

## Personnel Policies Report for the Faculty Senate—January 25, 2012

The Personnel Policies Committee met on Monday, January 23, in M219, from 3:00 to 4:45.

**Members Present:** William Fridley, George Jacox, Dennis Brewster, Hal Poovey, Dan Althoff, and Chris Moretti (guest)

The focus of our meeting was on post-tenure review. In the fall of 2011, a Post-Tenure Review Task-Force (PTRTF) was formed, composed of select administrators and the Personnel Policies Committee (PPC). At the first meeting of the PTRTF (November 14, 2011), William Fridley agreed to oversee the drafting of a critical analysis of the Faculty Senate document “[Principles for Post-Tenure Review](#).”

Dr. Fridley presented the nearly completed draft of the critical analysis to the PPC. The draft, titled “A Critical Analysis of the Faculty Senate’s Principles for Post-Tenure Review: An Explanation, Clarification, and Justification with Policy Recommendations,” includes a sketch of the recent background of PTR at Southeastern (see below), appendices of relevant documents, and runs over 25 pages. The PPC agreed that the finished document should include a succinct list of our findings and recommendations. The consensus view of the PPC was that we should continue to use the current system of PTR (with some minor tweaks), in which the academic department chair conducts the review in collaboration with the faculty member, in accord with the procedures outlined in the APPM (4.4 Faculty Development and Evaluation Policies).

The question arose as to the need for the PTRTF and all this work, if we intend to basically continue the current PTR practices. The answer, in short, is that this is a result of our efforts to call attention to the implementation of a new post-tenure review “policy” in the SEBS. We were of the opinion that those attempts lacked adequate faculty input and review, were not adequately published or communicated through official University channels, were inconsistent in several respects to existing policy, and included features that served to weaken the principles and meaningful practice of tenure.

In response to the attempt to implement the new PTR “policy” in the SEBS, the Faculty Senate approved and published the document “Principles on Post-Tenure Review” and a request for a moratorium on any **new** PTR. This led to the formation of the PTRTF.

The PPC expressed a sense of discouragement about what we perceive as a lack of administrative responsiveness to, clear communication about, and action on Faculty Senate concerns about policy. These concerns have included post-tenure review, tenure and promotion processes, departmental criteria for T & P, long-pending policy recommendations, formal processes for shared governance, developing and publishing a policy on making policy, faculty prerogatives to create classroom policies, the selection processes for academic department chairs, departmental independence, policy and precedent on faculty re-applying for tenure and promotion, and fulfillment of the University’s mission to “adhere to well-defined organizational structures, policies, and procedures (APPM 1.5.2 “for the faculty” point 3).

Respectfully submitted,

William Lloyd Fridley, Ph.D.

Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee

## **Background Sketch of Events Related to Post-Tenure Review:**

**2006—2007:** At the direction of the Dean of the SEBS and the EIL Department Chair, a faculty committee is formed of EIL faculty who are given the charge of developing a post-tenure review policy for the department. While no official explanation is given as to what is driving this policy initiative, informal comments circulate to the effect that “this is coming from the top” and “the Regents want this.” The EIL committee works from the early fall of 2006 through February of 2007, but are unable to develop a policy that is approved by departmental faculty.

**February 14, 2007:** In light of the attempt by EIL to develop a post-tenure review policy, the Faculty Senate approves a resolution. “The Faculty Senate opposes any post-tenure review policy that eviscerates, weakens, or is inconsistent with the concept and practice of *tenure*.” (Brett Elliott/David Barnes = [Vote: 17 for, 0 against, 1 abstention]).<sup>i</sup>

**Fall 2008:** University faculty were told that they were no longer to use departmental tenure and promotion criteria when reviewing candidates for tenure and promotion. To the best of our knowledge, there was no written communication from the administration to notify faculty of this change in practice or to explain this policy initiative. In EIL, for instance, the department chair orally notified departmental faculty of this change. The departmental T & P criteria were developed by many academic departments in the 2005-2006 academic year, and were implemented in the fall of 2006. While we have not ascertained the degree to which this was typical of other departments, the T & P criteria for EIL were developed by a faculty committee, approved by a vote of the departmental faculty, approved by the Dean of SEBS, and praised by the VPAA.

**January 25, 2009:** The Faculty Senate approves a resolution, objecting to the administration’s decision to discontinue use of the departmental T & P criteria. The resolution cites the administration’s actions as a violation of the policies and principles of *shared governance*. The resolution was sent to the administration in a letter dated 1/25/2010.<sup>ii</sup>

**February 23, 2010:** Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, Douglas N. McMillan issues a memorandum in which he responds to the Faculty Senate resolution. Dr. McMillan concludes that the arguments and objections contained in the resolution are without merit. (The text of the memorandum is included in Appendix B, as is a brief commentary on the memorandum that was prepared for this critical analysis document)

**Fall 2008:** The Dean of the SEBS appoints a school wide “Tenure and Promotion Committee,” which is given the charge of developing a post-tenure review policy. The Committee works on developing the policy in the spring and summer of 2009.

**September 17, 2009:** The Dean of SEBS sends an email to SEBS faculty. The email reports on the status of the Committee’s post-tenure policy draft and requests that feedback on and questions about the attached policy draft be directed to the Dean, who will forward the information to the Chair of the Committee. (The text of the email and attached policy draft are included in Appendix C)

**October of 2010:** At the request of an SEBS faculty member, the Dean emails the faculty member an explanation of the newly implemented post-tenure review “policy” and attaches the text of the “policy”. These emails and the attached policy are included in Appendix X. A cursory examination of these documents reveals there are significant differences from the post-tenure policy draft of 9/17/2009. The relevance of the SEBS “policy” to our task is further explained in the analysis of Principle Nine. A brief analysis of the pros and cons of the SEBS “policy” is also included in Appendix D.

**Fall of 2010:** In lieu of any official publication of the SEBS “policy”, or its adoption as official University policy, discussion and speculation about the policy circulate among faculty. Such talk includes rumors that the School of Arts and Sciences is planning to implement a post-tenure review policy that follows the “precedent” of the SEBS “policy”. Given these developments, the Personnel Policies Committee decides the issue of post-tenure review needs to be addressed. They develop a set of Principles for Post-Tenure Review, the Faculty Senate approves the Principles on [1/10/2011](#), and the approved Principles are emailed to the administration and to University faculty. The Principles document is included in Appendix E.

**May of 2011:** The Personnel Policies Committee drafts a resolution calling for a moratorium on any **new** (i.e. other than the current Faculty Evaluation Process that is described in the APPM) post-tenure review policy. The resolution is approved by the Faculty Senate and sent to the administration. Resolution:

The Faculty Senate recommends that a moratorium be placed on the implementation of any new (i.e. other than the current Faculty Evaluation Process that is described in the APPM) post-tenure review policy until an official university policy on post-tenure review has been developed, approved, and published. Given the importance and wide ranging effects of post-tenure review, any policy warrants careful, deliberate consideration and must be the product of sufficient and representative (i.e. the Faculty Senate) faculty input, participation, and review. The Faculty Senate also recommends that any proposed post-tenure review policy conform to the Faculty Senate’s “Principles for Post-Tenure Review.”

**August 9, 2011:** Doug McMillan, Interim V.P. for Academic Affairs, issues a memorandum responding to the Faculty Senate’s recommendation that a moratorium be placed on the implementation of any new post-tenure review policy. Dr. McMillan denies the recommendation for a moratorium, arguing that a moratorium would constitute an unacceptable exception to the requirements of RUSO policy. He apparently misunderstands the intent the resolution, which calls for a moratorium on any new policy, not a suspension of the practice of post-tenure review as required by SE and RUSO policy. In the memorandum, Dr. McMillan grants the Faculty Senate’s request for participation in the development of any new post-tenure review policy, and announces that a task force composed of select administrators and Faculty Senate appointees will be formed to make recommendations for a university wide post-tenure review policy and process. (The memorandum and a brief commentary prepared for this document are included in Appendix F)

**October 28, 2011:** Dr. McMillan sends an email to notify those individuals that have been selected to serve on the Post-Tenure Review Task Force. The Task Force includes members of the Faculty Senate’s Personnel Policies Committee. Dr. Lucretia Scoufos is appointed to chair the Task Force.

**November 14, 2011:** The initial meeting of the Post-Tenure Review Task Force is held. The Task Force is given its charges (included in Appendix G)

---

<sup>i</sup> FS [minutes](#)

<sup>ii</sup> The FS Resolution is included in Appendix A. FS [minutes](#)

---