Faculty Senate Recommendations

Most of the recommendations received from Faculty Senate were already in the proposed policy or have been added. The recommendations not included in the current version are noted below in red, policy office explanations are in blue, green shows portions that were in original proposed policy, and italics note portions included in the proposed policy.

Post Tenure Review

INTENT

Dixie State College currently (as of 2011) employs a number of evaluative processes that address faculty performance on the individual, peer, and administrative level. Although a Post Tenure Review (PTR) may use similar tools and reports, this policy is not being initiated to replace any pre-existing administrative procedures.

Recognizing the centrality of teaching excellence to the academic mission of Dixie State College, one of the primary goals of the College is to encourage and support professional development endeavors for faculty that promote excellence in programs and individual teaching performance after tenure has been granted. The primary function of PTR is to assist with this faculty development.

The primary intention of PTR policy is to put in place a procedure to enable faculty to identify areas needing improvement in teaching, and then, with peer support, identify training and resources that address weaknesses and improve performance. The PTR process is not intended to abridge or compromise Academic Freedom, pedagogical innovation and/or faculty Freedom of Speech.

Philosophical statements are not part of policy, but should be included in the Faculty Handbook as explanations of the purpose and intent of the policy.

DEFINITIONS

**Level I Post-Tenure Review** is a review of a tenured faculty member’s performance record undertaken every five years. This regular review is undertaken by the campus Post Tenure Review committee and it determines whether the faculty member is meeting the professional standards outlined by the School’s policy on standards and criteria. This will apply to all tenured faculty who have not applied for rank advancement with the previous 5 years. In extreme cases where a faculty member refuses to address areas needing improvement in teaching and/or service, or has exhausted the resources of the PTR process without improvement, the findings of the PTR committee may be considered in a case for dismissal.

Level I review is dependent upon objective criteria which determine a faculty member’s performance over the previous five years. The responsibilities and review criteria are negotiated with the Department Chair and school dean at the beginning of each academic year, contained in the faculty member’s yearly self evaluation and any amendments negotiated between the faculty member and the school dean. If all role responsibilities have been met satisfactorily, the file is reviewed by the appropriate dean for a recommendation of salary increase. This will not take place during the same year in which a faculty member is being reviewed for rank advancement.

**Level II Post-Tenure Review** refers to a department/school level committee that is created upon an unfavorable Level I Post Tenure Review.

All faculty reviews should be conducted using the same procedures. Unfavorable reviews should be dealt with by supervisor action in order to correct poor performance or other employment issues. Faculty have the responsibility to conduct reviews of their peers and should provide a supportive environment for
continued faculty development, but supervisors (Chairs, Associate Deans, Deans, and the Vice President of Academic Services) are responsible for ensuring appropriate improvement and corrective measures.

POLICY STATEMENT

1. Tenure is granted with the expectation of continued professional growth and ongoing productivity in teaching, research/creative work, and service. Thus, every tenured faculty member has a duty to maintain professional competence.

Tenure is appropriately defined in the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure policy and should be repeated here. Tenured faculty have, and will be reviewed on, more than their responsibility to maintain professional competence. Limiting the duties to one aspect of faculty performance is not appropriate.

The purposes of PTR are: (1) to monitor and facilitate continued faculty development, consistent with the academic needs and goals of the College and the most effective use of institutional resources; and (2) to ensure professional accountability by a regular, comprehensive evaluation of every tenured faculty member’s performance.

This section has been slightly modified and included in the proposed policy.

2. Faculty members who willfully or deliberately fail to participate in any aspect of the post tenure review process, as required, may be subject to sanctions for insubordination and dereliction of duty.

Policies list required behavior. Other policies, including Faculty Responsibilities and Faculty Termination, outline the institutional response for failing to follow policies.

3. A Level I PTR committee will be established, and populated by the tenured faculty of each DSC School.

   a) The PTR committee member from the school/department of the faculty member being reviewed will act as the chair, enabling them to assist the other committee members in understanding any special circumstances that directly relate to that discipline.

   There are not enough tenured faculty in schools to provide adequate representation of females and minorities. A campus committee, based on the model of the campus Retention, Promotion, and Tenure committee, is recommended to provide equal opportunity non-discriminatory protection for all faculty members. Current proposed policy includes statement: “Standards may differ considerably based on appointment, discipline, rank, etc.”

   b) Faculty undergoing PTR should not, in that year, serve on the PTR evaluation committee.

   c) No supervisor of a faculty member under review may participate in the committee’s review, other than in the form of administrative evaluations included in the faculty member’s file and letters written at the faculty member’s request.

Each faculty member shall be informed in writing of the results of the evaluation by the department chair or primary unit administrator.

5. The Level I PTR committee will provide an overall evaluation of the faculty member’s performance as either meeting expectations, or below expectations in teaching, research/creative work, and service, and shall provide a narrative explanation of that evaluation.

In slightly modified form, this information exists in the current proposed policy.

(It is highly encouraged that each School develop written standards that describe the nature and measures of achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service within that discipline.)
Policies address required behavior, not encouraged behavior. If School policies were to be developed, a method of institutional and faculty approval would need to be included.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Implementation of this policy will begin Fall Semester following its adoption.

Implementation of policies is covered in Policy Creation, Revision, and Approval Process policy.

2. Each year 20% of the tenured faculty will receive a Level I evaluation, until all have undergone post tenure review.

   a) The Faculty Senate Executive Committee, in consultation with Human Resources, will develop an addendum to the PTR policy to determine the manner in which faculty members are to be reviewed.

   b) Reviews may be delayed for a year for various reasons, but such delays require the agreement of the department chair, dean/associate dean, and Vice President of Academic Services.

PROCEDURE

PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW

A. Level I Review

1. Tenured faculty who have not applied for rank advancement with the previous 5 years will undergo a Level I review every five years.

   a) For a Level I review, the faculty member will submit their e-portfolio (which includes evaluations from students, supervisors and peers, information on continued professional development, research/creativity and service), role statement (position description), and any other information deemed helpful by the faculty member to facilitate a fair evaluation by February 1 in the fifth year since the previous Level 1 review or advancement in rank.

   b) Not later than March 1, the Level I Post Tenure Review Committee shall respond with a written report to the faculty member being reviewed, the department chair and the dean/associate dean.

   c) The PTR committee will write a brief report stating whether the candidate is meeting expectations or not. The report will summarize the unit’s findings regarding the faculty member’s meeting the department's/primary unit's standards, and conclusions about his/her productivity and contributions to the College in teaching, research/creative work, and service. A copy of this report will be given to the primary unit administrator and the faculty member. After consultation with the affected faculty member, the administrator will determine if any additional review or action is needed.

   d) The faculty member under review has the opportunity to send a response with comments and/or challenges regarding the report to the dean/associate dean not more than 10 days after the report was submitted to, and received, by the faculty member.

2. Faculty who receive favorable continuing review reports shall be reviewed by the appropriate dean for a recommendation of salary increase.

   The Vice President of Academic Services requests that Deans not be charged with recommendation of salary increases but limit their participation to recommendations regarding faculty performance.

   a) The dean shall forward his/her recommendation to the Vice President of Academic services not later than March 20.

   b) Not later than April 10, the Vice President of Academic Services shall forward his/her recommendation regarding a salary increase to the President.
c) Typically, and based on available funding, such faculty recommended to receive a 2% increase in base salary, will receive that increase beginning July 1 of that year.

d) After the President determines the salary increase, the faculty member shall be notified.
   i. An individual faculty member may receive only one continuing review increase in any five (5) year period of time.
   ii. An individual faculty member may not receive more than a total of 10% in continuing review and rank advancement increases within a five (5) year period of time.
   iii. If a faculty member receives a rank advancement increase, s/he may not receive a continuing status increase for five (5) years.
   iv. If a faculty member receives a continuing status increase, any rank advancement increase s/he receives within the following five (5) years will be decreased by 2%.
   v. Such limits exclude equity increases and COLA adjustments.

B. Level II Review

1. If a faculty member receives an evaluation of "below expectations" on the Level I review, then the Department chair will convene a Department Post Tenure Review Committee in order to assist the faculty member in addressing the deficiency / weakness. The form of this assistance will be the result of a process of negotiation between the PTR committee and the faculty member.

   Individual processes cannot be developed. Processes must be the same for all employees. Asking an individual faculty member to negotiate with an entire committee is inappropriate. Faculty Development Plans are addresses in the forthcoming revision to the Faculty Evaluation Policy. A faculty member's supervisor MUST be involved in remedial actions. The department could assign a mentor as part of a faculty development plan.

   The Department Chair does not participate in the PTR proceedings at any time.

   a) If deficient in any area, a 1-2 year period is established from the date of the review in which time the deficient faculty members may address the deficiency / weakness.
      i. One year is defined as the 9-month contractual period, typically covering the Fall and Spring semesters of a single academic year.
   b) If funding is needed to pursue one or more options, the deficient faculty member shall receive priority consideration from the Professional Development Committee in regard to funding appropriate actions that will address the deficiency / weakness. These actions may include: workshops, specialized training, necessary travel expenses to attend discipline-specific teaching conferences, et al.
   c) The unsatisfactory criteria must be included in the new role Statement document so that progress in those areas can be monitored.

See below.

7. At the end of the established time period, if the criteria weaknesses have been successfully addressed by means of intervention by the PTR, the PTR committee is disbanded with regard to the faculty member and a letter is generated by this Level II PTR Committee and sent to the faculty member, the department chair, and dean. The faculty member will be eligible for the next cycle of Level I review.

   The weaknesses, in this case, belong to the faculty member being reviewed, not the criteria.

8. If the deficiency / weakness has not been resolved, additional negotiation between the PTR and the faculty member continue. Then the third and fourth year of the process ensues.

See below.
9. If the deficiency/weakness have not been successfully addressed and corrected at the end of the 5-year period, the level II PTR committee compiles a record of the previous years’ efforts to alleviate professional weaknesses and presents this compilation to the Department Chair, who then forwards it on to the appropriate Dean. This compilation contains no recommendations as to further action.

According to the Utah Attorney General’s office, the institution must retain the right to terminate employees for cause. Allowing continued negotiations to improve a noted deficiency over a period of five years is unacceptable. According to the Vice President of Academic Services, DSC does not use “role Statements” but relies upon position descriptions. Funding included in the Faculty Professional Development policy should not be included here.

ADDENDA:
Continuing Review Level I Timetables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member delivers portfolio to chair of the Post Tenure Review Committee (in print or online as required)</td>
<td>February 1 of fifth year since previous review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of the Post Tenure Review Committee sends written report to faculty member under review</td>
<td>March 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member being reviewed responds as desired</td>
<td>10 days after report was sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean reviews file and forwards recommendations for those faculty members receiving favorable reviews to Vice President Academic Services</td>
<td>March 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President Academic Services forwards salary increase recommendation to President</td>
<td>April 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>