

TAMU Faculty Forum on Post Tenure Review

May 10, 2016

Moderator: I'm Len Bierman, Speaker of the Faculty Senate. I'm coordinating today, or moderating today's session on feedback regarding the recommendation to the provost's task force on faculty evaluation for post tenure review. Thanks for coming out and coming all the way over here on this hot day. Procedurally we're honored to have Vice Provost Michael Benedik here who was chair of the committee and he'll be helping to answer any questions and so forth.

Commentator: Steven Fulling, Professor of Mathematics. Most of my colleagues and I want to say surely you can't be serious that you're taking our hardest working and best teachers and threatening to fire them because they no longer publish papers and no longer have grants. I can say more and more and more about the perverse incentives that such an action would take but I think that I should let somebody respond first.

Moderator: Dr. Benedik, would you care to respond?

Respondent: Unless anyone from the committee would like to speak up? I will lead in. I think there's a couple of issues. First of all, firing is not necessarily the outcome here. The outcome is, I think that would be the last resort if someone is absolutely not performing their duties. I think the intent here is that we have some faculty who are on the tenure track and some faculty who are not on the tenure track. There's a significant equity issue because we have some faculty who are teaching as their primary duty. They're usually teaching higher loads, they are being paid significantly less, they're not on the tenure track and what they're doing in their work is exactly the same if not more than a number of people who are tenured but who are no longer participating in scholarship and no longer doing significant service and that's a significant equity issue for the university. So what the intent would be, if those people are still in fact incredible teachers, is that they would have the option of returning to all three pillars of work that forms the basis of tenure track and tenured faculty, or taking on a different role in the university that plays to what they're actually doing. Now obviously if someone is at the very tail end of their career, and we're talking about a few years, that's not what we're talking about. We're talking about someone who may have 20 years to go. They've stopping doing research, they're not doing significant service, they are probably teaching well but how is that equitable to have that person continue to do that for 20 years and there are a significant number of individuals on the campus who are doing that or more at a different rank. I think people who resort to similar work should be treated similarly. I'm going to say that's not my opinion. What you're seeing is the result of a faculty task force. These are the recommendations of the faculty on the task force. I think there was a widespread concern about equity and workloads and also about the way reviews were being done across colleges and across departments which also had significantly to do with equity as well. Those were kind of the two issues that the task force dealt with.

Commentator: May I respond?

Respondent: Absolutely.

Commentator: I strongly agree with the equity issue. In my department and in many others it's very strongly a gender issue. We're very conscious of it. I'm happy to learn, if I understood you correctly, that

you have in mind that the one outcome of this process might be that a tenured person transfers to the academic professional track.

Respondent: Yeah in fact we have created a very special title for faculty who have tenure who have now agreed to give up tenure and move on to a non-tenure track and that's called a Senior Professor. The only people who can be called a senior is someone who has earned tenure previously. We have frequently used this for people who are approaching retirement or who are choosing to retire and go on to a modified track but it's open to anyone who has earned tenure and has decided they no longer want to be held accountable for scholarship, or scholarship and service, or whatever combination it is. That's absolutely a professional track appointment that can be held for as long as they and their department agree.

Commentator: Ok. I had several points to make, I'm trying to decide the best way.

Respondent: Sure, take your time.

Commentator: Already the sort of person we're talking about gets very paltry raises. If the person is an associate professor he or she knows he's not going to be promoted to full professor. The teaching loads, under the present budgetary committee, the teaching loads are being increased. It seems to us, this problem is solving itself. It's perhaps more slowly than you envision. The equity is being smoothed out. What we're concerned about is several things. One is, if you put pressure on people to do research when they have decided that that's no longer the role in which they can best serve then you're causing people who are doing a good job of teaching and service, or teaching, or service, to spend a huge amount of time struggling to publish papers which probably are not going to be very good papers, that doesn't seem to help anyone. It does not improve the prestige of the department or the university because the average research paper coming out of the university will go down in quality. The document itself says "quantity is not the same as quality". It will definitely take this individual away from full concentration on teaching and various service activities which is the area in which he or she shines. There's also another case which is rarer, but nevertheless very important. That is the case of a truly good researcher who decided to spend several years working on an extremely hard problem-extremely significant problem-that may or may not pay off. There will be a gap in that person's resume, with no papers and it may not pay off in a really good result later on. It seems that one of the purposes of tenure is precisely to give good researchers the possibility of doing that, of taking risks, of spending a major portion of their career searching for a really big prize rather than racking up more routine successes. I think I should stop there.

Respondent: So I absolutely agree with you on that latter point. Totally agree with you, and I would hope that no post tenure review policy would every get in the way of that. I think that there is a sufficient amount of flexibility given to the faculty in the department to make those judgements. The faculty in the department are the ones who decide, is this persons research productivity up to what they believe is appropriate? If they know this individual is working on a really difficult problem, and is taking time, it is the faculty in the department that get to make that determination. "Yeah, we're not worried about this, let's give this person a few more years." In a lot of the liberal arts, they're in book cultures and it make take them five or six years to write a book. Those faculty in the department know which are the ones who are working on a book and are likely to get it out (they just may need a little more time) and which are the ones who we know they have not actually done anything on this book in the last five years. It's the faculty that make these determinations. It's not an administrator; it's not the dean; it's not the

provost; it's not me; it's not the president. There's a whole lot of flexibility built into the system to handle these kind of things. I absolutely agree with you. You never want to get in the way of someone who is working on a substantive problem. I don't think there's an issue; I know actually out of the college of science there were some people put forward a concern, "we have some faculty who are outstanding researchers but they're really not doing—we've given them permission not to be in the classroom anymore. We think this is going to be a problem" and I say "it's not a problem at all". If their department head is not assigning them to the classroom and they're involved in graduate education, so they've got two or three PhD students, they're fulfilling their teaching requirements. They are doing what is assigned to them to do and that's what counts. Likewise, for people who have significant service obligations, because they're an associate department head, they're running a graduate program, they're running a center, they're doing something that their department has assigned them that is their duty, there is in this document an out that says alternate duties can be assigned to a faculty member it just requires the approval of the department head or the dean. It can't be self-declared, "I'm doing this and give me credit for it". As long as the department head and the dean say "yeah, if you're doing this, great. We think this is important. We think this is valuable. We're holding you accountable for that duty and your teaching and your university committee work," that's also fine. All those kind of options are absolutely available. This isn't taking away. In fact, I think this is giving more flexibility than the current version which doesn't really permit those exceptions. Some departments have really run a foul of that because they've written a very tight set of guidelines and then realized that they have not permitted themselves to grant exceptions to people in their department who are doing something alternate. I have absolutely no problems with people who are really performing the duties their department's assigning them and doing it well. I think where this rule becomes really important is for people who disengage in mid-career and who have 20 years ahead of them. We need to figure out how to reengage them or get them into the right role where they can actually be successful. Rather than, as you said, never getting a raise again, they can now perform excellently in a duty that's more appropriate. That to me is the ideal outcome.

Respondent2: Let me say, I'm Richard Carlson, and just so you know I was on the very first post tenure review task force back in '96 and I was on this one as well. Basically what I should start by saying is that this report of the task force was entirely faculty driven. In fact, Mike wasn't even in the room for much of our discussion precisely because he wanted to keep his hands off. Basically he presented us with the equity problem and then we added some other things that we thought needed to be addressed. Something else I'd point out here is that neither of these steps, post tenure review nor what we're now calling the comprehensive professional review, is a termination proceeding. Furthermore, they're both peer reviews. They're not administrative reviews. It's going to be entirely up to one's peers what the outcome is. For most of us the outcome is going to be a check, "yeah you're doing your thing". I would emphasize those points. Getting back to the equity issue, I was persuaded that this is a real problem and it's partly a problem because the number of academic professional track faculty is growing. That may be a good thing, may be a bad thing, but the point is they teach more and are paid less than tenure track faculty. So there is an equity problem if we have people that are tenured doing basically the same thing. That was the presenting problem we were asked to address.

Commentator: Alberto Moreiras, Hispanic Studies. Like our colleague from mathematics I also have many concerns about these new rules. One of them is why is there a need now to engage with people who disengage in mid-careers, to quote you? Submit them to disciplinary procedures, because after all

that's what they are. This is of course perceived as an attack on the tenure system, therefore an attack on tenured security for faculty members. The fact that many people are not here that should be here should not be taken as consent. Actually there is a lot of anger about these things that are going on now. I can only speak for my department but in my department that anger is widespread. And then of course what he have to resort to is what James Scott, Anthropologist, used to call weapons of the weak. I thought after coming to the United States to get my PhD and learn a little bit about the university system here, that tenured is something that you are, not something that you must keep earning every year. Of course now the rules are being changed for us and this has historical implications in terms of the American university and the 200 year history attached to it. I think that this stuff needs to be reflected about frankly and honestly without business, without masks. The tenured system is being altered fundamentally. We are the generation that must receive the brunt of that. Frankly I am not speaking for myself, I have no problem with teaching, service or research, but I am concerned about many that do for whatever reason. There are many reasons. People that have received tenure 20 years ago and have changed tactics and have changed life structure for whatever reason. I agree with our colleague that publications happen that are not particularly relevant. They are only done to meet, not the duties of the scholarship, but only the imposition of the annual review now drastically over determined by post tenure rules imposed by administration. This is not conducive to a better university. It is not conducive to a better university even if you do manage to submit to disciplinary procedure any number of people and get rid of a few of them. Those are some of my critiques but I do have a question, which I do associate with weapons of the weak because it means that departments will have to change their rules, their internal review rules. I note in the document that the rules cannot be changed without permission of the dean and the dean of faculties. My question is would you allow us to identify the standard definition of 'research' for instance? Would you allow us to look for an overall score as opposed to, you know, failing people who for some reason have not published an article or two or three over the last three years? Because if there is not flexibility at the level of approving, where we have to redefine annual review definitions, then I think you are setting it up for us, frankly.

Respondent: I'll grant you that, nationally, tenure is under a certain threat partially because there is a perception on the part of the public that we're not accountable once we're tenured, that we treat it as a guaranteed employment for life regardless of performance. I would reverse your argument. I would say probably the best protection for tenure, in certain circumstances, is to have a procedure by which we are held accountable, and this is a procedure by which we hold ourselves accountable because it's a peer review. I, frankly, think it's a good idea to have post tenure review just for that reason even if it wasn't required by law, which it is. Given that we have to do this, we need to have a system that's equitable as much as possible. I can tell you that the original design of this process was to help faculty avoid getting in to a circumstance where their tenure would be threatened. That's why we have the initial peer review, a provision for helping faculty get back on track if they need to. If you get to the comprehensive professional review, that requires a plan that the faculty member has to agree to. There's only one line in the policy that even refers to termination of tenure. I think, frankly, people are a little more concerned about this than they need to be. We've had this since 1996. There's also the presumption that this is punitive, and I don't see how a peer review is punitive. That certainly wasn't our intent to start with and I don't see that intent in this document. On the other hand, I will say people are concerned about it and that concern is something we shouldn't discount. We need to address it. I would ask you to say, how would you modify the document? Given that we have to have a post tenure review process.

Respondent2: Let me add two more things before you go. Just so everyone knows, as Rick said, we have been doing post tenure review for 20 years now. I think it was 1997 the policy was put in place. The rule that you see before you is a modification of the existing rule. Most of what's in there is essentially the same as what has been on the books for a number of years. The only significant change I think, there's a couple of recommendations, but to me the only really important significant change is that first paragraph that says the expectation is that people are performing adequately teaching, research and service. That's the one change that I believe is very significant from the existing document that is. Other than that this document has been on the books for years, as y'all know. The question you asked earlier is what does the department need to change? I don't think, and you are welcome to change your definitions of scholarship, I don't think that you have to and I don't think that this document says that you need to or that you can't. That is up to the faculty member to define what they view as appropriate scholarship for their department. I would like to see all departments grapple with the issue of, "how do we evaluate these kinds of things? What are the appropriate norms for our department?" Because I know, I would say off the top of my head, 50% of the departments haven't touched this in at least 10 or 12 years. And they've not actually intellectually engaged in what they believe are the appropriate norms for their discipline. I think that it's actually a good thing for faculty to engage in that discussion. I would very much like to see and I would encourage all departments to review how they're doing their annual reviews and how they're doing their post tenure reviews because I think most of them would find that they are either not following the rules that they have written down or when they actually read their current rules they're going "who passed this?". I think that's really appropriate for groups to do. They are some departments that have actually visited them recently and revised them and that's wonderful. I'm going to bet that at least half of the departments haven't, perhaps more. It's something that really should be done on a regular basis.

Commentator: You don't answer the question. Right, we already have a procedure. We have had a procedure for many years. So it is the change, the change that says if you have 'unsatisfactory' in one area or 'needs improvement' in two areas you are liable to be punished, to be condemned or doomed to disciplinary procedures at the hands of your peers and beyond.

Respondent2: You need to be reviewed by your peers.

Commentator: That is my point. We do have documents, documents that concern tenure, documents that concern promotion. Normally annual review forms are conducted on a similar basis to tenure and promotion cases. I think that's what has to be changed.

Respondent2: Not on tenure.

Commentator: No, not on tenure, on the annual review. In other words, the annual review will have to be redesigned in my opinion so that it is made clear that people are not up for tenure every year. And they are not up for promotion every year either. When you say it is up to the faculty to decide what is proper scholarship for their discipline, I will take you literally on that. Obviously this is not what we hear from the back, this is not what we hear from any number of indexations, analytics, and stuff like that that is going around everywhere. So there is a gap between "it is up to the faculty to decide" and everything else.

Respondent2: I think there is a disconnect if the faculty abrogates its responsibility to do that properly. For example, there is at least one department in this university who's post tenure review guidelines say

that in order to be unsatisfactory you must be 'unsatisfactory' in teaching, and research, and service and only when you're 'unsatisfactory' in all three are you unsatisfactory. That's an abrogation of responsibility. I think if a department says "if you publish one abstract every five years we view you as 'satisfactory' in scholarship" that's an abrogation of responsibility. I think as long as the faculty come up with what would be responsible norms that are defensible and that are comparable to other places, I don't see that there's a problem. There needs to be some agreement that these are reasonable standards because what you don't want to have happen is you say "these are the definitions of our department" and then every one of your faculty that go up to for tenure, the dean says "no, those aren't up to reasonable standards at all". There needs to be some agreement that these are reasonable and appropriate definitions and standards. The provost is not going to say what they are. The president is not going to say what they are. I'm not going to say what they are. I don't think the dean of faculties is going to say what they are. I think it is appropriate that they are agreed upon with faculty and clearly I think the dean would need to agree as well because he is ultimately responsible.

Respondent: Let me bring up a couple of things. You referred to the annual review and there is a little bit of confusion in the language I think. This is not an annual review process and was never intended to be and I think that's a point we understand needs to be clarified. The annual review is the department head's responsibility. Some departments, like mine, have a peer component to that, others don't. This, the post tenure review, which comes along every third year or every fifth year, is a peer review and that does not involve the department. Something else that's come to light is, and this is a weakness in the original policy, nowhere does it specify who can serve as a peer for that purpose or who appoints that group. I think that is a point on which we agree that the document needs to be revised because quite reasonably people feel like they have no protection, if they feel that administrators who might be hostile to them get to appoint the peer review group. The idea is that it's supposed to be a peer review and it's supposed to be objective.

Commentator: I think you bring up an important point. I'm sorry, this is Lynn Opperman, from Baylor up in Dallas. In the document it gives so many different options. In fact one of the options that is described is one that you've described for your department which is that the annual review, which is conducted by the chair of the department, also has as a component to it, this peer review. Technically, their annual review is the equivalent of an annual post tenure review and it does not seem to me that it's been clear, in that department would you then, every three to five or three to six years, have over and above that another real post tenure review? That seems to me to be almost a double jeopardy to people in that department.

Respondent: One of the things I think needs to be done is to separate those so there is a separate chair for the peer component who can certify the peer review. The other thing I can tell you is that in our department and I think in our college we've been doing this for 20 years and it's never been a problem. Yeah, we kind of check of people to make sure they're progressing alright in terms of post tenure review every year. I think what the rule is intended to say is at the very minimum you gather up that information every third year and do the certification. The rule actually doesn't require an annual review but we put that language in, and I grant you it's not very well cast, so that departments like mine can continue their practice of just doing this as part of their routine evaluation procedure. I would add as well that one of the advantages of that is that if your peers see you starting to decline, you can intervene early and that is an important thing from my point of view. Folks who know me will tell you, some administrators will tell you, I'm obnoxious about this. I think the first principle of management is

to take care of your people. From my point of view, the earlier you provide help to someone who is struggling, the better. I have argued for three years not six because by the time someone has gone six years off the tracks, you've got a very deep hole to try to recover from. I grant that the language needs to be clarified. There is no requirement for an annual post tenure review.

Respondent2: If I can address that part. In my cover memo that went out to deans and department heads and faculty senate that probable never quite made it out to everyone else because of how things got forwarded, what I said is that, given that many department do this annual peer review component, I would hope that as the department formulated its post tenure review policy, the department would decide how the peer review component of the annual review qualifies for post tenure review. I don't know that you want the university to make that decision or the rule to make that decision, I think the department should make that decision. The department can say it's going to be every fifth one counts or the department can say the average of the last three can count, or the department can choose however they want to do it. As long as there has been a peer review. I think it should be up to the faculty to decide how they want to factor that in. A department could choose to have a separate peer review committee that meets every fifth or sixth year or whatever it is, over and above the annual peer review committee or they could choose not to. I am in favor of leaving it up to the faculty.

Commentator: I'd like to add something factual to precisely that point. In my department, we do have annual peer reviews in the sense that there is the departmental executive committee, not just the head is responsible for the review. Also there is, at least for our non-full professors, there is teaching evaluation by a separate committee. Don't ask me why there's no teaching evaluation of our full professors-I believe there should be, but that's a separate issue. Furthermore, these reviews are based on rolling three year reports. Every year you have to submit a report that says everything you did in the past three years. Then the next year you erase what was at the top and add to the bottom what you just did. So in a sense we're always doing three year peer reviews. It's a three year peer review every year. I think the department would be rather unhappy if we were told that on top of that you have to do something special every three years for everybody, not just the people who had unsatisfactory annual reviews. As I understood your last statement, that's not what you're saying. We're encouraged to build this into the process that we already have and if necessary modify that process so it fits the requirements.

Respondent: I found when I was department head and when I served on the executive committee as well in our department that that peer review component was really helpful. The peer component of the annual review was really helpful because people sitting around the table were pretty constructive. People's evaluations tended to go up because there was a peer input, not down. Personally, if I had my way, I would require a peer component to the annual review because I really feel that peer input is important to the whole evaluation process. I also believe that one of the problems with evaluation we're hearing in these comments and from my colleagues and what-not, is that fundamentally a great number of people don't trust the evaluator or the process. It's that element of distrust that's a big underlying problem even though the intent of the rule is to be constructive. The other thing I'd like to come back to is somebody I think alluded to academic analytics is effecting evaluations. I don't know whether it effects evaluations in your department or not but I would stress that particular instrument was not a consideration in the development of the revision of this rule. I think I can also honestly say that the senate doesn't like Academic Analytics any better than the faculty do. There is in fact a calling to

account the administration for what this instrument is about. Can they certify the accuracy? What are they using it for? That's underway in the senate right now.

Respondent2: Let me briefly address Academic Analytics for one thing just so that people know. No one outside of the provost and myself see Academic Analytics data at the individual level. Your department heads and deans only see data at the cumulative level.

Respondent: Not true according to mine. He says he sees the original data.

Respondent2: Ok then that's a change. I know the department heads don't.

Respondent: I don't think the deans should either.

Respondent2: I didn't think the deans did either. As of a couple of years ago I know they didn't but maybe that's something I don't know about then. Academic Analytics is absolutely not used in annual reviews or any of these processes because department heads do not get the individual data. They only get the cumulative data for their department. That's not addressing whether or not it's a valid instrument, that's just saying we are not using that as an assessment tool for individual faculty.

Commentator: I'm Alex Thomasson from Biological and Agricultural Engineering. I'm sorry I came in a few minutes late. I may have missed some things. Your previous question may have addressed the impression that I had. There were a couple of things that came out of our faculty meeting that we had a couple of weeks ago but the principle issue that sort of stuck in my mind is, this seemed like an added administrative burden to the entire faculty when we've got a process that probably serves the purpose now. I'm perfectly willing to be mistaken about that.

Respondent: I would say there's no added burden. I would say other than perhaps revising the process to fit in with whatever the new guidelines that are passed, but I think the process would be identical. The only thing that changes perhaps are the standards that are being used. There's no change in the process whatsoever in this document relative to what's been in place for years.

Commentator: It may have just been our interpretation of it that was at fault.

Respondent: The process is the same.

Commentator: So my concerns are unwarranted because we've been doing what we've been doing by the old document and you've never objected.

Respondent: Pretty much. So the only thing that is changed is that many departments have permitted faculty to be successful while being unsatisfactory in one area and this new document is changing that, but the process is the same. The standards are changed, unless Faculty Senate chooses to change the time frame. I mean the proposal out of the taskforce was to do it more often. State law says every six years. I don't care what the timeframe is. The provost doesn't care what the timeframe is. Whatever the Faculty Senate chooses to pass as the appropriate timeframe is fine. The taskforce recommended every three years because they thought it was appropriate to do it quickly. I am of the opinion to do it less often but I don't really care. I know the provost doesn't really care. So it's really kind of whatever the Faculty Senate passes and approves.

Respondent2: I'm John Stallone. I'm on the executive committee now and I am former speaker several years ago for the Senate. I was also on the taskforce. I want to just make a couple points about this.

First, I want to echo the points that Dr. Carlson made earlier this afternoon. I think in the end this is a very constructive and a positive thing for the faculty. I also want faculty to appreciate that the task force was very much faculty driven. It was a review of your peers by us, by your colleagues. I, frankly, being a person that is very supportive of the institution of tenure, and have been increasingly concerned over the last five to ten years over the negative press that tenure has gotten in the public eye and what's stated of the state government in general, I think we should do everything we can to defend the process. I was just amazed and the post tenure review committee members were amazed at how variable the review process has been from department to department and college to college. That's not going to support the process. When that's looked at by state legislatures and by the public they're going to say "You don't even have a uniform process for evaluating faculty? That's crazy!" It's absolutely ridiculous. First of all, it gets unfair. It's very unfair to the faculty. One of the goals of this I think and one of the good things that's going to come out of it is that the process is going to be more uniform, it's going to be peer driven and I don't see those as bad things. I think there's just a lot of miscommunication and misunderstanding about the objectives of this process, what the committee developed. I hope that we can alleviate that by just communicating a little bit better.

Commentator: There was one other question that came out of my faculty meeting and this isn't something that I particularly adhere to but it appeared to me that the evaluation metric had sort of two negative possibilities and one positive one and there was some concern about "well people usually pick the one in the middle" but the one in the middle is negative so where would that leave you? Just to make the comment.

Respondent: Well the task force members, they're the one that came up with that. If one of y'all wants to address the two?

Respondent2: What, the 'needs improvement'? That's gotten a lot of comment. The intent was to say "well we want something between pass/fail. We want something that won't, by itself, trigger anything, unless you get two of them". Again, I didn't see that as threatening. I saw that as a landing.

Commentator: The recommendation probably would have been to have another one above, such as 'exceeds requirements' or something.

Respondent: You can do that in annual review, but I think that's irrelevant in post tenure review because you're 'satisfactory' or not. 'Satisfactory' or 'Excellent' is irrelevant in post tenure review.

Respondent2: Something, before I get to mention it, again, I come back to. If you would like to recommend changes, that's one of the things we're trying to elicit here. How do we need to make changes to this document to make it more equitable/clarify? That sort of thing. I don't expect people to do that on the fly here but if you do have a chance, and you have thoughts about how to revise the document, send an email. Point to the part of it that you think needs revision and suggest how to revise it.

Respondent3: It could even just be a clarifying statement alongside it.

Respondent4: And you could send that either to any one of us or to the executive committee. We're happy to, we want to, hear these comments.

Respondent2: That's one of the reason we're having these forums. We want feedback. We don't want to participate in something that simply imposes on the faculty. That's kind of not our job as members of the faculty senate. Again, we have to have a rule, we have to make it as fair as we can. A lot of concerns that have come up in various discussions have related the original rule we drafted not the revision. There are a few related to the revision and some of it is just, I think, confusion for example about one year. There's no requirement in here for a one year post tenure review cycle.

Commentator: I want to address that, but first let me say my colleagues think that the Academic Analytics are widely used by all kinds of things and some things for many different reasons.

Respondent: They're used to evaluate departments against their peer departments.

Commentator: Not only that. This is second hand but I heard from my department head that a person recommended for one of the Association of Former Students prize was rejected because his citations were not as good as those from the guy in Economics or those from the guy in Sociology.

Respondent: But you could do that with Google. Most people use Google citations.

Commentator: In any case, I'm talking about the culture, a culture that is becoming more and more widespread and which happens to be very threatening for those of us who respect scholarship more than citations. Just to say one thing. To address the main issue, everyone here is from their practice, their department of practice. I have no idea what they are doing in Mathematics or what they are doing in Psychology, right? What I do know is that in our department, peer review happens every year. That's the way we do our annual review, which means that for instance, and let me just, and I have colleagues from the review committee in my department with me, without revealing anything that I should not reveal, let me say that this year a little bit less than 50% of the department had 'unsatisfactory' in one category. That means 40-45% of the department is going to be risking post tenure review process every year. That is going to destroy the department. If my department is any symptom of the state of the college, it will destroy the college. We cannot live under that violent interference with climate and with the way things should be. Unless of course we change, but then, because we are hearing contradictory messages here and the language needs to be clarified radically. For us, there is no difference between peer review and annual review as you call it. For us, it happens every year. That means, about 7 people are going to go up to the dean, their names are going to be signaled to the dean, put up there on the chopping block every year. That is really bad. I don't know if you realize that this may be happening in many departments. This is going to prove devastating to them all. That's why I am claiming that this is not going to make for a better university, but for a worse one.

Respondent2: But, that is up to the department. There is not requirement in this rule for any annual review.

Commentator: This is the practice in my department. We are held to that by the dean.

Respondent2: Then are you saying the rule needs to say you can only report this every third year? Seriously, if you think there's a problem here that needs to be remedied...

Commentator: Yes, I think so. Every six years. It should report every sixth year.

Respondent3: Send us a statement.

Commentator: The unsatisfactory is supposed to report to the dean is what you have now.

Respondent: No. That is the peer review. The department determines what constitutes a peer review. The department can choose to say it's going to get reported every year. The department can choose to say every sixth year will be the one we turn in. The department can choose to say, we're going to average the last three years peer reviews

Commentator: Michael, paragraph 2.3 explicitly says "an annual review resulting in an overall unsatisfactory performance shall state the basis for the ranking in the college and criterion. Each unsatisfactory review should be reported to the dean". That's not the peer review, that's the annual review.

Respondent: That's the annual review but that does not per say trigger the comprehensive review. That triggers nothing other than system policy requires that any individual who has 'unsatisfactory' needs to be reported up and up. We've been doing that for years. That's not post tenure review. That's not triggering, per say that alone does not trigger the comprehensive review. That's part of the annual review process and that's been in place for years.

Commentator: Ok, so I think it should be made clear because I read this document several times and for me it has been very obscure- the difference between annual review and peer review, when departments incorporate peer review into annual review. Very obscure.

Respondent2: I agree, I think that's a point. That lack of clarity is something that became clear, if you will, fairly early in our conversations with various people. That's definitely one of the points that needs to be clarified. The others have to do with who can participate in peer review and who chooses the peers. Those two come from the old rule but I think they both need to be addressed as well.

Respondent: I certainly, speaking for the administration, have no problem with whatever the Faculty Senate decides is the appropriate way to do that. State law says it has to be a peer review. I think departments can choose how they want to define that criteria. I certainly don't want to try to put in a central definition in the university rule because different departments have very different types of cultures and I think that needs to be respected. I don't really care how it's done.

Moderator: From a faculty senate perspective I just want everyone to be clear that we are going to try to make sure this as fair and uniform as possible across the university and seek your input on that because I want to make sure that everyone is treated in a uniform and fair way. The other thing that we've talked about quite a bit is the 'needs to improve' category and is there some way that the 'needs to improve' category can be positive in terms of creating a win-win, possible resource allocations and so forth to make sure if somebody needs to improve for example in one area they get resources or help that they need to improve. That could be developmental, if it can be, in a positive way.

Commentator: I'm John Nielson-Gammon, department of Atmospheric Sciences. I was on the Faculty Senate about 17-18 years ago after the first post tenure review policy went in and we were concerned about whether that was going to have an undue focus on research productivity. There was a committee forum that spent two years looking at the issue and eventually coming up with a report that was approved by the faculty senate on multiple missions of Texas A&M and the tenure reward system. One of the conclusions of the report was, as faculty members progress in their careers it makes more and more sense for them to specialize as it becomes clear what they're better at and what they're not as

good at. From an organizational perspective, it would make more sense for department heads to allocate their faculty members time to focus on those things that they are better at because that improves the overall performance of the department in all of its areas. Professor Fulling referred to this, in the sense of, if you have someone who is doing well in one area and poorly in another, should you focus your energy on improving in the area they're doing less well in or focus their energies to make a bigger impact in what they're doing well at. I'm concerned that this policy, by requiring a certain level of performance in all three areas, no matter how much effort is allocated to any given area, takes a serious step back from that and requires people to be broad throughout their career rather than becoming superb at what they're very good at. So, given that reaction I'll follow up with a question.

Respondent: Well, yeah, I think a lot of us share that concern. The thing is, when we went through that and I was on the Senate at the same time with John, the composition faculty was different. What has driven part of this is the growth of academic professional track faculty, we had few or none 20 years ago, so that's where the equity issue comes in. I understand and in fact, I don't know if Michael remembers this but my very first comment in the task force was, when this came up "well maybe these teaching faculty should be tenured" but apparently that's not going to happen. Truthfully I think that option would be much more in keeping with the multiple missions and the commitment to teaching we have at Texas A&M. That said, once you have the equity issue on the table then the problem is how do you deal with it? The other point I'd make here though is that it doesn't require everybody to have the same activity profile. You can't go to zero in any category. So you have to maintain some level of activity. Now what level of activity that is and how that's evidenced is going to vary from one program to another. Truthfully I have to tell you, you and I probably both have colleagues who at some point for some considerable period of time really haven't been pulling their weight as tenured faculty and typically it's in the area of scholarship. There have also been cases where people aren't pulling their weight in the classroom either. My argument would be that that's an equity problem for your whole faculty. Then you've got a department where most of the faculty are kind of dragging along someone else who's not fully in harness. That's another issue and one we haven't really talked about.

Commentator: That can be addressed in context of a holistic review. What's the overall performance of the faculty member and are they of substantial benefit to the department? It doesn't require, I mean you could have somebody who is doing lousy in one area but has a much bigger impact in the department than someone who is doing well in all three areas. In fact we actually promoted a faculty to full professor who was not very active in research but was making outstanding contributions in teaching and service.

Commentator2: We've done the same thing.

Commentator: Right. So I would prefer to go back to a holistic post tenure review rather than by category. I've argued that it makes more sense that way for the faculty member and it makes more sense that way for the department and you've raised the point that we have this equity issue that we have to deal with so I'd like to discuss a bit about that. Is the equity concern primarily with tenured versus not tenured or high pay versus low pay?

Respondent: I think it depends on the unit. I think in some units it is a combination both of workload and pay. There are tenured faculty who are really doing nothing other than teaching and who have both a lower teaching load and a significantly higher teaching salary than academic professional track faculty. I think in other units pay is probably comparable but workload may not be. Then I think in some units the

issue really is in tenure. Why should that individual have tenure and I don't and we are doing and have been doing the exact same job for 10 years now. I don't think there's a single answer because it varies dramatically across colleges.

Commentator: Ok. Tenure is acquired over time and it requires achievement in a broad range of areas which the non-tenured faculty have not done. I don't think them not having tenure relative to people having tenure... it's not because they're in similar circumstances and being treated unfairly. It's that the tenured faculty have demonstrated different abilities. Whether or not that's fair, they're not equivalent. In terms of pay and assignment, post tenure review policy is not the way to address that. The way to address that is to make it a university requirement that the faculty who are not doing significant research do not have a significantly lower teaching load than professional faculty who are primarily teaching. Their duties should align with their responsibilities, irrespective of their titles.

Commentator2: Those are good comments I think.

Moderator: Please introduce yourself.

Commentator2: I'm Mark Clayton from the department of Architecture. In general the notion of post tenure review is not unreasonable. I think our department would rather it be six years rather than three years. I think that if someone is starting to slip then the annual review should pick that up and it shouldn't have to trigger... there shouldn't have to be a whole post tenure review to figure out that someone is not meeting their role. A concern in our faculty was the administrative burden that is likely to come upon us, and yes this could be handled in a departmental way but there kind of tends to be a benign neglect in the university about how the departments run things and that's why there's inequity among departments. There's very little guidance how to run things. The very specific kind of example is, I can just imagine being brought up six years down and the department tells me "ok, compile a list of all the courses you've taught and all the students you've had" and whenever they ask me something like that I'm always thinking to myself "you have that data, why do you ask me to do it?". The starting point for post tenure review should be the administration gives a report to the faculty about what your achievements have been because we have reported it over and over and over again. We are not administrators; we are not clerical staff; we are not very good at keeping records of these things. We have clerical staff, and libraries and online repositories and all this stuff to keep that for me. You know what I do of course is I go to Howdy and I download the courses. Really a post tenure review ought to be triggered by the administration giving a report back to the faculty member of what you think we have accomplished. That would put it in a very different respect, a different perspective. Then the burden on us is minimal, all we have to do is look at it and say "well that's wrong, shoot-I forgot all about that, that was pretty good." Then you can go from there. That's one kind of, and that's probably not in policy, but it is in the implementation and what I'm asking for generally is more information flow from the top of the university back down to the faculty instead of this what seems like incessant demands to produce constant reports usually for which I go download the information from the administrators who are asking for it. I think that sort of thing would make it much more palatable to faculty. If it's less painful, less threatening, you know "you're going to have post tenure review, prepare a packet!" Ugh, well the tendency is "ok I'm going to give them 500 pages of information to make sure it's a slam dunk", but it may just be your six last annual reviews, which your department head should already have, let's sit down and look at those together and see if there's a trend or trajectory and the predominant assessment should be what has been your evaluation those six times. If those six times are excellent and

glowing it doesn't make sense to come around on the sixth year and say 'poor'. That's unfair to the faculty. It seems like one of the drafts still allowed the department head to do that, but I might be wrong. I don't have it with me right now. Post tenure review could be perceived as a very simple and painless kind of process. Maybe you all giving could give examples out to the faculty to understand how it could be simple and the department heads, how to do it instead of shoot- I know I'm on the P&T committee I'll be tasked to work on this and I will spend two years going to committee meetings pondering over exactly how to do this process. That's not productive. That keeps me from publishing papers.

Respondent: I 100% agree with you Mark. I think most departments should be using whatever faculty turn in with their annual reviews as part of their post tenure review policy. I have no problems whatsoever if that's the norm. If a department, and the faculty in the department however, choose that they want to do something different then I'm not going to stand in their way and say no you can't do it that way. I don't think anyone is saying it should be any more difficult than combining your last three annual reviews, or your last five, and have a set of peers looking at them as opposed to just the department head, if the peers were never involved in the annual review process. Not an issue.

Commentator: This sounds very familiar to what we do up here at the Baylor College of Dentistry. We have a five year post tenure review cycle. Our post tenure review peer review is our APT committee and it is essentially a combination of our last 5 annual reviews that we then compile so show our body of work and it then goes to the APT review committee. I agree with you, there should be no big surprises in the post tenure review. I think part of the issue that I'm still struggling with is the issue that you raised where you were saying that especially for the outside when the state legislature looks at this, when the public looks at us and they look at how we are policing our self in terms of our performance, if you look at the recommendations from the provost (number five of those recommendations) there is no clarity here. That allows for so much variability. For the public looking at that, they would say well just about anything goes. There is no straightforward process to be followed. Its straightforward unless you want to do it really complicated and then you can do it any way you wish. That certainly what I'm struggling with and what our college is struggling with is we find it pretty simple and straightforward and we don't understand how it can be so complicated. The document actually seems to be making it more complicated rather than less complicated.

Respondent: The recommendations came from the taskforce by the way not the provost.

Commentator: Oh, the provost taskforce, my apologies. I didn't read the whole sentence.

Respondent: Don't blame Mike; that was us. That probably one of the things that needs to be tidied up in terms of the language. What we were trying to do was to honor the different practices across the university. We didn't want to step on anyone existing practice if we could avoid it so we're allowing flexibility because different departments have post tenure review policies and practices but they're quite different. We were trying not to impose one on departments that already have one. The other thing, I wanted to come back to your comment. I've been subject to post tenure review for 20 years and I've never been aware of it. Somebody simply reports it; I guess they report that I'm satisfactory. They're looking at those materials that I submit every year and my activity report and my evaluations come out of that and so on. I'm completely unaware of the post tenure review process even though I know it's going on. Unless your department wanted to make something burdensome of this, I don't think it's a great big problem. It's just a matter of having a peer group sit down after three years or five years or six

years, go through that material, compile a list of faculty, and say “Ok, you guys are satisfactory”. Then you report that to the dean. One of the problems is that there was no report up so what we discovered was that there are some departments who have never done a post tenure review. They are out of compliance with the law. I don’t think it has to be a big administrative burden; it shouldn’t be. For 99% or 95% of the faculty who are reviewed, it’s going to be routine. “We pass.” If you, again, I would stress if you’re looking at the document and you see ways to improve the language, send us an email. Let us know what you think because this is subject now to review and revision. Ultimately it’s subject to approval by the Faculty Senate. It’s largely a faculty operation. No rule is going to be approved by the administration by itself; it’s got to pass muster in the Senate.

Moderator: You made one point, and maybe I’m thinking counterintuitively, but you, Clayton correct? Very articulate. What if someone is cross wired with their department head? We’ve had that in my department. We’ve also had department heads in our college that kind of fit through this exception where they’ve been there, honestly, we have had one department head that has been there 30 years as department head. Maybe this is something we could work on as Faculty Senate. Is there a way we could sort of work this into a positive? In terms of peer review, I mean in some ways, sometimes, maybe it’s me, I would much rather have my peers reviewing me than a department head that maybe doesn’t like me or there’s some animus or maybe we work in different fields. That could be something that is positive out of this. You could vision a faculty member who has gotten kind of lukewarm-ish annual reviews from the department head even though their performance may be better. I’m just throwing that out as a possibility. It’s a big university, lots of different things. Just a thought. We really do want to look at the positive things that we can do in terms of reforming this document.

Commentator: I want to bring attention to the fact that the comprehensive professional review which is the stuff to worry about will be initiated, according to 4.1, when a tenured faculty received three consecutive overall unsatisfactory annual reviews or an unsatisfactory peer review. We haven’t discussed that today here so I wanted to bring that to your attention. Three unsatisfactory consecutive reviews, three years, a comprehensive professional review without the peer review, right?

Respondent: Well the comprehensive professional review is a peer review.

Commentator: But doing a peer review is not necessarily three annual reviews unsatisfactory is enough to trigger the comprehensive professional review. Right? That’s what it says.

Respondent: Yeah and I don’t think that’s new.

Commentator: What is new is the fact that if you get unsatisfactory in service three consecutive years then you’re up for the comprehensive professional review, for instance. That’s a completely drastic change. I don’t think we should minimize the fact that “nothing has changed except for this little thing”. That little thing is actually a huge thing.

Commentator2: Although I think you could make the case there that in that particular case it actually can be helpful. Rather than waiting up to six years of being unsatisfactory and now you have to remediate to get up to a level of performing unsatisfactorily. That’s a big hole to dig out of. If you have three years of unsatisfactory that triggers a comprehensive professional review, you now have a peer review that can give you advice on how to come out of that so this is not necessarily negative. A lot of it is in perception.

Moderator: Thank you Dr. Opperman. One thing, now that Dr. Benedik is out of the room, I've been pushing and I pushed yesterday on this, for money for faculty development. If we're going towards 'needs to improve' what does that mean? What if someone needs money for data? What if they need money to develop their teaching skills and so forth? There are things that we can get in terms of money and resources for the faculty so this is something that is not punitive and negative but can be used to help them. What if faculty needs seed money for their research because grants are drying up? That's a problem we're hearing about. If we can get the university to give us some money for the faculty, to help people, maybe we could make something good in that respect. It's easier said than done. I sense from Dr. Benedik that there was a willingness to go in that direction. Clearly there has to be a tradeoff here. If we're going to be putting people into a 'needs to improve' well you need to improve how do we help you do that?

Respondent: Remember the original rule. If you go through the comprehensive professional review now called the comprehensive professional review and there's a 'need to improve' say. There's also a commitment in the rule that the university has to help you develop a plan and I forgot whether it states it explicitly but the idea was that there would be an investment. We're essentially rehabilitating the faculty member. I don't know that the administration ever made a commitment along those lines but that was the intent. Again, the very first time we did this, the whole idea was to help faculty perform better if they weren't performing up to expectations. The argument we made going in was it takes you six years to earn tenure, it ought to take you at least six years to lose it. Furthermore the institution ought to be helpful to the faculty member, so it wasn't ever intended to be a punitive process. Unless the faculty member agrees to a plan and then fails to execute it. That's the only point at which you really come to a problem. That's three to six years down the line from the initial process.

Moderator: Thank you Richard. President Young, if any of you went to his speech to the faculty, emphasized the fact that we need to work on developing the faculty that have been here for a while. Neilson-Gammon, I think we were on Faculty Senate together 18 years ago (we're dating ourselves). We're hiring all this superstar faculty. What about the people, some who are in this room, that have been here a while? We maybe need to refurbish our skills. Clearly the faculty development leaves and things like that are meant to help accomplish those sort of things but I want, at least my view is, through whatever voice I have and we have on the Faculty Senate this year is to try to use this thing to help get money for the faculty to develop if we can.

Respondent: Since Mike is now out of the room I'm going to answer this as well. A parallel with this, some of us pushed for a taskforce on management and leadership in the university to elevate the bar on that side of the house. I've mentioned this to the president a couple of times; he seems to like the idea. The executive committee is now in cahoots, if you will, with the Dean of Faculties Office to develop a plan to do that. So we're going to push forward with that because one of the messages that comes out of all these conversations is there's a whole lot of distrust of the administration- department heads on up. One of the things we need to do for Texas A&M is to remedy that. The intent there is to improve the administrative practice of the institution. My argument is, trust has to come from the top; faculty can't build it. We need to work on that side of the problem as well (they need a post tenure review).

Moderator: Dr. Sicilio says "that's right".

Commentator: I'll speak loudly. I'm so very proud of everyone who has spoken.

Moderator: Mark please introduce yourself.

Commentator: I'm Mark Sicilio, Pediatrics. Howdy Lynn, up in Dallas. She's the elephant one in the room, I'll tell ya and everyone else here has been as well. The passion is apparent. People are very committed. There's also a lot of anxiety about opportunity, security, inequity... it's got to be resolved. Just sitting back looking from afar, there are so many different departments and different approaches and it really seems to me unfair to have so many different levels of evaluation. For one department head to have a bad relationship or a history to be cavalier, etc., that's unacceptable. Again, I always go back to the same deal though, the faculty have to contribute, right? Being on faculty isn't an opportunity to slack, at all, and we have to hold each other accountable to a high standard of performance. If we're not doing that then we're bad stewards of the state resources and we're taking advantage of the hardest workers. We don't want to do that, I don't think? I think if we take a standard and are very fair, we have to rally around each other as well because we want people to be able to work and perform and achieve their potential. I loved your comments, sir, about all the different levels and the holistic approach because holistic evaluation is very helpful in medicine and it would I think be helpful with the faculty also. I applaud, seriously, everyone's comments. I'm glad it's recorded because this needs to be teased out, the suggestions, and Rick and John are so committed to the process as is Lynn. We've got to tease out the great suggestions and put them in the document and come back and revisit and hold administration, who is faculty, to the same standard that we are asking of ourselves. Thank you all very much for coming.

Moderator: We have some more time. Any other comments you want on the record, press or claim?

Commentator: You all opened that bag of snakes of reviewing administrators, and it's not necessarily reviewing administrators but to, as I mentioned before, coach them on what best practices are. I have heard of department heads who announce that "we don't take votes in our department". So much for faculty governance. I've heard other stories about department heads and leadership who do an 'us against them' strategy. "Let's bash the other departments in the college." There are some egregious practices. I'm terribly worried about someone who's been department head 30 years, they've got to be a glutton for punishment, you know, but at times there have been rumors of term limits. Right now, my understanding is there aren't term limits for deans or department heads.

Moderator: There are term limits, but they can be extended for department heads.

Commentator: I think there is a great deal of validity to looking at administrative roles as temporary because that involves more faculty in administration and understanding the challenges and difficulties of it. I was an executive associate dean and interim department head and chose not to keep doing administration. I love teaching and I love the faculty position but I also felt it was time for someone else to learn the ropes. Although the legislature may not be mandating that, it may be something the faculty senate could... I hope there's some movement towards administrative review. Also in the same sense of the faculty post tenure review is not meant to be punitive, it's meant to be corrective and encouraging and improving, the same way the administrative review is meant to be. Honestly, most people when they become department head have never done any administrative work before. They do not know how to do it. There really needs to be considerably more training for administrators than what I witnessed as administrator and what I kind of perceive around the university.

Moderator: Your point's extremely well taken. We brought this up and are working on it in the Faculty Senate with Dr. Carlson taking the lead. There's training for department heads but it's not mandatory that they attend, so the dean of faculties says most of them don't come. There you go, just some of the things we can work on.

Respondent: The contrast I have drawn for the benefit of the president and others when I've talked to them about this is between the military and academic institutions. If you're going to be a general officer or a fleet officer in the military you're going to be steeped in leadership training and practice and evaluated on leadership. You're not going to get there if you don't have those qualities. We choose department heads, and that's where it starts, probably for all the wrong reasons. We never ask whether they have the qualities of leadership that we're looking for. They get no training. They're rarely held accountable and we have no mechanism for mitigation. Those are four items on my hit list for a task force to take a look at. I can tell you even going up to searched for presidents and vice presidents and what-not, I've seen a lot of CVs, been in a lot of interviews, you probably have to. We never ask about leadership qualities. People what to boast about their accomplishments. After the fact I realized that I should have been asking "how much damage did you do to your organization when you made that accomplishment? What resources did you strip away from something else so you'd have a bullet for your CV?" I've seen that time and again. My argument is, A&M has an opportunity to break the mold for academic institutions by actually doing something to ensure really high quality management and leadership. People understand what the best practices are so you don't do unintentional damage to the institution by doing frankly stupid things. I could sit here and give you a catalog of stupid things that I've witnessed and you're laughing but you could do the same thing couldn't you? There are some things I could have done better or would have done differently.

Commentator: I'd like to say something. First of all, we take the good intentions for granted. Everybody wants to help, everybody wants to improve the institution, everybody wants to be collaborative, cooperative and so forth. It seems to me at the same time, what always happens to good intentions? I'm not worried about the deans; I'm not worried about the heads of the departments; I'm worried about the guy that has been in the profession for 35 years who all of a sudden has some personal crisis and he's not aligning with the course of the department or maybe he's a little eccentric or he hasn't been publishing a lot, those are the people that worry me. When I hear the notion 'tightening up the screws' of post tenure review is not meant to be punitive it's meant to be corrective, nice, meant to help, you know, I tremble. We know, for instance, I am sure (there is no comparison of course, don't think I am making a comparison, I am just dropping the thing on the table) when the 'good guys' in the communist party came up with the notion of reeducation like in the 60s, they also meant to be corrective and nice and to help the members, but we know what happened with that.

Moderator: Your point is extremely well taken and I know one concern we've talked about a lot is that unequal enforcement. One person that doesn't align after 35 years and so for he's our friend and we like him and somehow we let that person pass. In another context we put the screws to somebody and that's not fair. We need to make sure whatever we do is fair and uniform for people. The department heads have a lot of power in this. We talked to President Young about it. You guys have been former department heads. The way it's structured as I understand it is department heads have a lot of power.

Respondent: Within post tenure review?

Moderator: Just in general.

Respondent: Oh well yeah. At least, when I was department head we had post tenure review and I never saw any part of it. Wasn't in my hands, it was a faculty process. Maybe the intent is that this is a faculty driven process so maybe what needs to be added somewhere in the SAP is to say explicitly "this must be a faculty process". So we had an example of one post tenure review committee where the department head was on the committee. No. No administrators should be allowed to serve on that group. It's a peer group. We probably need to do something when we recraft this thing to say "this is a faculty driven process".

Moderator: And the same committees will deal with people across the colleges. You could have a situation where certain committees apply for certain people in the college and you want to make sure it's clear, is it a departmental committee? Is it a college committee? Who's on these committees? Who chooses these committee members?

Respondent: We probably have to make it clear that the criteria have to be crafted and approved by the faculty. It can't be dictated by department heads and deans.

Commentator: Do you foresee the possibility that if a certain eccentric faculty member was cross wise with the rest of the faculty but the department head went to bat for that person, do you see a way to protect against that?

Respondent: I think that comes down to effective leadership. I would hope that you wouldn't have a peer review that would punish someone for being different in some way. You're supposed to be looking at people's productivity not personality. My own experience is limited to my own department and my own college and I can't imagine it happening but I suppose it could in some places. Remember, there are grievance procedures, so there are other protections. You'd hope you never have to invoke those. There's a Dean of Faculties Office, based on my own observation over the years the Dean of Faculties Office needs to be more proactive in protecting faculty. That's a different issue altogether.

Commentator: This may be college specific or even department specific but it seems to me the culture of peer interaction at this university has been so drastically undermined that people no longer know how to act without the eye of the head of the department on them. I would be very weary of instituting a system of peer review with supervision by the head or administrator. I think that this university has lost the ability to function that way out of lack of practice and out of the system undermining faculty governance. I wanted to say that because that is my experience over the last five years.

Moderator: Does anyone else have any points or things they'd like to raise? We are going to continue this dialogue in Faculty Senate with the executive committee I'd really encourage people to come to those meetings and participate again. We're having another faculty forum on the 16th. Thank you so much for coming I know this is a very complicated document and we're going to try to make it as clear and as uniform as possible.

Respondent: I would point out one last thing. One of the good thing about having these rules opened up is that it's an opportunity to improve them. I mentioned previously, a lot of what we're hearing about are concerns about the original rule and unless you get a proposed change you don't get an opportunity to fix those things either.