

Academic Senate Faculty Caucus Minutes

March 3, 2004

(Approved)

Call to Order

Senator Crothers called the Faculty Caucus to order.

Approval of Faculty Caucus Minutes:

Motion: To approve the February 4, 2004 Faculty Caucus Minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Faculty Liaison Senate Meeting Summaries

The Faculty Caucus discussed Senator Reid's compilation and dissemination of summaries of Senate meetings, as the Senate Faculty Liaison for the College of Arts and Sciences, to the faculty members of CAS and to the other Senate Faculty Liaisons. The liaisons for the other colleges generally forwarded Senator Reid's summaries to the faculty members within their respective colleges. As Senator Reid has been unavailable to provide these summaries, Senator Borg suggested that it become the responsibility of the Senate Secretary to do so; he agreed to provide summaries of the Senate meetings to the Senate Faculty Liaisons for faculty dissemination for the remainder of the spring term.

Post-Tenure Review Discussion

Senator Crothers: As you may recall, I sent out an e-mail recently concerning post-tenure review. We had a discussion about that question about a month ago. I simply pushed it off until after the presidential search was complete. I had a conversation with the Provost and I think that rather than initially starting a review of post-tenure review right away, we might suggest interim steps. The ASPT document is fairly quiet on the question of criteria and that is where the questions of punitive versus formative versus summative arise. I think we need to push about what are the criteria, not just what are the formal procedures for post-tenure review.

Senator Mohammadi: Why should the criteria be different from the tenure and promotion criteria? Can't we use the same set of criteria?

Provost Presley: At many institutions, it is exactly the same. Two friends of mine, who are probably the ranking national experts on this, have written a manuscript on post-tenure review. They have been working with AAHE on this issue for probably 15 years. Their book asks the question 'is post-tenure review worth the trouble?' Their answer is no. I believe that it occasionally is, but in the long run, across all people who get reviewed, the process is not worth the trouble. Does that mean we should not do it? No, because the process could be improved. Current models of post-tenure review are based on behavior surveillance. They are of very little use to the institution.

Senator Mohammadi: For those who are currently at the associate level, but who want to go for a full professorship, must go through this process anyway. So, for that group of people, I don't think there is a need to go through this process.

Provost Presley: Many institutions make post-tenure review full professor review after a certain number of years.

Senator Crothers: These are the kinds of questions that we need to think about. Senator Kurtz explained to us that when she served on the committee that revised the ASPT document, the committee just did not think through some of the implications of this. You ask why not the promotion and tenure standards. There may be a perfectly reasonable explanation, but it is not in the current document.

Senator Pryor: Provost Presley, could you elaborate on what you mean by behavior surveillance in this context?

Provost Presley: People are asked to report what they do and what they think. They are asked to produce student and sometimes peer evaluations of their teaching. So, it is surveillance of behavior. It is not about planning for the next year or next five years in many institutions. It is not about providing information about faculty workload, effort and productivity. It is just a report. You chop off the pieces of your resume that relate to the last review cycle and you send those in. The best policies involve looking forward, planning for the next five years, making faculty development budgets available for the people who are going through this kind of review. If they say they want to learn about a new kind of teaching, you pay the way to those conferences on teaching. It is worthwhile when you are putting some dollars behind it and making it a faculty development activity, not just a surveillance activity.

Senator Pryor: So basically you mean by surveillance just reporting on things you have done in the past?

Provost Presley: Yes, and it doesn't go anywhere. It might be useful if we could then factor that into *Results Reports* or use it to answer questions from the IBHE about faculty productivity; but now, we can't even do that with it.

Senator Mohammadi: I think that the last point the Provost mentioned is more relevant for program review rather than individual faculty post-tenure review.

Provost Presley: It should factor into program review. Nationally, the only places where people are ok with post-tenure review are places where when a person is deemed in need of remediation, they are actually given help. Usually it is dollar help, release time help, a program of development assistance with some expertise and mentoring. It is also not an issue and generally considered positive at medical schools. There, it is necessary because the product of post-tenure review is factored into the terms of the next contract.

Senator Crothers: There are a lot of big issues here and we will come back to this.

Election of Executive Committee Faculty Replacement

Senator Mohammadi nominated Senator Farzaneh Fazel to replace Senator Reid on the Executive Committee for the remainder of the 2004 spring term. The Faculty Caucus unanimously elected Senator Fazel to the Senate Executive Committee.

Adjournment