

Personnel Policies Report to the Faculty Senate—Wednesday, April 4, 2012

Post-Tenure Review Task Force

Background:

The Personnel Policies Committee submitted two documents for the task force's consideration:

- "A Critical Analysis of the Faculty Senate's Principles for Post-Tenure Review: An Explanation, Clarification, and Justification with Policy Recommendations" (approved at the Faculty Senate meeting of February 8, 2012)
- "Post-Tenure Review: A Recommended Policy and Procedure" (approved at the Faculty Senate meeting of February 22, 2012)

The Faculty Senate also approved a policy recommendation on February 22 to change the wording of references in the APPM from "two consecutive unsatisfactory post-tenure performance evaluations **will be** grounds for dismissal or suspension" to "**may be**" in order to conform to RUSO policy. The policy recommendation was emailed by the Faculty Senate to Dr. McMillan (cc Larry Minks and Bryon Clark) on March 2. On March 9, Dr. McMillan emailed Diane Dixon (cc Minks, Clark, Scoufos) recommending that the policy recommendation should be sent to Dean Scoufos. FS Chair Dixon responded to Dr. McMillan on March 9 with an explanation of why the policy recommendation was sent to the administration. On March 12, the Faculty Senate emailed the policy recommendation to Dean Scoufos (cc the FS Executive Committee). The policy recommendation was included in the packet of documents provided to the PTR Task Force.

Meeting Dates:

The original date scheduled for the second meeting of the PTR Task Force was for Monday, March 12. This was then changed to Wednesday, March 28.

Providing FS Documents to the Task Force:

The "Critical Analysis" document and the text of 3 related motions that were approved by the FS on 2/8 was emailed to Dean Scoufos by William Fridley on 2/9 (cc Personnel Policies Committee). A hard copy of the document was hand delivered to Dean Scoufos' office on 2/9. The document was also sent to Dean Scoufos on 3/1 as an email attachment from Diane Dixon (cc FS Executive Committee).

On March 9, Dean Scoufos emails the PTR TF and attaches files of relevant documents. The email does not include the "Critical Analysis" document. On March 10, William Fridley sends Dean Scoufos an email informing her of the omission and again attaches the document.

A "bound" hard copy version of the PTR documents is delivered to members of the PTR TF on Monday, 3/26. It does not include the "Critical Analysis" document.

Meeting of the Task Force:

The PTR TF met on Wednesday, March 28. The meeting started at approximately 3:15.

Members Present: Lawrence Silver (replacing Jane Licata), Chris Moretti, Dennis Brewster, William Fridley, George Jacox, Hal Poovey, Dan Althoff, Claire Stubblefield, Lucretia Scoufos, Jerry Polson, Bryon Clark, and Stacy Weger (replacing Will Mawer)

Dean Scoufos asks if all the relevant documents were included in the binder. When informed that it did not include the “Critical Analysis” document, she requested that one of her assistants run copies of the document. The copies were then distributed to those attending the meeting.

There was no Agenda for the meeting, and it did not appear that there was any clear direction for how the meeting should proceed.

Dean Scoufos asks if there is agreement that we should have PTR. It is mentioned that since PTR is a RUSO requirement, we don’t have any choice in the matter.

The matter of the recommended language change in the APPM (from “will be” to “may be”) was brought to the floor. There was consensus on supporting the recommended language change.

It was then suggested that the FS’s “Post-Tenure Review: A Recommended Policy and Procedure” be used as a starting point for discussion since it was the product of much thoughtful deliberation and was approved by the FS and endorsed by the SE Chapter of the AAUP. It quickly became apparent that the administrators were not familiar with the document.

While the administrators were at a loss to give specific or detailed criticism of the recommended policy, a major source of their resistance seemed to be that—in their minds—the policy did not allow for sufficient administrative input.

In response, Stacy Weger suggested modifying the Faculty Senate’s recommended post-tenure review policy to allow more participation from the Dean of Instruction. He suggested that in the event the departmental review committee upheld a department chair’s “unsatisfactory” evaluation of the professor, then the Dean would work in conjunction with the department chair in order to craft the plan of action for the professor to remedy identified deficiencies. This idea seemed to be welcomed by the FS members present in that it would work to support Dean Scoufos’ stated desire to use the post-tenure review process as a means for faculty development.

A related suggestion was that the Dean of Instruction could focus on supervising the evaluative methods and protocols of department chairs. It was argued that this could serve to ensure evaluative consistency across the university, and it would also be an intelligent division of labor (rather than having the Dean review and make an evaluative decision on every PTR).

I (William Fridley) had to leave the meeting at 4:20 to teach a class. I was told that Dean Scoufos indicated she would draft a report of the meeting to deliver to Dr. McMillan, and that another meeting of the PTR TF would be scheduled.

As of today (4/4/12), a meeting has not been scheduled.

On Thursday, 3/29, a newly-bound copy of the PTR documents was delivered to members of the TF. It included the "Critical Analysis" document.

Ongoing "Developments" on the APPM

"Communication" and attempts to arrange meetings between the Personnel Policies Committee, FS Executive Committee, and Drs. McMillan and Clark continue. As of today, no definitive action on our long-standing concerns (a policy on policy, decisions on pending policy recommendations, edits of the APPM) have taken place.