

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, October 11, 1999

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., October 11, 1999 in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library.

Members absent were: Behruz Abadi*, Anna Allen, Ali Amoli, Sammy Anderson, Leon Assael, Suketu Bhavsar, Deborah Blades, Rachel Bomberger, Fitzgerald Bramwell, James Brennan, Joseph Burch, Lauretta Byars, Edward Carter, Keisha Carter, Belva Collins, Fred Danner, George DeBin, Susan DeCarvalho, Henri DeHahn*, Jeffrey Dembo, David Durant*, Roberta Dwyer*, Vincent Fields, Donald Frazier, Richard Furst, Eugene Gaetke, Holly Gallion*, Amber Gatlin, Lori Gonzalez*, Philip Greasley*, Howard Grotch, O. J. Hahn, David Hamilton, Patrick Herring, Kay Hoffman, James Holsinger, Mike Inman, Ling Hwey Jeng, David Johnson, Alan Kaplan*, Benjamin Karp, Edward Kasarskis, Richard Kermode*, Thomas Lester, C. Oran Little, William Lubawy, Patrick McGrath*, David Mohny, Robert Molzon, Margo Monteith, Phyllis Nash*, William O'Connor, James Parker, Doug Poe, Shirley Raines, John Rawls, Luke Riddle, Thomas Robinson, Ramona Rush, Claire Schmelzer, Robert Shay, David Sloan, Sharon Stewart*, David Stockham, Thomas Troland, Jane Wells*, Charles Wethington*, Carolyn Williams, Eugene Williams, Emery Wilson, Elisabeth Zinser.

* Absence Explained

Chairperson Moore called the meeting to order.

The Chair said that the first item of business was the minutes of the September 13, 1999 meeting. There were no additions or corrections to the minutes and they were approved as circulated.

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Lee Meyer, Vice-Chair of the Senate Council, for introduction of the first item.

Professor Meyer said that there was some background that was not in the document that was circulated. In normal workings of the Senate Council, the Council has to make approvals of curriculum, programs, and other matters. It became apparent that there was not a clear path of how it was done or a clear path of responsibility. The Senate Council asked the Rules Committee for suggestions on revisions in the rules to better reflect accountability. That is reflected in the proposed agenda item. Basically, what happens is that approval starts at the level of the academic unit. It then goes to the college, and then to the undergraduate and graduate advisory committees. It goes to the undergraduate council and that ends with course approval. In the Medical Center, however, the descriptions of professional and graduate programs sometimes overlap. So this proposal basically clarifies and defines those different areas. If it is a program in the Medical Center, the Advisory Council for the Medical Center has approval. If it is an undergraduate program, the rules specify it now goes either to the undergraduate advisory committee or the graduate council. If it is an academic program or professional program it does not go through the undergraduate and graduate committees. With Lexington Community College, the Advisory Council for LCC approves and submits those for final approval. That is the general overview of the statement of the proposed changes.

ACTION ITEM 1 - Proposal to amend University Senate rules on course and program processing, Sections I and II.

Section III (deleted text is stricken, new text is underlined, relocated text is bracketed)

3.2.0 PROCEDURES FOR PROCESSING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND CHANGES

Procedures for processing Academic Program Proposals and Changes in Existing Academic Programs (US: 11/14/88)

For the purpose of these Rules, academic programs are defined as the requirements leading to a degree. The initiation of academic programs and changes in existing academic programs shall be processed as provided in this rule described below. When new programs involve new courses or changes in courses, the programs and courses will receive simultaneous consideration under this rule. Changes in courses not involving changes in academic programs shall be approved under Rule 3.3.0 and not under this Rule.

All proposed new programs and changes in programs must be approved by the Senate Council and all new courses or changes in courses associated with these new programs will be acted on by the Councils as prescribed, then transmitted to the Senate Council, with the program recommendation. Upon approval of the proposed program, the Senate Council will report out the program and the courses involved.

In addition to the above, the following procedures shall be followed:

A Initial approval by College

1. New programs or changes in programs, including degree titles, are initiated by the academic unit most nearly connected with the program and are approved by the College faculty in a manner they prescribe.

B-2. The College faculty makes its recommendations to the Dean who signs the proposal and forwards it to the Council(s) of the Senate, supplying the information required, and at the same time circulating a description of these recommendations to the Deans, Department Chairmen and members of the University Senate. In the case of Deans and Department Chairmen, these notices shall be posted in a central location where all faculty may see and have opportunity to raise objections in the allotted time.

3. [A set of guidelines, approved by the Senate Council, is available for proposing new undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs. Forms, approved by the Senate Council, are available for proposing changes in existing doctoral, masters, and undergraduate programs. (There are no program change forms for the programs in law, medicine, and dentistry.)]

4. University Studies Program. Changes in the University Studies Program need approval only of the University Studies Committee and no other College or Academic Council prior to submission to the Senate Council.

B Approval by Academic Council

1. Jurisdiction. If approved by the College, the proposed program or program change is forwarded to the appropriate academic council as provided in this subpart.

1. a. Medical Center. All programs recommended by the colleges of the Medical Center shall be forwarded first to the Academic Council for the Medical Center (ACMC). If approved by the ACMC, the proposal shall be forwarded as provided in subparts b-c below. for action first.

2. b. Undergraduate degree programs. All programs or changes in programs leading to the undergraduate or professional degree (except those in the College of Law or the colleges of the Medical Center) shall be forwarded to the Undergraduate Council first.

3. c. Graduate degree programs. All new graduate programs or changes in graduate programs (except for the colleges of the Medical Center) shall be forwarded to the Graduate Council for action first.

d. Professional degree programs. Programs or changes in programs leading to professional degrees in the Colleges of the Medical Center, including professional baccalaureate programs in the College of Allied Health, require approval by the ACMC only. Professional degree programs or program changes in the College of Law do not require approval by an academic council.

e. Lexington Community College programs. Programs or changes in programs recommended by divisions of the Lexington Community College shall be forwarded to the Academic Council for the Lexington Community College (ACLCC) only.

2. C Any faculty member having objection to any part of the College recommendations may report that objection to the chairman of the appropriate Council, within ten (10) days of the date of the College circulation.

3. D Within thirty (30) days of initial receipt of the proposal, the Council(s) will take action on it or notify the College as to the status and reason for delay, with a copy to the Senate Council and Registrar's Office. When action is taken, the Councils report their recommendations to the Senate Council, except that first, the Graduate Council recommends to the Graduate Faculty for action and transmittal to the Senate Council.

4. University Studies Program. Changes in the University Studies Program need approval only of the University Studies Committee and no other College or Academic Council prior to submission to the Senate Council.

C Approval by Senate Council

1. E The Senate Council acts on program recommendations only. If the proposal is a new program, New degree programs require a statement of administrative feasibility is requested from the Office of the President before final action is taken.

F 2. After clearance through the Registrar's Office, the Senate Council then acts reports on the program proposal. In the case of proposals involving the University Studies Program, if the Senate Council approves the proposed changes, it [shall put all proposals to make any significant changes in the nature of the University Studies p Program or in the structure of the p Program's requirements on the Senate agenda for approval. (from Rule 1.4.3.0(C))] In all other cases, [Upon approval of the proposed program, the Senate Council circulates notice of approval of will report out the program and the courses involved.] H If no objection is raised to the Senate Council actions on programs within ten (10) days of notification, these actions become official. If objection is raised and resolution not accomplished, a Senator may have the issue placed on the agenda of the next regular Senate meeting by sending a written objection, signed by five Senators, to the Senate Council. Action by the University Senate on such objections is final (See Section III - 3.0.)

3. [G In the case of new programs, the Senate Council, or the University Senate, reports the action taken to the President of the University, also.]

3.3.0 PROCEDURES FOR PROCESSING COURSES AND CHANGES IN COURSES

Applications for initiating new courses, changes in existing courses, or dropping courses, must be processed in a prescribed manner as provided in this rule.

When new programs involve new courses or changes in courses, the programs and courses will receive simultaneous consideration, action and transmittal under the procedure outlined under 2.0, this Section.

A Approval by Academic Council

Subject to Part B below, Final responsibility for the approval of new courses, changes in courses and dropping of courses, shall be vested in the appropriate Councils as follows:

1. The Undergraduate Council will make the final decision on all new courses or changes in courses which may be used for credit toward an undergraduate degree numbered 001-499 (including 400G- 499G), subject to appeal to the Senate through the Senate Council. The Undergraduate Council will have courses numbered 500-599 routed to it in the usual manner, but will recommend only on these and forward them to the Graduate Council for consideration (see paragraph 2j. below). In addition, it will make the final decision on all courses numbered 800-999 originating outside the colleges of the Medical Center and the College of Law, subject to appeal to the Senate through the Senate Council.

2. The Graduate Council will make the final decision on all new courses or changes in courses which may be used for credit toward a graduate degree numbered 500-799 subject to appeal to the Senate through the Senate Council. The Graduate Council will have courses numbered 400G-499G routed to it in the usual manner, but will recommend only on these and forward them to the Undergraduate Council for consideration (see paragraph j. below).

3. [9. Where the recommendation of the Undergraduate Council on a 500- 599 level course is in disagreement with the decision of the Graduate Council and in the case when the Graduate Council's recommendation of a 400G-499G is in disagreement with the Undergraduate Council, the material matter shall be referred to the Senate Council for a final decision.

3. 4. The Academic Council for the Medical Center will make the initial final decision on all new courses or changes in courses leading to undergraduate and graduate degrees numbered 800-999 originating in the colleges of the Medical Center (ACMC), subject to appeal to the Senate through the Senate Council. The Academic Council for the Medical Center will consider first all courses numbered 001-799 originating in the colleges of the Medical Center, and will recommend on them to the appropriate Council(s) for final decision., and will forward the recommendation according to paragraphs 1-2 above.

4. 5. New courses and changes in courses that are professional in nature originating in the colleges of the Medical Center shall be approved by the ACMC only.

6. The ACLCC will make the final decision on all new courses or changes in courses originating in the Lexington Community College.

7. [However, the initial Course proposal(s) of courses developed by the Committee to fulfill the program requirements relating to the University Studies Program shall, after approval by the Undergraduate Council, be circulated to the faculty prior to being forwarded to the Senate Council. The University Studies Committee shall give the faculty time to send written comments about the proposal(s) or to suggest additional courses. The Committee also shall hold one or more public meetings to hear comments and suggestions about the proposal(s) and may revise or add to the proposal(s) in light of the comments. (Relocated from Rule 1.4.3.0(C))]

8. All other new courses or changes in courses will be approved by the Senate Council only.

In addition to the preceding, the following procedures shall be utilized:

B Reporting and Approval by the Senate

5. The Senate Council will circulate notice of approval of reports final decisions on courses and, if no objection is raised within ten (10) days of this circulation, the actions become official. In the case of courses which are or are to become part of the University Studies Program, the 10-day notice period shall be 30 days. If objection is raised and resolution not accomplished, a Senator may have the issue placed on the agenda of the next regular Senate meeting by sending a written objection, signed by five (5) Senators, to the Senate Council. Action by the University Senate on such objections is final.

C. Program changes. 6. All proposed new courses or changes in courses which are involved in new programs shall be approved under Rule 3.2.0 and not under this Rule shall be acted on by the appropriate Councils and then transmitted to the Senate Council for inclusion in the final decision on the proposed new program. Upon approval of the program, the Senate Council will report out the program and the courses involved. [If, in the judgment of the Council having final decision authority, proposed new courses or changes in courses constitute a major expansion of a program, it may request, or have the Senate Council request, a statement of administrative feasibility as required for new programs.]

D. Cross-listing. 7. If a department wishes to cross-list a course which already exists in another department, it may receive approval by indicating that this is a minor change on the form for requesting changes in existing courses. Both chairmen must sign the form and, if the departments are in different colleges, both deans must signify approval. Cross-listing shall not be used as justification for duplication of teaching effort. Departments involved must agree on the time, place and instructor(s) in scheduling such courses.

E. Replaced courses. 8. If a new course is created through substitution, replacement, consolidation or combination of one or more courses, a form for dropping the eliminated course must be processed in the prescribed manner.

F. Exception for Minor Changes

1. Procedure. If a course change is determined to be a minor change, [the form shall be forwarded directly from the Dean of the College to the Chair of the Senate Council for approval. If the Chair of the Senate Council approves, he or she will notify the Registrar's office and the Dean of the College originating the request. If the Chair believes the change is not minor, the request shall be returned to the Dean of the College originating the request for processing through the appropriate Councils.]

2. Definition. [A request may be considered a minor change if it meets one of the following criteria:

- A change in number within the same hundred series
 - B an editorial change in the course title or description which does not imply change in content or emphasis
 - C a change in prerequisite(s) which does not imply a change in course content or emphasis, or which is made necessary by the elimination or significant alteration of the prerequisite(s)
 - D a cross-listing of a course as described below above
 - E correction of typographical errors.
- When requested as a Minor Change,]

G. Forms

Official forms to be used can be obtained from the Offices of the Chancellor, University of Kentucky Lexington Campus, the Chancellor, University of Kentucky Medical Center, the Office of Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, or the Senate Council office. Separate forms are required for new courses, changes in existing courses, and dropping courses. To avoid delay and possible disapproval of said applications, all information required and the requisite signatures must be supplied. The form for processing changes in existing courses shall allow the originating unit to request that it be considered a "Minor Change."

1.3.2 GRADUATE COUNCIL

1.3.2.1 Functions The Graduate Council shall have only the authority and responsibilities delegated to it by the Dean of the Graduate School, the Graduate Faculty, and the University Senate. Its responsibilities relative to courses and programs shall be as follows:

A Course Procedures--It shall consider all proposed new courses and changes in courses which may be used for credit toward a graduate degree. numbered 400G-499G and 500-799. It shall forward to the Undergraduate Council for final decision recommendations on the courses numbered 400G-499G from all colleges answering to the Chancellor, University of Kentucky, Lexington Campus, and those courses forwarded from the Academic Council for the Medical Center. It shall make the final decision, subject to appeal to the Senate through the Senate Council, on all courses numbered 500-799 (after consideration of the recommendations of the Undergraduate Council on the courses numbered 500-599, and receipt of recommendations on applicable courses 500-799 from the Academic Council for the Medical Center).

remainder of rule unchanged

1.3.3 UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

The Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Lexington Campus, (or another person designated by the Chancellor) shall chair the Undergraduate Council and report its recommendations to the Senate Council in accordance with the Rules of the University Senate.

1.3.3.1 Functions The Undergraduate Council's responsibilities relative to courses and programs shall be as follows:

A Course Procedures--It shall consider all proposed new courses and changes in courses which may be used for credit toward an undergraduate degree numbered 001-599. Also, it shall consider new courses and changes in courses numbered 800-999 in all colleges outside the Medical Center, except for the College of Law. It shall forward to the Graduate Council for final decision recommendation on all courses numbered 500-599. It shall make the final decision, subject to appeal to the Senate through the Senate Council, on all courses numbered 001-499 (after consideration of the recommendations of the Graduate Council on the courses numbered 400G-499G, and receipt of recommendations from the Academic Council for the Medical Center on applicable courses). Also, it shall make the final decision, subject to appeal to the Senate through the Senate Council, on all courses numbered 800-999 from the colleges outside the Medical Center, except those from the College of Law. (See Section III, 3.3.0) It will have no responsibilities for professional courses or associate degrees.

remainder of rule unchanged

1.3.4 ACADEMIC COUNCIL FOR THE MEDICAL CENTER

1.3.4.1 Functions The Academic Council for the Medical Center shall be responsible to the Chancellor, University of Kentucky Medical Center, and to the University Senate. Its principal functions and responsibilities are to:

A consider academic programs and courses in the Colleges of the Medical Center in relation to the objectives of the University;

B review all new courses or changes in courses and new or changed academic programs recommended by the Colleges of the Medical Center;

C evaluate educational program objectives and course content to insure appropriate breadth and depth and the availability of needed faculty;

D insure that the development of new programs or the introduction of new courses are accompanied by appropriate modification or discontinuation of old programs or courses in accordance with the Rules of the University Senate;

E recommend approval of new undergraduate or graduate academic programs or changes in programs, including degree titles, and changes in the University requirements or University

Studies component, to the appropriate council(s). Also it shall consider first and recommend to the applicable Council, on all courses numbered 001-799, from the colleges of the Medical Center;

F make the final initial decision, subject to appeal to the Senate through the Senate Council, on all new courses and changes in courses originating in numbered 800-999 from the Colleges of the Medical Center. (See Section III, 3.2.0 and 3.3.0)

remainder of rule unchanged

1.3.5 ACADEMIC COUNCIL FOR THE LEXINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

1.3.5.1 Functions

The Academic Council for the Lexington Community College shall be responsible to the Chancellor for the Lexington Campus and to the University Senate. Its principal functions and responsibilities are to:

A consider academic programs and courses in the divisions of Lexington Community College in relation to the objectives of the University;

B review all new courses or changes in courses and new or changed academic programs recommended by the divisions of the Lexington Community College;

C evaluate educational program objectives and course content to ensure appropriate breadth and depth and the availability of needed faculty;

D ensure that the development of new programs or the introduction of new courses is accompanied by appropriate modification or discontinuation of old programs or courses in accordance with these rules;

E make the final decision, subject to appeal to the Senate through the Senate Council, on all new programs and changes in programs, and all new courses and changes in courses, including degree titles, originating in the Lexington Community College; and

F review the summary reports of the program reviews prepared by the academic unit review committees. It shall participate directly in reviews of Lexington Community College programs upon the request of the Chancellors or Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs of the Lexington Campus. Following either such review, it may recommend appropriate action to maintain acceptable levels of academic quality to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs of the Lexington Campus. Such a recommendation may include suspension of a program to a maximum of five years and the lifting of such a suspension. All recommendations relating to imposing or lifting suspensions of the programs must be approved by the Senate Council.

G review distance learning activities for quality and effectiveness, in keeping with Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) substantive changes criteria.

1.3.5.2 Membership

The Academic Council for the Lexington Community College (ACLCC) is composed of one representative and one alternate representative from each of the divisions of the College. The President of the Lexington Community College or designate shall serve as chair of the ACLCC. In addition, there shall be three representatives outside of the Lexington Community College constituency: one shall be appointed by the Undergraduate Council, one by the Academic Council for the Medical Center, and one by the Senate Council. These representatives shall be appointed for two-year terms.

1.3.5.3 Election, Terms and Vacancies

One member and one alternate from half of the divisions shall be elected each year. To be eligible for election, candidates shall be from the full-time teaching faculty and shall be limited to those members who are eligible to be elected to the University Senate, i.e., assistant professor or higher academic rank. In addition, they should have been members of the faculty of the Lexington Community College in a full-time academic rank for a period of at least two years. Administrative officers who also hold faculty appointments are not eligible for election during their tenure as administrative officers. When a member becomes unable or ineligible to serve (i.e., resignation, leave of absence, assumption of administrative title, etc.), the alternate shall serve as member for the remainder of that term. The eligible faculty member who at the last election received the highest number of votes without being elected shall be appointed as alternate member.

1.3.5.4 Meetings

The Academic Council for the Lexington Community College shall meet monthly and upon call of the chair. Six members or designated alternates shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Alternate members shall be notified of all meetings and shall have the privilege of attending all meetings; they shall not vote, however, unless they are serving in place of official representatives. The alternates shall receive copies of minutes and other materials distributed to the Council. When an official representative must be absent from a meeting, the alternate from his or her division will be designated by the chair to serve during that particular meeting.

1.4.3.0 UNIVERSITY STUDIES COMMITTEE

Parts A and B unchanged

C Waivers All waivers of or substitutions for program requirements for particular categories of students, if approved by the Committee, shall be submitted to the Senate Council for its approval. The Senate Council's approval of temporary waivers of or substitutions for program requirements

for particular categories of students shall be final. [Remainder of rule relocated to Rules 3.2.0 and 3.3.0]

Implementation: Fall Semester, 2000

These proposals were drafted by the Rules Committee and approved by the University Senate Council.

Tagavi Kaveh (Engineering) said that he wanted to make a friendly amendment. On Item A 1, page 5, the first and second sentences appear to be in conflict. It could be fixed by adding a comma at the end of the first sentence and then saying "except that the Undergraduate Council...". On A 2, page 5, the first and second sentences are also in conflict. Adding a comma at the end of the first sentence and the word except to connect the sentences would fix that also.

The amendment passed in a show of hands.

Professor Tagavi said that the three items on page 2 are obviously the steps to be taken for the new program before they get to the Council. It seems they need the same steps before they have new courses. He proposed adding Steps 1, 2, and 3 from page 2, with minor editorial changes to change program to courses and new programs to new courses at the beginning of 3.3.0.

The amendment passed in a show of hands.

Phil Kraemer (Dean, Undergraduate Studies) said that in the language on page 2 under B 1 b he would suggest that a qualifier be added "except those that are then governed by B 1 d." The same change also needs to be made under 3.3.0, A 1 but that was dealt with in the last amendment.

The amendment to add the qualifier passed in a show of hands.

Professor Tagavi wanted to make a friendly amendment to change wording on page 5, A 1, line 5, the language should read "only recommend" instead of "recommend only."

The Chair asked if there were any objections in making that editorial change. There were none.

Professor Tagavi said that on page 6, number 5 that "professional in nature" was very subjective. He asked who decided what courses were professional in nature.

The Chair said that this was the original language.

Dan Reedy (Spanish and Italian Languages and Literatures) said that all professional courses in the University carry a distinctive numbering system of 800, and above and those that are undergraduate or graduate go up through 700. So there is a clear understanding of what the numbering system means.

The proposal as amended passed in a show of hands.

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Lee Meyer for introduction of the second item.

Professor Meyer said that at the December 1998 meeting there was a proposal to change the elected faculty membership. At that time, the full Senate asked for clarification of the implications of the proposal. The chart attached to the proposal is not a final version of how the redistribution will be. He recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

ACTION ITEM 2 - Proposal to modify the University Senate Rules - Section I - 1.2.2.1 Elected Faculty Membership.

Proposal: [add sections bolded and underlined; delete strikeouts]

Section I

1.2.2.1 Elected Faculty Membership

The 94 elected faculty members shall be apportioned each spring among the colleges and the University Libraries according to the following two equally weighted factors based on data for the preceding fall semester: (1) the number of the following individuals' all of whom shall be considered "faculty" for purposes of this Rule: (a) full-time faculty with the rank of assistant professor or higher, except (b) faculty those appointed in the extension series (although they are eligible for election to membership), research title series, Medical Center and clinical title series, and (c) lecturers and instructors visiting series, with the rank of assistant professor or higher in the college or the University Libraries; and (2) the number of full time students enrolled in the college, computed so that students enrolled in the Graduate School shall be assigned to the college in which they are pursuing their studies.

[remainder of Rule unchanged]

The rule as modified (without showing changes) would then read as follows:

1.2.2.1 Elected Faculty Membership

The 94 elected faculty members shall be apportioned each spring among the colleges and the University Libraries according to the following two equally weighted factors based on data for the preceding fall semester: (1) the number of the following individuals, all of whom shall be considered "faculty" for purposes of this Rule: (a) full-time faculty with the rank of assistant professor or higher, (b) faculty appointed in the extension, research, and clinical title series, and (c) lecturers and instructors; and (2) the number of full time students enrolled in the college, computed so that students enrolled in the Graduate School shall be assigned to the college in which they are pursuing their studies. [remainder of Rule unchanged]

Background and Rationale:

As a preliminary step to considering the P&T and Special Title Series Task Force recommendation, the Chair of the Senate Council asked the Rules Committee to consider and draft a proposed rule change granting representation (for purposes of determining the number of Senators to which each College is entitled) to extension, clinical, and research title series faculty, as well as to instructors and lecturers. The Committee met on January 26, 1999, pursuant to this request. While the Rules Committee members were not unanimous in their support for the merits underlying the rule, they agreed on the preceding proposal as best achieving what the Senate Council Chair had asked.

The University Senate subsequently considered the proposals from the Task Forces on Privilege and Tenure and Special Title Series where the recommendation was adopted that voting status be granted to all extension, clinical, and research titles series faculty, as well as to instructors and lecturers. The Senate Council then asked the Registrar to prepare an analysis of the impact of this change on each College's representation in the Senate. A copy is attached.

The changes have been approved by the University Senate Council.

Implementation: Fall, 2000

Joachim Knuf (Communications) asked if they were apportioning faculty members or seats. He proposed changing the word members to seats.

The Chair asked if there were objections to the change. There were none.

Brad Canon (Political Science) said that in 1-a, b, and c that faculty have to be full-time, but there was no full-time in front of extension, lecturers and instructors. He proposed adding the word full-time in b and c.

Chairperson Moore said that would be an editorial change because that was the intent. There were no objections.

Professor Reedy said that he realized the numbers were not at this time correct, but he would invite the Senate to look at the section called Graduate School. There are some students who are disenfranchised there because they are not in another college. They are only in the Graduate School. That is their college. Those include students in the Patterson School, the Martin School, the Interdisciplinary Centers of Toxicology, Biomedical Engineering, and Nutritional Science. They have no college other than the Graduate School. So when this is finally computed these students should be taken into account.

Chairperson Moore said that these calculations are just estimates.

An unidentified Senator asked if it was clear that there would be a minimum of one seat to each of these units or could it come out as zero representation?

The Chair said that there was nothing in the proposal concerning that.

Loys Mather (Agriculture) said that he was quite sure that somewhere in the rules each college was allowed at least one seat.

Mary Davis (Law) said that, under the total number in the chart, some of the numbers are not consistent as to the total and the current. If the formula is supposed to reflect the number of senators, why does it not reflect it currently? Secondly, the background and rationale of the rule says that the Rules Committee members were not unanimous in their support for the merits underlying the rule. Would someone identify what the dissenters opinions were regarding the merit?

Professor Tagavi said that he had one concern which is not very clear, especially with post-tenure. First, it gives votes to those who do not have tenure. Secondly, if originally certain lines were excluded, what was the rationale for that?

Chairperson Moore said in the Senate Rules under 1.2.2.1 it says, "The seats shall be apportioned to units in a manner which minimizes the total inequity subject to the condition that each unit gets at least one seat."

Robert Gewirtz (Medicine) said that there are colleges that do not have tenured lines--the professors are clinical series, no tenure, associate or special title series. How does that fit into this? Are those numbers not counted in the formula?

Professor Lee Meyer said that the big difference was due to the inclusion of the Lexington Community College numbers in the new number.

Jane Lindle (Education) asked about the database for determining which college graduate students are assigned to in which they are pursuing their studies. They have in the College of

Education wandering nondegree graduate students who are taking all their courses with them but end up on an Arts and Sciences list as graduate students.

Professor Mather said that was a relevant question but was not really a part of the proposal today. Maybe that is an issue that should be addressed and brought back later.

Mary Molinaro (University Libraries) said that she was sure that the intent was not to strike the libraries out of this entirely, but the reference to the Libraries was struck out, and they do not have assistant professor rank. They have Librarian I, II, III, and IV. She proposed adding the Librarians under (b).

The amendment passed in a show of hands.

The proposal as amended passed in a show of hands.

Chairperson Moore recognized Lee Meyer for introduction of the next item.

Professor Meyer stated that the Senate Council proposes changes in this AR. The Senate Council convened a subcommittee to look at the existing retirement programs, focusing on early retirement. In general, the committee was comfortable with the current opportunities with the rule of 75, but, in looking at this, found that electing a phased retirement program could only be done in the 65th year. It was felt that for two basic reasons to give faculty a chance to widen their scope of opportunities that phased retirement should be extended to 60 through 65, to give a five year window of opportunity for faculty to elect the phased retirement option. Based on that background, the new proposal if you look at the AR, Phased Retirement Policy and Program, the purpose would stay the same. Under II, a the third line would be changed to "who have reached the age of 60." Under B the second sentence would be dropped, and points 1 and 2 would be dropped.

ACTION ITEM 3 - Recommendations to change Phased Retirement Policy and Program, AR II-1.6.2. See Attachment I.

Craig Infanger (Agriculture) asked if they knew how many faculty had elected phased retirement.

Lee Meyer said he had forgotten the exact numbers, but they were modest, three to four per year. One of the questions raised to the committee was "if there be a mad rush," and that is why they talked to various administrators and got some data. The committee was convinced that there would not be. There is a safeguard for that because this is not a right or privilege. The Administration has to approve this. If a particular unit were losing too many faculty members, that would not have to be approved to protect that unit.

John Thelin (Education) said that the beauty of something like TIAA-CREF is that it is portable across institutions. So why the 15 year requirement? What does that accomplish? At the very least someone would have had to come to the university at age 45.

Lee Meyer said that the committee considered that. They were trying to make changes that would be acceptable to the Administration and go one step at a time. That would be a radical change, and they were more interested in getting something that was acceptable.

Professor Thelin asked why they assume that longevity is attractive to the institution.

The Chair said that was not a proposed change unless Professor Thelin wanted to make an amendment.

The proposal passed in a show of hands.

Chairperson Moore made the following announcements.

On October 18, 1999, the new Chair of the Board of Trustees, Billy Joe Miles, the new Vice-Chair of the Board of Trustees, Steven Reed, and the Secretary of the Board of Trustees, Dan Reedy, will be meeting with the Senate Council. Any of you who would like to come are certainly invited. The meeting will be in the Old Board Room of the Administration Building.

On November 8, 1999, Billy Joe Miles, Mr. Reed, and Dr. Reedy have agreed to come to this body and to talk about the Presidential search and other matters. There will be an opportunity for you to ask questions and for discussion. Also at that meeting there will be a presentation by Lloyd Axelrod on the latest version of the UK Marketing Plan.

In December, I have asked Gene Williams, who has agreed to come and talk about some changes in Administrative Computing here at the University of Kentucky.

The Chair said that for the next item there would need to be a waiver of the ten-day rule. The item was sent out on October 5, 1999. The item is to recommend a change in the Governing Regulations in the make-up of the Joint Board-Faculty Presidential Search Committee. There were no objections in waiving the ten-day rule and considering the item.

Chairperson Moore recognized Lee Meyer for introduction of the item.

Professor Meyer said that this was a recommendation to change the GRs and University Senate Rules reflecting election of members of the Search Committee. This was stimulated by the institutional change when the community colleges were separated from the University. Under the old rules, there is a regulation requiring one member of the search committee to be a full-time teaching faculty from the Community College System. We felt like that was inappropriate under the current circumstances.

Chairperson Moore said that he wrote the rationale at the direction of the Council. He felt that everyone agreed it should not be a member of the Community College System, since the community colleges are no longer a part of the University. Then the debate was who should hold the position: an LCC faculty member, a student, or a staff person. After quite a bit of discussion, the Council felt pretty strongly that the one constituency that is not mandated to be represented on committee is a staff member. There is a staff member on the Board of Trustees, but there is no guarantee that this individual will be appointed to the search committee. The Chair of the Board of Trustees appoints six members of the search committee. Of the remaining members of the search committee, three are faculty members, who are elected by this body by a process in the rules. The nomination process is done at a Senate meeting. Then there is an election. A student member is appointed by the Chair of the Board. It does not necessarily have to be the student member or the SGA President. It can be any full-time student. The fifth person is appointed by the Chair of the Board. At the present time, it is a member of the full-time faculty of the Community College System. What this would do is simply change that to a staff member using the same qualifications that are indicated in the state statute regarding a staff member on the Board of Trustees. It was to be non-teaching personnel, excluding the president, vice-presidents, academic deans, and academic department chairpersons.

ACTION ITEM 4 - Recommended Change in the Governing Regulations as reflected in the University Senate Rules Regarding Election of Joint Board-Faculty Presidential Search Committee, Section I - 1.5.1. If approved, the proposed change will be forwarded to the Administration with a request that the change in the Governing Regulations be placed on the 26 October Board agenda.

Background:

At its October 4, 1999 meeting, the Senate Council voted unanimously to recommend that the Rules of the University Senate and the University Governing Regulations regarding election of the Joint Board-Faculty Presidential Search Committee be changed as follows:

Section I (delete strikeouts; add bolded portions)

1.5.1 ELECTION OF JOINT BOARD-FACULTY PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE

1.5.1.1 Authority Relative to Appointment of President (US: 3/9/98 & BoT, 4/7/98) The Governing Regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees May 5, 1970 and amended February, 1972, October, 1987, and April 7, 1998 provide: "In the event of a vacancy in the Office of President or disability of the President, the Vice President for Administration shall exercise the functions of the President in the absence of the appointment of an Interim President by the Board. If the Board finds it desirable to appoint an Interim President it shall seek advice from a joint Board-Faculty Committee to recommend the appointment of a President if such has been constituted or, if the committee has not been constituted, from the University Senate Council. . . .The President of the University is appointed by the Board of Trustees with the advice of a joint committee of the Board, faculty, and student body. The committee shall consist of five members of the Board appointed by its chair; three members of the full-time teaching and/or research faculty of the University System, selected by a procedure determined by the University Senate; one member of the full-time [teaching faculty of the Community College System] nonteaching personnel, excluding the president, vice-presidents, academic deans, and academic department chairpersons, and one full-time student, both appointed by the chair of the Board. The committee shall provide opportunity for discussion between representative administrative, faculty, staff, and student groups and prospective presidential candidates."

The Senate Council is requesting that the Senate approve this change, which would then be submitted to the President and the Board of Trustees for consideration. The Council is also requesting that the Senate waive the 10-day circulation rule (1.3.1.1E) so, if approved, this proposal can be placed on the agenda for the October 26 Board of Trustees meeting and then voted upon at the December 14 meeting.

Rationale: Staff members are the only major constituency not represented by mandate on the Presidential Search Committee. There is a staff representative on the Board of Trustees, as mandated by Kentucky Revised Statutes, but there is no requirement that this individual serve on the Search Committee. At least three faculty members are on the Committee (as mandated by the selection process), and at least one student will be a member (also mandated). Assigning the "Community College System" position to Lexington Community College would single out one College for special treatment. LCC faculty still have the same opportunity to elect faculty representatives from their College, just as faculty from other academic units also have the chance to elect representatives from their Colleges.

Finally, it is reasonable to include staff among the groups the Search Committee is expected to consult in providing an opportunity for discussion among the various campus constituencies. There is a particularly strong argument for this change in light of the state mandate that a staff member be among the elected members of the Board of Trustees.

An unidentified Senator asked who would select the staff person?

The Chair said that currently it is setup that the Chair of the Board would select the staff person, just as the Chair of the Board selected the staff member from the Community College system. The reason for that is that we felt there is not sufficient time to go through an election process for this time since it would take quite a while to do that. We would have to first get the Governing Regulations changed and also change the Senate Rules. We felt there was not sufficient time to

work out a process, given some of the criticism that was made in the last election, such as the fact that it was done by e-mail and the internet. We felt that the best way to do it, at this point, would be to have the Chair of the Board of Trustees select this individual.

Professor Tagavi said that if the only reason they don't want to at this time have staff elect their own member is lack of time, why don't you just put in that the staff would start electing their own member in 2000 or 2001. He felt it was a can of worms. Once you open it and give it to the Chairman of the Board, how are you going to take it away? It is not true that only staff are not represented. Alumni are not represented. We are told that students are our customers and their parents are our customers. Parents are not represented. He wanted to propose that the staff choose their own representative, and, if it is not convenient the first time, they can start in 2001 or 2002.

The Chair said that he felt the Senate Council had every intention to recommend a process whereby this would be done. The Council felt, in order to get the search committee going as soon as possible, this would be the most expeditious way.

Professor Canon asked how soon the search committee was going to be appointed.

Chairperson Moore said that he had not talked with the Chair of the Board, Billy Joe Miles about specific times yet. The last time he talked with him the indication was that he expects to do it fairly quickly.

Professor Reedy said that he had no specific information, other than it possibly could be as early as December or as late as February in the time frame. Nothing specifically has been said at a Board meeting.

The Chair said that the intent behind this was, if this does pass, there would be time to be placed on the October agenda of the Board of Trustees. It cannot be voted on at the next Board meeting because it has to be on the agenda at least a month. The Board does not meet in November. Therefore, even if we pass this now, December would be the earliest that the Board would consider this proposal.

Professor Thelin said that since they were a University Senate not a faculty senate, why don't they have some other appointed mechanism and suggest that the appointment be made, for example, by the Senate Council. If the concern is there is not time for a vote, have another appointment and recommend that it not be made by the chair of the board.

The Chair said that, as he recalled the discussion, the idea was that this had the best chance of getting approval.

Professor Thelin said he would wonder how much contact or knowledge the Chairman of the Board of Trustees has with the staff of the University. If you are talking plausibility, here is a chance to assert a greater role in governance rather than forfeit it.

Professor Infanger (Agriculture) said that the Board has an elected staff trustee. The University Senate has no staff elected in this body. The Board has someone who has a direct connection back to the staff; we have no direct connection back to the staff.

There was no second to the amendment. The proposal passed in a show of hands.

Professor Canon asked the Chair if the Senate would be holding the initial nomination phase for the faculty committee members this fall?

The Chair said he would be talking with Billy Joe Miles, but he wanted to wait and see what his timetable, was and, depending on that, they certainly could do so.

Kelly Shields (Student-Business and Economics) said that the Student Government is trying to get more student representation on the search committee. It is not necessarily that they oppose having a staff member on the committee, but they will be formulating their own resolution to restructure the search committee beyond necessarily adding a staff person. At this time, they do not feel they could support this proposal.

Chairperson Moore said they would now move to the discussion items. The way discussion items work is that they are for discussion only. Amendments can be proposed but they can not be voted on. Any amendments that require action will have to be part of what is presented after the discussion by the Senate Council or would have to be proposed when this comes back up for an actual vote. The Council has not taken a position on either one of the discussion items but wanted to see how the discussion went and what concerns there were and then take the two proposals and vote on them.

ACTION ITEM 5 - FOR DISCUSSION ONLY: Proposal to revise the general education program (USP). See Attachment II.

Chairperson Moore said that they would begin with the General Education Program and recognized Dean Phil Kraemer to lead the discussion.

Dean Kraemer made the following remarks:

Let me begin by first thanking on behalf of the entire University, the members of last year's University Studies Committee. I think that this group of individuals faced a very difficult challenge To try to find a way in which we could improve the University Studies Program which represents our general studies curriculum. I think that they are also to be applauded for having developed three recommendations that will indeed allow us to improve the quality of the University Studies Program while also maintaining the strength of the current curriculum. I would just add as an editorial comment I think it is important that as we talk about curriculum reform, we recognize that a curriculum represents more than a list of courses. I think that it represents our attitudes and values toward higher education as well as our hopes and aspirations for our students. I think for an institution to engage in a reform of the general studies curriculum based merely on expedience or practicality would probably be an institution unworthy of the kind of bold aspirations we now hold for ourselves. Again I commend the committee for having faced a difficult problem and having done so by keeping a close eye on improving the quality of this general studies curriculum.

The three recommendations, I believe have been circulated. What was circulated was a part of the memo that went forth from the University Studies Committee to the Senate Council. It includes all the pertinent information for each of the three recommendations. There is a rationale included, and I think the rationale speaks for itself. I don't find it necessary to add more to what is available in the attachments. I would point out that as we go through these, this is more than just trying to simplify the curriculum. As I tried to imply in my opening comments, I think that is something we need to be very cautious about.

Let's proceed through, beginning with the first recommendation. It reads to change the disciplinary requirements in humanities and natural sciences in such a way as to allow students to satisfy this portion of University Studies by taking any two courses on the current list of approved courses in the humanities and natural sciences. I would add one editorial comment with respect to this particular recommendation. I think one thing it does that is very positive is that it will enhance the breadth of exposure of our students to the sciences. In looking at the originating documents for the University Studies Program, I think that the intent was always to expose our

students to sciences as a way of knowing, and, given that objective, I think that by exposing them perhaps, if they so choose, to two different sciences would not be a bad thing.

The second recommendation is to abandon the Cross-Disciplinary requirement and allow students instead to choose any six hours of free electives at the 200-level or above as long as they are outside the major. I think that part of the concern with this area of University Studies was somewhat practical in that this part of the curriculum was believed not to be working very well that the original intent was to link the courses in pairs that had a legitimate intellectual connection. We have violated that over the years and in some situations students have not taken the courses in close temporal proximity. There has not been the kind of conversation between faculty that are teaching the paired courses. Students have expressed some very legitimate concerns that the courses are not offered as they should be.

The third recommendation is to expand the definition of the Cross-Cultural requirement in a way that will allow the inclusion to focus on diversity within the United States.

I think that when you look at all three recommendations--if you do have your eye on simplification--you can see some simplification in that all three of these recommendations do make the curriculum less restrictive. I would encourage you to keep your eye on the quality of the University Studies Program as we engage in our discussion.

The Chair said the floor was open for questions.

Doug Boyd (Communications and Information Studies) said he would like to commend both Phil and the committee. My belief over the years is that not only do students not understand the present situation, but many faculty do not also. I think that it contributes to time degree problems. There is no evidence that going this way will in any way lessen the educational experience. I think this kind of thing is very positive.

Mark Meier (Chemistry) said he would like to emphasize and amplify what was just said. The current system actually hurts the retention rate. A lot of people get very frustrated very early on and simply give up. I do have my eye on simplification and think that is what I am seeing here.

Brad Canon asked what kind of courses they have in mind that would fulfill recommendation three? He felt that was important in deciding whether they want to adopt this. Otherwise, they would be adopting a vague pig in a poke.

Professor Kraemer said he had not actually seen the kinds of lists of courses. He asked for someone from last year's committee to address the question. He assumed that all of the courses that would be put forth would go through the normal channels of approval. If they are existing courses, they would have to go to the University Studies committee for approval there. If they are new courses, they would go through the Undergraduate Council as well as the USP committee.

Jonathan Golding (Psychology) said that these courses were not decided upon yet. That it was the general principle that was being discussed. It would be opened up so that basically whatever courses people would want to satisfy this requirement would have to go to the committee as with any cross-cultural course. It was more the general principle that was raised, nothing specific.

Anibal Biglieri (Spanish and Italian) said no, the committee didn't feel it was necessary and useful at this stage of the discussions to enter in those details. All we were doing was to submit to the Senate some broad recommendations; if approved, then we will have to discuss what courses (those already in place or new ones) could satisfy this requirement.

Joe Anthony (LCC) said that he recognized that cross-disciplinary courses have not worked out as well as they had hoped, and there are practical difficulties with them. I get the feeling that we

have abandoned all hope for recommendation too of trying to mix the disciplines. With just two courses outside the department, will that do the original idea or even come close to it, to broaden student's education? I recognize that what we have is not working. I helped design a couple of those cross-disciplines, and I see that they don't really do what they originally intended. I am disappointed in just abandoning the cross-disciplinary and telling them to take two courses outside. I am afraid that we have also abandoned the original intent with the cross-cultural as well. There is a lot of diversity inside the United States, but the idea was to get them outside the United States. I am afraid there will be a lot of Appalachian students taking lots of Appalachian courses. How are we to determine they are actually stepping outside their culture, which is what cultural diversity was intended to accomplish?

Professor Golding said that the first point made about the cross-disciplinary is that it is not working, and it has not been working for a number of years, no matter what the original intent was. What they think is going to happen is that departments, and many departments now have that huge listing that covers one and a half pages in the Schedule of Classes, many departments will just keep with the small number of courses that they have their students taking now. In some departments they are required courses. They are not even part of cross-disciplinary. Many departments will just keep that. You say that you are disappointed in us. The year that we spent looking over this we tried to think of other possible alternatives. For right now, there is none. It is going to take a great deal of work either by that committee or some other committee to figure out a way to deal effectively with cross-disciplinary studies. It is a problem that requires a lot of resources and a lot of thinking by everyone in the University. The issue was still in the end whether to keep this, in a sense, charade going or not. The committee felt, and it was a very difficult decision, that basically it has gone on too long. I will give an example to show the problem. I think it must be clear what kinds of practical problems there are. There is one pairing of an anthropology course and a family studies course. The family studies course basically is opened up to 800 students. The anthropology course can only be taken by 200 students. So now you have a problem. There are 600 students who are dying to get into that Anthropology 255. What makes it worse Anthro realized this is just too much of a hassle for them, and they are dropping 255. So now it is a little game. Did they consult with family studies? No. They had to make a tough decision, what was best for them. Again, I hope you can understand, as it seems you do, that there were practical considerations that had to be dealt with. There will be a lot work I'm sure in the future from Phil's office and others trying to figure out how to deal with this cross-disciplinary problem.

Dean Kraemer said that different studies preclude them going back and trying to find perhaps another way to implement what was a pretty good principle--to expose students to the limits of their own discipline where other disciplines come in especially in the world in which we are trying to emphasize interdisciplinary. It doesn't necessarily mean that they have to forgo forever.

Bill Maloney (Engineering) said that his concern was with the general education possibilities. Now you just have to take two 200 level courses outside your department. What is to stop civil engineering students from taking mechanical engineering courses to satisfy that?

Professor Golding said that the argument was still that hopefully those of you in engineering within a specific area of engineering are not going to just let the students do whatever they want. Understanding that yes, in the end, the student responsibility for what course. But the thought is that it is going to take work on the part of faculty advising students to talk to them and make them understand that this situation is not the best. Is that going to work? Are we playing games with ourselves? Perhaps. It is just like the cross-cultural issue. It is going to take work on the part of faculty and advisors to help guide the students for what is best. These problems are going to arise. There are probably measures that can be taken to make sure that does not happen. That is down the line. Those are the mechanics. We, again, are trying to deal with the broad principles.

Professor Maloney said that they advise students, sign off on their curriculum sheet, and they go to register and take whatever they want.

Dean Kraemer said that another implication to this particular recommendation is by going to free electives, there is something very different than in the past whereby every University Studies program course has been approved by University Studies Committee.

Professor Canon asked if they did not already required six hours of free electives in the Undergraduate Program? Recommendation 2 abandons the cross-disciplinary requirement and allow students to choose six hours of free electives at the 200-level or above which are outside the department. Nothing was said about University Studies. Why not just abandon cross-disciplinary and let it go at that?

Dean Kraemer said that was exactly right. That was different than the other requirements that have courses associated with them and have all been approved by the University Studies Committee.

Beth Rompf (Social Work) said that another problem was they were assuming that the person has declared a major to know what is outside their department.

Dean Kraemer said that was correct. He was a little worried about simply abandoning it and opening it up as free electives, but maybe that is the intent of the committee.

Professor Golding said the one thing he could say about whether students had chosen a major or not was that the cross-disciplinary courses, given that they are 200-level and above even now, the thinking is that students are not taking them as freshmen when most students are undeclared. It is true students are still undeclared as sophomores and even as juniors, regrettably. The thought is that the undeclared student takes some courses in social work and then decides to become a psychology major. The student has not lost anything by taking that social work course. If you think about it in the way of losing, the student has lost three credit hours, but no matter what the hours will count toward the total number to graduate, and yes, it may be the case because of the way the hours are distributed the student might be forced to take another course.

Enid Waldhart (Communications and Information Studies) asked if the proposal would go into effect in fall 2000? Does that mean at that point everyone gets to meet the new requirements? It makes a certain amount of sense to do that, but on the other hand, if there is wind that this might come along, there might be a sort of unguided choice of courses.

Dean Kraemer said he had not seen that either. He asked when it would go through for a vote?

The Chair said it would have to go on the Senate Council agenda. It could be possible for it to take effect in fall 2000.

Professor Anthony said that he did not quite understand the discussion of number 2. Would the department guide in six hours of free electives?

Professor Golding said that what he understood about how advising goes in many but not all. He could speak for his own. Right now students in psychology, all 700, basically take a very few number of pairings. What is going to happen, is still these courses are important courses for psychology major, many of the students will be guided towards still taking those courses. Now they are not viewed as a pair. They are just two important courses. This is true in other majors, also.

Professor Anthony said the students would be guided, not mandated.

Chairperson Moore said if anyone had concerns about the general education program, he or she should let Dean Kraemer or himself know.

The Chair said that the next item on the agenda, which is the last item for discussion, is a proposal to develop a tenured faculty review policy.

ACTION ITEM 6 - FOR DISCUSSION ONLY: Proposal to Develop a Tenured Faculty Review Policy.

The attached draft proposal was developed by the Steering Committee for Development of a Tenured Faculty Review Policy and will be discussed at the Senate meeting on October 11. A copy of the draft report is available on the Senate Website as well.

It is anticipated that the Senate will take formal action on the proposal in November or December, 1999. If approved it will be forwarded to the President as a recommendation for incorporation into the appropriate Regulations.

Memorandum

TO: University Senate Council, University of Kentucky

FROM: Committee for Development of a Tenured Faculty Review Policy

Kim Anderson
Jim Applegate, Chair
Nolen Embry
Richard Greissman
Michael Kennedy
Roy Moore
Lois Nora Sue Rimmer

RE: Submission of Policy Draft

DATE: July 6, 1999

Upon receipt of a grant from the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), the University Senate Council appointed this Steering Committee in late Fall 1998 to guide the development of a University-wide tenured faculty review and development policy. In the Spring of 1999 the Steering Committee reviewed policies from around the country and regularly reported progress to the University Senate and Administration. In March 1999 the Committee sponsored a campus conference on the issue involving experts from around the country, all segments of the University community, and faculty leaders from campuses around the State (see Conference and other Committee resource material at <http://www.uky.edu/USC/>). The components of the policy were reviewed at a June 1999 meeting in Washington, D.C. of institutions funded by AAHE post-tenure review grants. The Steering Committee now submits this policy, with unanimous committee approval, to the Senate Council.

We have recommended a process for approval that insures full faculty debate and control of the process. We have outlined proposals to fund faculty development efforts required by the policy: funds to reward excellence and address problems in performance. We hope that University Senate and Administrative review can be completed in time to allow for implementation in Fall 2000.

Many of the guiding principles used in the development of this policy are captured in the 1997 report on post tenure review provided by the American Association of University Professor (AAUP) (Academe, September/October, 1997). We felt any policy must:

- Ensure protection of academic freedom
- Be committed to peer review
- Take into account review procedures already in place
- Be campus/faculty initiated and adapted to the institutional mission

- Be clearly differentiated from dismissal for cause procedures
- Be developmental in focus and supported by adequate institutional resources
- Be flexible, allowing disciplines, colleges, and campuses to achieve a "fit"
- Ensure confidentiality and adequate opportunity for faculty feedback/appeal
- Be built on our trial A&S policy already in place
- Contain procedures requiring periodic review and change of the policy

The Committee approached the development of a tenured faculty review and development policy as a means of strengthening and preserving academic tenure. We view tenure as critical to sustaining institutional excellence. It requires years of probation during which faculty performance is stringently assessed. It allows scholars freedom to pursue independent lines of inquiry. It encourages a spirit of institutional service and responsibility. Tenure does not insulate faculty from regular evaluation. In fact, few professions are practiced more publicly than ours: before students in teaching, peers in publishing, and colleagues/citizens in service and outreach. In addition, tenured faculty at the University of Kentucky are reviewed for merit and salary purposes at least every two years.

This policy helps faculty communicate and coordinate their work with one another and the institution's goals. For the two or so percent of faculty who are in serious need of professional assistance this policy provides a means of identifying the problem and offering solutions that increase productivity. In extreme cases, the policy may fail. This could result in the institution of separate and independent dismissal for cause procedures already in place in this and most other universities. However, the policy primarily (a) provides greater recognition and support to tenured faculty whose excellent performance serves the institution (b) recognizes changing circumstances and interests of faculty across their careers, adjusting roles and rewards accordingly, and (c) identifies and addresses problems in performance through peer review and collaborative planning.

Specifically, the policy contains several new features that build on the current system for conducting regular performance or "merit" reviews of tenured faculty for purposes of salary increases. It requires that:

1. Each academic unit must develop a clear set of expectations for satisfactory performance for tenured faculty linked to the distribution of effort agreement required of all faculty. Merit reviews and distribution of effort agreements are more tightly integrated. In addition, a performance review system must be in place in which the lowest performance rating is "unsatisfactory."
2. A developmental review of tenured faculty must be integrated into the current performance review cycle every six years. This review is formative in nature and sets the goals and plans against which distributions of effort and performance evaluations are conducted over the subsequent six years.
3. A consequential review process must be instituted for any faculty member receiving two successive unsatisfactory performance reviews (over a two or four year period depending on the frequency of the reviews) in a substantial area of work. This review is summative in nature and demands plans to improve performance within a specified period.

The last item follows from the pilot consequential review process that has been in effect in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Kentucky for the last four years. The first two items, however, are designed to encourage collegiality and mutual goal setting on the campus.

The Committee originally focused on the consequential review as the defining feature of post-tenure review. However, our review of national trends and conversations with colleagues on campuses with post-tenure review, as well as those doing research in the area, convinced the Committee that if we are to reap maximum benefit from such a policy it must have a strong proactive, developmental component. We heard again and again of the benefits that come from all tenured faculty sharing accomplishments and plans with unit administrators and colleagues: increased collegiality, better appreciation of differences, greater alignment of individual faculty goals with department, college, and university goals, more effective realignment of faculty roles and rewards with changing individual interests as faculty progress along natural career trajectories, better understanding of the reward system.

Post-tenure review systems that focus only on the tiny percentage of faculty evidencing serious performance problems require more investment for less return, proportionally. Moreover, the framing of a consequential review aimed at unsatisfactory performance within a more explicit, proactive, six-year development review process in which expectations and long-term goals are clear reduces the need for consequential reviews. It also increases the quality of performance reviews and the developmental plans they produce.

The primary objection to the inclusion of a six-year developmental review for all tenured faculty is increased administrative burden. We have addressed that concern in several ways: the six year review is done at the same time as the traditional biennial performance review, the additional materials required for the developmental review are minimal, the people and processes currently used for the biennial review could be used for the developmental review if the unit wishes, and, finally, in setting the long term framework for the faculty member's activities, the six year review should simplify the subsequent biennial reviews.

We anticipate proposals to eliminate the six-year review. We urge against that. This process addresses many of the problems our campus faces: fragmentation of faculty work, low levels of awareness of colleagues goals, plans, and accomplishments that lessen the general level of collegiality, failure to symbolically and concretely reward and recognize faculty accomplishments on a widespread and systematic basis, lack of identification with institutional goals and plans.

The Committee listened to colleagues from similar schools who spoke with passion about the positive effects of periodic developmental review. Some departments instituted special dinners and ceremonies to acknowledge faculty accomplishments (once those were generally known). Collegiality increased. The broader community learned, as a matter of course, of faculty work and goals thus increasing opportunities for development of transdisciplinary collaborations. Faculty better understood the merit reward system and why some colleagues were more rewarded than others. To be sure, some academic units undercut the process through perfunctory efforts at goal setting and communication. However, enough engaged the process with good outcomes that those with whom we spoke were convinced of its worth, even some who had been skeptical at first (e.g., a chair of a department at another major state land grant institution with 62 faculty, 58 of whom were tenured).

In sum, we offer a three-part policy with each part improving the outcomes of the other two. As noted in the policy proposal, we also have recommended a process for approval that insures full faculty debate and control of the process. We have outlined proposals to fund faculty development efforts required by the policy: funds to reward excellence and address problems in performance. We look forward to its consideration by the University community.

TENURED FACULTY REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY

Submitted to University Senate Council by

Steering Committee for Development of a Tenured Faculty Review Policy

July 6, 1999

TENURED FACULTY REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY: DRAFT PROPOSAL

Preamble

With the end of the Cold War and the reconfiguration of society's demographic, economic, and social character at the dawn of a new Millennium, has come the demand that higher education and the disciplines within it reconsider our role. We are, traditionally, the institution primarily charged with the generation and dissemination of knowledge that challenges and enriches the human condition. However, society now demands we more specifically justify the huge investment being made in research and teaching institutions. Leaders call for "engaged campuses" that create partnerships with local, state, national, and international communities improving our intellectual, spiritual, and material lives.

The increased concern for defining and increasing the contributions of higher education has created great concern for assessment and accountability. This, in turn, has fostered rethinking of some of higher education's most time-honored practices. Among these is the granting of tenure. Across the United States, universities are examining the processes through which tenure is granted and the ways in which faculty are evaluated after the granting of tenure. Faculty roles and reward systems are being revised to reflect greater awareness of the multiple forms of scholarship can produce and the need greater engagement with society. The University Senate of the University of Kentucky only last year approved just such a massive reform in its promotion and tenure system, which now awaits administrative implementation.

Logically, now the University Senate is considering the issue of how best to review and facilitate continued contributions from its tenured faculty. Four years ago a pilot "post tenure review" policy was put into place in the University's largest College of Arts and Sciences [<http://address here>]. In 1998, the State Legislature

called for the development of such policies at all State Universities and asked the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education to report on institutional progress in developing such policies in the Fall of 1999. In the Fall of 1998, the University Senate Council received a grant from the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) to explore development of a University-wide post tenure review policy (i.e., applying to the Lexington Campus including the Lexington Community College and the Medical Campus).

The University Senate Council appointed a Steering Committee in late Fall 1998 to oversee the development of a University-wide tenured faculty review and development policy. In the Spring of 1999 the Steering Committee reviewed policies from around the country and regularly reported progress to the University Senate and Administration. In March, 1999 the Committee sponsored a campus conference on the issue involving experts from around the country, all segments of the University community, and faculty leaders from campuses around the State (see Conference and other Committee resource material at <http://www.uky.edu/USC/>). The components of the policy were reviewed at a June 1999 meeting in Washington, D.C. of institutions funded by AAHE post tenure review grants. The Steering Committee now submits this policy to the Senate Council with suggestions for necessary funding and an implementation plan that ensures continued broad discussion of the policy. We hope for implementation by Fall, 2000.

Philosophical Foundations

One of the Committee's first tasks was to articulate the basic assumptions or guiding principles for the development of the policy, based on its reading of national debates on 21st Century approaches to faculty roles and rewards policies, faculty development policies, and post tenure review policies. Many of the guiding principles adopted are captured in the 1997 report on post tenure review provided by the American Association of University Professor (AAUP) (*Academe*, September/October, 1997). We felt any policy must:

- Ensure protection of academic freedom
- Be committed to peer review
- Take into account review procedures already in place
- Be campus/faculty initiated and adapted to the institutional mission
- Be clearly differentiated from dismissal for cause procedures
- Be developmental in focus and supported by adequate institutional resources
- Be flexible, allowing disciplines, colleges, and campuses to achieve a "fit"
- Ensure confidentiality and adequate opportunity for faculty feedback/appeal
- Be built on our trial A&S policy already in place
- Contain procedures requiring periodic review and change of the policy

The Committee approached the development of a tenured faculty review and development policy as a means of strengthening and preserving academic tenure. We view tenure as critical to sustaining institutional excellence. It requires years of probation during which faculty performance is stringently assessed. It allows scholars freedom to pursue independent lines of inquiry. It encourages a spirit of institutional service and responsibility. Tenure does not insulate faculty from regular evaluation. In fact, few professions are practiced more publicly than ours: before students in teaching, peers in publishing, and colleagues/citizens in service and outreach. In addition, tenured faculty at the University of Kentucky are reviewed for merit and salary purposes at least every two years.

This policy helps faculty communicate and coordinate their work with one another and the institution's goals. For the two percent of faculty who are in serious need of professional assistance this policy provides a means of identifying the problem and offering solutions that increase productivity. In extreme cases, the policy may fail. This could result in the institution of separate and independent dismissal for cause procedures already in place in this and most other universities. However, the policy primarily (a) provides greater recognition and support to tenured faculty whose excellent performance serves the institution (b) recognizes changing circumstances and interests of faculty and the

institution across time, adjusting roles and rewards accordingly, and (c) identifies and addresses problems in performance through peer review and collaborative planning.

Specifically, the policy contains several new features that build on the current system for conducting regular performance or "merit" reviews of tenured faculty for purposes of salary increases. It requires that:

1. Each academic unit must develop a clear set of expectations for satisfactory performance for tenured faculty linked to the distribution of effort agreement required of all faculty. In addition, a performance review system must be in place in which the lowest performance rating is "unsatisfactory."

2. A developmental review of tenured faculty must be integrated into the current performance review cycle every six years. This review is formative in nature and sets the goals and plans against which distributions of effort and performance evaluations are conducted over the subsequent six years.

3. A consequential review process must be instituted for any faculty member receiving two successive unsatisfactory performance reviews (over a two or four year period depending on the frequency of the reviews) in a substantial area of work. This review is summative in nature and demands plans to improve performance within a specified period

The last item follows from the pilot consequential review process that has been in effect in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Kentucky for the last four years. The first two items, however, are designed to encourage collegiality and mutual goal setting on the campus.

The Committee originally focused on the consequential review as the defining feature of post-tenure review. However, our review of national trends and conversations with colleagues on campuses with post-tenure review, as well as those doing research in the area, convinced the Committee that if we are to reap maximum benefit from such a policy it must have a strong proactive, developmental component. We heard again and again of the benefits that come from all tenured faculty sharing accomplishments and plans with unit administrators and colleagues: increased collegiality, better appreciation of differences, greater alignment of individual faculty goals with department, college, and university goals, more effective realignment of faculty roles and rewards with changing individual interests as faculty progress along natural career trajectories, better understanding of the reward system.

Post-tenure review systems that focus only on the tiny percentage of faculty evidencing serious performance problems require more investment for less return, proportionally. Moreover, the framing of a consequential review aimed at unsatisfactory performance within a more explicit, proactive, six-year development review process in which expectations and long-term goals are clear reduces the need for consequential reviews. It also increases the quality of performance reviews and the developmental plans they produce.

The primary objection to the inclusion of a six-year developmental review for all tenured faculty is increased administrative burden. We have addressed that concern in several ways: the six year review is done at the same time as the traditional biennial performance review, the additional materials required for the developmental review are minimal, the people and processes currently used for the biennial review could be used for the developmental review if the unit wishes, and, finally, in setting the long term framework for the faculty member's activities, the six year review should simplify the subsequent biennial reviews.

We anticipate proposals to eliminate the six-year review. We urge the Senate not to do so. This process addresses many of the problems our campus faces: fragmentation of faculty work, low levels of awareness of colleagues goals, plans, and accomplishments that lessen the general level of collegiality, failure to symbolically and concretely reward and recognize faculty accomplishments on a widespread and systematic basis, lack of identification with institutional goals and plans.

The Committee listened to colleagues from similar schools who spoke with passion about the positive effects of periodic developmental review. Some departments instituted special dinners and ceremonies to acknowledge faculty accomplishments (once those were generally known). Collegiality increased. The broader community learned, as a matter of course, of faculty work and goals thus increasing opportunities for development of transdisciplinary collaborations. Faculty better understood the merit reward system and why some colleagues were more rewarded than others. To be sure, some academic units undercut the process through perfunctory efforts at goal setting and communication. However, enough engaged the process with good outcomes that those with whom we spoke were convinced of its worth, even some who

had been skeptical at first (e.g., a chair of a department at another major state land grant institution with 62 faculty, 58 of whom were tenured).

In sum, we offer a three-part policy with each part improving the outcomes of the other two. A detailed description follows.

The Policy

A. Developing Expectations for Satisfactory Performance

Each academic unit will develop a narrative statement of its expectations for adequate or satisfactory faculty performance by tenured faculty. Such statements shall include expectations for the areas of performance as they are defined by percentage effort allocated to each area on the distribution of effort agreement (DOE) generated annually for each faculty member. They shall be differentiated by rank, level of seniority if relevant, and they shall be as specific as is possible without unduly restricting the recognition of the diverse contributions that individual faculty members may make. This statement, once agreed upon by the faculty of the academic unit, will be reviewed by the appropriate college advisory committee and the dean to assure that the faculty performance expectations are in keeping with the established mission of the college and that they do not fall below college expectations for faculty performance. The approved statement of expectations will be the basis on which all reviews of performance are conducted. Building on the statements of expectations each college will develop a merit-rating system in which the lowest level of performance is identified as "unsatisfactory." The definition of performance expectations for tenured faculty should be consistent with and naturally follow from the departmental document outlining expectations for performance for untenured faculty mandated in the promotion and tenure revised regulations currently under administrative review.

The development of clear expectations for faculty performance will be useful only if these are clearly communicated within the current process of faculty performance (merit) reviews and the creation of annual distribution of effort agreements. The DOE defines the focus of faculty work and the performance review evaluates its quality. To make clear what is already University policy, academic unit heads are required to meet with each faculty member to develop the faculty member's DOE for the coming year and are obliged to do the same in the communication of the results of performance reviews.

We strongly recommend, in addition, that after completion of each performance review, these two meetings (the communication of review results and the development of DOE agreements) occur as a single meeting at which the past and future activities of the faculty member are discussed within the context set by the six year developmental review. Further, this policy requires such a meeting when the faculty member receives unsatisfactory ratings or ratings at the level just above unsatisfactory.

B. Periodic Developmental Review of All Tenured Faculty Every Six Years

With the intent of facilitating continued professional development, all tenured faculty members will undergo formal periodic review of their professional activities for purposes of assessment every six years. The process begins during the Fall semester of the sixth year and results in a final written development plan no later than the end of the following Spring semester. The periodic review is done in conjunction with the faculty member's required biennial or annual merit review.

The periodic faculty review: 1) recognizes long-term meritorious performance; 2) improves quality of faculty efforts in teaching, research, and service; 3) increases opportunities for professional development; and 4) uncovers impediments to faculty productivity. The written report generated by the periodic review provides goals and plans for faculty activity for at least a six-year period. These goals and plans will inform subsequent annual or biennial merit reviews and will be reflected in the faculty member's Distribution of Effort agreement during the subsequent six-year period. The goals and plans should be consistent with the mission, goals, and plans of the faculty member's academic unit and of the University of Kentucky.

Each academic unit¹ shall develop a plan for the six-year periodic review of tenured faculty as part of its unit rules. This review process should be consistent with traditional principles of peer review as embodied in the current University requirement for peer input into performance ("merit") reviews. Separate reviews mandated for consideration for promotion in rank or due to inadequate performance (see the Consequential Review) may substitute for this faculty review. In those cases, those review policies shall take precedence.

The principal instrument of the six year developmental review of faculty will be a written report generated by the faculty member under review that addresses for the period of review: 1) teaching, advising, and other educational activities; 2) research, scholarly or creative activities; 3) documented service activities to the University, state, nation, professional community, or other organizations and 4) a statement of goals and plans for the subsequent six years following from the focus and accomplishments outlined in items 1-3. The report may include an annotated synopsis of peer or public review processes, which the faculty member has undergone since the previous periodic review. This written report shall be appraised by a peer review committee, as specified in the unit rules, as a means of increasing consistency between individual, unit, and University goals and as a means of increasing communication and collegiality among colleagues. The peer committee will prepare a brief written appraisal of the report for use by the unit administrator and the faculty member in finalizing goals and plans for the subsequent six-year period.

The results of a periodic review should have major influence on a faculty member's future, and on the rewards to the faculty member. The results of a review should generate a discussion between a faculty member and the unit administrator. This discussion should concentrate on the future professional development of the faculty member. The faculty member and the unit administrator shall prepare a firm written development plan, with timetable, for enhancing meritorious work and improving performance.

Initially, the six year periodic review of tenured faculty will be conducted on a rotating basis with one-third of each academic unit's tenured faculty reviewed during the first two years following the effective date of this policy, one-third in the third and fourth years, and one-third during the fifth and sixth years. Academic units will develop policies for implementing this initial rotation in a fair manner, minimizing administrative burden by coordinating the developmental six-year review with the performance ("merit") review.

C. The Consequential Review

The Consequential Review will be conducted with faculty for whom the performance ("merit") reviews indicate persistent inadequate performance. It is thus intended for a specific sub-group of the faculty who receive unsatisfactory ratings in an important area of effort in two successive performance ("merit") reviews. These are conducted annually or biannually as dictated by the rules of specific academic units.

Evaluation can be a positive force when used to encourage members of the faculty community to continue their professional growth and to remain professionally active. This policy emphasizes continuing engagement with all forms of scholarship and to provide incentives and resources to assist faculty members in remaining engaged.

Selection for consequential review. Each academic college and school will be expected to adopt a merit-rating scheme in which the lowest level of performance is identified as "unsatisfactory." Any tenured faculty member who receives a merit rating indicating unsatisfactory performance

for two successive biennial evaluation periods in any category (or categories) of activity on the distribution of effort agreement in which the faculty member's cumulative percentage of effort is more than 10 percent will be selected for a Consequential Review. An assignment with a DOE of 10 percent or less normally will be exempted from consideration for review. Upon recommendation of the department chair and approval of the dean, a faculty member subject to evaluation under this plan also may be exempted if there are extenuating circumstances (such as health problems). The faculty member shall have the right to appeal his or her merit rating as specified in University Governing and Administrative Regulations, and the selection of a faculty person for consequential review will not be undertaken until the final disposition of a merit appeal has been determined.

The department chair shall inform the faculty member of being selected for review and of the nature and procedures of the review. One option that would avoid a review would be for the faculty member to change his or her DOE so as to reduce below 10 percent the category in which he or she is deficient. This alternative follows from the notion of "multiple profiles" of a successful faculty member -- that is, that there need not be a "one-size-fits-all" DOE and that faculty members can contribute in a variety of ways to the multiple missions of the college. A change in the DOE would imply the assignment of new duties to the faculty member, and it would need to be approved by the department chair and the dean.

The review dossier. For faculty selected for consequential review, the department chair shall prepare a review dossier in consultation with the faculty member. The faculty member has the right and obligation to provide for the review dossier all the documents, materials, and statements he or she believes to be relevant and necessary for the review, and all materials submitted shall be included in the dossier. Ordinarily, such a dossier would include at least the following: an up-to-date vita, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research or creative work. The chair shall add to the dossier any further materials (prior evaluations, other documents, etc.) he or she deems relevant, in every case providing the faculty member with a copy of each item added. The faculty member shall have the right to add any material, including statements and additional documents, at any time during the review process.

The review process. The Consequential Review will be conducted by either

the department chair

a three member ad hoc faculty committee, not including the chair but including (a) one member of the college council selected by the dean and (b) one faculty member chosen by the College Council who do not serve on the Council, and (c) one member chosen by the faculty member

a subcommittee of the college council appointed by the council.

The faculty member will select the reviewing agent from these three options. The reviewing agent will create a development plan designed to remedy the deficiencies indicated in the performance reviews. Ideally, the plan should grow out of an iterative collaboration among the faculty

member, department chair, reviewing agent (if not the chair), and dean.

It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan once it is adopted. In the event that the faculty member objects to the terms of the plan, he or she may request an independent review of the plan by the appropriate college advisory committee. The committee's recommendation to the dean is advisory, and the dean will be the final arbiter at the college level. The faculty member also will have recourse to appeal to the appropriate chancellor. Once the appeal has been resolved, the plan will be implemented.

The plan must:

- 1) Identify the specific deficiencies to be addressed
- 2) Define specific goals or outcomes that are needed to remedy the deficiencies
- 3) Outline the activities that are to be undertaken to achieve the needed outcomes
- 4) Set timelines for accomplishing the activities and achieving the outcomes
- 5) Indicate the criteria for annual progress reviews
- 6) Identify the source of any funding which may be required to implement the development plan.²

Monitoring and follow-up. The faculty member and his or her department chair will meet annually to review the faculty member's progress towards remedying the deficiencies. A progress report will be forwarded to the Dean.

Further evaluation of the faculty member within the regular faculty performance evaluation processes of the University may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in this plan. However, the six-year developmental review process will be suspended during the plan period.

Completion of plan. When the objectives of the plan have been fully met, or in any case no later than three years after the start of the development plan, the department chair shall make a final report to the faculty member and the Dean. A prospective six-year developmental review will occur during the year when the next scheduled performance review occurs.

Dismissal for Cause

The successful completion of the development plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in this process must be committed. If the disengagement of some scholars derives in part from an organizational failure, the re-engaging of their talents and energies reflects a success for the entire University community. However, in

those rare cases where serious deficiencies continue to exist after the consequential review plans are completed the University may decide to initiate separate and independent dismissal for cause procedures currently in place. The multiple criteria for instituting the dismissal for cause process are independent from and extend beyond the scope of this review policy.

Faculty Professional Development Fund

The focus of the fund. The Faculty Professional Development Fund (FPDF) is established as a system of recognition, reward, and enhancement of faculty performance. It is designed to promote continuing professional growth and to encourage faculty to sustain patterns of strong performance and heightened motivation as academic unit priorities and personal direction change over careers.

The FPDF is a source of funding for supporting (1) the goals of the six year development plans of tenured faculty who have demonstrated exemplary performance as documented in the performance merit reviews and the six year developmental review and (2) the faculty development plans created out of the consequential reviews designed to improve unsatisfactory performance in major areas of faculty work. Examples of activities that might be funded as a result of goals established in the six year development plan or from plans generated by the consequential reviews to improve unsatisfactory performance include support for:

- a. International study, attendance at conferences, seminars, etc.
- b. Faculty returning to duties from administrative roles
- c. Redirection of the faculty member's career focus
- d. Efforts to secure extramural funding
- e. Enhancement of research skills
- f. Curriculum innovation
- g. Improvement in teaching and use of new instructional technologies

The allocation process. Each Chancellor would be charged with developing a process for allocating development funds based on six-year development, biennial performance, and consequential reviews. The Committee recommends that funding priority be given to activities tied to development plans generated by consequential reviews with other allocations made on a competitive basis. Given the special circumstances surrounding the consequential review, funding seems especially important. Not all plans will require funding or funding beyond the department level (satisfactory performance

is the norm with current support levels). However, where additional support is reasonable, to not provide support would make it difficult for the University to hold the faculty member accountable for improvement.

Funding levels. The University currently devotes a part of its resources to various programs aimed at faculty development (e.g., the Teaching and Learning Center on the Lexington Campus). We anticipate the various types of development plans generated by this policy would fully access current funds. However, the Committee reviewed current and proposed allocations for faculty development directly tied to tenured faculty review processes at several other institutions (e.g., the University of Georgia and Massachusetts systems, the University of Hawaii, and some private institutions).

Estimates are difficult given the inability to predict the number of consequential reviews that will be done four years after the implementation of the system and thereafter, the number of applications that will be made based on exemplary six year reviews, and the disciplines from which these will come.

The Committee recommends that the University designate \$75,000 for faculty development activities specifically linked to this senior faculty review policy during the second year following the effective date of implementation (when 1/3 of the tenured faculty will be reviewed). That amount should be added in each successive biennium so that a total of \$225,000 in recurring dollars is available by the sixth year when all faculty will have completed their six-year reviews and consequential reviews will be possible for almost all faculty. Obviously, funding should be modified based on use. However, this size fund, combined with current support for faculty development generally, should provide adequate funding.

The size of support for individual faculty will depend on discipline and the nature of the plans developed. The Committee recommends awards generally ranging in amount to \$6,000 annually with definite time limits for achieving goals and strong accountability measures. Awards may be higher depending on the nature of the plan and the discipline.

Eligibility. Any tenured University faculty member participating in the senior faculty development and review process is eligible for FPDF funds. Each application must include a professional development plan consistent with the mission, goals and plans of the faculty member's academic unit and college as well as the University of Kentucky's goals and strategic plans. The application must include letters of support from the head of the faculty member's academic unit, dean of their college, and the peer review body involved in their review. The plan must be based on either exemplary performance and goals documented in the six year review or goals and activities identified in the consequential review for improving areas of unsatisfactory performance.

Policy Review Procedures

At the conclusion of the second year following implementation and biannually thereafter, the unit heads will submit to the Office for Institutional Research a brief summary including but not limited to the following:

1. Number of faculty receiving unsatisfactory ratings in areas of effort in which the faculty member's distribution of effort is more than 10 percent
2. Number of faculty changing assignment as a result of the policy (including retirement, change in distribution of effort)
3. Number of faculty applying for and receiving professional development funds

At the conclusion of the fourth year and thereafter biennially the unit head will include, in addition to 1-3 above:

4. Number of faculty selected for Consequential Review based on unsatisfactory performance review
5. Number of faculty successfully completing development plans based on Consequential Review
6. A brief narrative account of other benefits and problems created by the policy

During the fifth year after the effective implementation date of this policy, the University Office for Institutional Research will survey a scientifically constructed sample of faculty and unit heads to determine perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the policy. The

Council will appoint a Policy Review Committee to use the analysis of survey results and the biennial unit head reports provided by the

Office for Institutional Research to review the policy and make recommendations by the end of the sixth year of the policy's operation.

Implementation

While not a part of the policy proposal itself, the implementation plan offered here is strongly recommended by the

Steering Committee to ensure full faculty and administration discussion of the plan and successful implementation of what emerges from that conversation.

Approval Plan. The Senate Council has received the plan in mid-Summer, 1999. The draft should be posted

immediately on the Council web site and distributed electronically to the campus (faculty and selected administration) as

a draft under Council consideration, inviting input. Senators especially should be encouraged to offer reactions based on

discussions with constituents. At the beginning of the Fall, 1999 semester the Council should have its own revised draft

of the proposal to present to the Senate for discussion only.

The current pilot Professional Review for Tenure Faculty policy in the College of Arts and Sciences was adopted in a

College-wide faculty plebiscite. The College of Arts and Sciences faculty recently passed a sense of the faculty

resolution urging that final adoption of a senior faculty review and development policy "occur only with the consent, by

majority vote, of the faculty voting."

Our committee is supportive of the logic informing this motion but we recommend a modification of this procedure. After the Senate has discussed the policy and had an opportunity to amend, Senators will be asked to conduct a plebiscite of their College constituents on the policy before the final vote. The results of the vote would inform the Senator's vote in the Senate. The Senate Council office will support the plebiscites. The Registrar with the help of the Council office will construct a common ballot, conduct the mailings for each College, and generally administer the election in each College requesting a vote. However, the final vote on the policy should be conducted by the University Senate. To do otherwise would be to undercut the Senate's role in setting academic policy.

Finally, we strongly suggest that whatever policy is approved by the Senate be submitted for administrative review with the formal condition that any substantive change in the policy nullifies Senate approval and requires reconsideration by the full Senate.

We hope a policy could become effective in Fall of 2000. The first set of periodic six-year reviews would be conducted in 2002 at the time of the normal performance ("merit") review for all tenured faculty (including those on a biennial review schedule.) This allows time for infrastructure development (see below). On the other hand, beginning the evaluation of the first 1/3 of the tenured faculty in 2000 also could be considered (see Timeline, Attachment 1)

Infrastructure Development to Support the Plan. If one clear message was delivered by all the colleagues with whom we consulted over the course of the year, it was that the success of any policy is dependent upon the development of a sound infrastructure to support its implementation from the outset.

Faculty Professional Development Fund. First and most importantly, the Administration must budget the requested amount for the Faculty Professional Development Fund. Without this fund the policy's usefulness is limited. Though monetary rewards and support are not the only methods for fostering improvement, without an adequate development fund the policy will be much less effective in rewarding and promoting excellent faculty performance and in improving unsatisfactory performance. Moreover, if the University does not budget to support specifically the improvement plans created under the consequential review, it will be less able to hold faculty accountable for performance improvement. Finally, the Committee believes it equally essential that such funds be competitively available for faculty doing excellent work to support them in pursuing goals that serve the University. In a time of limited operating budgets, to provide development funds only to those in difficulty would send a confusing message. Funds should be budgeted for 2002 if that is the year when the first third of tenure faculty go through the six-year developmental review.

Personnel development. One clear and consistent lesson was offered by other institutions and our national experts: we cannot underestimate the importance of providing educational support for faculty (who will serve on peer review committees as well as being reviewed), department chairs, and deans. These groups, most directly, must have the knowledge and communication skills to make this policy work for the common good. During the administrative review of the policy the Council should ensure that the appropriate offices on each campus [Lexington (including Lexington Community College) and Medical Center] are designing seminars that can be implemented as soon as the policy is in place. Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis has focused its AAHE grant activities on the development of materials for personnel involved in tenured faculty reviews. Texas A&M University also has focused a part of its efforts on this work.

Finally, the Committee suggests that even before implementation of the policy that Council or Committee members conduct meetings with faculty and administrative groups to place the current proposal in a national context. These would build on the March 1999 conference held on campus. Such conversations should facilitate debate on the policy and clarify the reasoning behind its components. It would be tragic if certain important features of the policy we know reflect best practices nationally were lost simply because they are not currently familiar to our campus.

Concluding Remarks

The Steering Committee has devoted an enormous amount of time and effort to the development of this policy. We have tried to set a broad campus discussion in motion. We appreciate the support of the Senate Council, its Chair, the Administration, and the AAHE. Our goal has been to develop a national model for post-tenure review policies that both enhances senior faculty development and ensures accountability. Our challenge has been to develop a policy applicable to a traditional campus, a medical center, and a community college.

Based on a review of work in this area nationwide, the March 1999 campus symposium, and assessment of our own pilot project in the College of Arts and Sciences, the Steering Committee has defined the components of a sound policy. The policy we offer will: (a) ensure accountability in the performance of tenured faculty (b) focus on maximizing the contributions of tenured faculty through development opportunities for all faculty (c) meet the criteria for fairness established by AAUP and other groups, and (d) minimize the administrative burden placed on faculty and administrators already deeply involved in multiple summative and formative evaluations of faculty, program, and student performance. In submitting the policy to the Senate Council at this time, we have met the timeline outlined in our grant proposal to AAHE.

It would have been easier to import a policy from elsewhere that met some, but not all of the goals, mentioned above. Similarly, we

simply could have proposed the pilot Arts and Sciences policy. However, we set out to first understand what was working and not working with various types of policies around the country at various types of institutions, including our own pilot. We understood that any proposed policy must apply not just to the College of Arts and Sciences but also to the diverse academic settings inside our University. As a result, we will now have a policy that avoids the pitfalls of earlier post tenure review efforts (e.g., overly cumbersome administrative procedures, violations of faculty rights to due process, confusion of post tenure review and dismissal for cause policies, failure to both improve deficient and enhance excellent senior faculty performance.) In the process, we also have placed ourselves in a position to exert national leadership in this important area of higher education reform.

We are available to the Senate Council or other groups to answer questions and provide background. This is, of course, now the Council's report. We look forward to the conversations to follow.

The Chair recognized Jim Applegate, who chaired the committee to give an overview.

Professor Applegate made the following remarks:

Today in my capacity as a Senior Fellow for the Council on Postsecondary Education I met with the legislative subcommittee on Postsecondary Education to whom the Council on Postsecondary Education reported on the progress of state institutions in developing post tenure review policies. If you will remember in the last legislative session there was a proposal to impose post-tenure review by legislative mandate. Thanks to the good work of the Council of Senate Faculty Leaders, of which I was a member at the time, and Loys Mather was the lead, that was averted. Senate Bill 11 did pass which asked the Council on Postsecondary Education to conduct a status review on progress among colleges in developing post-tenure review (PTR) policies and report. I want to let you know a little bit about the national and Kentucky context for our discussions and then highlight a couple of things about the proposal.

First, on the handout, if you look nationally, 32 states have system PTR policies right now. Eight states have pursued this on a college by college basis, which is what is happening in Kentucky. Only six states had to deal with this by legislative mandate. The Carnegie Study of private sector colleges shows that 46% of the institutions studied have policies in place and 28% have policies under consideration. So, PTR is not a new thing or something that only we are doing.

I should say that a lot of this information has been gathered as a part of the work that the committee did fund by the American Association of Higher Education as part of its faculty roles and rewards initiative, of which we are a part. We will be meeting with them in New Orleans to report where we are. There are 18 institutions that they funded to try to develop best practices in post tenure review and we are one of those.

If you look at the kinds of policies that exist around the country there are three basic types. The first one is pretty rare. It takes an annual review and beefs it up and requires more planning. There are a few of these but not very many.

The second more popular one is the formative-developmental policy which primarily looks at future planning. Very seldom does it have personnel actions associated with it. Maryland is a good example of this. Someone of you participated in the campus-wide symposium which we held in March of this year. We had a lot of people from around the country that have been heavily involved in the development of post tenure review policies including senior associates at the AAHE. Also the Chair of the English Department of Maryland who has 62 faculty, 58 of whom are tenured, 50 of whom are full professors, who instituted this kind of policy. He was very eloquent in his discussions of how he did not think it was such a good idea at first, but the years since they have done this have had an enormous effect on department, the collegiality, the awareness of one another's work, and the coming together around common goals.

The third most popular form of PTR is the one that almost every institution in Kentucky has either adopted or is considering adopting, is the summative review termed consequential or managerial by some. Usually it focuses on all tenured faculty or only those who are identified through some other performance review process as having something less than satisfactory performance. It is similar to the formative model in its focus on plans and measures to improve but it does often link to certain kinds of personal actions. (Reassignments or sometimes the initiation of dismissal procedures.)

There is not a lot of data on the effectiveness of these policies as yet. Although they have been implemented widely they are relative new. The University of Hawaii has a summative policy in place and reports only twelve percent of the faculty were evaluated as unsatisfactory of the 72 faculty reviewed. Twenty retired and the remaining fifty developed remediation plans. Forty-seven made satisfactory progress.

Let me just share briefly what has happened in Kentucky. Eastern Kentucky University has had the PTR policy approved by the Faculty Senate. It is under administrative review and is scheduled for final faculty approval and implementation in fall 2000. At Kentucky State University it has been approved by the Faculty Senate and is scheduled for the Board of Regents action October 1999. At Morehead State University it has been approved by the Faculty Senate and is scheduled for consideration of the Board of Regents Fall 1999. At Murray State University it has been approved by the Faculty Senate and is scheduled for consideration of the Board of Regents December 1999. At Northern Kentucky it is under administrative review and scheduled for Faculty Senate review in fall 1999 with implementation scheduled for spring or fall 2000. At the University of Louisville, they have had a policy for quite some

time. Evaluation to date show approximately five percent of the faculty received unsatisfactory post tenure reviews resulting in mediation plans. Western University implemented their policy this fall so it is just starting. KCTCS is just beginning to consider this process.

The policy we have proposed here for UK, is a policy that begins with an adoption of the AAUP Principles for post tenure review which is that any policy should ensure the protection of academic freedom. We want to strengthen tenure by ensuring accountability. One of the things that we said over and over again at the Legislature, in the last session, when there was a possibility, not a strong one, but a possibility, of a legislative mandate was that in fact if there were cases of misconduct or incompetence on the part of any faculty member, tenured or not, that the statutes currently allow for that person to be dismissed, in case of incompetence, failure to perform a duty, or moral turpitude. If something horrible is happening to put students at risk, for example, if that person was not removed that reflected administrative cowardliness and not a tenure problem. Tenure was never intended to protect that. Tenure was intended to protect the ability of faculty to engage in productive work free of the fear of restriction on academic freedom both in research, teaching, and community involvement.

I would highlight the other AAUP principles shared in the policy before you because we really tried to ensure that we follow those AAUP guidelines. I want to thank the committee member once again and Michael Kennedy representing AAUP on this committee. There will in fact be an AAUP Forum on this policy on October 26, 1999 at 3:30 p.m. in the Classroom Building, Room 110.

What we proposed was a policy that is a hybrid of the summative and the formative. It does take, with some modifications, the Arts and Sciences policy that suggested that faculty members who received two successive unsatisfactory performance reviews would be triggered into a more formal post tenure review with plans developed for improvement.

We looked around the country at what kind of money institutions put into these kinds of policies to fund improvement and we called for that kind of policy. We also in this policy allow for those funds to be available to faculty who are doing very well in their reviews. What we found was that the best policies are ones that are designed to raise everyone to new levels and give them the support they need in terms of true faculty development policy. So that if you are a chair and you have a faculty member who is doing very well but you feel like with some small support in one direction or another they could really move to another level, with this policy they are eligible for support as well, as well as of course the people who are perhaps because of their performance review situation have been triggered in need for policy to improve. It is not just aimed at remediation.

We also put in here and I know this will be one of the more controversial pieces, that all faculty would once every six years, one third every two years, at the time of their annual review, work with their peer review committee to talk about goals for the coming six years. If you read that, we tried to make that as minimally invasive in terms of paperwork as possible. What we wanted was just an opportunity, which we felt was sorely lacking, where faculty have a chance to sit down and think about the department/institution goals and their work.

I will say the committee, when we started were pretty much for going to triggered consequential review and we just thought to expand that and do it on campus. However, everywhere we went and everyone we talked to said that if all you do is focus on the small percent of poor performance it is hardly worth the trouble because it is such a small percentage people that will be involved. If you can get a policy that does not overly administratively burden people and get all people talking proactively and formatively about where they are headed in relation to their colleagues and with their colleagues, they had enormous positive results. The Chair at Maryland was particularly eloquent in that regard. If that is an issue we can bring someone like that here. That is one of advantages of having a grant. You can find out how he has done it with fifty-eight tenured faculty and fifty-full professors. We modeled this after Maryland because we wanted it to be the type of thing you could do easily. This is not a retenuing process at all.

Basically the triggered policy are for those who have performance review indications of problems. But everybody at least once every six years has a chance to set down with peers and talk about where they are headed in relation to the department. Money put aside to help both faculty doing very well and those in need of a plan for upgrading because of some performance review problems. Those are some key pieces of this and you have probably seen other features which have caught your eye and have questions about them.

Other members of the committee that are here are Nolen Embry from Lexington Community College, Michael Kennedy was here but had to leave, Lois Nora is now an ACE Fellow from our campus serving at Ohio State, and Roy Moore who is here.

Professor Tagavi said that obviously this is a monumental proposal that is going to affect their lives a lot. The goal is that this becomes a national model for post tenure review policy. When people realize this document is available on the Web, hundreds of universities are going to rush in and read it and the first sentence that they are going to read is "With the end of the Cold War and" These are really overused cliches and have no relationship with this proposal. He would like to make the recommendation that they drop the cliches.

Robert Gewirtz (Medicine) did not quite understand what is meant by support, When you talk about if the chairman of the division or department sees that he has someone in their department who only had a little more support would go to the next level. What kind of crazy chairman would not be doing that already? How does this help that come about?

When you say support does that mean that they get another graduate student, a new technician, and some piece of glassware they do not have? One of the things in talking to the other professors, where he works it that they expect this

is some kind of financial reward. Is that what is being considered here? If so how is it being funded?

Professor Applegate said that on page 14 under the Faculty Professional Development Fund, it suggests that it is a source of funding for the six year development plans of tenured faculty who have demonstrated exemplary performance as documented in the performance merit reviews and the six year development review. This includes things like international study, attendance at conferences, faculty returning to duties from administrative roles, redirection of the faculty member's career focus, effort to secure extramural funding, enhancement of research

skills, curriculum innovation, and improvement in teaching and use of new instructional technologies. Here is the allocation process. Each Chancellor would be charged with developing a process for allocating development funds based on six-year development, biennial performance, and consequential reviews. The Committee recommends that funding priority be given to activities tied to development plans generated by consequential reviews. Obviously if you have someone who is having difficulties and thought they needed to be given priority in terms of support to get back on track. Not all plans require funding or funding beyond the department level. However when additional support is reasonable, to not provide support would make it difficult for the University to hold the faculty member accountable for improvement.

We did not go into a whole process of how this would be done. We did talk about the kinds of money that it would take and funding levels. We looked at other institutions, the Massachusetts System and the Hawaii System, and how much money they had put in.

Professor Gewirtz said that then specifically what it is not is an incentive system for the professors to perform.

Professor Applegate said it was not an incentive system as in salary. It is support for activities, either activities that for a faculty member who is doing very well but might warrant support in a particular area to help move them forward or in the case of the consequential review, the triggered review, the faculty member who has had two successive inadequate performance reviews and for which a plan is developed with their peers. This is really peer driven. These plans, for example, are created by a group of peers. We really wanted that piece to be in there. We wanted to sustain the guiding principle of peer review that we have here in our personnel process.

Professor Gewirtz said that the suggestion he would have is that this sort of stuff should be happening anyway. If there is someone in your department who needs to have additional funding so they can take grant to the NIH or whatever it is, that should be happening anyway if we are going to make ourselves a top twenty research institution. If you want people to perform better in post tenure, perhaps do include some type of incentive program. That is how people perform. That is what should be considered in post tenure review. It does not necessarily have to be salary. It could be other things.

That is probably the most direct way to get someone to have incentive to perform. It seems that one of the things that is going to happen with this type of review, one of the things that I always imagined tenure protecting you from, is that you can do research and not fear losing your job if that research turns out to be unpopular. Whereas, here this may be construed as a way of people who are doing unpopular research can then get a bad review and be subject to disciplinary action. They are not being protected from that sort of thing.

Professor Applegate said the normal appeal processes are still in place. You could get a low performance review, but, of course, those could be appealed. What we have done here is require peer review and there is an appeal process built in.

We did everything possible to ensure that type of scenario, which could occur now, would be checked and balanced by the appeal process

Geza Bruckner (Allied Health) asked about the folks that are already performing in exemplary fashion, five percent for example and five percent who fall into the deficient category. To move this institution forward to this next level, top twenty, what happens to the ninety percent that fall in the middle that could really be moved forward to that next level instead of rewarding the ones at the top and bottom? Obviously you want to keep rewarding the ones who are successful, and that is already built into the system. The chances of moving forward by targeting that middle group that are doing and struggling to get along, what happens to ninety percent of the faculty?

Professor Applegate said that the policy was not intended to provide all of the support for faculty development. There needs to be a lot more done in faculty development.

Professor Bruckner asked if the focus should not be on that?

Professor Applegate said that the policy is aimed primarily at working with faculty in relations to PTR specifications. To look proactively. One of the things that we came away with in talking to people on the campus, here, in addition to the fact that we did not want to add administrative burden, but still we really spend very little time looking out in a visionary way. We spend a lot of time, on performance reviews which are retrospective. They look over the previous two years.

How did you do? You did good. You did not so good. You did great, and you get this much money. There is very little conversation, particularly among peers about the future, even though we have a regulation that says that stuff is supposed to happen with peers. It turns out not all regulations are observed equally.

Our main thrust was to put in an element of accountability that would strengthen the tenure system for what is intended and to provide more opportunities for faculty to think about goal setting. As to the funding piece, we said primarily you have to have money to help people who are off track get back on track and force department chairs to have those conversations and get that happening. In looking at other policies, we found it works best when you can also have some monies available for good performance. Again this is marginal money, The amount of money spent for faculty development at this institution has to be a hundred times whatever this policy suggests. Most studies suggest that higher education as an idea industry spends less money on the development of its personnel than any other idea industry.

Professor Bruckner said that the message that is being sent is that you are either failing at faculty development or doing great.

Bill Fortune (Law) asked if the policies that had been adopted by Eastern and Kentucky States had the developmental review?

Professor Applegate said that almost all of them are summative reviews, but they have the developmental piece.

Summative review mainly is triggered by two unsatisfactory merit reviews in five years. The focus of the review is the creation of a peer review formal development plan through remediation. They are going to meet the conditions of the formal development plan and achieve a satisfactory performance review that results in personnel action. It is

consequential. Almost all the other policies are summative. Louisville, for example, evaluates everyone every five years

but the focus is on those people who are not getting satisfactory ratings and how to get them back on track.

Professor Fortune said they had received a memo from Mike Nietzel in August that was commenting on what he thought might be the administrative burdens which would be connected with the developmental review. He asked if Professor Applegate felt strongly that this is the heart of your recommendation, the developmental review?

Professor Applegate said that if he were to say the heart of it, he thinks it is that we have to have the consequential review, otherwise we do not have the obvious accountability of the system that he feels is necessary to preserve tenure. The committee did think about the formative piece, at first, as being important until they started talking to people from Maryland, Texas A & M, and other places that said that is where you get the payoff, the real change in your culture in your departments and where good things start to happen.

Professor Fortune asked if those places had enough experience with this over time so they are sold on it?

Professor Applegate said yes. Maryland, particularly.

Professor Thelin said that the danger was that if faculty conscientiously earnestly prepare this dossier and then you don't get a genuine discussion or response and there is little development money or rewards, then you may be counterproductive. You have built up false hope. They would be better off being more honest that they are really concerned more about deadwood and incompetence. It is a dangerous carrot to hold out.

Professor Applegate said he was not concerned with deadwood. He did not feel there was enough deadwood to be that concerned about. This is about a process to try and proactively help the institution do a better job of assisting faculty in getting their work done.

Professor Thelin asked who was going to assist faculty to get their work done?

Professor Applegate answered that one of the things that they do at Maryland is that they set the goals. They do not have that much money. They sit down with their peers in their department and talk about what you have done and what you plan to do in the next six years. In that conversation is shared some of their thoughts about the department and where it ought to go. The Chair is involved in the discussion of goals. They come to a kind of greater recognition of what everyone is doing and come to some greater consensus on where you are headed. You don't always get money for it. You are going to pursue your goals, but it creates a culture in which everybody is more aware of where everybody is headed, and there is support that begins to come from colleagues. Maybe we made a mistake in making this fund

available, but we thought there should be some availability for people whose special cases might need some support. We never intended that part of it to be that you get your six-year review and then you get a bunch of money to support your goals. The fund was never intended to be the faculty development fund. The assumption is that most of the money that is in the budget is in the budget and the department will work that either for ill or good to support the faculty. This was just an effort on just a minor scale, every six years, to get faculty to talk to one another about what they are doing and where they are headed and to try to bring more collegiality and a sense of common purpose.

John Garen (Economics) said he confessed a bit of puzzlement over the discussion of post tenure review both here and in Arts and Sciences in the last couple of years. He considers himself to already be reviewed every two years. This sounds like a bit of redundancy. They are reviewed every two years. It is not done by peers, so in some sense they have a more arduous review than what is recommended here. He appreciates the comments about improving collegiality in departments. That is very important. It seems that this a bit of intent to force collegiality in terms of development and a person's plan. For those who are doing well, it is a lot of work to put together a plan. It is a lot of work for chairs who are still active faculty in most cases and a lot of work for peers.

Professor Applegate said they had in mind the Maryland model. The understanding from the Chair at Maryland was basically the six-year review is no more than what they would normally do for a two-year performance reviews that are already in place, plus a brief document. A two page or so document that is a goal setting document. We could take it out but most everyone they talked to in their conversations nationally said that this piece is the most valuable piece of post tenure review. The summative piece is important for accountability purposes and for external consumption. The current biennial performance review to the outside public is not a PT Review. We argued that with the legislature last time. We said don't get the idea that tenured faculty are not reviewed. They are every two years, and it has consequences on salary. In the two year review someone could get bad performance reviews every two years and get low salary increases and nothing ever happens. He sees the policy as an effort to ensure that the institution helps faculty who are having problems.

Chairperson Moore said he felt the Council had gotten a pretty good flavor of the issues. The Council will certainly take all these ideas under consideration. If there are other questions, let the Council members know. There is a copy of this on the Senate Web site. The Senate Web site now also includes all the Senate committees, including those appointed by the President. Also on the Web site the Futures Committee has a very nice section.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Donald Witt
Secretary, University Senate

1 Academic unit typically refers to the academic department though in non-departmental colleges the college is the academic unit. In the latter case, the duties of the department chair reside with the dean.

2 Should the plan reasonably require monetary support from the University for completion, the plan must be submitted through the appropriate channels for funding (see "Faculty Professional Development Fund below). If adequate funding is not available the plan must be modified.
