

Minutes from the Personnel Policies Committee Meeting of Wednesday, November 7, 2011

Meeting began at 2:10 in Morrison 219

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

We discussed issues related to Post-Tenure Review in preparation for the initial meeting of the Post-Tenure Review Task Force (November 21). Those items we decided should be introduced at the first meeting of the Task Force are in bold print. The other items will be raised should we deem it appropriate (given the charge and the procedures established at the meeting).

Items and Talking Points

- **Present the FS's Principles on Post-Tenure Review (PTR)—this is the faculty's voice and we ask that these principles guide our development of a PTR policy. William Fridley will bring hard copies of the Principles to distribute to the Task Force. (It might be a good idea to sketch out the rationale and the APPM referents for these principles for use at our future meetings).**
- **Chris Moretti will bring hard copies of the document "Post Tenure Review: An AAUP Response," to distribute to members of the Task Force.**
- **Get our charge—ask for clarification of any RUSO directives related to PTR. We have heard rumors of such directives since 2006, when at least one department (EIL) formed a committee charged with developing a PTR policy. Clarification of RUSO's desires will help us to give an informed and careful consideration of their concerns.**
- **Ask that the Task Force's charge be expanded to include the consideration of re-instating departmental T & P review criteria (give a rationale and supporting documents).**

FS Resolution from February 14, 2007: Personnel Policies Committee – William Fridley requested that the faculty senate endorse a statement he had drafted that opposed a proposed post-tenure policy within the School of Educational and Behavioral Sciences. Specifically, it stated: "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]).

Provide links and/or cut and paste PTR policies from RUSO, ORHEC, and our sister institutions:

- **RUSO Policy Manual 3.3.5-- b)** The academic and professional performances of each tenured faculty member at each institution must be reviewed at least every three (3) years. When the review results in a finding that a tenured faculty member's academic and professional performance is unsatisfactory, the faculty member shall be notified of the deficiencies in performance and must be reviewed again within one (1) year. The results of each review

will be placed in the personnel record of the tenured faculty member. The tenured faculty member should be given a copy of the review and an opportunity to respond. Two consecutive unsatisfactory post-tenure performance evaluations may be grounds for dismissal or suspension.

- **SE APPM 4.6.6-- Evaluation of Tenured Faculty**

The academic and professional performance of each tenured faculty member may be reviewed annually and must be reviewed at least every third year. The results of the review will be placed in the personnel record of the tenured faculty member. The tenured faculty member should be given a copy of the review and an opportunity to respond before it is placed in the personnel folder. An unsatisfactory review will require another review within one year. An unsatisfactory review at that time will be grounds for dismissal as listed under Sections 4.6.7 and 4.6.8 below.

Foundational Questions: What are the rationale, the meaning, the purpose, and the function of PTR?

To what degree are the aims, characteristics (e.g. flexibility, considering quantity and quality of work), standards, and functions of PTR related to those of current policies and procedures for faculty development and evaluation?

To what degree are the aims, characteristics, standards, and functions of PTR related to those of current policies and procedures for tenure and promotion?

One benefit of having clear PTR policies and procedures is to “immunize” the administration from accusations and the perception of making arbitrary or unfair decisions.

The PTR procedure used in SEBS has a “pass/fail-type” function. What are the pros and cons of this?

Question: is the policy intended to function as a device to weed out professors? Hopefully, the administration’s answer will be “no,” and we would be in agreement with that position.

We view any PTR policy that is developed as part of a comprehensive effort to support and improve faculty performance.

According to the FS’s Principles, there must be an appeals process to appeal any “negative” PTR decision. In conjunction with our work with Dr. Clark on the APPM, we would like to recommend that such appeals be heard by the Faculty Appellate Committee, and that the APPM be modified so that appeals are heard and decided on by the entire Faculty Appellate Committee (i.e. not the current practice of having only 3 members of the Committee make such decisions).

We recognize that for some time, faculty of the John Massey School of Business have operated as a—for lack of a better term—separate entity on matters of T & P and PTR. We respect this independence on PTR, and have no desire to encroach on the PTR standards they have developed for themselves.

Ask for documents: is there a rubric for the SEBS PTR policy?

While we believe academic departments should be responsible for developing the specific PTR criteria, this Task Force need to come to some agreement on the meta-evaluative terms such as *satisfactory*, *unsatisfactory*, and *deficient*.

The question arose: “where are the carrots in the PTR policy?” While we are not at this time suggesting a merit pay system, we would like to discuss the feasibility of a voucher for travel, equipment, books and research materials for those faculty that successfully complete PTR.