1. Description of Committee Activities and/or Issues Discussed

- Developed and approved a change in the policy statement “implementation practices/stopping the tenure clock” document with respect to an automatic one-year extension of the tenure system probationary appointment for reasons related to the birth or adoption of a child, upon faculty request. Faculty are no longer required to take a 12 week leave in order to be eligible for this option.

- Approved the motion that the request for the implementation practice above must be submitted within two years of the birth/adoption of a
child but no later than the due date for submission of the dossier for the next reappointment/promotion/tenure review.

○ The Committee was asked to forward the names of tenured faculty for consideration for service as Dismissal for Cause Review Officers.

○ Suggested revisions to the annual memorandum on Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Recommendations. The committee felt that a) faculty history of salary increases and b) potential employment by other universities may not be a reliable measure of performance.

○ Reviewed/approved extension requests from 16 probationary tenure system faculty members.

○ Spent several meetings discussing a draft of a policy on post-tenure development and review at MSU. The committee had strong concerns about the policy proposal and presented these concerns and comments to the UCFA Personnel Policies subcommittee.

The principles and values that the UCFT felt were critical are

1. All policies need to respect academic freedom.
2. Faculty evaluations need to be based on unit criteria developed by the faculty and are an absolute and not a normative comparison (where someone is good and someone is bad). It is critical that unit faculty think about and develop their own unit criteria.
3. Faculty development needs to be across the career cycle and dissociated from punitive connotations.
4. There must be faculty/peer involvement in the process through faculty elected faculty advisory committee members or other faculty mechanisms.

Furthermore, the committee voiced strong concerns

1. about the specification and validity of criterion/measures to be used across different disciplines
2. about the definition of “failed to meet expectations” and “incompetent” and ways that it links with the notion of post-tenure review.
3. that the proposed draft policy will have a negative impact on the culture and climate within the departments and colleges and university at large.
4. that the proposed draft would exacerbate problems with existing policies and their enforcement.
Representatives from the UCFA Personnel Policies subcommittee attended two UCFT meetings to discuss the draft policy on post-tenure development and review. Questions that developed were:

- What problem does the post-tenure review policy solve?
- How many faculty would be impacted by a post-tenure review policy?
- What does the concept of tenure mean if there is a post-tenure review policy?
- What is the impact of the quality of annual reviews on a post-tenure review policy?

2. Matters Pending before the Committee

- Consideration of changes to university bylaw documents pertaining to annual review.
  - The committee would like to identify and frame the problems associated with the annual review process and discipline short of dismissal and work with existing policies to address their problems.
  - The committee is considering prompting departments and faculty to think about annual review
  - The committee would like to develop a survey on faculty opinion on existing university faculty review.

- Election of Committee Chairperson.

3. Issues Making the Committee’s Work more Difficult

None to report

4. Changes to the Academic Governance System to Improve the Committee’s Work

None to report.