

## Motions for the Faculty Senate Meeting of January 25, 2017

- I. Motion to make the following non-substantive editorial corrections to the Post-Tenure Review Policy (APPM 4.4.7)

### 4.4.7.2 Post-Tenure Reviews: The Determination of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory Findings

The post-tenure review finding shall be a synthesis of the review panel rating and the department chair's annual evaluations in the three-year period covered by the review panel rating. If the review panel overall rating is *deficient* (as defined in 4.4.7.4 4.4.7.5 below) and the faculty member received a "less than proficient" overall rating on at least one of the annual evaluations in the three-year period, then the post-tenure review finding shall be unsatisfactory. If the review panel rating is proficient or the faculty member received no "less than proficient" overall rating on any of the three annual evaluations in the three-year period, then the post-tenure review finding shall be satisfactory. The faculty member that receives a deficient rating shall have the opportunity to appeal that rating on both substantive and procedural grounds (see section 4.4.7.7).

### 4.4.7.3, Point E

E. The panel will review the packet with reference to the faculty member's performance over the previous three years in the categories of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. While the annual reviews recognize a fourth category, (non-teaching or administrative duties) for the purpose of post-tenure review these activities would fall under the category of service. The review panel will not be permitted to interview the faculty member or any additional entities during their review process. The panel will assign a *proficient* or *deficient* rating in each of the three categories, and also assign an overall rating (see 4.4.7.3 4.4.7.4 *Proficient Ratings* and 4.4.7.4 4.4.7.5 *Deficient Ratings* below). Panel members shall not be permitted to abstain. Panel decisions will be made by a majority vote. The panel will make its decision and issue its report on or before March 1.

- II. Motion to make the following editorial updates to the post-tenure review policy, replacing references to the Executive Dean for Academic Affairs (EDAA) with references to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) or designee.

### 4.4.7.3 Post-Tenure Review Process

A. The chair of each academic department will maintain and post a three-year post-tenure review calendar that includes the schedule of post-tenure reviews for all tenured faculty. By September 15th each year, the department chair will inform the departmental faculty of the need to conduct a post-tenure review. The chair will make a formal request of the faculty member to prepare a post-tenure review packet. In regard to the post tenure review of department chairs, the role and functions of the department chair, as described herein, will be performed by the ~~Executive Dean for Academic Affairs (EDAA)~~ Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) or designee.

#### **4.4.7.4 Proficient Ratings:**

If the panel decides on a proficient overall rating, they will draft a succinct report in which they describe their review of the faculty member's performance that includes constructive suggestions and advice for improvement and faculty development. On or before March 1, the review panel chair will send this report to the faculty member, the department chair, and the EDAA VPAA. No later than April 1, the department chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review panel's report. The EDAA VPAA (or designee) may opt to attend the meeting. In the case of a successful appeal (as described in 4.4.7.7), this meeting will occur after the conclusion of the appeals process.

#### **4.4.7.5 Deficient Ratings:**

Professional Development Plan: the EDAA VPAA (or designee) and the department chair will arrange a meeting with the faculty member to discuss the review panel's report and to sketch an outline of a professional development plan. This is not to be confused with the annual Faculty Development Agreement utilized by departments for the annual faculty evaluations. In consultation with the EDAA-VPAA (or designee), the department chair will then draft a professional development plan for the faculty member. The plan will include goals, timelines and institutional resources available to support the plan. The department chair will schedule a meeting at which the development plan is given to the faculty member and discussed. If the plan does not reflect the expectations that were established during the meeting with the chair and EDAA VPAA (or designee), then there will be opportunity to revise the plan so that it is mutually agreeable and clear. This meeting will take place on or before April 15. In the case of an unsuccessful appeal, this meeting will occur after the conclusion of the appeals process and by the end of the semester. The department chair will then serve in a mentoring and supervisory capacity to monitor the faculty member's progress on achieving the goals and timelines of the development plan in the following academic year.