

3-10-2006

DOC 2006-04 Sense of the Senate Document -- Post-Tenure Review Recommendation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_docs

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee, "DOC 2006-04 Sense of the Senate Document -- Post-Tenure Review Recommendation" (2006). *Senate Documents*. 28.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_docs/28

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

PROPOSAL TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

TITLE: *Sense of the Senate Document--Post-Tenure Review Recommendation*

SUBMITTED BY: Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

DATE: March 10, 2006

ACTION: Sense of the Senate Discussion

Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC)
(Reviewed and supported by Provost Council, 12-22-06)
06

Final Report
2-18-

Recommendation: We, the members of the PTRC, recommend the formation of a “second phase” PTR group, now that the first PTRC has concluded its work of providing the guiding document. This new group could report to Assoc. Provost Joe Untener or to the Provost. Its primary charge would be to oversee the implementation process for university-wide PTR and to design appropriate information-sharing across units as the individual unit policies and procedures are being created. There is precedent for having a new group because the all-university Promotion and Tenure Committee process has now been taken up by a new and more broadly representative implementation committee.

The outgoing PTRC recommends that such a group be formed now by the Provost and that it include a few members of the outgoing PTRC to provide history and continuity. The new group may well include members of the Academic Senate, its committees, and ECAS, as well as representatives from each of the schools and the College.

Final Report of the Post Tenure Review Committee (One of the Provost’s Foundational Committees 2005-06)

I. Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC): Charge and Membership

The University of Dayton Faculty Handbook contains a policy requiring post-tenure review as follows:

“Each tenured faculty member must be evaluated by peers, using a method acceptable to the department, at least once during each six-year interval.” [M.] University Policy on Faculty Evaluation, C. Conduct of Faculty Evaluations, section 2.b.]

The Provost and the Provost’s Council empanelled and charged the PTRC to investigate and reflect upon best practices for post-tenure review and to propose recommended statements and guidelines to assist in full implementation of the UD policy across all academic units. (The complete charge to the PTRC is included at [Appendix A.](#))

Toward these ends, the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) committee has reviewed literature and has engaged in discussions

to define the critical issues for post-tenure review at the University of Dayton. The resulting recommendation, philosophy, principles, standards, and models provided below are offered to the university-wide community to serve as general guides for full implementation of the University's existing policy mandating post-tenure review. Within these principles and guidelines, each school, department, the library or other relevant unit will create and implement its own post-tenure review process.

Members of the PTRC:

Name	Title	Address
Deb Bickford	Associate Provost for Academic Affairs & Learning Initiatives Director - LTC	Learning Teaching Center and Provost's Office
Harry Gerla	Associate Dean and Professor	School of Law Office of the Dean
Sawyer Hunley	Program Coordinator School Psychology and Associate Professor Member, Faculty Development Cmte.	SOEAP Counselor Ed. & Human Services
Vinod Jain	Professor Chair, School of Engineering, Promotion and Tenure Committee	School of Engineering Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
Fred Jenkins	Head, Collection Management	Roesch Library
Pat Meyers, Chair	Dean and Professor	School of Business Administration
David Myszka	Professor Member, Faculty Development Cmte.	School of Engineering Engineering Technology
Fran Pestello	Chair, Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work Professor	College of Arts & Sciences Sociology/Anthropology
John Rapp	Professor Representing the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate	School of Business Administration Economics & Finance Dept.
Rebecca Wells	Professor (ECAS Member 2006)	School of Business Administration Management & Mktg. Dept.

II. Overall Recommendation

By August 1, 2007, each academic unit is to design and implement a process for post-tenure peer review to include:

1. a clear statement of the purpose of the peer review;
2. the process for identifying a peer review committee;
3. detail as to process, timing, and review events;
4. a description of the content of the review committee's report;
5. a statement indicating who receives the peer review committee's report;
6. an explanation of follow up activities for the faculty member being reviewed, including the possibilities for further development, remediation, and/or sanctions.

The PTRC strongly advises that process descriptions and policies within the units be clear and concise, not to exceed roughly five pages of text.

The philosophy, guiding principles and standards for post-tenure review at the University of Dayton appear later in this document.

Note: At the launch of a new PTR system, provision will be made for sorting the faculty who were tenured more than six years prior to the implementation of the system across the upcoming five years.

The recommended timeline for the approval and implementation of post-tenure review processes includes the following:

Proposed Timeline For Post-Tenure Review Process (revised 11-18-05)

Date	Activity
Mid December, 2005	PTRC completes final recommendations and report
Early January, 2006	Final report transmitted to provost (for provost's council) and senate executive committee. Comments and reactions solicited for PTRC.
January and February, 2006	Deans solicit comments and reactions from department chairs (and other faculty).
February 10, 2006	Present document to academic senate for discussion.
Late February and early March, 2006	PTRC makes any revisions, following reactions from above groups.
April 21, 2006	Endorsement by full academic senate.
Early May, 2006	Endorsement by provost's council.
Fall Semester 2006	Units asked to convert guidelines into specific policies and procedures. PTR seminars begin for deans, chairs and interested faculty.
January -March 2007	Unit plans submitted to deans, provost and associate provost for review.
August 15, 2007	Units begin full implementation of post-tenure review.

III. Philosophy of Post-Tenure Review at the University of Dayton

The University of Dayton is dedicated to facilitating the highest level of performance for all faculty. Faculty performance is based, at least in part, on a supportive work environment and on professional development opportunities. Post-tenure peer review is a process that, when viewed holistically and implemented appropriately, can provide a collegial environment to support the lifelong learning and professional development of faculty.

The faculty is a largely self-regulating community of teachers and scholars dedicated to the generation, transmission, and application of knowledge. The academic community holds at least three expectations of its members in order to carry out its mission. One of the expectations of the community is that membership in it entails a career-long commitment to developing one's skills in generating, transmitting, and applying knowledge. The process of generating, transmitting, and applying knowledge is dynamic. This implies that the organization is committed to providing development opportunities throughout one's career. The second expectation is that a faculty member should regularly evaluate his or her own effectiveness as a teacher, scholar and community servant; indeed, reflection is a key component of learning. The third expectation is that colleagues serve an important role in helping provide insights and ideas through involvement in a regular evaluation process, which is shared with one's colleagues to help enhance their effectiveness as teachers, scholars, and providers of service to the community. Fulfillment of these expectations is a necessity for the community to thrive and grow. Post-tenure peer review is a community-based mechanism to assist faculty members to develop and to meet these expectations.

Given these expectations, faculty are entitled to an unbiased evaluation of their performance that serves as a source of feedback and a guide for professional development. The primary purpose of the post-tenure review process is to

promote development for tenured faculty in the spirit of the Marianist traditions of community and the integration of learning. A review process that is based on informed reflection, and that is expressive of the culture of the university and of each department, will lead to a life-long commitment toward excellence. A secondary purpose of PTR is to identify faculty who are performing below acceptable University community standards.

IV. Guiding Principles

Through our reading of the literature, especially of best practices and lessons learned from other universities, and our own extensive deliberations, we believe that the following principles are important to meaningful post-tenure review at the University of Dayton. We strongly urge that each unit develop a written plan that considers or reflects the following basic principles for the PTR process.

From our research, best practice post-tenure review processes:

1. are attentive to the work environment and the quality of faculty work life when considering the productivity of tenured faculty. PTR looks at all areas of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, and service) in a balanced way. It reflects the unit's promotion and tenure policies. Likewise, it recognizes: (a) departmental expectations and support, (b) each faculty member's unique set of contributions, and (c) changes in those contributions over a faculty member's career. It also looks at how faculty activity supports the mission of the unit and of the University.
2. involve a committee(s) of peers, with both commendations and recommendations for improvement sent to chairs and deans for implementation. Remediation and rewards should be administrative matters. If there are significant variations between annual reviews and the results of PTR, deans should examine both processes to ensure that they are fair and rigorous.
3. outline an ongoing formative and a periodic summative evaluation process for faculty who have achieved tenure, and include definitions and descriptions of procedures, timelines, and possible outcomes.
4. observe a unit PTR plan that devotes comprehensive attention to each faculty member's performance in teaching, research, and service; and is tied clearly to university, college, department, and program missions.
5. build upon but are not necessarily limited by existing evaluation structures (e.g., merit evaluation). Thus, PTR processes do not need to be a totally separate evaluation track. Units have the option of incorporating existing review mechanisms. Promotion reviews, sabbatical applications reviews, and other forms of peer review may take the place of some or all of the PTR process in a given cycle.
6. provide a system of checks and balances by incorporating multiple methods (e.g., observation, record/vita review, student outcomes), and multiple sources (e.g., students, peers, department chair, dean, etc.).
7. are created by and with tenured faculty and published by a designated date. This assures accountability. A unit's PTR plan becomes part of the unit's permanent policies and procedures and is distributed in a timely way to all faculty after being taken through appropriate approval processes.
8. are developmental. There is an assumption that most faculty are doing a good job and that PTR will help them to become better. In the relatively few cases of serious underperformers, the process is intended to help them get back on track.
9. constitute a real review but are not onerous to execute. Faculty may already feel that the demands of work have greatly increased. The purpose is as much to know what each other is doing and model for junior faculty.
10. provide informational support for Chairs and Deans to address the problem of non-productive faculty.

V. (Recommended) Standards

Based upon best practices drawn from experience at other universities and our understanding of the Catholic and Marianist heritage of our University, we recommend the following section on the standards by which the PTR will be conducted:

The standards below are minimum standards. A unit is free to exceed these standards in its post-tenure peer review process. For instance, a unit might wish to conduct reviews more frequently than the required interval of once every six years. Such a provision exceeds the standards in these guidelines and a unit is at liberty to adopt that time interval for its review process. A unit, however, is not free, except in extraordinary circumstances, to have a post-tenure review process that does not at least comport with these standards. Thus, for example, a unit should not provide for reviews less frequently than every 6 years, as this would not meet the standard as written.

1. As required by UD policy, the PTR will occur at least every 6 years for each tenured faculty member based on the date of original tenure.
2. The PTR is not a “re-tenuring” or “re-promotion” decision. Rather, it is a developmental and evaluative process to assess and communicate ways in which each individual faculty member continues to be a contributing and valued member of the UD faculty.
3. The primary persons who make post-tenure review evaluations of tenured faculty generally must themselves be tenured faculty in the same unit or department. PTR is intended to be a peer review.
4. The areas in which the performance of a tenured faculty member are evaluated for PTR generally will include scholarly activity/research, teaching and service.
5. Each unit shall include in its PTR process a peer review of teaching that is not based solely upon student evaluations.
6. The evaluators must create a written report and the faculty member under review must be given a meaningful opportunity to challenge any findings of fact or conclusions contained in the review. The faculty member must be given sufficient time to review and comment upon the report. If the parties within a unit cannot come to an agreement, the dispute will be referred to the normal university grievance procedure (see [UD Faculty Handbook](#)).
7. The post-tenure review process should make remediation the first response to a conclusion that the faculty member is not meeting the standards expected of a tenure member of the University of Dayton faculty. Units must offer reasonable support and allow realistic timeframes for underperformers to get back on track.
8. The post-tenure review process must provide for meaningful consequences for the faculty member who, after realistic opportunities for remediation, will not or cannot meet the standards expected of a tenured member of the University of Dayton faculty.

VI. Support for PTR

The University, the College, the Schools and the Departments are encouraged to offer and/or take advantage of supports and developmental activities that can help assure excellence in the implementation of post-tenure review. (A list of resources provided by the Ryan C. Harris Learning Teaching Center is included at [Appendix B.](#))

In addition, members of the PTR Committee strongly recommend the design of a developmental seminar for department chairs, associate deans and deans that will assist them in launching and sustaining a PTR process that fosters frank feedback and useful development for individual faculty.

To this end, a “just-in-time” developmental seminar will be offered to requesting units by the Ryan C. Harris Learning Teaching Center in collaboration with the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administrative Affairs. Each seminar will provide materials and present background information on the purposes of post-tenure review, best

practices, as well as model implementation guidelines, including implementation do's and don'ts, offering suggestions aimed at both those who review and also those being reviewed. Other topics would include appeal processes. In addition, a portion of each seminar would be tailored to the needs of the specific unit requesting the seminar, through a collaborative process involving the LTC, the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administrative Affairs, and the appropriate representative from the unit seeking development.

VII. Resources

Each unit must consider its own culture and the standards of its own discipline in writing its post-tenure review document. It should also write the document in light of its own mission statement and that of the University. There is no one-size fits all model; this is a community endeavor to set community standards. Rather than providing a model document, we offer a list of resources to help each unit put forth criteria and standards suited to its needs.

Background Materials

American Association of University Professors. Post –tenure Review: An AAUP Response. URL:
<http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/rbpostn.htm>

Aper, J.P., and Judith E. Fry. "A Survey of Post-Tenure Review Practices." *Academic Leader*: 5.

Bickford, Deborah, and Rebecca Wells. *The Quality of Faculty Work Life at the University of Dayton*. Dayton: University of Dayton Business Research Group, 2003. 1-23.

Doe, John B. *Conceptual Planning: A Guide to a Better Planet*, 3d ed. Reading, MA: SmithJones, 1996.

Fry, Judith E. An Executive Summary of the Results of the National Survey on Post-Tenure Review Policies and Practices at Colleges and Universities in the United States. Diss. The Univ. of Tennessee, 2000.

Hornum, Barbara G., and Christine M. Licata. "What Post-Tenure Review Can Achievement." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (2001): b20-b21.

Licata, Christine M. "Precepts for Post-Tenure Reviews." *Trusteeship*. Nov.-Dec. 1999: 8-13.

Licata, Christine M. and Joseph C. Morreale. *Post-Tenure Faculty Review and Renewal: Experienced Voices*. Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 2002.

Licata, Christine M. and Betsy Brown. *Post-Tenure Faculty Review and Renewal II: Reporting Results & Shaping Policy*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc., 2004.

McMillin, Linda A., and Jerry Berberet. *A New Academic Compact: Revisioning the Relationship between Faculty and Their Institutions*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc., 2002. 29-60, 167-184.

Simpson, Kevin, and Alicia Caldwell. "CU Putting Faculty Reviews up for Grade." *Denver Post* 13 June 2005. 13 June 2005 <http://denverpost.com/portlet/article/html/gragments/print_article.jsp?article=2798637>.

Smith, Chris. *Theory and the Art of Communications Design*. State of the University Press, 1997.

University of Dayton. "University Policy on Faculty Evaluation." *University of Dayton Faculty Handbook*. 12 Apr. 2005 <<http://applications.udayton.edu/Provost/FacultyH.nsf>>.

University of Dayton. School of Education. "Post-tenure Review of Teaching Policies & Procedures." 04 October 2004

University of Dayton. Libraries. "Promotion and Tenure Policy." 30 January 1994

Some Sample Policies

Existing UD Policies:

SBA

<http://academic.udayton.edu/SBAPolicies/Linked%20Files/Post%20Tenure%20Review.htm>

University of Dayton. Department of Philosophy. "Peer Evaluation of Tenured Faculty."

02 April 1992.

External University-wide Policies:

IUPUI Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement (includes links to departmental policies)

<http://www.opd.iupui.edu/flre/documentation.html>

Calvin College

http://www.calvin.edu/admin/provost/fac_hb/chap_3/3_9.htm

External Departmental Policies:

Dept. of Geosciences, Virginia Tech

<http://www.geol.vt.edu/adminstr/PTR.html>

Dept. of Chemical Engineering, Univ. of Utah

<http://www.che.utah.edu/facultyStaff/departmentPolicy/>

Dept. of Political Science, Univl of Hawaii

<http://www.politicalscience.hawaii.edu/policies/08postenurereview.htm>

Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of Missouri

<http://anthropology.missouri.edu/people/facultydocs/post-tenure%20policy.doc>

Dept. of History, Univ. of South Carolina

<http://www.cas.sc.edu/hist/administration/policies.html>

Dept. of Instruction & Teacher Education, Univ. of South Carolina

<http://72.14.203.104/search?>

[q=cache:AXMjg5IixkwJ:www.ite.sc.edu/ite/posttenure.pdf+post+tenure+review+policy&hl=en](http://www.ite.sc.edu/ite/posttenure.pdf+post+tenure+review+policy&hl=en)

VIII. Primary References Used by the PTRC

Aper, J.P., and Judith E. Fry. "A Survey of Post-Tenure Review Practices." *Academic Leader*: 5.

Bickford, Deborah, and Rebecca Wells. *The Quality of Faculty Work Life at the University of Dayton*. Dayton: University of Dayton Business Research Group, 2003. 1-23.

Doe, John B. *Conceptual Planning: A Guide to a Better Planet*, 3d ed. Reading, MA: SmithJones, 1996.

Fry, Judith E. An Executive Summary of the Results of the National Survey on Post-Tenure Review Policies and Practices at Colleges and Universities in the United States. Diss. The Univ. of Tennessee, 2000.

Hornum, Barbara G., and Christine M. Licata. "What Post-Tenure Review Can Achievement." *The Chronicle of*

Higher Education (2001): b20-b21.

Licata, Christine M. "Precepts for Post-Tenure Reviews." *Trusteeship*. Nov.-Dec. 1999: 8-13.

Licata, Christine M. and Joseph C. Morreale. *Post-Tenure Faculty Review and Renewal: Experienced Voices*. Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 2002.

Licata, Christine M. and Betsy Brown. *Post-Tenure Faculty Review and Renewal II: Reporting Results & Shaping Policy*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc., 2004.

McMillin, Linda A., and Jerry Berberet. *A New Academic Compact: Revisioning the Relationship between Faculty and Their Institutions*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc., 2002. 29-60, 167-184.

Simpson, Kevin, and Alicia Caldwell. "CU Putting Faculty Reviews up for Grade." *Denver Post* 13 June 2005. 13 June 2005 <http://denverpost.com/portlet/article/html/gragments/print_article.jsp?article=2798637>.

Smith, Chris. *Theory and the Art of Communications Design*. State of the University Press, 1997.

University of Dayton. "University Policy on Faculty Evaluation." *University of Dayton Faculty Handbook*. 12 Apr. 2005 <<http://applications.udayton.edu/Provost/FacultyH.nsf>>.

University of Dayton School of Education. "Post-tenure Review of Teaching Policies & Procedures." 04 October 2004

University of Dayton Libraries. "Promotion and Tenure Policy." 30 January 1994

University of Dayton School of Business Administration. "SBA Policies and Procedures." 04 February 2000. 10 May 2005 <<http://academic.udayton.edu/sbapolicies>>.

University of Dayton Department of Philosophy. "Peer Evaluation of Tenured Faculty." 02 April 1992.

Appendix A

Foundations for the Vision of Excellence

Post-Tenure Review Committee

Charge:

The UD Faculty Handbook mandates Post-Tenure Review (PTR) to occur at least every six years for tenured faculty. PTR has been implemented by some UD departments but by no means all.

Our team will propose guidelines to be shared with the Provost's Council that will assist the deans as they work with the chairs to craft and implement Post-Tenure Review for their College or School.

These guidelines will reflect "best practices" nationally. They will allow some flexibility so that departments are able to accommodate their promotion, tenure, and evaluation policies and procedures.

Activities:

1. Review the literature to identify best practices and learn from mistakes of others.

2. Consider these best practices in light of our UD culture and its commitment to community, academic freedom, and fairness.
3. Offer guidelines for good practice, consistency, and rigor across UD's PTR processes.

Prepared for the PTRC by Pat Meyers, Committee Chair
Reviewed and approved by Provost Pestello, May 31, 2005

Appendix B

LTC Resources to Support Development and Implementation of PTR Processes and Subsequent Faculty Development

Preparing PTR Processes

1. Consultation services:
 - a. advice on how to proceed
 - b. provide examples of measurements units/departments might want to include
 - c. provide sample evaluation procedures
 - d. provide examples of best practices from other institutions
2. If need exists, create workshops for units to develop PTR processes
3. Provide resources including web site materials, web links, books, etc.
4. Provide expertise and serve as clearinghouse for campus practices and best practices beyond

Implementing PTR Processes

1. Just-in-time training for implementation
 - a. work with PTR committees to develop peer review expertise
 - b. work with administrative teams of deans
2. Make available collection of resources, including articles, manuals, web links, etc.
3. Provide expertise and serve as clearinghouse for campus practices and best practices beyond

Faculty Development

1. Provide confidential consultations, including classroom observations
2. Provide resources including web site materials, web links, LTC library, etc.

3. Provide teaching mentors when needed
4. Offer expertise in best practices
5. Develop customized programming if demand exists
6. Provide regular, development and confidential input, including the midterm instructional diagnosis, interpretation of student evaluation results, etc.
7. Tap into campus' most talented colleagues to provide support
8. Provide regular programming on pedagogical techniques, technology-enhanced learning, and writing and publication skills
9. Offer services to include development of research skills
10. Sponsor Faculty Exchange Series
11. Offer the opportunity to teach in the LTC Studio and participate in its community of practice
12. Administer LTC Innovation Grants Competition to support faculty development