

Subject: PTR update**Resent-From:** Faculty-All@wku.edu**Date:** Mon, 21 Feb 2000 12:50:03 -0600**From:** "Edward Wolfe" <Edward.Wolfe@wku.edu> Internal**Organization:** Western Kentucky University**To:** "Faculty-All@wku.edu" <Faculty-All@wku.edu>

From the Faculty Senate:

Last Thursday (2/17) the FS met and the whole meeting was devoted to discussing PTR. Betsy Shoenfelt, chair of the PTR committee, explained the changes made by her committee since last fall and took questions/comments, etc. The two main changes made were (1) removal of the dept. head/chair's evaluations from the peer review process, and (2) explicit provision for rewards.

The FS Executive Committee had previously met and developed a motion that was presented at the Thursday meeting that passed by a 2-to-1 margin. The motion asked that PTR be put on a "two track" system--described later.

As it is currently written, the PTR committee's proposal has the PTR process conducted every 5 yrs. for all tenured faculty members--the exact same overall process for everyone. There are 300+ tenured faculty members, which means that 60+ faculty PTR records will wind there way through the PTR system each year--starting out at the department level, going through the college, and eventually ending up on the desk of the Provost. The rationale given for doing it this way was that this was the way faculty personnel decisions have always been done in the past.

Our FS motion provides for a two track approach:

Track One: all tenured faculty members would go through a PTR every 5 yrs. This would be part of the annual dept. evaluation, but at a more intense level with a comprehensive review of the past 5 yrs. and the development of a general plan for the next 5 yrs. We call this a Developmental PTR. It would be accomplished at the departmental level and need not proceed further. Deans of colleges would be allowed to submit faculty names to the Provost to be considered for PTR rewards.

Track Two: any tenured faculty member who received two successive unsatisfactory evaluations either in teaching or overall would be put into the PTR process developed by the PTR committee (described above). We call this a Consequential PTR. Any individual faculty member could also request a Consequential PTR, presumably in an attempt to overcome "bad" evaluations by her/his dept. chair/head.

Our overall rationale is that PTR is put in place to "weed out" what everyone agrees will be only a few faculty members. The operative assumption is that most faculty are doing a good job. Further, we see the proposed PTR system as unnecessarily bureaucratic and involving an enormous expenditure of faculty time and energy--especially given the likely outcome.

At this point we are at a dead end. The PTR committee is winding down its process and will soon be forwarding their proposal to the Provost. I think it is fair to say that the PTR committee is NOT likely to make the changes (moving to two tracks) the FS has suggested.

Earlier this month Betsy put out an email that contained the latest draft of the PTR proposal and asked for input. If you have not responded to that proposal, your time is running out.

erw

--

Edward R. Wolfe
Professor of Finance
Director, Financial Planning Program
Accounting & Finance Dept.
327 Grise Hall
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, KY 42101

Phone: (270) 745-6193
Fax: (270) 745-5284
E-mail: edward.wolfe@wku.edu