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Memo:  To Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee

From:  Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee

Subject:  Review of the proposed revisions of section 405 of the Faculty Code

Outline:  What follows is: 1) an executive summary of the findings of the BFW committee (pages 1 - 3), and, 2) detailed notes and comment attached to the proposed code changes (pages 4 - 16).

Findings: It is our finding that the revision poses significant issues with respect to faculty welfare

Key Issues

1. The foundation for the justification of this code revision lacks academic rigor. Private interviews with administrators and unscientific sampling of DH do not meet the standards of scientific statistical data collection. At this point in time, based on what evidence has been provided us, we are not convinced there is actually a problem sufficient to warrant the proposed changes in code.

2. The tenor of the proposed code change has moved from supportive and recognizing accomplishment to adversarial and punitive actions.

3. The net result of this code change is a reduction in the benefits of tenure and a significant reduction if not elimination of the concept of shared governance.

4. The code changes the standard of performance a tenured faculty member must meet to avoid sanctions. Thus the reasonable care standard 403.3.5 has been replace by a requirement to meet the same standards (e.g. excellence in primary role) applied to achieving tenure.
   a. This code change eliminates the “reasonable care standard” as the criteria for evaluation.
   b. This code change eliminates the following statement in the existing code; “The criteria for the award of tenure or promotion to the most senior ranks shall not be employed for the review of the tenured faculty.”

---

1 403.3.5 Definition of Reasonable Care

This term, which is familiar to the law, means that the level of performance required of a faculty member is that which is recognized in the profession as reasonable in the light of the obligations which he or she has assumed, competing demands upon his or her energy and time, nature and quality of his or her work, and all other circumstances which the academic community would properly take into account in determining whether he or she was discharging his or her responsibilities at an acceptable level.
c. The effect of this change is that a faculty member will be required to re-
earn tenure every year, since annual faculty reviews will be based solely on the
role statement.

d. There are enormous problems with the current form of role statements as
expressed to the BFW committee and in the faculty forum.

5. This code change places these decisions in the hands of administrators, contrary
to current code section 401.8.1 (3) “Faculty status and related matters, such as
appointments, reappointments, nonrenewals of appointments, terminations,
discharges, reductions in status, promotions, and the granting of tenure are
primarily a faculty responsibility.”

a. Professional development plans, rather than being negotiated between a
faculty member and DH are now written by the DH only in consultation with the
faculty member.

b. This granting of faculty rights to administration represents a degradation
of tenure and consequently the rights of shared governance.

6. The proposed language of the code is directed to dismissal, rather than
constructive actions.

7. This code change omits an evaluation of tenured faculty holding administrative
positions. This is far more serious than any faculty under performance, since
these individuals can do long term harm to the university.

8. With respect to this proposed code change:

a. A group of departmental faculty peers is better qualified to evaluate a
faculty member’s work than a single DH or college committee.

b. Only two consecutive annual reviews as a trigger of committee review
provides too brief a window to adequately assess a trend of non-performance.

c. Suggest an addition to the code that allows a faculty member to have a
departmental committee review at any point following a negative review.

d. Adequate time (minimum 3 years after development of the work plan) and
funding (e.g. professional development workshops, meeting attendance) to meet
the objectives of a faculty work plan should be provided.
Vote of the Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee:

This document is to be delivered to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and to the chair of the Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee from the Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee. The vote was unanimous.
Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Task Force

Impetus for taskforce development:

1. NWCCU 2007 accreditation team recommended USU review its PTR policies for possible revision and for consistent implementation (based on the finding that some 5 year reviews are cursory in nature and “faculty don’t have time to perform rigorous annual reviews”).
2. Every year at the state legislature there is discussion of eliminating tenure for new faculty hires, but so far no bill has made it out of committee.
3. Utah Board of Regents policy (R481) says the purpose of PTR is to: a) recognize good performance, and b) communicate to faculty specific areas in need of improvement.

The PTR Task Force

Members: Renee Galliher, Gretchen Peacock, Robert Schmidt, Diane Calloway-Graham, Ralph Whitesides, Richard Jenson

Task Force Activities: Across spring and summer 2012, the task force met 15 times, held three “town hall” meetings to gather feedback from faculty, met with the administrative councils for all colleges and the library, and reviewed the faculty codes for 10 sister institutions. This information was analyzed to generate a summary of issues and recommendations presented to the faculty senate in April. A recommended code revision was drafted over summer/fall 2012. Unanimous approval of a recommended code revision was not achieved by the task force. The current draft of suggested revisions represents a compromise that the task force presents to the broader faculty for additional input and review.

Task Force Meetings:
- February 1, 2012
- February 8, 2012
- February 22, 2012
- March 1, 2012
- March 6, 2012
- March 19, 2012
- March 27, 2012
- April 3, 2012
- April 9, 2012
- April 18, 2012
- May 3, 2012
- May 9, 2012
- June 12, 2012
- August 28, 2012
- October 11, 2012

Meetings with Colleges:
- February 7, 2012 (Libraries)
- February 9, 2012 (Engineering)
- February 14, 2012 (Science)
- February 15, 2012 (Agriculture; Education and Human Services)
- February 16, 2012 (Arts; Humanities and Social Sciences; Natural Resources)
- February 27, 2012 (Business)

Town Hall (Faculty Forum) Meetings:
- February 14, 2012
- February 15, 2012
- February 16, 2012

Comment [BFW1]: NWCU did request some changes: Recommendation Number 8: The committee recommends that the university review for possible revision and for consistent implementation of the pre-tenure faculty mentoring and evaluation policies and procedures and the post-tenure faculty evaluation policies and procedures, including institutional involvement in implementing plans for improvement.

In response the university issued the following response:
Faculty Senate leadership and central administration have agreed that the topic of post-tenure faculty evaluation will be widely discussed during the Academic Year 2011-2012. To launch this discussion, the Executive Vice President and Provost made a presentation to all department heads, deans and Faculty Senate Leadership regarding the value of a meaningful review process for tenured faculty. Three of the “take away” messages from the presentation included:
(1) there is a concern about underperforming faculty who seem protected by tenure; (2) underperforming faculty must be given the opportunity to bring their performance in line with their role statements; and (3) if they fail to do so, there is language in our current faculty code to dismiss a tenured faculty member. This conversation will be ongoing throughout the Academic Year 2011-2012.

Comment [BFW2]: Two basic points
1) The takeaways make the assumption that this is a problem.
a. Foundations of the assumption.
   i. Interviews by the task force with some administrators and a small number of faculty. (as per Senate President statement at Faculty Forum)
      1. We need access to the notes the committee took on their meetings with colleges to determine for ourselves the extent of the problem. At this point in time, based on what evidence has been provided us, we are not convinced there is actually a problem sufficient to warrant the proposed changes in code.
      2. A survey by the provost in which he said DH identified 10% of their faculty as a problem.

2) Comment: lacks academic rigor. Private interviews with administrators and unscientific sampling of DH do not meet the standards of scientific statistical data collection
3) The third condition, “if they fail to do so, there is language in our current faculty code to dismiss a tenured faculty member” in the response to NWCU is evidence that the purpose of this proposal is to make it easier for administrators to dismiss faculty, including those who dare challenge administration...

Comment [BFW3]: This is a deceptive reason.
Only 2 bills have been presented to the legislature since 1997. These were in 2011 and 2012 by Christopher Herrod, who is no longer in the legislature.
Guiding Principles of the Task Force Efforts

1) **Retain the integrity of tenure as a valued system for protecting academic freedom:** See 405.12 “Tenure is a means to certain ends, specifically academic freedom and a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability”

In USU’s system of shared governance, faculty have primary responsibility for appointments, promotions, tenure, terminations, and dismissals of other faculty (401.8.1(3)).

“To hold a position with tenure means that appointment is permanent and not subject to dismissal or reduction in rank except as defined in Policy 407” (405.1.2).

2) **Demonstrate to external stake holders that tenured faculty members undergo meaningful and rigorous evaluation, with explicit remediation guidelines and consequences for chronic underperformance:**

The current code says that if a DH determines that the performance of a tenured faculty member is unsatisfactory, he or she “may initiate the negotiation of a professional development plan” (405.12.3). This draft of proposed code says that upon finding that a tenured faculty member’s performance is unsatisfactory for two consecutive years, the DH “must initiate a professional development plan” and this plan is written by the DH in consultation with the faculty member.

The current code says that if performance problems by tenured faculty are not rectified through the professional development plan process then “other nonpunitive measures should be considered in lieu of a sanction…the standard for sanction remains that of adequate cause, namely conduct contrary to the standards set forth in policy 403.” This draft of proposed code states that if the DH finds the tenured faculty member’s performance unsatisfactory over three years and a comprehensive peer review committee agrees with this assessment in two consecutive years, then “the department head and dean will refer the matter to the President who may initiate sanction proceedings as outlined in Section 407.”

The current standard for sanctioning a faculty member for performance problems is that faculty members must exercise “reasonable care in meeting their commitments to the institution” (403.3.2(7)) and “reasonable care” is defined in 403.3.5. This draft of proposed code leaves this standard in place, but suggests adding a second standard of conduct related to performance: namely that “faculty members fulfill the duties associated with their position as specified in their role statements.” The current code says that the criteria for the award of tenure or promotion shall not be employed in post-tenure reviews (405.12.2) and, that the basic performance standard for both annual reviews and for post-tenure reviews is whether the faculty member discharges “conscientiously and with professional competence” the duties associated with his/her position (405.12.1 and 405.12.2). This draft of proposed code contains a statement that says “The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review fulfills the duties associated with his/her position as specified in his/her role statement.” Thus, the standard of performance against which a tenured faculty member is reviewed changes from discharging duties “conscientiously and with professional competence” to the standard that is articulated in the role statement.

3) **Respond to suggestions and concerns raised by faculty and administrative colleagues regarding strengths and challenges with current post tenure review:** See table below

---

Section 405, Page 5
The Current Draft Code Revision Proposal: The following table summarizes the reports to the faculty senate on April 2nd and April 30th, along with specific code revision suggestions outlined in the attached code draft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues Identified during Data Collection (Presented to FS on April 2)</th>
<th>General Guiding principles for Revision (Presented to FS on April 30)</th>
<th>Specific Code Revision Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The conduct of post-tenure reviews varies widely across campus.</td>
<td>In revising the process, practices for post-tenure review should be standardized across the university and more detailed instructions should be provided in Section 405 of the USU Policy Manual.</td>
<td>Greater detail throughout the section to provide more structure; annual review process described in greater detail with timeline and decision making criteria; comprehensive peer review occurs at college level to provide greater consistency; language clarified throughout to reference role statement as standard for evaluating performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current policy requiring 5-year post-tenure reviews for all tenured faculty members is labor intensive, time consuming and largely focused on faculty who are meeting or exceeding expectations in all areas of their role statement.</td>
<td>In light of the small number of tenured faculty with serious performance deficiencies as well as the fact that all faculty members are reviewed annually by their department heads, conducting a comprehensive peer review on every tenured faculty member every five years (as required by the present USU Policy Manual) provides little added value. Instead, we suggest that some type of precipitating event (e.g., multiple negative performance reviews by the department head) be used to trigger a more comprehensive post-tenure review. In essence, the annual review of all tenured faculty members by their department head that is required by current code is a post-tenure review.</td>
<td>Section 12.1 – the annual review serves as the basis of post tenure review. Section 12.2(2) – a comprehensive peer review is triggered by two consecutive annual reviews stating that the faculty is not fulfilling the duties outlined in the role statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current requirement of an individualized</td>
<td>If comprehensive post-tenure reviews involving peers only occur after some “precipitating event;” this problem is</td>
<td>Section 12.2(2) and 12. 4 – a comprehensive college peer review committee will be utilized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A review committee for each tenured faculty member increases the workload for senior faculty and, moreover, can pit “neighbor against neighbor” in a very delicate and critical personnel decision. These procedures can result in uncomfortable or difficult relationships between colleagues.

Substandard faculty performance needs to be addressed quickly and should not wait for the next scheduled 5-year post-tenure review. The annual performance reviews of tenured faculty by department heads can be misleading if based on a 12-month cycle instead of a “rolling” 3 to 5 year period.

If the annual review is considered the post-tenure review, then deficiencies in performance can be identified on an annual basis and professional development plans (if needed) can be implemented to “help the tenured faculty member more fully meet role expectations” (Section 405.12.3). Given the vagaries of review and publication cycles, as well as fluctuations in other performance metrics, annual reviews of tenured faculty by department heads should cover the last three to five years versus just the past 12 months; i.e., a rolling system.

We endorse the idea of checks and balances in post-tenure review – some combination of administrative perspective balanced with some sort of peer review. After the precipitating event, input of both constituents should be solicited. After a serious performance deficiency is identified and communicated in the comprehensive post-tenure review, the faculty member should have a reasonable period

Section 12.1 and 12.2(1) – Annual review covers past 5 years; professional development plan may be initiated after first negative annual review; comprehensive peer review must be conducted after second negative review; if the peer review committee agrees that the faculty member is underperforming a professional development plan must be initiated.

Section 12.2 - An initial negative review from the department head indicates declining performance across the past 5 years. Following the first negative annual review, the faculty member has one year to demonstrate improvement. The next annual review is to take “into account progress on the professional development plan” (Section 12.3) if one was implemented. Thus, the faculty
of time to improve his/her performance. member may not have returned to the desired level of performance over the course of one year, but progress on the professional development plan in accordance with the timeline outlined in the plan will move the faculty member out the comprehensive review process. If a subsequent annual review indicates failure to meet expectations of the role statement and a comprehensive review committee agrees that the faculty member is not satisfying his or her role statement, a professional development plan must be implemented. Thus, faculty members have two years following the first negative review to return to satisfactory fulfillment of the role statement.

| In the ideal, there should be some financial reward for superior post-tenure performance. | If the annual review is considered as our post-tenure review process, then every year when there are revenues allocated there will be opportunities for merit, equity, and retention adjustments for tenured and untenured faculty. Given the vagaries of legislative funding, it is not possible to guarantee senior faculty a fixed salary increase for a positive post-tenure review. | Section 12.2(1) Faculty members are eligible for merit increases as available when the annual review indicates that they are fulfilling the expectations outlined in their role statements. |
405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY

In addition to the reviews that are mandatory, there are two additional reviews of faculty performance other than those for tenure-eligible faculty and for promotion, the performance of all faculty members will be reviewed annually. These annual reviews for faculty will be used as the basis for recommendations for salary adjustments and for term appointment renewal, and quinquennial reviews of tenured faculty. They will also serve as the basis for the post-tenure review process for tenured faculty.

Tenure (see Section 405.1) is a means to certain ends, specifically: freedom of teaching, research and other academic endeavors, and a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Academic freedom and economic security for faculty are indispensable to the success of a university in fulfilling its obligation to its students and to society.

With tenure comes a professional responsibility, the obligation to conscientiously and competently devote one's energies and skills to the teaching, research, extension and service missions of the university. A central dimension of academic freedom is the exercise of professional judgment in such matters. The intent of the post-tenure review process is to support the principles of academic freedom and tenure through the provision of effective evaluation, useful feedback, appropriate intervention, and timely and affirmative assistance to create an environment where ensure that every faculty member can continue to experience professional development and accomplishment during the various phases of his or her career. Useful feedback should include tangible recognition to those faculty members who have demonstrated high or improved performance. It is also the intent of this policy to acknowledge that there will be different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. Consistent with these differing expectations is the realization that the evaluative weights allocated within a faculty member's role statement may change over time to reflect new duties and responsibilities as one's career evolves. (See policy 4.5.6.1 for a description of the process that must be followed to change the role statement of a faculty member.)

12.1 Annual Review of Faculty

Each department, in collaboration with the academic dean or vice president for extension and agriculture, and where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, shall establish procedures by which all faculty members shall be reviewed annually. Such reviews shall focus on, at a minimum, incorporate an analysis of the fulfillment of the duties outlined in the role statement.

Recognizing that faculty accomplishments do not always occur in a linear fashion, this review should take into account performance over the past 5 years (or since the individual's appointment to USU if less than 5 years). The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review fulfills the duties conscientiously and with professional competence the duties associated with his/her position as specified in assigned within the context of his/her role statement. If this standard is met, the faculty member will be considered to be meeting expectations appropriately associated with his or her position. The department head or supervisor shall meet with the faculty member annually to review this analysis of the fulfillment of the role statement and, subsequently, provide a written report of this review to the faculty member. A copy of this report shall be sent to the academic dean or vice president for extension and agriculture, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean. The annual evaluation and recommendation by the department head or

Comment [BFW8]: This change takes the review process out of the hands of the faculty and transfers it to administration. This is a direct contradiction of 405.10.1.3 “Faculty status and related matters, such as appointments, reappointments, nonrenewals of appointments, terminations, dismissals, reductions in status, promotions, and the granting of tenure are primarily a faculty responsibility.” The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its obligations to its students and to society. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such cases it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Determination in these matters should be first by faculty action through established university procedures, reviewed and approved by the president, followed where necessary, by the approval of the Board of Trustees and/or the Board of Regents.

Comment [BFW10]: In the existing code the standard of reviews which meets the criteria of 405.12.2 (The criteria for the award of tenure or promotion to the most senior ranks shall not be employed for the review of the tenured faculty) is; “The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharged conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position.” This changes the existing code from the reasonable care standard 403.3.2.7 and 403.3.5 to failure to meet requirements of the role statement.

403.3.5 Definition of Reasonable Care
This term, which is familiar to the law, means that the level of performance required of a faculty member is that which is recognized in the profession as reasonable in the light of the obligations which he or she has assumed, competing demands upon his or her energy and time, nature and quality of his or her work, and all other circumstances which the academic community would properly take into account in determining whether he or she was discharging his or her responsibilities at an acceptable level. Ignoring the enormous problems with the current form of role statements as expressed to this committee and in the faculty forum, most role statement require excellence in the primary role, which is the standard by which tenure is awarded. This is such a standard to violate of 405.12.2. This proposal seeks to destroy that standard as well. Thus every year a is a tenure year. This is a severe restriction of tenure and the likely consequence of this proposal will be a reduction in shared governance since no faculty will be willing to be involved in any substantive committee.
supervisor for tenure-eligible faculty (405.7.1 (3)) may constitute this review for salary adjustment. For faculty with term appointments, the annual review shall also include a recommendation regarding renewal of the term appointment. This annual review is the basis for merit increases when funding for such increases is available.

12.2 Quinquennial Post-Tenure Review of Tenured Faculty

Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years by a post tenure quinquennial review committee consisting of at least three tenured faculty members who hold rank equal to or greater than the faculty member being reviewed. The committee shall be appointed by the department head or supervisor in consultation with the faculty member and academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean, and must include at least one member from outside the academic unit. If there are fewer than two faculty members in the academic unit with equal to or higher rank than the candidate, then the department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, complete the membership of the committee with faculty of related academic units. Department heads and supervisors of the faculty member being reviewed shall not serve on this committee, and no committee member may be a department head or supervisor of any other member of the committee. An administrator may only be appointed to the quinquennial review committee with the approval of the faculty member under consideration.11

For post-tenure quinquennial review meetings and for meetings held between either the department head or supervisor and the candidate to review the committee’s evaluation and recommendation, the candidate or department head or supervisor may request the presence of an ombudsperson in accordance with policy 405.6.5. The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position as specified in the role statement.12 It is the intent of this policy to acknowledge that there will be different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. This evaluation of tenured faculty shall include the review of the annual evaluation (405.12.1), and shall include the current curriculum vita and other professional materials deemed necessary by the faculty member, and any professional development plan in place. The review will be discipline and role specific, as appropriate to evaluate: (1) teaching, through student, collegial, and administrative assessment; (2) the quality of scholarly and creative performance and/or research productivity; and (3) service to the profession, the university, and the community. The criteria for the award of tenure or promotion to the most senior ranks shall not be employed for the review of the tenured faculty.13 In the event that a faculty member is promoted to the most senior rank, the review made by his or her promotion committee shall constitute the quinquennial review. In such cases, another review need not be scheduled for five years. Upon completion of its review, the review committee for tenured faculty shall submit a written report to the department head or supervisor, who shall forward a copy to the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean. A copy of the committee’s report shall be sent to the faculty member. In the event that the outcomes of a professional development plan are contested (405.12.3(3)), the review committee for tenured faculty may be called upon by the faculty member to conduct its quinquennial review ahead of schedule. In such cases, another review need not be scheduled for five years. The review committee may also, at times, between its quinquennial reviews, review the professional development plan as described in sections (405.12.3(1-2)).

(1) Annual Review
For tenured faculty, the annual review specified above constitutes the post-tenure review as long as the faculty member continues to fulfill the duties associated with his/her position as specified in his/her role statement. If a tenured faculty member is deemed to be fulfilling the duties as outlined in his/her role statement, he/she will be considered to be meeting expectations and will be considered eligible for a merit increase, if such monies are available.

If a tenured faculty member is deemed to not be fulfilling the duties specified in his/her role statement, a professional development plan may be implemented to address the specific area(s) of concern (see section 405.12.3). The department head or supervisor has the latitude to consider other options, including re-negotiation with the faculty member of his/her role statement to emphasize area(s) in which the faculty member is fulfilling duties as specified in his/her role statement. In addition, other options, such as phased resignation/retirement, medical leave, unpaid leave of absence, or career counseling may be available to the faculty member upon consultation with the USU Office of Human Resources.

If the next annual review indicates that the tenured faculty member is fulfilling the duties in his/her role statement, taking into account progress on the professional development plan if one was implemented, the faculty member will be considered eligible for merit pay increases if available. However, if the faculty member is judged as not fulfilling his/her duties as specified in his/her role statement by the department head for a second consecutive year, then a more comprehensive post-tenure review process will occur, as outlined below.

(2) Comprehensive Peer Review

If a tenured faculty member receives a second consecutive annual review in which he/she is deemed to not be fulfilling the duties of his/her position as specified in his/her role statement, the department head will request a comprehensive peer review be conducted by the appropriate college peer review committee (see section 405.12.4). College peer review committees will receive copies of the annual reviews from the previous two years (with each review covering a 5-year period as stated in 405.12.1), the material upon which the annual reviews were based (e.g., current curriculum vita, role statement, and self-assessment material), the most recent professional development plan (if one was implemented), and any additional material the faculty member or department head wishes the committee to consider. The committee may also elect to invite the faculty member and/or department head to provide additional input.

Following the review of all materials submitted by the department head and faculty member, the peer review committee will prepare a written report, providing an assessment of the faculty member’s performance relative to his or her role statement, including a statement regarding whether the faculty member under review fulfills the duties associated with his/her position as specified in his/her role statement. Copies of the written report will be provided to the faculty member, department head, academic dean or vice president for extension and agriculture, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean. An ombudsperson must be present at all meetings of a comprehensive peer review committee. Ombudspersons must receive adequate advance notice of a committee meeting from the chairperson (see policy 405.6.5).

If the peer review committee concludes that the faculty member is not fulfilling the duties associated with his/her position as specified in his/her role statement, the department head will implement a Professional Development Plan in consultation with the faculty member, as described in 405.12.3.
If the peer review committee concludes that the faculty member is fulfilling the duties associated with his/her position as specified in his/her role statement, no sanctions will be pursued against the faculty member relative to standard X in 403.3.2 and the faculty member will be eligible for merit increases as available.

Following a comprehensive peer review and the initiation of a Professional Development Plan, if the subsequent annual review indicates that the faculty member is fulfilling the duties of his/her position as specified in his/her role statement, the Professional Development Plan will be considered complete and the faculty member will be eligible for merit pay increase as available.

(3) Uncorrected Performance Deficiencies over Time

If, following an initial comprehensive peer review and the initiation of a Professional Development Plan, the subsequent (third consecutive) annual review indicates that the tenured faculty member is continuing to not fulfill the duties associated with his/her position as specified in his/her role statement, the department head will request a second comprehensive peer review. The procedures for this peer review will be the same as those outlined in 405.12.2 (2).

If the committee concludes that the faculty member continues to demonstrate recurrent and chronic performance deficiencies and is not fulfilling the duties of his/her position as specified in his/her role statement, the department head and dean will refer the matter to the President who may initiate sanction proceedings as outlined in Section 407.

12.3 Professional Development Plan

(1) The department head or supervisor may, as a consequence of the annual review process, initiate the negotiation of a professional development plan to help the tenured faculty member more fully meet role expectations. The plan shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and shall permit subsequent alteration. The professional development plan is written by the department head or supervisor in consultation with the faculty member. The final plan shall be mutually agreed to and signed by the faculty member and the department head or supervisor and approved by the academic dean or vice president for extension and agriculture, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean. If agreement cannot be reached, individual department, college, and/or University appeal or hearing procedures should be used to resolve disagreements before transmitting revised role statements to promotion advisory committees and tenure committees. Such appeal and hearing procedures can, upon request, include a review of the professional development plan by the Review Committee described in policy 405.12.2.

(2) The professional development plan should include elements which: (1) identify the faculty member’s specific strengths and weaknesses (if any) and relate these to the allocation of evaluative weight assigned in the role statement; (2) define specific goals or outcomes needed to remedy the identified performance deficiencies; (3) outline the activities that are necessary to achieve the needed outcomes; (4) set appropriate time lines for implementing and monitoring the activities and achieving the outcomes; (5) indicate appropriate criteria for progress reviews and the evaluation of outcomes; and (6) identify any institutional commitments in the plan.

(3) The faculty member shall meet with the department head or supervisor, at times indicated as appropriate in the professional development plan, to monitor progress toward accomplishment of the
goals or outcomes included in the plan. The department head or supervisor shall, at the conclusion of
the professional development plan, evaluate the performance of the faculty member to determine
whether the faculty member is consistent with the duties set forth in his/her role statement, taking into
account progress on the professional development plan. The department head or supervisor shall
meet with the faculty member to review this analysis and subsequently, the department head or
supervisor shall provide a written report of this review to the faculty member and shall also forward a
copy to the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or
regional campus dean. For meetings held between either the department head or supervisor and the
faculty member to discuss the report, the faculty member or department head or supervisor may
request the presence of an ombudsperson in accordance with policy 405.6.5.

At the request of the faculty member, department head, or supervisor, this report may be
reviewed by the committee for tenured faculty, who shall conduct an in-depth evaluation as
described in 405.12.2, including an analysis of the fulfillment of the goals or outcomes, or
any other features included in the professional development plan. In this event, this in-depth
review shall constitute the quinquennial review and another review need not be scheduled for
five years. Upon completion of its review, the committee shall submit a written report to the
department head or supervisor. A copy of the committee's report shall be sent to the faculty
member, to the chancellor or campus dean and to the academic dean or vice president for
extension.

12.4 College Comprehensive Peer Review Committee 18 19 20 21

Comprehensive peer review committees consisting of five standing members and three alternates, all
of whom are full Professors, shall be formed by every college, the Library, and Extension. Standing
committee members will include four individuals elected by the college faculty and one individual
appointed by the college dean. Alternates will include two elected individuals and one individual
appointed by the dean. While only full Professors can serve on the peer review committee,
nominations for the elected positions will be sought from all tenured and tenure-eligible faculty
members within the college. All tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members will then vote for the
appropriate number of candidates to ensure there are four elected standing members and two elected
alternate members. With the exception of the Library, no more than two members can be from any
one department. Department heads, associate deans, and others with full- or part-time administrative
assignments are not eligible to serve on these committees. If a committee member takes on an
administrative position during his/her period of committee service, he/she will be replaced.

Each comprehensive peer review committee member will serve a three-year term. However, terms
will be staggered to ensure some continuity and to avoid, if possible, no more than half of the
members being replaced in any given year. Vacancies will be filled through college elections for the
four elected members and two elected alternates and dean appointment for the one appointed member
and one appointed alternate. Each year the committee will elect an individual from within the
committee who will serve as the committee chairperson for that year.

When a tenured faculty member undergoes a comprehensive peer review, the faculty member and/or
department head or supervisor may each request that one committee member recuse him/herself and
be replaced by an alternate member. Such requests should be made only when there is a clear
conflict of interest (e.g., faculty member or department head has a close personal or professional
relationship with a committee member). The alternate selected will be an elected alternate if an
elected standing member is replaced and the appointed alternate if the dean-appointed member is replaced.

12.4 Academic Process
Evaluations, conducted pursuant to Policy 407, may reveal continuing and persistent problems with a faculty member’s performance that call into question the faculty member’s ability to function in his or her position. If such problems have not been rectified by efforts at improvement as prescribed in a professional development plan, the outcomes of which have been judged (405.12.3.(3)) by the review committee (405.12.2), then other nonpunitive measures, should be considered in lieu of a sanction as per policy 407.1.1. The standard for sanction (policy 407.2) remains that of adequate cause, namely conduct contrary to the standards set forth in policy 403.

Successive negative reviews do not in any way diminish the obligations of the university to show such adequate cause pursuant to policy 407.4.22

Note: With the referral to Section 407 for sanction determination an additional standard must be added to section 403.3.2 (Standards of Conduct – Professional Obligations). This standard would read as follows: 23


Faculty members fulfill the duties associated with their position as specified in their role statements.

Comment [BFW22]: These deletions can lead to a more heavy handed response instead of “then other nonpunitive measures, should be considered in lieu of a sanction” as per policy 407.1.1.

Comment [BFW23]: Again, an attempt to eliminate the reasonable care standard outlined in 403.3.2.7 “Faculty members exercise “reasonable care” (policy 403.3.5) in meeting their commitments to the institution and to funding agencies where appropriate in research, publication, or other professional endeavors”
Two basic points

1) The takeaways make the assumption that this is a problem.
   a. Foundations of the assumption.
      i. Interviews by the task force with some administrators and a small number of faculty. (as per Senate President statement at Faculty Forum)
         1. We need access to the notes the committee took on their meetings with colleges to determine for ourselves the extent of the problem, At this point in time, based on what evidence has been provided us, we are not convinced there is actually a problem sufficient to warrant the proposed changes in code.
         2. A survey by the provost in which he said DH identified 10% of their faculty as a problem.

2) Comment: lacks academic rigor. Private interviews with administrators and unscientific sampling of DH do not meet the standards of scientific statistical data collection

3) The third condition, “if they fail to do so, there is language in our current faculty code to dismiss a tenured faculty member” in the response to NWCCU is evidence that the purpose of this proposal is to make it easier for administrators to dismiss faculty, including those who dare challenge administration, as is their right under tenure, which is central to SHARED GOVERNENCE.