

ACADEMIC SENATE

SPECIAL MEETING

Wednesday October 15, 1980

2:00 p.m. SSC-107

AGENDA:

AS 80-61/Ex. EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

The Academic Senate approves the "Procedures for Evaluating Instructional Performance of Tenured Faculty" (attached).

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING INSTRUCTIONAL PERFORMANCE
OF TENURED FACULTY

1. Procedures for evaluating the teaching performance of tenured faculty shall be developed by the department (or equivalent unit), and shall be approved by a majority of the department's faculty, the dean/division chair, and the President.
2. Committees to evaluate tenured faculty shall be selected by and from the tenured faculty of the department of the person being evaluated. The committee shall include at least three members.
- OK* 3. Evidence considered by the committee shall include: (a) standard student evaluation instruments in use by that unit, submitted to classes typically taught by the faculty member under evaluation; (b) evidence related to instructional performance and currency in the field, ^{of instruction} contained in a ~~post-tenure review~~ ^{Teaching} file (the ~~post-tenure review~~ ^{teaching evaluation} file may be the personnel action file); (c) such other types of evidence related to instructional effectiveness as provided by departmental policies. Departmental procedures shall specify the types of evidence appropriate for determining the faculty member's ^{of instruction} currency in the field.
4. The faculty member under evaluation shall have the right to meet with the evaluation committee during the evaluation and prior to the submission of the evaluation report.
- ~~5. Following the evaluation, the evaluation committee shall prepare a signed evaluation summary. The department chair shall meet with the faculty member evaluated to discuss the results of the evaluation, to point out areas of strength and weakness which may have been identified, and to advise the faculty member of available assistance for making improvements. The written summary of the evaluation shall be placed in the faculty member's file. The faculty member may respond to the evaluation report in writing, and the response shall be placed in the file.~~
6. Each tenured faculty member must be evaluated ~~at least~~ once every five years, An evaluation for ARTP purposes shall fulfill this requirement.

~~unless the faculty member involved requests an earlier evaluation.~~

10/1/80

~~but not more than once a year?~~

9. or 2-3-12-21

TO: FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS

FROM: Joseph Furey, Economics Rep.

This is a copy of a motion on post-tenure review that was adopted by the Faculty Affairs Committee by a vote of 7 yes, 2 no, and 1 abstention.

THE MOTION

It is moved that the Academic Senate resist the implementation of Trustee Resolution FSA 80-44 -- Post-Tenure Review -- for the following reasons:

- 1) FSA 80-44 contains an implied threat to academic freedom via an implied threat to tenure. As we are aware, tenure does not carry with it a sinecure but does allow that a tenured faculty be given reasons for dismissal. Tenure was the result of a long fight by faculty members to prevent campus presidents dismissing faculty who expressed opposition to administrative policies or actions, who expressed unpopular political positions, or simply on whim.

While not expressly connoted, it is distinctly possible that the review process coupled with the placing of materials in a standing file is but a mechanism to amass "evidence" which can be used to dismiss a tenured faculty member for reasons other than those upon which dismissal is in fact based: political opposition to administrative policies and practice and the like.

As tenure is one very important guarantee of academic freedom and academic freedom is necessary for a viable academic community, FSA 80-44 presents a very real threat to the maintenance of a university community free from coercive administrative intervention.

- 2) FSA 80-44 becomes even more of a threat when paired with the proposed "merit" salary scheme. Such a scheme allows a much greater discretion to campus presidents to reward or punish faculty members with one's income as the whip used to inflict such punishment. Again, the possibility of using income to ~~punish dissident faculty and reward seville faculty is apparent.~~ Again, we observe an implied threat to academic freedom.
- 3) It is our understanding that neither FSA 80-44 nor the proposed salary scheme was developed in joint responsibility with the academic senate. With regard to FSA 80-44, this may well be illegal under the stipulations set forth in the Berman Act. With regard to the proposed salary scheme, it is simply reprehensible.
- 4) FSA 80-44 will probably add to the climate of competitiveness and, thus, divisiveness which already exists within academic departments and divisions. Such a climate promotes, not academic excellence but academic sterility.
- 5) Some provisions contained within FSA 80-44 may be inoperable. For example, section (1) of the Resolution demands an evaluation of "currency in the field". in an era of specialization it will be discovered that many departments (perhaps all) contain only one individual who specializes in a particular area. As currency in the field can only be evaluated by other specialists, we find that the only faculty member competent to judge such currency is the individual being evaluated. This is, of course, nonsensical.

10/8/80