



OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

SOUTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY  
1405 N. FOURTH AVE., PMB 4137  
DURANT, OK 74701-0609

580-745-2200  
FAX 580-745-7474  
WWW.SE.EDU

MEMORANDUM

TO: President Larry Minks  
Diane Dixon, Chair of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Doug McMillan, Interim V.P. for Academic Affairs

RE: Response to Post-Tenure Review Policy

DATE: August 9, 2011

---

This memo is in response to the Faculty Senate Resolution on Post-tenure Review which was passed in the May 2011 meeting. I have included the wording of the review below for your convenience:

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."

I want to support the general theme communicated in the resolution which is that Southeastern needs a university wide policy on post-tenure review and that the Faculty Senate needs to have substantial input in developing the policy. I also want to express my support for making this a priority issue during the upcoming academic year. There are, however, some parts of the resolution that I would like to discuss further. For example, under RUSO Board Policy we are required to conduct post-tenure reviews (RUSO Board Policy 3.3.5 Procedure for Granting Tenure and Reviewing Tenured Faculty). RUSO Board Policy 3.3.5 requires at a minimum each tenured faculty member must be reviewed every three years. If this review leads to a determination of professional performance that is unsatisfactory then a second review is required within one year. Since post-tenure review is required by the RUSO Board, we (the administration or the Faculty Senate) do not have the authority to suspend the policy or declare a moratorium.

In addition, I would like to discuss some of the language and concepts in the "Principles for Post-Tenure Review" document further. Just as an example, in the opening of the "Principles of Post-Tenure Review" the Faculty Senate is identified as "the governing body for all Southeastern faculty". The Faculty Senate, as defined in Article II—Functions and Powers of the Faculty Senate Constitution is the "official representative body of the faculty". I believe the RUSO Board could possibly take exception to the use of the term "governing body" since the RUSO Board is our governing board and no other entity is recognized as the governing body for Southeastern. Again this is just an illustration. Before we can consider these principles we will need to have a review and discussion of them in light of RUSO and Southeastern policy and practice in the area of tenure and promotion.



**OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

---

**SOUTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY  
1405 N. FOURTH AVE., PMB 4137  
DURANT, OK 74701-0609**

**580-745-2200  
FAX 580-745-7474  
WWW.SE.EDU**

I would like to propose that early in the fall semester we form a task force made up of both Faculty Senate appointees and selected academic administrators with the following charge:

1) Review the "Principles of Post-Tenure Review" document with the intention of including the revised document in the Academic Policy and Procedures Manual;

2) Develop a university wide policy that would govern the post-tenure review process. The review of this policy should include a careful examination of RUSO Board Policy and the APPM.

After the task force completes this charge, I would further recommend that we have a period of formal review by the Faculty Senate and the administration before becoming policy with final authority for approval being President Minks. This work will need to be done quickly so that we can conduct a pilot test of the new procedure during the spring semester of 2012. I will be happy to discuss any comments or concerns either of you have concerning this recommendation.