

Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures 2012-2013

The members of the Committee for 2012-2013 were Lily Goetz, Brett Hursey, David Lehr, Rachel Mathews, Scott Senn, and Vonnie Colvin (Chair).

During the September 2012 meeting of Faculty Senate, the committee was charged with completing the work of the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Post Tenure Review (PTR). The committee began meeting in September and met at least three times each month throughout the academic year. The committee recognized the extreme importance of PTR and sought input from faculty, administrators and the Faculty Senate. Every point that was brought to the committee's attention was discussed.

Sections S and Appendix F - One change to a policy can have a ripple effect into other areas and the PTR was no exception. Since Post Tenure Review is based on yearly faculty evaluations, any changes to PTR would necessitate adjustments to **Section S** and **Appendix F** in the *Faculty Policies and Procedures Manual (FPPM)*. The rationale behind and the major changes to **Section S** and **Appendix F** were:

1. The titles of the evaluation categories (**Appendix F**) were decreased from five (distinguished, above average, satisfactory, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory) to three categories: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, and fails to meet expectations.
2. Post Tenure Review requires faculty members to be evaluated yearly, since receiving an overall rating of "fails to meet expectations" in two of three years necessitates placement on PTR. **Section S** did not require yearly evaluations. The committee proposed changing that to require yearly evaluations; but the workload on department chairs would be increased.
3. To minimize the additional work required of department chairs, the committee proposed that goals established by the faculty member (which form the basis for yearly evaluations) would be submitted electronically. The faculty member's spring report on meeting those goals would also be submitted electronically to the chair, utilizing the same document. The chair's response would be added to the same document. This would ease the work load of the chair as individual letters would not be required. **Appendix F** has been adjusted to provide a format for those submissions.
4. To further decrease the workload of the chair, the committee proposed that he or she would not be required to meet with a faculty member unless that individual receives a "Fails to Meet Expectations" in any category of the yearly evaluation or if the faculty member requests it (**Section S**).

Faculty Senate passed the revisions to **Section S** and **Appendix F** on March 14, 2013.

Section V – Post Tenure Review – The Post Tenure Review (PTR) document that appears in the 2011-2012 FPPM was totally re-written. The committee utilized the work and research of the Senate appointed Ad Hoc Committee (comprised of Drs. Brian Bates – Chair, Ray Brastow, Vonnie Colvin, and Bob Webber). The final document was approved by Faculty Senate on April 11, 2013.

The major adjustments to the document include:

1. A faculty member will be placed on PTR if he/she receives a "Fails to Meet Expectations" in two consecutive years or in two out of three years. The earlier policy required placement on PTR if the faculty member had an unsatisfactory evaluation for two consecutive years or three out of five years.
2. The department's Promotion and Tenure (P & T) Committee is now involved in the process.
3. The role of the faculty member, P & T Committee, department chair, dean and VPAA are clearly defined.
4. The content of the remedial action plan is clearly outlined.

Lecturers negotiating years toward tenure when appointed to a tenure-track line. There are three locations in the *FPPM* that pertain to faculty who are hired into tenure track lines and permitting the negotiation of up to three years toward tenure when appointed. **Section G. Selection, Appointment and Reappointment of Faculty** (Page 78, No. 6) pertains to the entire faculty; it does not mention Lecturers specifically. **Tenure** (Page 104) discusses tenure. However on page 83 (**Section I - Rank of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer**), there are sections that are confusing about whether lecturers who are later appointed to tenure track positions are able to negotiate up to three years toward tenure. The committee made adjustments to all three parts of the *FPPM* mentioned above to indicate that the Lecturer who is later hired into a tenure track line may negotiate up to three years toward tenure. This will be placed on the April 25 agenda.

Adjusting time lines located in Appendix B. Appendix B of the *FPPM* has separate time tables for: Promotion, Probationary Review, and Tenure. Embedded within the time line for Probationary Review are faculty members in years two through five of employment and their evaluation begins during the fall semester. It also includes time lines for first year faculty members whose evaluation begins in the spring semester. This is a very confusing document. The committee is working toward combining everything into one chart. This is a work in progress, but the committee believes the decrease in pages from six to three, with everything on one location will be helpful.