Post Tenure Review Pilot

February 15, 2014

Introduction:
The 2006 WASC visiting team recommended consideration of a post-tenure faculty review. In response, the Provost's Office asked the Rank and Tenure Committee to research this issue and develop a plan. They did so and presented their results to faculty in August, 2013. This document largely follows their recommendations, which were based on research, consideration of processes used by other universities, and conflicting opinions by academics both in favor or and opposed to the introduction of a post tenure review process.

When Rank and Tenure committee representatives presented their research and recommendations to the faculty body, those present acknowledged their work with appreciation and after discussion voted unanimously that this process belonged under the purview of the Faculty Development committee. This vote derived from the intent to emphasize the post tenure process as affirmative of faculty contributions rather than tying it to the more evaluative role of the Rank and Tenure process. To do so, the following procedures represent a Post Tenure Review pilot program to begin the process of post tenure review while allowing for revisions as appropriate for the purposes of effectively aligning the process to the development of faculty.

Research:
The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) provides a definitive recommendation with regard to post-tenure review while providing relevant background in best practices. This they document in a report titled, "Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response." Of primary importance is their recommendation with regard to responsibility for the post-tenure review process, affirming NDNU's practice firmly that "the faculty is the appropriate body to take a leadership role in designing procedures for the evaluation of peers." Other relevant excerpts follow, assessing the practices of other institutions within the context of post-tenure review:

"The principles guiding this document are these: post-tenure review ought to be aimed not at accountability, but at faculty development. Post-tenure review must be developed and carried out by faculty. Post-tenure review must not be a reevaluation of tenure, nor may it be used to shift the burden of proof from an institution's administration (to show cause for dismissal) to the individual faculty member (to show cause why he or she should be retained)."

"Lurking within the phrase ["post-tenure review"] are often two misconceptions: that tenured faculty are not already recurrently subject to a variety of forms of evaluation of their work, and that the presumption of merit that attaches to tenure should be periodically case aside so that the faculty member must bear the burden of justifying retention. Neither

assumption is true" [because] "post tenure review is a system of periodic evaluation that goes beyond the many traditional forms of continuous evaluation utilized at most colleges and universities." NDNU utilizes many of these traditional forms, including reviews for the awarding of grants and sabbaticals, reviews for appointment to school and university committees and Program Director/Chair positions, course-by-course teaching evaluations, classroom observation, "peer review and wider scrutiny of scholarly presentations and publications, and both administrative and collegial observation of service activities." Faculty are also "evaluated in the course of program reviews and specialized accreditation and certification of programs."

The AAUP report offers the conclusion that "comprehensive post-tenure review is thus a costly and risky innovation, which may fail either to satisfy ill-informed critics on one hand or to protect professional integrity on the other. …If designed and implemented by the faculty in a form that properly safeguards academic freedom and tenure and the principle of peer review, and if funded at a meaningful level, it may offer a way of evaluation tenured faculty which supports professional development as well as professional responsibility."

The following pilot program proposal takes into consideration the "minimum standards for good practice" outlined by the AAUP. While they do not specifically address the creation of a pilot project, this proposal does so both to introduce this new process, promoting it as a method for supporting faculty development and to allow for additional adjustments as use suggests improvements.

Purpose:
The purpose of this pilot review will be to recognize and enhance the performance of tenured faculty members at Notre Dame de Namur University. More specifically, this review of tenured professors is intended to develop and protect and specifically not to diminish the benefits associated with tenure, in particular, academic freedom. The review is intended to:

- Provide a summary of achievements and activities over the previous period that can be recognized
- Reflect a good-faith commitment by faculty and administration to support the principles of faculty development, to protect academic freedom, to identify areas of collaboration as appropriate and desired, and to enhance the quality of higher education at NDNU.
- To provide faculty a way to demonstrate the quality of their respective research, teaching skills, or related achievements.

The purpose of the review process specifically is NOT to reevaluate previous tenure decisions, to show cause for dismissal, to damper creativity or collegial relationships, or to threaten academic freedom.

Criteria:

This process will include:
- · All tenured faculty who have achieved the rank of full Professor;
- · Associate Professors who have achieved tenure but after five years have not applied for promotion;
- · Tenured faculty who are in administrative roles;
- · Faculty Librarians;
- · Emeritus faculty by invitation.

This process MAY include:
- Non-tenure track Full Time faculty who have services at least five years and who wish to participate. An invitation will be extended and those who wish to participate will be encouraged to do so.

NOTE that these criterion eliminate part-time and tenure track faculty from inclusion. Tenure track faculty have a separate review process prior to being eligible for this process. It is the expectation of the Faculty Development committee that all non-tenure track faculty, both full and part time, will be in conversation with their Chair/Program Director to recognize their successes, give needed feedback, and discuss professional development opportunities. The Faculty Development committee recognizes the importance of the contributions of all faculty and encourages engaged participation in the other developmental opportunities offered.

Process:
The process requires steps for both the tenured faculty and the Faculty Development Committee:

Tenured professors who are part of a current cycle will submit:
- An updated CV
- A narrative describing the goals achieved or anticipated since the last review. These may include the criterion utilized for promotion and tenure decisions, which include:
  - Teaching Effectiveness (evaluations, other comments)
  - Professional Development (summary of activities that enhance teaching, scholarship)
  - Faculty Administration, as applicable (summarize roles taken)
  - Service to NDNU/Campus Presence (committee work, advising, attendance at events, etc.)
  - Engagement with the Mission/Inclusive Excellence (summary of activities related to diversity, community based learning, social justice)
- A reflection on the support needed or ideas related to enhancing professional development.
- A proposal for what element of this work could be shared with the NDNU faculty community in a colloquium or similar venue.

This packet, which is envisioned as a two to three page document, may include evidence as appropriate. A hard copy of the packet will be submitted to the Faculty Development committee by a date to be announced at the beginning of the academic year.

Important Note: As stated above, this process is not intended to assess or address real or perceived faculty performance issues. Such issues should follow procedures outlined in the Faculty Manual, which do contain a section specifically addressing faculty performance. AAUP affirms this recommendation, noting in the report referenced above that "post-tenure review should not be undertaken for the purpose of dismissal. Other formal disciplinary procedures exist for that purpose. If they do not, they should be developed separately, following generally accepted procedures."

Our review of those procedures shows that what currently exists is incomplete and thus inappropriate. We therefore strongly recommend that the Faculty Manual section be rewritten and more appropriately collaborative procedures developed.

The criterion above mirror the seven criterion that NDNU uses for the tenure process. The criterion in the Faculty Manual overlap with the above in only one category. This discrepancy should be reconciled with clarifying language that reflects the appropriate scope of faculty duties.

Moreover, the Faculty Manual includes only the final step in a performance management process – procedures for dismissal of a faculty member. This section should be expanded to allow for the important preliminary steps in an effective performance management process, which include clearly delineated expectations, frequent and regular communication, performance improvement plans, support, and more. Moreover, they should clearly affirm the tenure process, specifically delineating the areas of performance that are addressed through this rigorous process and therefore not appropriate to revisit or otherwise overlap.

Implementation Responsibilities - Faculty Development:
The Faculty Development committee will take responsibility to review the packets submitted. The review will result in a document for both faculty and the administration that summarizes faculty accomplishments for the purposes of celebrating, creating collaborative opportunities, and enhancing the development of faculty to meet their professional interests and needs.

Faculty Development will also organize an annual event recognizing those in this post-tenure review process, creating a collegial environment in which faculty can present their accomplishments in the form most relevant to their work; this may include oral presentations, table displays, or other visual evidence of achievements and acquired knowledge to be shared. As per AAUP (American Association of University Professor) recommendations, this event will be designed to be flexible and dynamic, acknowledging different expectations in different disciplines as well as changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. The annual presentation of accomplishments for those in that

year's cycle and will take place in early April at a date/venue to be organized by the Faculty Development Committee.

Faculty Development will also take responsibility for the hard copies of the submitted packets. There will be no electronic storage of data; instead, everything will be stored in a binder with the Faculty Development Chair and kept for four years (the length of the cycle). After that, the documentation can be reclaimed by the faculty member. No documentation will be retained beyond this time, nor will it be accessible to anyone other than current members of the Faculty Development committee.

Schedule:
For the pilot (first) year: eight to ten tenured faculty, representing approximately one-quarter of the total number eligible for this recognition, as defined under "criterion" above, will be invited to voluntarily participate in the first year's cycle. This will include preparing and presenting the information described under "process" above and participating in a spring workshop that will showcase work and contributions.

After the first year, the Faculty Development Committee will survey those who participated and make adjustments as needed. After the first year, the intent is that all post-tenured faculty will be included in the process, which will occur on a four-year cycle, so that each tenured faculty member would participate once every four years after he or she has achieved tenure and/or exhausted Rank and Tenure's processes.

Process Review: After the pilot program is initiated, the intent is for faculty to review this process for enhancements/modifications before finalizing it. Ongoing review and modifications will occur periodically through dialogue between faculty, the Faculty Development Committee, and the Provost's office to ensure that it meets its intended purpose. The review will address the program's effectiveness in supporting faculty development, a cost-benefit analysis, standards and criteria, and other procedural elements with changes made as necessary and agreed to by the faculty body.