The DRC shall meet to conduct its review **no later than the second Friday in November**. As a part of its review, the DRC shall consider the PTR record, the recommendation of the PPRC, and any statements provided by the faculty member. If the DRC finds that the case warrants more detailed consideration, the DRC may follow standard parliamentary procedure and stand in adjournment, in which case, the DRC chair shall provide the faculty member under review a written summary of questions/issues and/or request any additional materials.

At the conclusion of its review, the DRC shall deliberate in closed session and determine, by a simple majority vote, whether to rate the faculty member “meets expectations” or “does not meet expectations.” The DRC chair or designee shall provide the rationale in support of the rating, considering the criteria for demonstrating professional competence.

The DRC rating must be **completed by the second Friday in December**.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**DRC Members:**

- 1) \_\_\_\_\_ (DRC Chair);  
2) \_\_\_\_\_; 3) \_\_\_\_\_; 4) \_\_\_\_\_;  
5) \_\_\_\_\_; 6) \_\_\_\_\_

*Note: Decision requires a majority vote of the DRC.*

**DRC Rating:**

- ☐ **Meets Expectations**  
☐ **Does Not Meet Expectations**

*Instructions to DRC Chair or designee: Provide the rationale in support of the rating, considering the criteria for demonstrating professional competence. Reference each of the three performance categories (Teaching; Research/Creative Activity/Scholarship; and Service). (Box allows for a maximum of 300 words.)*

The faculty member under review may write a response, addressing the PPRC's and/or the DRC's rating(s), to the dean within **ten business days of receipt of the DRC Rating.** The faculty member's response, as applicable, shall be uploaded **here.**

.....

# ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

## Dean Review

### Instruction to dean:

On or before the **first Friday in February**, the dean shall conduct an independent sufficiency review of the PTR record. The dean shall conduct a review of the PTR record to determine if the dean agrees with the previous faculty rating and if the review criteria were properly applied.

### The dean checks the box that applies:

- ☐ The dean's rating is "meets expectations," which concurs with the DRC's rating (or the PPRC's rating, if the DRC was waived). **The review process is concluded. (Dean completes Final Rating.)**
- ☐ The dean's rating is "does not meet expectations," which concurs with the DRC's rating (or the PPRC's rating, if the DRC was waived). **The dean initiates the remediation process. (Dean completes Final Rating.)**

Instructions to dean: Provide the rationale in support of the rating, considering the criteria for demonstrating professional competence. Reference each of the three performance categories (Teaching; Research/Creative Activity/Scholarship; and Service).

- **The dean's rating does not concur with the previous faculty rating, and the dean request CSC Consultation.**  
If the dean's review results in a determination that is different than the previous faculty (PPRC or DRC) rating, then by the **fourth Friday in February**, the dean shall consult with the **Constituency Standards Committee (CSC)** in a meeting, in closed session, to seek its advice on whether the dean's determination is consistent with the PTR record. The dean shall provide the CSC with a copy of the PTR record for its review, and at the meeting, the dean will describe questions and/or concerns the dean has with the PTR record. Moreover, the dean shall convene the Constituency Standards Committee (CSC) **by the fourth Friday in February** and charge it to conduct a review of the PTR record so it can provide the dean with its advice, which must be rendered by **first Friday in April**.

### Constituency Standards Committee

#### Instruction to Constituency Standards Committee (CSC):

**No later than the first Friday in April**, the CSC shall issue a letter to the dean (1) responding to the questions and concerns raised and (2) indicating whether the information in the PTR Record supports the determination by the dean, which did not concur with the previous faculty (PPRC or DRC) rating.

**CSC Chair shall upload CSC Letter here [attached here], and provides a copy of the letter to the faculty member.**

### Dean's Final Recommendation

**Within ten business days** from receipt of the CSC's advice, the **dean shall provide a written statement** and check the recommendation below.

The dean's final recommendation shall explain, using evidence, the rationale in support of the rating, considering the criteria for demonstrating professional competence, including any departures from prior levels of the review and addressing the advice of the CSC.

*Instructions to dean for the dean's final recommendation: Explain, using evidence, the rationale in support of the rating, considering the criteria for demonstrating professional competence, including any departures from prior levels of the review and addressing the advice of the CSC.*

- ☐ **Meets Expectations**
- ☐ **Does Not Meet Expectations**

The faculty member under review may write a response to the dean's final recommendation within five business days of receipt. The faculty member's response, as applicable, shall be uploaded **here**.

### Provost Review

If and only if the dean disagrees with the recommendation of the faculty (DRC or PPRC), the provost is notified by the dean so that the provost can render a final decision. The provost shall consider all information contained in the PTR record and issue a final rating of either "meets expectations" or "does not meet expectations" **no later than the final day of the spring term.**

- ☐ **Meets Expectations.** The provost writes a letter of explanation. **(Provost completes Final Rating.)**  
The provost letter shall state the final rating and indicate that the PTR process is now complete.
- ☐ **Does Not Meet Expectations.** The provost writes a letter of explanation. **(Provost completes Final Rating.)**  
The provost letter shall state the final rating and provide a criteria-based explanation of the reasons that one or more performance categories were found to be unsatisfactory.

**Provost shall upload decision letter here [attached here],** and provides a copy of the letter to the faculty member and dean.

## FINAL RATING

- ☐ *Meets Expectations*  
☐ *Does Not Meet Expectations*

*Date of Final Rating:* \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

**NEXT PTR — Scheduled for \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ academic year**

A copy of the PTR record shall be added to the faculty member's personnel file.  
 A faculty member who receives a final rating of "meets expectations" shall be considered for professional development opportunities or additional compensation, subject to available resources.

This Post-Tenure Review Form shall be in effect for one five-year PTR cycle, and consequently, it will remain in effect as indicated herein until at least the end of the 2022-2023 academic year. If there are major unforeseen issues that arise, those major issues may be addressed and amended by the Faculty Senate, through shared governance, prior to the end of the five-year PTR cycle. After the five-year PTR cycle is completed, the PTR Form may be reconsidered and revised by the Faculty Senate, through shared governance, based on information provided on the effectiveness of the initial five-year PTR cycle.

### Reference Documents:

1. UWW PTR Policy [http://www.uww.edu/Documents/facultyandstaff/FINAL%20Post-Tenure%20Review%20Policy\\_04072017\[1\].pdf](http://www.uww.edu/Documents/facultyandstaff/FINAL%20Post-Tenure%20Review%20Policy_04072017[1].pdf)
2. Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development (RPD 20-9)  
<https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/policies/periodic-post-tenure-review-in-support-of-tenured-faculty-development/>