

4-27-2021

Senators,

Below is a copy of the email that was sent to SE Department chairs 4-19-2021:

Department Chair,

Faculty Senate is requesting Department Chair input on the Post Tenure Review Policy.

FS is in the process of reviewing the PTR process and has begun collecting data which FS will share with the campus community during a Shared Governance Forum in the Fall of 2021. Your input will be invaluable to the completion of our review. We request that we receive your response back by 5 p.m., Monday, April 26, 2021.

Attached you will find data that was requested by FS and collected from the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The FS-Executive Committee has reviewed this data. In sum, the data demonstrates that academic departments have been conducting and completing PTR reviews as outlined in APPM 4.4.7. And the process is being conducted as codified in the APPM 4.4.7.3-6.

In addition to this data, FS-EC is asking that department chairs share their insights on the PTR process. The FS-EC does not need your thoughts expressed in any particular format. You can feel free to offer your thoughts as a direct reply to this email or you may send them to me through campus mail. In expressing your thoughts as Chair of your department, the FS-EC asks you to provide a response to the following prompts:

1. Briefly share your overall thoughts of the current PTR process.
2. Do you feel that the PTR process has been constructed in a way which adequately allows the process to fulfill its principles and goals?
3. What changes/improvements would you request be made to the PTR process?

Your responses along with those of all the department chairs will be collected by the FS-EC and used to develop additional questions which will be added to the 2020-2021 Annual Faculty Senate Survey. Rest assured that any responses collected by the FS-EC will remain anonymous in the development of questions for the Annual FS Survey or as a part of any presentation given by FS on our review of the PTR process. Individual responses will be deleted and destroyed or altered if necessary, to not identify any department chair.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you in advance,

Below are the responses that were received back from the SE Department chairs. Unfortunately, only three (3) department chairs responded:

- The only comment I would like to make is that I don't think the majority of the faculty take this process seriously.
- I think the current PTR procedures are very well-written in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual. The process was well thought-out. However, I think the

implementation of the process has devolved into just another "check the box" administrative proof that we are performing a process of post-tenure review, as required by the regents and/or other entities. The purpose of post-tenure review is supposed to be developmental. However, in a very foreseeable way, all the emphasis from the faculty senate data and the administration's request for data from the chairs was on how many faculty members went through the process, how often they are reviewed, and how many were deficient. As far as I know, nobody has asked the important question, which is, *has the PTR process been effective at fulfilling its purpose of assisting tenured faculty in active and consistent engagement in their discipline?* This might be a difficult question to answer, but if that is the main purpose of the PTR process, then it is the most important one to answer. My feeling is that PTR has not assisted any tenured faculty in my department to be more actively and consistently engaged in their discipline. On the other hand, each tenured faculty member in my department proved their ability and determination to remain active and consistently engaged when they were given tenure. It is possible that going through this process has motivated some university faculty to continue engagement in the years after tenure was awarded. I'm just not sure it has. The most common assertion I have seen on PTR reports amounts to *No suggestions for improvement*. The most common complaint I have heard from faculty serving on post-tenure review panels amounts to *What is the purpose of the review if the chair has consistently given commendable ratings on the annual evaluations?* Statements or questions like these suggest that PTR is not used primarily to assist faculty, but rather to identify inactive faculty and verify personnel action against a faculty member who is not performing responsibilities the way they used to. I have no major suggestions for improvement. If there is one area that should be amended, it is probably the choice of panel members. Strictly speaking, the process outlined in APPM 4.4.7.3.C has not always been followed, but for arguably good reasons. Some panel members have been chosen outside of departments because of a relation in discipline or because of similar responsibilities in service or administration, without regard to any form of randomness.

The next step is to develop questions for the Annual Faculty Survey, which is scheduled to be released in two weeks.

Thank you in advance,

Randy Clark