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THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
1995-96
VOLUME 20
Called by the Faculty Senate
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1995
4:00 P.M.
KIVA

TO DISCUSS AND GIVE INPUT ON
THE FINAL DRAFT
OF THE POST-TENURE REVIEW
TASK FORCE REPORT

THE TASK FORCE ENCOURAGES YOUR
PARTICIPATION!

ALL FACULTY SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED A COPY OF THE ORIGINAL REPORT.
IF YOU DID NOT THE POST-TENURE REVIEW REPORT IS AVAILABLE THROUGH
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1995

This meeting was called by the Faculty Senate to allow the faculty to hold an open, informal discussion regarding the post-tenure review report. The meeting began at 4:10 p.m. in the Kiva.

Robert Sickels, Chair, Post-Tenure Review Task Force presided.

Senators present: Alok Bohara (Economics), Tom DeCoste (Orthopaedics), Victor Delclos (Education), John Geissman (Earth & Planetary Sciences), Roy Johnson (Civil Engineering), William Johnson (Biology), Tom Kyner (Theatre & Dance), Larry Lavender (Theatre & Dance), Harry Lull (General Library), Elizabeth Nielsen (Education), Kees Oonnewer (Mathematics & Statistics), Peter Pabisch (Foreign Languages & Literature), Maurice Wildin (Mechanical Engineering), Beulah Woodfin (Biochemistry)

Faculty present: David Baldwin (General Library), Garland Bills (Linguistics), Stephen Burd (Anderson Schools of Management), Louise Lamphere (Anthropology), Byron Lindsey (Foreign Languages & Literature), Vera Norwood (American Studies), Henry Shapiro (Computer Science), Robert Sickels (Political Science), Warren Smith (Foreign Languages & Literature), Paul Weiss (General Library), Hugh Witemeyer (English)

Professor Sickels provided a brief summary on the report of the Post-Tenure Review Task Force. He said under this proposal relatively few faculty would undergo any formal reviews. Some universities have set three-year or five-year reviews for all faculty. Other universities, similarly as UNM, have suggested one way or another to keep track of a faculty regularly, conducting formal reviews only after two successive years of bad annual reviews. Professor Sickels described the proposed time schedule. He said if a faculty member has two successive bad reviews, then a formal review would occur in the third year. In keeping with the Academic Freedom & Tenure provision of the Faculty Handbook, there would be a period allowing the faculty member to reform. It is not specified how long this would be. If the faculty member does not shape up, he or she would be brought before the AF&T Committee and the Faculty Handbook rules would then apply. At each step of the post-tenure review process there is a chance not only that a faculty member would be found deficient, but could be found not to be deficient. The proposed post-tenure review process would build a paper trail of annual reviews for the record. It would require yearly evaluations of all faculty, which would make it likely that a person who is doing well would not be found deficient. It would make it difficult for a department chair to suddenly decide that what a faculty member has been doing or has been planning to do is not satisfactory. Professor Sickels said Senator Wildin's suggestion that faculty be allowed to vote in the cases of formal reviews was a good one, and this important change will be discussed by the task force for possible incorporation in the post-tenure review report. Professor Sickels said instead of having...
decisions made only by departmental chairs in formal reviews the chair would be assisted by at least three faculty members; or a majority vote by the faculty not to be overturned by the chair; or an elected college-wide committee deciding with the dean, or having the power to decide by a majority vote. A number of options are being considered.

Comments from those in attendance at this meeting are summarized below:

Senator Pabish felt the number of annual reviews for all faculty as outlined in the post-tenure review are already in place. Student evaluations (ICES), peer reviews, annual evaluations for salary recommendations, evaluations of teaching, etc., are being conducted on a regular and equitable basis in some colleges, such as Arts and Sciences.

Senate Vice President Llull pointed out that colleges have different procedures and the scope of annual reviews are not conducted as extensively in some colleges.

A faculty member from the Anderson Schools of Management said faculty have been discussing the post-tenure review report and feel the system suggested could be counterproductive. He said a faculty member who has ventured into new ideas and research may find the chair telling him that he has not performed as required, constituting inadequate teaching performance even though the faculty member has been performing admirably in other areas. Anderson Schools of Management faculty would like to have a balance in the post-tenure review process with faculty deciding who is really deficient. They would like to protect themselves when doing what is required of them.

Professor Henry Shapiro expressed concern that some colleges protect their own and do not adhere to an equitable review policy. He would like to see a statement of criteria in the post-tenure review report that would allow more protection for faculty members from strong chairs who may bully their faculty to increase emphasis in other areas. He said a mechanism is needed in the proposed post-tenure review procedures that would identify problems publicly for when a chair does not adhere to recognizing inadequate performance of faculty member(s).

Professor Louise Lamphere and Garland Bills, Chair, Linguistics Department felt the suggested post-tenure review process is too cumbersome and would require an inordinate amount of paperwork annually. Professor Bills said he is already overwhelmed with work. He said the post-tenure review process would add more to his workload and he would like to see this document "tossed and started over".

Professors Robert Sickels and Vera Norwood stated they did not think the post-tenure review process requiring annual evaluations of all faculty would require that much more paperwork. The annual reviews are already being conducted for faculty salary recommendations to the dean. Professors Sickels and Norwood estimated that approximately 95% would be informal reviews (annual reviews) and 5% would constitute the more thorough, formal reviews for non-performing faculty members.
Professor Sickels said he was told that the UNM Health Sciences faculty think it is much easier to have annual reviews instead of every five years.

Professor David Baldwin said the post-tenure review document appeared to him to read very defensively. He said a strong review process is needed in order for the legislature to go along with it, otherwise post-tenure review will be imposed on faculty.

Professor Warren Smith expressed concern that some faculty do not turn in annual supplements to the biographical record reports. He supports the idea of openness and frankness during salary reviews for faculty.

Senator Woodfin stated that a small percentage of non-performing faculty exist, however, the legislature’s view is that there is a large number of these faculty. The post-tenure review document will protect faculty by showing their productivity.

Senate Vice President Wildin said the legislature provides tenure would be removed only in inadequate teaching. The Faculty Senate added the other issues to be addressed by the post-tenure review task force.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.
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