

Notes from the Academic Planning/Post Tenure Review Meeting (11/13/2013):

Attendees: VP McMillan, AVP Clark, Executive Committee, Personnel Policies Committee

### Part 1: Academic Planning

The current “Academic Planning” is a regents-mandated report due each September that consists primarily of reporting - this is not what Doug is looking for.

What Doug is thinking of is something which separate from that report - some framework of academic planning, goal setting, etc.

What he is thinking of is developing some themes across the university focused on Teaching and Learning that faculty can become invested in/excited about without necessarily imposing new “burdens”.

Things that were mentioned as examples were “Writing Across the Curriculum” and the old “Teaching Academy”.

Ideas and trial projects don’t have to yield fruit, provided there was feedback and useful information that was generated and broadcast back to the greater faculty. Disruptive innovation is OK.

Doug would like this to be in large part faculty-driven (likely under the aegis of the Senate) - we should bring this back to the Senate to kick around ideas.

Ideas could be tied into the new professional development funding that is available. In the future we could send people to campuses that do this well to get some ideas and bring them back.

### Part 2: Post Tenure Review

Doug thinks the overall policy looks good. There may be some tweaking required (notes: current policy requires peer review of teaching for the portfolio, the “will be ground” to “may be grounds” change in APPM 4.6.6 is fine but hasn’t yet occurred).

The biggest complaint about the new Tenure/Promotion policy stemmed from a perceived lack of input, especially from chairs (who didn’t like the “apply up to 3 times” feature provided by application withdrawals). Given the time period over which the T&P changes were pending the general feeling was that there was plenty of time for input on both T&P and PTR, but Doug suggested we consider an open comment period.

After some discussion we arrived at the consensus that an open comment period would be OK, with the following general parameters:

Open commenting period for all involved at the start of the Spring 14 semester  
30 days (with periodic reminders)  
Done via joint Senate-VPAA announcement  
Comments to be sent to the faculty senate e-mail address (non-anonymously so  
clarifications can be requested); only the Senate chair would see the original e-  
mails.

As part of that discussion there was some back-and-forth about fear of reprisal among faculty  
and how we need to get past that (comments to the Senate address being a first step).