

Faculty Senate Meeting

December 7, 2011, 8:34 AM CST

Present: Richard Green, Pat Holmes, Megan de Valdez , Brent Snow, Durant Frantzen, Kevin Kendricks, Dennis Elam, Theresa Droeco, Melody Mendoza from the Mesquite, Gary Coulton

Jingquan Li arrived about 9:10 AM

President Green called the meeting to order.

Approval of the Minutes

In the future the minutes to the meeting will be sent to Senate Members after the meeting. That way the committee will have a chance to look at the minutes.

Motion made and seconded on distribution of the meetings.

Post Tenure Review

Richard observed that the serious objection was by Wayne Coleman. The Post Tenure Review was a draft. The basic thing was that as written the policy requires an annual report post tenure. The objection is to the annual requirement. The alternate is to put together a package every five years. It would be submitted to a faculty committee for review. The second comment is that it should be sent to a faculty not an administration committee.

Pat Holmes asked Richard to re-send comments about the proposal. Kevin inquired that the tenured faculty would only be reviewed every five years. What if a salary review was tied to a tenure review? If there was not an annual review, how would one obtain a salary increase.

Richard noted there is still an annual report. Durant inquired if it was typical to have a report from a faculty member as a basis for evaluation. It was noted there is still an administrative review of that report.

Pat and Kevin both thought of the annual review as part of this process.

Brent noted that there is an annual review conducted by the Department Chair. In the event of three negative reports, there would be a follow up report.

Brent notes that a post tenure review is like tenure and promotion. Brent mentioned that the annual review is part of the overall tenure review. Brent noted that he was not able to meet with the committee before the report was prepared. Brent sees post tenure review given by the tenured faculty.

Tenure review should result in a portfolio submission. The tenured faculty should give feedback on service, teaching and scholarship. Ratings would be pass-fail, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Brent would see the Department Chair as developing a plan for the faculty member to improve the situation.

Richard mentioned that the intention was not for two separate reports.

Three years of unsatisfactory reports are why there is a tenure review according to Brent. Kevin noted that a person could be there with four years of unsatisfactory performance, do okay the next year, and then re-start with this all over again.

Pat asked Gary for his input. Brent addressed the five year time frame again. The five year review would be after the latest personnel application.

Richard mentioned that we need a procedure for how the tenured committee would be selected. It could be elected, established by the Faculty Senate, a faculty member could be allowed to ask faculty to serve on such a committee. Kevin suggested all the tenured faculty in a department. Megan suggested that at this point we do not have enough tenured faculty to fill the slots. Richard mentioned that a common practice would be having one member from another department.

Megan disagreed with the idea of allowing faculty to pick their own committee. Theresa suggested the Department select or elect a committee for this purpose.

Megan asked what is the purpose of making sure it is tenured faculty. Richard replied that was the practice he had encountered. It is a political issue, tenured faculty did not want to be reviewed by non-tenured faculty. Pat thought non-tenured would not want to sit in judgment. Brent suggested there is an assumption that tenured faculty had more experience and tended to make better decisions. Megan agreed with that.

Durant asked what issue we should address. Durant posed the question, someone is up for promotion, is that the same as a post tenure review committee. Richard noted that the establishment of tenured faculty is contained elsewhere in the Faculty Handbook.

Make it explicit that we take all reference to the annual report out of this report, 2.2. Annual would come out of Post Tenure Annual Review.

Then Richard suggested we take out all of Section 2. It would be replaced with a statement that says five years following the most recent promotion... Brent suggested the annual reviews would be included in the portfolio.

This would be by tenured faculty for tenured faculty. Megan wanted to know if scholarship, leadership, service would be included.

This should be the same information that one has when one goes up for tenure, Megan.

Pat suggested this should be a generalize document. Pat thought we should not be too explicit about these things. There are different standards. Brent disagreed stating that we are all evaluated the same way.

Richard interjected that there should be a statement that the document should support these three things, suggested materials would include....

What about a statement, refer to your school's guidelines.

Brent referred to 12.06 Post Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness. Pat noted she did not have that document. She noted she had lifted the process submitted from Kingsville and College Station.

Jingquan noted one was already evaluated. Pat said the committee felt pressured and was glad to hear Brent say use what other campuses have done.

Brent noted the committee had done its job. Durant suggested we start with the system policy and change what we want, default is the policy. Durant suggests starting with 12.06 as a baseline. Megan suggested that Pat not take the comments personally. Richard suggested that this discussion was not a criticism of the report. College Station has chosen to review annually. Brent noted this is a system policy.

Richard suggested we do this as the Senate rather than go back to the committee. We have a list of the objections. Richard noted we are running out of time. Brent suggested that Pat and Megan get together and take the original work and then brush it up. Pat commented that she would like Kevin to be involved.

Megan wrote on the board

- 5 Year Post Tenure Review
- Based on annual reviews collected by the department and or portfolio
- Which summarizes the faculty members
 - Teaching
 - Scholarship
 - Service
- Reviewed by tenured faculty committee , created by?

Brent asked, what is it, who does it, Kevin commented what is the criteria for remediation. Megan suggested the above would be the new 2.0 in the document.

Richard suggested we keep the remediation statement general. It would be the responsibility of the faculty member to develop a remedial plan. Brent mentioned that this was an important document.

Kevin made a motion to create a committee within Faculty Senate. Richard asked Durant, Kevin, Pat, and Megan to address the post tenure review document. It was seconded and carried. Brent suggested that either Megan or Richard be on the committee.

Kevin said a concern was that the Chair might not be tenured but playing a role in the process. Brent noted this was an issue for a young university.

New Business

Kevin asked about the policy for bringing up new business. Richard said the 15th of the month was the cut-off for the next meeting. Megan asked if we were going to have a call for items by the first week.

Schedule Meeting for Spring Semester

Megan suggested the sooner we establish a constant date the better. Richard suggested we begin in February as school did not begin until January 17.

January would be an executive meeting but set a meeting date was not set at this time.

Megan suggested the first Thursday of each month at noon. February meeting would be at Brooks. Megan suggested we meet in the joint double classroom on the second floor. It would be set up with the Senators at front, and faculty in the audience. If people have to sign in to talk, that adds to the meeting. Senators should be up front. February 2 Brooks Small Auditorium.

Senate will meet in January to address post tenure policy. By that time there will be a draft of the Faculty Handbook. Richard noted this would be a large document. Durant noted the priority would be post tenure review policy.

Pat thanks Dr. Li for coming this morning. She appreciated what he and Dr. Bohman did on the project.

Brent had a final comment that he could be here or not, Pat asked that he meet with us on the Tenure Review Process. Brent has to report to the System on Post Tenure Review. He gave a report last August. Should we be implementing the System policy, have a document ready by August, what do we want by that time. Richard suggested we have the first reviews completed by May. The policy has been created and we would have reviewed some people.

Megan thought all reviews should be done by the end of Fall or the Summer. She thought the earliest would be August. Durant suggested this should be done by May. Brent suggested that if we get a document by summer, then ... we will operate as if this is approved by the Board.

Richard suggested that if the policy is done by the summer, beginning a Fall schedule could start then.

Durant wanted to know if we set an interim target date. Richard said first we need something to review. Megan said the week of January 9, the committee meet. Dr. Snow will be available.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded.

