

University of Kentucky



Office of the Chair
University Senate Council
10 Administration Building
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506-0032
(606) 257-5872; FAX (606) 323-1062
Senate Website: <http://www.uky.edu/USC/>

23 September 1999

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, 11 October 1999. Proposal to Develop a Tenured Faculty Review Policy FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

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*

US Agenda: PostTenureFacDev FDO.10.11.99

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

Kimberly W. Anderson
Associate Professor
Chemical Engineering

Michael Kennedy
Associate Professor, Geography
President, UK AAUP Chapter

Jim Applegate
Committee Chair
Professor, Communication
Immediate Past Senate Chair

Roy Moore
Professor, School of Journalism
Senate Council Chair

Nolen Embry
Professor,
Lexington Community College

Lois Nora
Professor, Department of
Neurology

Richard B. Greissman
Assistant Dean for Faculty
Affairs, College of Arts and
Sciences

Sue Rimmer
Associate Professor, Geological
Sciences

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://www.uky.edu/ArtsSciences/Facaffairs/postten.html>). 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:

4. 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.”
5. 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.
6. 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 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

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.

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 plan².

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.

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

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.

US Agenda Item: PostTenureFacDev.10.11.99.doc