

Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure – Sept. 13, 2012
Revision of HoP 2.22 - Comprehensive Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

Background and Summary Conclusion

In response to the recent revisions to Regents' *Rule 31102*, the committee reviewed the current version of related HOP policy 2.22 and presented suggested changes to the Senate for feedback in March. The committee also suggested recommendations for clarifying issues related to leave and CPE in April. Subsequently, these recommendations were conveyed to Jesse Zapata. The committee chair then met with Dr. Zapata and Dr. Frederick to discuss the committee's recommendations. Following this discussion and additional revisions, the committee reviewed the resulting revisions over the summer and concluded that the committee's concerns had been addressed. This version is now out for stakeholder review until late October.

Overall summary: The latest version, while not identical to the CAFT version in all cases, adequately addressed all issues of concern raised by the committee.

Detailed Discussion of Issues

Most of the committee's suggestions were incorporated into this revision, in some cases as is, and in others with modifications. Instances in which there is a substantial variance between CAFT recommendations and the latest version are discussed below.

Period of activity to be reviewed in CPE and time frame for FDPs

• Section IV. A. The committee recommended that a minimum time frame for FDP should be 3 years because of concerns that a period of less than 3 years was insufficient for making significant changes. In the most recent version the timeline is up to 2 years with possibility that Dean's can approve a longer time frame.

-In discussions with Drs. Zapata and Frederick, it became clear that there the goals and expectations of the FDP are intended to be more modest and would not involve a complete transformation during the timeframe of the FDP. The intention is to see concrete steps taken in the direction towards longer term goals. For example, if someone has had a manuscript in preparation for a number of years on their annual reports, but not submitted the manuscript, a short-term criterion for the FDP would be to submit the manuscript.

-Concern: The wording previously did not make a distinction between the long-term goals and the short-term criteria.

--Response: Wording changes were suggested in order to: 1) make a distinction between the long-term objectives and short-term criteria, 2) to make clear that only the short-term criteria are included in FDP, and 3) to state that the FDP criteria should be established from the outset so that accomplishing in a shorter time is reasonable. Drs. Frederick and Zapata agreed with these wording changes and they are included in the version currently being reviewed by stakeholders. In addition, the possibility for longer timeline when needed is still included. (Given the new clarification of the short-term criteria, a shorter time frame is desirable – this means that the faculty member can accomplish the FDP and move out of the position of being monitored more quickly.)

Conclusion: While the committee's original wording suggestions are not included verbatim, the current revision provides greater clarity regarding the expectations of the FDP. In addition, with specific short-term criteria developed in conjunction with faculty member, the substance of the committees concern has been addressed.

•Section IV.B.1: Because research in some academic areas is affected by the academic year schedule and because some FDP may involve improvement on teaching, CAFT recommended that the time frame for FDP should begin at the start of the academic year following the determination that a FDP is needed. We also had concerns about whether report would be submitted during the summer when committee is not available. While the committee’s specific wording was not included, the new wording does include a requirement that the FDP (which is developed in consultation with the faculty member) have a clearly established date for submission of the first annual report and there is flexibility that would allow the date to be set one year after the start of the following academic year.

Conclusion: The wording in current version is more concise, yet it achieves the committee’s original goals.

Reports – Section II.C. 5

In cases in which the committee concludes that performance has “exceeded expectations”, “meets expectations” or “fails to meet expectation” CAFT recommended that the committee shall simply provide a written statement of their conclusion to the Department Chair and not summarize the basis of the determination unless the result was “unsatisfactory”. The basis for this suggestion was to avoid inadvertently adding additional demands when the faculty member’s performance has been satisfactory. For this same reason, and because current CPEs may include reports, the policy now includes a statement that all CPEs be independent and not biased by prior CPEs.

Our suggestions were included. However, the current version also includes the possibility that a report can be requested by Chair or Dean if the Chair or Dean concludes that performance is unsatisfactory when the committee had given a different recommendation. The committee does not object to this addition as this would potentially be a benefit the faculty member as the justification of the review committee’s recommendation should be supportive of the faculty member.

Conclusion: Our wording was included. The committee did not object to the additional wording.

Providing a process for appealing the outcome of CPE – Section III.F

The current published version of the policy does not have a process for appeals. CAFT recommended appeal of the department CPE review committee’s recommendation be made to that same committee. The current version has appeal made to provost.

-In retrospect, not clear that CAFT’s original recommendation was appropriate: The department CPE review committee made the decision and is unlikely to see it from a different perspective. In addition, by having the appeal go to the provost and not the committee the additional evaluations of Chair and Dean could be appealed.

Conclusion: Committee raised no objections to the revised wording.

Process for developing and monitoring FDP – Sections IV.B and C.

Committee made recommendations for wording to specify the process for developing a FDP, monitoring progress towards FDP goals, and completion of FDP. A streamlined version is in Section IV.B and C.

Conclusion: Although more concise, the revised wording captured the essential elements conveyed by the committee’s originally suggested wording.

CPE process should be a tool for improvement

- CAFT recommended that including language regarding termination implies a punitive tone or goal to the CPE process. An original revision from Dr. Zapata included the wording on termination in multiple locations, while the CAFT version had no such wording. The latest version includes one such statement. The point of the CAFT recommendation was to change the tenor of the policy, but ultimately the HOP policy on termination applies regardless of whether it is referenced here or not.

Conclusion: This issue is not central and does not affect the substance of the policy.

- New addition: In cases in which the result of the CPE is “Does not meet expectations” the faculty member will not be placed in FDP and the next CPE will not be for another six years. However, faculty member in this position may need additional support or changes in workload in order to improve to a position of meeting expectations. It is not particularly helpful to simply say “you are not meeting expectations” and then not do anything to help correct this. To address this, the current version Section III. B includes wording taken from SYSFAC model policy on annual reports.

Conclusion: This change is potentially beneficial for faculty.