people annually than marihuana. People in KY would not like it. Being untenured he stopped talking. Tenure now allows him to share information with students. Under PTR, he fears he might be threatening his career. (Did you know that marihuana is the #1 crop in KY?) There is already a performance evaluation system in place. If that system is flawed because some department heads are not doing their jobs then fix that system – don’t superimpose another system. I am very concerned that there has been no money set aside to mentor faculty. The document has a punitive tone. Supposedly if there are two independent tracks – one in administrators look at a person’s record and another with a faculty committee. Whose judgement rules if there is controversy? Dr. Burch – I can not imagine the scenario where a department committee recommends something and a dean recommends something and an administrator reverses the decision. Speaker – Well, maybe you wouldn’t but can you guarantee us that the next administrator wouldn’t? Dr. Burch – No. (The meeting continued in this manner. You are probably as tired of reading my notes as I am of writing them. As a whole, I was really impressed that a large number of people were voicing their concerns. It appeared to be a constructive effort where faculty understand that there will be a PTR process. They just want to get the process right. Again, these notes are my impression and I take full responsibility for them. Call Ed Wolfe with complaints. I have to go home now and feed my poodles, whom incidentally had their teeth cleaned this week for the tune of $313. Oh when will our health plan include vet care?)
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**Senate Minutes**

A Special Meeting to Discuss the Post Tenure Review document

September 30, 1999

[Before I start let me explain that I had over ten pages of notes so I am forced to be concise or take the chance of developing Carpal Tunnel Syndrome which may or may not be covered under the new medical plan. I have also decided to include my observations in parenthesis to separate my feeling versus factual statement.]

People came and went because the meeting lasted from 3:30 until 5:45. Nevertheless, around 60 people were in attendance. [There appears to be real
interest in discussing this topic.]

Dr. Burch made a few statements. She said that she wanted to find out ways to improve the existing PTR document. She wants everyone to have a good feeling about the process. The PTR is not her document but a state-mandated document. We should look upon this as an opportunity to control our own destiny. It is not a punitive document but rather a document that went through many changes - being based on the original faculty proposal and having changed through suggestions by both administrators and faculty. She regrets and is surprised that there are now faculty concerns. This should not be a process of faulting anyone but rather another piece of the puzzle. It is a critical document that the faculty should own and shape. Dr. Burch desires to have strong faculty voice in the matter since it is a document for all of us.

Dr. Burch then went on that Regent Miller had shared with her faculty concerns after the last Senate meeting. Dr. Burch thought that the faculty requested that she remove the administrators’ annual evaluations from the PTR and she had no power to do that. She feels that this “we...they” attitude that tends to crop up among administrators and faculty is not uncommon. This is not fun. She wants to work with faculty. She was here to listen.

Ed Wolfe asked for an explanation as to why the original faculty document was revised. Dr. Burch said that it was revised after she had shared the document with a number of constituents, got feedback, and recirculated. The final document is a reflection of the best compromise.

“No,” Ed stated, “I am not talking about the document after you started circulating it. I am talking about the fact that the faculty document was revised by your office PRIOR to going out to the constituents.”

Dr. Burch: Yes, it was revised because I was also charged with formulating a document. I then sent it onto the Deans, who were suppose to circulate it to the Dept. Heads, who in turn was suppose to circulate it to the faculty. It was just so difficult because some of the faculty suggestions required resources that I just didn’t have. I did try to distribute the document to as many faculty as possible but it is so hard with so many individual committees representing the faculty. I cannot wait until there is a new faculty governance system so that we have one voice representing the faculty.
Ed: The Faculty Senate does speak for the faculty.

At this point, Ed tried to summarize the various concerns that he and other faculty have expressed. They are:

The document needs to be precise. Right now it is filled with nebulous terms.
It was hard to find the PTR document [It took me three days and five phone calls.]
This is really a new tenure process. The first tenure decision takes 7 years and then every five years you are up for review again. In addition, the new guidelines were requiring even more information than a tenure document required.
It is a punitive document. All the risks for the faculty member are on the downside. There is nothing of substance for a reward system. Your best outcome is that you get to stay.

At UK [not that we want to be like them], they have a 2-track system. If the annual reports are positive, nothing much happens. If the annual reports are not positive, then you have a consequential review where an elaborate system follows. Our PTR tries to collapse this 2-track system into one but as a result, we have made an elaborate system for everyone.

Linda E. Parry - We sent out an email to all dept. heads asking how they feel about putting evaluations into the packets. Thus far, they are running 2-to-1 in favor of leaving them out. Reasons given were confidentiality, using a document that was intended for one purpose to be used for another, and causing dissension in the dept. In favor, stated that it might lend some light to the procedure but shouldn’t be included until after 2000 because no one expected that the documents would be used this way.

The floor was then opened up to anyone who wanted to speak or who wanted to speak for another colleague. These were the comments.

Speakers - Dept. heads would be less than candid if they knew everyone would be reading the documents.

People would start comparing their ranking with their colleagues.
Not an efficient system. Under the PTR guidelines everyone is going under review – even those with satisfactory performance. Based on some criteria, we need to target those that need remediation. It would take less time and probably less legal fees if challenged.

Specific to the current PTR document. Pg. 2 – administrator’s have their own evaluations? Pg. 3 needs tenured faculty to look at document. What if your department has no tenured members or just a few? The committee review documents are to be forwarded to the administration – the whole document or just the committee’s report? (If it is the whole document, there would be approximately 60 documents going up to hill in addition to those for tenure and promotion and tenure – quite the load). Document talks about the person providing long and short-term plans. What is the timeline? Is a two year time-line enough given that in many of our professions, it takes 4-5 years to begin a stream of research, collect that data, have it reviewed, accepted, and finally published. (Can you imagine Mozart under this pressure?)

Are student evaluations to be included? Are student comments to be included?

Disturbing is the language, the PTR file should be based on the “criteria” for the P&T document – another example that this is like a second tenure process.

If, and when, a person goes through PTR it should be based on their record. Dept. head evaluations are not unbiased. Asking people for a statement of philosophy is self-serving. You can say you are doing one thing in the classroom but actually are doing another.

Saying that the committee can look at the documents and any other document they see as relevant is giving employers a blank check. As a government agency there may be legal consequences.

You want independence in job reviews, if dept. heads have not been doing their job – you certainly don’t want that person to act as a filter. You need a system that treats all people the same way – not biased by any one individual. The PTR material should just be that the faculty needs to provide evidence that they have performed in teaching, research, and service. This alone will probably eliminate some poor performers.
Ed – Some people have suggested a summary of the evaluations be put in the file but again that raises the issue of who is writing the summary.

Speaker - Some units have Deans who are disinclined to have faculty sitting on any PTR committees if they are also undergoing the PTR process. A number of faculty feel disenfranchised.

Dr. Burch – This is an interpretation issue. Her interpretation was to let faculty participate.

Speakers – Process should start with new hires. There is a contractual issue here. People did not start working here with the idea of a PTR. (This issue keeps getting raised. I have asked an attorney (a relative so he works real cheap) to look up the issue.)

Ed – I think we are getting caught in a switch of tenure rules. As we probably can realize, tenure will probably be a dead duck so this process is the first step. As a group, we are not opposed to some sort of PTR policy but let us take the time to get the process right. We don’t want to be the example that everyone points to in KY as “we don’t want to do it like Western.”

Speakers – Making dept. head evaluations public to the committee is like making student grades public.

We should not distinguish new from old faculty in this process – it is divisive.

John Petersen – Basically, we need to know from you, what information do you need to make a judgement if you are a member of the PTR committee? Providing access to the dept. head evaluations may be imperfect but we need the full picture.

Speakers - What do dept. head evaluations really add?

Tenure is not a guarantee of employment. It is protecting your freedom of speech. If we want to evaluate performance, that is a different issue. There are some depts. where people don’t even talk to one another (This is sad). These people would be poor evaluators. Governance is important – let the faculty
decide. If you move these evaluations into other depts. or higher up, these people don’t know me. They don’t know my research or how I teach my classes. You lose control of the process.

If we are going to use the business model for evaluations, someone should ask the regents if they have a similar policy at their workplaces. Making the dept. head evaluations public will cause chaos.

This document needs to be reviewed. We need a more sophisticated policy before adopting anything.

I don’t see this as a second tenure process. It is good to have some sort of accountability. The logistics of this system make take some trial and error.

The faculty PTR proposal called for remediation. I asked Dr. Burch if money asked been put aside for remediation. She replied that the present document calls for both the individual and the university to provide resources.

There is a time crunch problem. The entire process could take place from beginning to end in as short a time frame as “putting in your documents by Sept. 15 and being terminated in February.”

This whole process has been rushed. It needs to be put to a vote. People feel disenfranchised.

Tenure is supposed to help people do controversial research without fear of losing their jobs. For example, one professor was told that he should not say to students that tobacco kills more people annually than marihuana. People in KY would not like it. Being untenured he stopped talking. Tenure now allows him to share information with students. Under PTR, he fears he might be threatening his career. (Did you know that marihuana is the #1 crop in KY?)

There is already a performance evaluation system in place. If that system is flawed because some department heads are not doing their jobs then fix that system – don’t superimpose another system.

I am very concerned that there has been no money set aside to mentor faculty.
The document has a punitive tone. Supposedly if there are two independent tracks – one in administrators look at a person’s record and another with a faculty committee. Whose judgement rules if there is controversy?

Dr. Burch – I can not imagine the scenario where a department committee recommends something and a dean recommends something and an administrator reverses the decision.

Speaker – Well, maybe you wouldn’t but can you guarantee us that the next administrator wouldn’t?

Dr. Burch – No.

(The meeting continued in this manner. You are probably as tired of reading my notes as I am of writing them. As a whole, I was really impressed that a large number of people were voicing their concerns. It appeared to be a constructive effort where faculty understand that there will be a PTR process. They just want to get the process right. Again, these notes are my impression and I take full responsibility for them. Call Ed Wolfe with complaints. I have to go home now and feed my poodles, whom incidentally had their teeth cleaned this week for the tune of $313. Oh when will our health plan include vet care?)