

Forum on Shared Governance

Senate Post-tenure Review Proposal

April 24th, 2015

A History of the PTR Proposal

May 2012: VP McMillan meets with the Executive and Personnel Policies Committees to discuss PTR. He notes the tension between developmental and personnel-action roles of PTR, preferring the former. He sends a rough draft of what a PTR policy might look like.

Summer 2012: The Senate committees review and comment on the draft. VP McMillan asks for a draft that would reflect those ideas and could be supported by the Senate, AAUP, and a previous PTR task force.

A History of the PTR Proposal

October 2012: The Senate works on and approves a policy proposal based on those ideas and that incorporates the Senate and AAUP principles. Further work on the draft is put on hold so that changes to Tenure & Promotion can be worked out.

November 2013: VP McMillan thinks the draft proposal looks OK but may require tweaking in several areas. He suggests sending the policy out to the general faculty as well as to the department chairs for their comments.

A History of the PTR Proposal

March 2014: The Senate sends out the draft policy for review by both the department chairs and the general faculty. The comment period lasts a month.

July 2014: The Executive and Personnel Policies Committees meet to discuss the feedback and make some corresponding changes to the PTR draft.

A History of the PTR Proposal

October 2014: The joint committee sends the revised draft back to Academic Council for a final round of comments/feedback.

March 2015: The Executive and Personnel Policies Committees receive feedback from the Academic Council and meet to discuss and incorporate it into a new PTR draft.

April 2015: The draft is opened up to comment from the AAUP chapter and approved by the Senate (with 1 minor revision) 15-0.

The Current PTR Policy

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 may be grounds for dismissal as listed under Sections 4.6.7 and 4.6.8

Principles Behind the PTR Proposal

In PTR faculty are assumed to be proficient; it is up to evaluators to show they are deficient.

A path to dismissal already exists for faculty whose performance is truly or repeatedly critical; therefore PTR should handle cases where faculty performance can be improved and PTR should be primarily developmental.

Faculty in a given area should have the primary responsibility for judging performance that can lead to changes in faculty status, although there should be some consensus with the chair.

Principles Behind the PTR Proposal

PTR should be based on annual evaluations but still cover the body of work over a period of time (i.e. PTR should not be annual itself).

There should be no surprises/“gotchas” in PTR. There should be opportunities for appeal prior to dismissal proceedings.

While PTR will take work on behalf of the faculty, that work should be kept to a minimum.

A well-documented remediation process protects both the faculty and the University.

Basics of the PTR Proposal

PTR happens every third year in the spring semester (so you have three completed annual evaluations in hand for the review).

A PTR packet consists of a current CV, the three annual evaluations, and any brief explanatory material the faculty member thinks is necessary. The overall Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory finding is determined by two components - the annual evaluations and a review of the packet by a faculty panel chosen as in tenure/promotion.

Basics of the PTR Proposal

The faculty panel will assign ratings of proficient or deficient in each of the 3 main categories (counting Category IV as Service).

If 2 or more of the individual categories are rated as deficient, then the faculty panel overall rating will be Deficient. Otherwise it will be Proficient.

The overall finding will be Unsatisfactory only if the faculty panel issues a Deficient rating and the annual evaluations show an overall rating of Needs Improvement or Critical at least once over the review period.

Basics of the PTR Proposal

In both Proficient and Deficient cases the faculty panel will write a letter to the faculty member evaluating their performance in all of the areas (similar to tenure and promotion).

In the case of a Deficient rating the faculty member may appeal to the Faculty Appellate Committee on both procedural and substantive grounds.

If the overall finding is Satisfactory, the process concludes and the cycle begins anew.

Basics of the PTR Proposal

For an Unsatisfactory finding the chair and the EDAA will meet with the faculty member and create a development plan to remedy the issues found by the panel.

The chair will meet with the faculty member 3 times over the following year to monitor progress. Each meeting will have reports from the faculty member and from the department chair which discuss any progress made.

Basics of the PTR Proposal

If the chair finds that sufficient progress has been made in that second year, the process concludes and the PTR cycle begins anew.

If the chair does not find that sufficient progress has been made, another faculty panel is convened to review the reports (and be addressed by the faculty member and chair) and determine if satisfactory progress has been made or not.

If the second panel finds sufficient progress has been made, then the process concludes and the cycle begins anew.

Basics of the PTR Proposal

If the second panel does not find sufficient progress has been made the faculty member may again appeal this finding to the Faculty Appellate Committee. If the faculty member does not appeal to the FAC or the FAC affirms the panel decision, a second Unsatisfactory rating is applied and personnel decisions may follow.

If on appeal the FAC finds for the faculty member, the process is concluded and the cycle begins anew.

PTR Policy Review

If the policy is approved for use, it contains a provision that it will be subject to ongoing and periodic review. The understanding is that there will be a major review 3 years into the policy (after everyone has gone through the cycle).