

Academic Senate Faculty Caucus Minutes

April 7, 2004

(Approved)

Call to Order

Senator Crothers called the Faculty Caucus to order.

Approval of Faculty Caucus Minutes:

Motion: By Senator Pryor, seconded by Senator Adams, to approve the March 3, 2004 Faculty Caucus Minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Information Item:

03.19.04.01 Proposed Post-Tenure Five-Year Review Appeal Process From University Review Committee

Jan Shane, Associate Provost/University Review Committee Representative: The University Review Committee, while looking at the appeal process for post-tenure review, did look at some clarifying language for the post-tenure review itself. So, the first couple of pages of the document speak to clarify the purpose of the process. The committee felt that it would be hard to determine whether something is appealable if you don't know the purpose of the process to begin with. The last page deals with the appeal process, in that, to the extent possible, the process runs parallel to an annual performance appeal process.

Professor Vanette Schwartz, Milner Library/University Review Committee Representative: We did disseminate a draft of the process to gather campus-wide input, as requested by the Faculty Caucus in the fall. In Teresa Palmer's cover letter, she indicated the responses that we received. We reviewed those and considered them in our revisions.

Senator Crothers: In the concept of the five-year review, perhaps the single biggest change that I think that people ought to note is on page one in the first paragraph of the document of proposed revisions, "Post-tenure five-year review responses written by the DFSC/SFSC shall not be inconsistent with annual evaluations of the faculty member during the five-year review period." That is a significant revision. I have a follow up question for the Provost that we have dealt with before. This document does not particularly deal with the question of remediation processes or faculty development monies, nor particularly should it. But as these projects go forward, are those kinds of things on your agenda?

Provost Presley: I saw a version of this at a certain point and it was my assumption that we were putting an appeal process in place for the current version of post-tenure review. Given our conversations in this body previously, the consideration of whether or not we should have post-tenure review without remediation plans and development dollars is a real issue, but I saw that issue and the appeal process as separate.

Senator Wang: Is post-tenure review redundant if it "shall not be inconsistent with annual evaluations of the faculty member during the five-year review period"?

Dr. Shane: The two reviews are for much different purposes. The idea is that a faculty member should not receive five years of outstanding performance evaluations and then receive a five-year review that is inconsistent. The annual performance evaluation tends to be a snapshot of a year and looks very much at productivity, quality of teaching and service activities. The post-tenure review is more formative. It focuses on what direction the faculty is going. It allows the faculty to reflect on where they want to be in five years and what kinds of developmental activities they may need. Post-tenure review does encompass an evaluative

process, but I think that if we are going to have post-tenure reviews, we also should look to the future. We should look at the kind of support that we provide faculty in terms of their direction and the direction of the department.

Senator Crothers: Also, it is your declaration of what your goals and plans are. As we look at this more broadly, we have to decide how to integrate the one-year and five-year plans.

Senator Wang: From my experience, they take the previous year and cut and paste.

Senator Crothers: They are not supposed to.

Senator Wang: In reality, that is probably what a lot of departments do.

Senator Crothers: If you recall, I asked the Provost at a previous meeting, and he agreed, that we would conduct an audit of current practices. It will be different in different departments.

Senator Swindler: One reservation that I hear from faculty is that with the move to a more holistic evaluation that we accomplished a couple of years ago, we are not just taking a snapshot of a year at a time with the annual review. We ask the faculty to reflect, at least on the past year or two, on what they want to do next. In so far as the annual review becomes more holistic, the post-tenure review appears more redundant to the faculty.

Dr. Shane: That could very well be. We are not going to defend the idea of post-tenure review here. I think the performance evaluation process is pretty variable in terms of how holistic it is by department.

Senator Fowles: The year that a person has to write their five-year review, do they also have to write a performance evaluation document at the same time?

Dr. Shane: Yes, but they would be submitting two different things. They would be submitting an annual evaluation and then the narrative that goes with that. The post-tenure review is the narrative portion.

Senator Adams: On page three of the revisions, specific dates are listed by which time specific actions must occur. Might those dates fall on weekends?

Dr. Shane: The ASPT calendar has a qualifying statement that always pushes it to a working date.

Senator Mohammadi: In our department, we have a component in the annual review that is forward looking. In my view, if all of the departments follow this type of annual evaluation, this whole idea of post-tenure review would be redundant.

Senator Crothers: At this time, we are focusing on the appeal process only.

Senator Riegle: I am deeply opposed to post-tenure review for philosophical reasons. When we get to the voting stage, we will have to vote yea, nay or abstain, but none of those traditional categories will describe my true position on why I voted as I did. Is there any solution to this quandary?

Senator Crothers: I believe that you can actually vote present, which indicates that you are here, but not taking a position because you disagree entirely with the question itself.

Senator Coliz: Are we voting on the appeal process, but also on the wording about how this has to be in line with the annual review?

Senator Crothers: That's a fair statement.

Senator Plantholt: Would you clarify the part of the process on page three, item D? Does the faculty member get the DFSC response, responds back to the DFSC and then the DFSC replies?

Dr. Shane: A faculty member submits a narrative, which is their post-tenure review, at the same time as the annual review. If the DFSC proposes a remediation plan, it has to be provided to the faculty member in writing by February 15. If the faculty member disagrees with the DFSC response, he/she must respond to the DFSC by February 25. The DFSC will then make a final decision by March 7. If the faculty member wishes to file a formal appeal, that appeal must be filed with the CFSC by March 22. However, informal discussion between the faculty member and the DFSC must occur before a formal appeal is filed. The CFSC has to have reviewed the appeal and made a determination by April 15.

Senator Armstrong: Why is a faculty member's failure to devote significant effort to the review process a matter of serious concern, as stated on page two?

Professor Schwartz: The committee's feeling is that a faculty member taking a look at what they have accomplished over the last five years and what they intend to accomplish in the future is a fairly weighty matter.

Senator Winchip: How seriously will faculty members, who are about to retire, take this five-year plan?

Professor Schwartz: Retirement will be taken into consideration by the department chair and the DFSC.

Senator Mohammadi: It appears that we have one informal appeal process, which is basically taking place in items C and D. Then, it appears that if that does not resolve the situation, then there is a formal appeal process.

Dr. Shane: An informal conversation between the faculty member and the DFSC must occur before a formal appeal is filed.

This matter will come before the caucus as an action item on April 21, 2004.

Vita of Candidates for Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee

Vita of the candidates for membership on the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee were submitted to the Faculty Caucus for review. The caucus will conduct the election of representatives to the AFEGC on April 21, 2004.

Vita of Candidates for Panel of 10

Vita of the candidates for membership on the Panel of Ten were submitted to the Faculty Caucus. The election of representatives to the panel will occur at the Faculty Caucus meeting of April 21, 2004. Senator Crothers noted that Professor Thomas Simon, Department of Philosophy, is a candidate for the Panel of Ten and also has been elected to the Senate. Senator Crothers stated that he checked as to whether or not that excluded Professor Simon from service and found that it does not, because the Panel of Ten is not formally an external committee of the Academic Senate. Therefore, Professor Simon is eligible to serve on both the Senate and the Panel of Ten concurrently.

Communications:***03.26.04.01 NCA Special Emphasis Team Focus Groups – Faculty Forums Schedule***

As part of the preparation for the report for the NCA, the NCA Accreditation Special Emphasis Team will gather information on faculty life and work at the University. The team provided a schedule for group meetings with faculty; the schedule is as follows:

April 13, 14, 15; 8:30-9:30 a.m.; Milner Library, Room 311

April 20, 21, 22; 4:30-5:30 p.m.; Milner Library, Room 311

The team will address the Faculty Caucus on May 5, 2004.

Adjournment