

1993-94
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, May 12, 1994
Forest Suite, University Union



3:00-4:30 p.m. (following 1994-95 Organizational Meeting #2)

INFORMATION

Spring Schedule of Meetings (tentative):
May 19, 26

MOMENT OF SILENCE - LIZ HOCKADAY
NORMAN LAMB

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 94-33/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of April 21 (#20), 1994.

AS 94-38/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of April 28 (#21), 1994.

FIRST READING

AS 94-36/FA, Ex. PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY (Amends AS 84-64
and PM 85-06) *Page 4, April 28 Agenda*

Old Business

AS 94-10/Ex. STANDING RULES--Changes to Existing Rules . . . *Page 3, March 10 Agenda*

AS 94-10A CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, CREATE *Page 3, March 10 Agenda*

AS 94-10B ACADEMIC PROGRAMS REVIEW COMMITTEE, CREATE
. *Page 4, March 10 Agenda*

AS 94-10C ACADEMIC SUPPORT COMMITTEE, CREATE . . . *Page 4, March 10 Agenda*

AS 94-10D STUDENT RETENTION AND EDUCATIONAL EQUITY COMMITTEE (as
Standing Subcommittee of Academic Policies Committee), CREATE
. *Page 5, March 10 Agenda*

AS 94-10E FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE *Page 5, March 10 Agenda*

AS 94-10F UNIVERSITY WRITING COMMITTEE--Standing Subcommittee of General
Education Committee *Page 6, March 10 Agenda*

AS 94-10G VISITING SCHOLARS COMMITTEE--Subcommittee of Faculty Professional
Development Committee *Page 6, March 10 Agenda*

To: Senate Colleagues

From: Charlotte Cook

Re: Periodic ^{Eval} Review of Tenured Faculty: two suggested (and, I think friendly) amendments to the proposed revisions to current policy

*Called
5/19/94*

(W/C PEATF) (6 of 2. 27) :

The policy on Periodic Eval of Tenured Faculty is based on the following assumption

1. To create a more positive tone to the document, I suggest a preamble stating that the policy is based on a set of assumptions, to read something like the following:

An excellent education for students depends upon an excellent faculty;

Faculty excellence encompasses intellectual vitality and currency, as well as skills in teaching;

Faculty excellence is best achieved when individuals engage in on-going professional development, supported by colleagues willing to commit time and energy to fostering one another's professional well-being;

An extensive and varied array of professional development opportunities must be available to meet individual needs and interests.

Faculty should be able to look forward to periodic performance review as an opportunity to come together with colleagues to 1) reflect on professional accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses, and 2) forge directions for professional development during the following five years.

*facult
as
review*

2. If the above assumptions are adopted, it would be necessary to change part H, because a meeting would be imperative -- not simply to present "suggestions, if any, for improvement" from the review committee, but to have a collegial discussion about the faculty member's aspirations for professional growth during the following five years and means by which the department -- individually and collectively -- could support those aspirations.

Where are we?

Cultures of Teaching

- Fragmented Individualism
- Balkanization
- Collaboration

Fragmented Individualism

- isolation
- protection from outside interference
- walls of privatism
- barriers to improvement

Balkanization

- city states
- loyalties and identities tied to particular groups
- inconsistencies in values and expectations

Collaboration

- trust, sharing, support
- joint planning and evaluation
- professional development fostered

From: Michael Fullan, Univ. of Toronto. "Managing Change."
Workshop for CA. Center for School Restructuring, April 1994.

Distributed
5/12/94 Acad.
Senate

May 9, 1994
California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819-6036

To: Members of the Academic Senate
From: Robert L. Curry, Economics and International Affairs

William A. Dorman, Journalism & Peace and Conflict Resolution Studies

MAY - 9 1994

Academic Senate Received
413

RE: Revised Procedures for Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty

We have come to believe about our present situation that there has been an erosion over the past decade or so in the reputation for good teaching at Sacramento State, both among our students and in the community. The reasons for this decline are far too complicated for this memo. Suffice it to say that to the degree our diminished reputation is deserved, our problems are rooted in the weakening of a once vital culture of teaching on this campus that needs to be addressed. We have not reached these views lightly; they are based on our experiences as students and graduates of Sacramento State, and as faculty members with more than 50 combined years of service to this campus.

Why these concerns take on some urgency has to do with our considered judgment that **teaching** is what this place is really about, and good teaching, *particularly by senior faculty*, is largely the means for our salvation at a time of declining support for higher education.

In the troubled years to come, it is not new technology that will save CSU-Sacramento, and we say this as faculty who welcome it and use it, nor will it be research that sustains our reputation for excellence, and we say this although one of us previously served as research director for the campus and both of us are former recipients of the university's Scholarly Achievement Award. We also doubt seriously whether it will be the programs we offer or even our curriculum that makes the decisive difference. Certainly, we would argue, it will not be the administration. Never once in our careers have we heard a student say that s/he had selected a campus because of its President, or because they had heard the place had an outstanding complement of vice-presidents and deans.

In sum our view is a simple one: **good teaching, both in reputation and in fact**, is the only thing that will insure Sacramento State's success in the years to come.

Given these assumptions and conclusions, we think the revised document on periodic review of tenured faculty now before the Senate is a very promising *first* step in revitalizing the culture of teaching at CSUS, primarily because it may prod departments to begin taking seriously the process of periodic review of tenured faculty *in the top rank*, which at present we are convinced most do not. At least in our view, the current process is a pro-forma, perfunctory exercise that does little or nothing to encourage faculty to seriously examine their classroom performance--let alone improve it. Some one or some mechanism *outside* the department is required to make the process meaningful. We should add that having spent most of our careers working to protect individual faculty from unreasonable and arbitrary judgments rendered on high, and protecting departmental autonomy, we have come to this position only after much reflection.

All of this said, we do have one concern about the revised document before the Senate, and two suggestions. Our concern is this: what if a dean or deans are reluctant to second-guess a primary committee's favorable judgment of a faculty member's performance, or feel too overburdened to do the work necessary to make such a challenge stick? As it is now, at least in our school, the Dean already has plenty to do in the evaluation of faculty still moving through the ranks.

Our first suggestion, assuming the revised document is adopted, is that the Senate review the effectiveness of the new procedures in, say, a **two year** period, specifically looking at (1) how many *negative* post-tenure reviews were forwarded by departments to the various schools; (2) how many meetings (as described on page 3 of the revised document) occurred between faculty member, dean and dept. chair as a result of a negative periodic review, particularly compared to the number of such meetings under the old procedures; and (3) what evidence exists of supportive, collegially-based plans for corrective action as a result of these meetings.

Our second suggestion is that the Senate's Faculty Affairs Committee immediately begin investigating **means** for periodic review that go beyond the methods used at present, which consist largely of preparing a rather sterile file for consideration at an oftentimes perfunctory primary committee meeting. What we would like to see explored is a much richer system for helping faculty assess their performance and improve it, if necessary. Such a system must be built on trust and collegiality rather than punishment and intimidation, and it must have as its ultimate goal the enrichment of the teaching and learning experience.

For instance, we are familiar with a scheme used in Britain's state-supported universities that involves annual appraisals that go far beyond what CSUS now does--and yet was negotiated by the union and is highly regarded by all concerned. There is also the possibility that a **teaching portfolio** approach might work, which Prof. Mark Stoner (Communication Studies and one of the coordinators of the Peer Coaching Program) is exploring. Both he and Senator Linda Martin, who is also familiar with the portfolio method and is the other Peer Coaching coordinator, might be approached as resources.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE GUIDELINES RELATING TO PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY (PTR)

Sources of policy and procedure - substitute the following for the second paragraph of the Guidelines

Periodic review of tenured faculty, commonly called "Post-Tenure Review" (PTR), is a species of periodic review provided for by Trustee policy, section 15.28 of the M.O.U. and section 9.03.A.3 of the University ARTP document. Except as otherwise expressly provided in primary, secondary and University Post Tenure Review documents, periodic review of tenured faculty shall be governed by the primary, secondary and University ARTP documents.

Scope of review - add to section 1 of the Guidelines

Periodic review of tenured faculty shall extend to nothing but teaching performance and that currency in the field which is directly and immediately related to teaching performance. No requirement not clearly and specifically stated and described in the discussion of teaching performance and currency in the field in a unit's PTR document shall be applied to a tenured faculty unit employee in the course of periodic review. Each requirement as written and applied shall be reasonably related to teaching performance, currency in the field and the actual conditions that define employment in the unit during the period under review.

Notice of expectations - add as new section 3, and renumber the subsequent sections

Immediately after a faculty unit employee has been permanently retained and promoted to the rank of professor or its equivalent, each primary unit in which he or she teaches and is subject to periodic review shall provide a copy of the currently approved Post Tenure Review policies and procedures of (1) the unit, (2) the secondary unit which evaluates the faculty unit employees in the primary unit and (3) the University. The primary unit shall provide these copies before the end of the first pay period following the effective date of the faculty unit employee's being permanently retained and promoted to the rank of professor or its equivalent. The primary unit shall expressly draw the attention of the faculty unit employee to the content of the documents provided and to its significance in general and particularly in relation to the requirements defining the performance to be reviewed.

Basis of review - add as new sub-section 4.h, and reletter the subsequent sub-sections

In each case of periodic review of tenured faculty, evaluative statements and recommendations adopted at all levels of review shall be based on a review of the entire contents of the Working Personnel Action File in that case. The conclusion about performance under each criterion of evaluation (i.e., teaching performance or currency in the field) recorded in the evaluative statement required to accompany each recommendation shall be supported by a preponderance of the evidence in the file relative to that criterion.

Preponderance in this context refers to the weight or persuasiveness of evidence in the mind of the evaluator. Weight is a function of the quantity, quality and source of evidence, including the knowledge and trustworthiness of the source. Under a preponderance requirement, the evaluator must consider all of the relevant evidence and resolve conflicts in the evidence by means of the idea of preponderance.

5/19/94
never discussed

Right to unprejudiced evaluation - add after existing subsection 4.a, and reletter the subsequent subsections

Consistent with Section II.1 of P.M. FSA 94-02 "Statement on Faculty Responsibilities and Professional Ethics", no faculty unit employee shall evaluate or participate in evaluation of the performance of a permanent faculty unit employee if he or she has an intimate relationship or a significant financial or contractual obligation with the employee under review or is a party to an unresolved conflict with the employee under review about scholarly, pedagogical or other matters. A permanent faculty unit employee who believes himself or herself to be about to be subject to an evaluation in violation of Section II. 1 of P.M. FSA 94-02 may ask the Department Chair to request a faculty unit employee to excuse himself or herself from serving as a member of the peer review committee evaluating him or her. If the faculty unit employee does not retire from the committee as requested in that case, the Department Chair shall immediately cause the Department after notice and hearing to decide whether the cause alleged by the permanent faculty employee exists in fact. A finding that the cause exists in fact shall disqualify the faculty employee from further participation in the evaluation in that case. A decision of the Department adverse to the permanent faculty unit employee initiating the request may be appealed by that employee to the Dean for want of fair hearing.

In the case of a request to excuse a Department Chair, the employee shall make the request to the Dean who shall decide the question of cause to disqualify after notice and hearing. The employee may appeal an adverse decision of the Dean to the Academic Vice-President for denial of fair hearing.

Basis of review - add as new sub_section 4.h, and reletter the subsequent sub_sections

In each case of periodic review of tenured faculty, evaluative statements and recommendations adopted at all levels of review shall be based on a review of the entire contents of the Working Personnel Action File in that case. The conclusion about performance under each criterion of evaluation (i.e., teaching performance or currency in the field) recorded in the evaluative statement required to accompany each recommendation shall be supported by a preponderance of the evidence in the file relative to that criterion.

Preponderance in this context refers to the weight or persuasiveness of evidence in the mind of the evaluator. Weight is a function of the quantity, quality and source of evidence, including the knowledge and trustworthiness of the source. Under a preponderance requirement, the evaluator must consider all of the relevant evidence and resolve conflicts in the evidence by means of the idea of preponderance.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE GUIDELINES RELATING TO PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY (PTR)

The following amendments respond to several difficulties noted by *permanent faculty* subject to periodic evaluation. The effect of these amendments is to provide to all tenured faculty the same elements of procedural fairness as have been established for evaluation of probationary faculty.

Sources of policy and procedure - substitute the following for the second paragraph of the Guidelines.

Periodic review of tenured faculty, commonly called "Post-Tenure Review" (PTR), is a species of periodic review provided for by Trustee policy, section 15.28 of the M.O.U. and section 9.03.A.3 of the University ARTP document. Except as otherwise expressly provided in primary, secondary and University Post Tenure Review documents, periodic review of tenured faculty shall be governed by the primary, secondary and University ARTP documents.

Notice of expectations - add as new section 3, and renumber the subsequent sections

Immediately after a faculty unit employee has been permanently retained and promoted to the rank of professor or its equivalent, each primary unit in which he or she teaches and is subject to periodic review shall provide a copy of the currently approved Post Tenure Review policies and procedures of (1) the unit, (2) the secondary unit which evaluates the faculty unit employees in the primary unit and (3) the University. The primary unit shall provide these copies before the end of the first pay period following the effective date of the faculty unit employee's being permanently retained and promoted to the rank of professor or its equivalent. The primary unit shall expressly draw the attention of the faculty unit employee to the content of the documents provided and to its significance in general and particularly in relation to the requirements defining the performance to be reviewed.

Clarity of Expectations - add as new subsection 4.2, and reletter the subsequent subsection

No requirement not clearly and specifically stated and described in the discussion of teaching performance and currency in the field in a unit's PTR document shall be applied to a tenured faculty unit employee in the course of periodic review. Each requirement as written and applied shall be reasonably related to teaching performance, currency in the field and the actual conditions that define employment in the unit during the period under review.

The Chair would entertain a motion from the floor to divide the question on Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty (PRTF) as follows:

- 1st: on the question of expanding the PRTF evaluative categories (**Part I of the Guidelines**): Part I of the Guidelines removes the word "teaching" which, in effect, based on the language in IV. D.3, expands the evaluative categories from solely that of "Teaching" to, "Teaching", "Contributions to the University", and "Currency".

THE QUESTION IS WHETHER OR NOT TO DELETE THE WORD "TEACHING"

- 2nd: on the question of "Frequency of Evaluations" (**Part II of Guidelines**)--when effectiveness is in question a "subsequent review" would be after two years rather than the regular five.

THE QUESTION IS WHETHER OR NOT TO ADD LANGUAGE REGARDING SUBSEQUENT REVIEWS (when effectiveness is in question)

- 3rd: Part III of the guidelines is an editorial change requiring no action--this section identifies the Dean as the "keeper" or "monitor" of the entire PRTF process.

- 4th: on the question of "the role of the Chair and the Dean" (**Part IV of Guidelines**)--this changes the role of the Chair from that of an independent evaluator to a member of the review committee and makes the Dean the independent evaluator (and monitor of the entire process--Part III of Guidelines).

THE QUESTION TO BE VOTED ON IS WHETHER OR NOT THE CURRENT ROLE OF THE CHAIR SHOULD BE CHANGED FROM THAT OF AN INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR TO A MEMBER OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE?

IF THERE IS A "YES" VOTE ON THE ABOVE A SECOND QUESTION TO BE ADDRESSED IS WHETHER THE DEAN SHOULD BE THE INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR?

May 19, 1994