Report on Post Tenure Review

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee charged the Ad-Hoc Committee on Post Tenure Review with reviewing the implementation of the Post-Tenure Review policy across the campus. Identify areas of inconsistencies, concerns, or successes, and report recommendations as appropriate to FacEx.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ad-Hoc Committee on Post Tenure Review (PRT) distributed a survey in the Fall of 2015 to faculty members that had gone through the Post Tenure Review during the first year of implementation.

The overall response rate was 43%¹.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor/Librarian</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor/Librarian</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplines</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural science</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Libraries</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years since your last promotion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Based on total emails sent to Faculty members that had completed PTR in 2014-2015.
SURVEY ANALYSIS

METHODS
- Survey developed by the Ad-Hoc PTR Committee in October 2015
- Distributed by the Governance office via confidential email list received by the Vice Provost for Faculty Development.
- Available for response November 12- December 1, 2015

RESULTS
- 37 completed surveys, which is a 43% response rate from the Lawrence campus faculty
- Topics included in the survey:
  - Who did you consult regarding your post-tenure review
  - What was your experience going through PTR
  - What resulted from completing post-tenure review
  - Comments section at the end of the survey question

Survey Question:
If you consulted any of the sources below for information about post-tenure review, please indicate the extent to which each was helpful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely unhelpful</th>
<th>Moderately unhelpful</th>
<th>Neither helpful nor unhelpful</th>
<th>Moderately helpful</th>
<th>Extremely helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

School or College policy and website

- Extremely unhelpful: 0%
- Moderately unhelpful: 5%
- Neither helpful nor unhelpful: 10%
- Moderately helpful: 20%
- Extremely helpful: 45%

Department policy and governance documents

- Extremely unhelpful: 10%
- Moderately unhelpful: 15%
- Neither helpful nor unhelpful: 20%
- Moderately helpful: 25%
- Extremely helpful: 30%
- 40% of the respondents found the KU Provost’s Policy Neither Helpful nor Unhelpful
- 38% of the respondents found their own School or College policy and website Moderately helpful
- 42% of the respondents found their chairs Extremely helpful
- Open information meetings for faculty and faculty mentors were Extremely unhelpful.

Comments:
- The process is unhelpful; there is no clear outline as to what was to be reported, unsure of the purpose of the review.
- This was the first year, and no others had experience with the process.
- I co-authored the school policy, so I was familiar with the policy.
Survey Questions:

Based on your experience going through the post-tenure review process, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

Strongly disagree   Disagree   Neither agree nor disagree   Agree   Strongly agree

Post-tenure review serves an important purpose.

My faculty peer-evaluators seemed to understand the purpose of post-tenure review.

My immediate unit administrator (eg: chair, director, dean) seemed to understand the purpose of post-tenure review.

Sufficient guidance was provided to me about what to expect during the post-tenure review process.
It was clear how my research and scholarship would be evaluated during post-tenure review.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

It was clear how my teaching would be evaluated during post-tenure review.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

It was clear how my service would be evaluated during post-tenure review.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Anticipating post-tenure review was stressful.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

The criteria for post-tenure review seemed consistent with prior performance evaluations.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

The criteria for post-tenure review seemed sufficiently flexible to account for my varied interests, activities, and accomplishments.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
The criteria for post-tenure review were sufficiently flexible to recognize my efforts at different career stages.

The post-tenure review process resulted in consequences that were negative and/or stigmatizing.

The post-tenure review process resulted in feedback that was beneficial for my continued development.

Preparing the requisite materials for post-tenure review was time consuming.

The post-tenure review process has resulted in additional support and/or resources for my continued development.

The materials upon which post-tenure review were based allowed adequate opportunities for presenting my varied accomplishments.
I received copies of all evaluation materials (e.g., committee’s summary report, unit administrator’s written statements) that were placed in my post-tenure review file.

Overall, I am satisfied with the outcome(s) of my post-tenure review.

I had the opportunity to submit my own written response(s) for inclusion in my post-tenure review file.

The procedures for handling disagreements about my evaluation were clear.

Overall, the post-tenure review process was conducted in a fair manner.
Summary:

- The same amount of respondents either strongly disagreed or agreed that Post-Tenure Review serves an important purpose.
- The majority of respondents agreed that their faculty peer-evaluators and unit administrators understood the purpose of post-tenure review.
- 67% of responses neither agree nor disagree that the procedures for handling disagreements regarding evaluations were clear.
• 50% of responses agree the overall post-tenure review process was conducted in a fair manner.
• 47% of responses agree with the outcome of their post-tenure review.

Comments

• 55% of the responses were negative
• 20% of the responses were Good
• 15% of the responses were suggestions
• 10% of the responses were from faculty that were in the first group to go through the process.

Negative Comments:

• “Get rid of the process. Find a different way to go after your under-performing faculty and spare the rest of us this waste of time.”
• It serves no additional purpose.
• There should be a solid and obvious appeal process.
• It seems to vary between different units at the university.

Positive Comments:

• Our department chair was very helpful. I agree with the principle of accountability. The post tenure review by a committee of peers was done in an excellent manner, providing feedback on teaching, research and service.

Suggestions obtained from comments on the process:

• People who are at the 7 year mark from the time they were promoted to associate should be allowed to wait for PTR one year, and just simply go up for full that year instead. It is ridiculous to have two committees review the file with different criteria but thinking that PTR informs promotion process. They were given different criteria for PTR and yet felt compelled to judge my PTR as if it was for promotion to full. They made comments that without external reviewers they couldn't judge the value or impact of my work and ranked me lower in part because of it. PTR does not require or allow for external reviewers.

• Don't require the submission of detailed and voluminous collections of materials that have been accumulated and noted in the usual places (CV, etc.). Eliminate the tone that implies that there is a lot of "deadwood" around here. Acknowledge that we are all subjected to entirely too much evaluation. Don't request a report of this magnitude in January. Let the University know the overall results of the process--not the publication of individual evaluations--but report on whether the exercise truly yielded information that faculty and departments could learn from.
Additional Comments:

(Verbatim)

PTR is a malicious practice that is designed to brow beat faculty who are already over-evaluated. Administration should be evaluated by their constituents (faculty) as much as faculty are evaluated each year. Those evaluations should be shared with faculty so that appropriate actions could be taken. When asked in the LJW recently about any plans for retirement on the part of Chancellor Bernadette Gray-Little she was obsequious at best and yet we are asked in this survey whether we have been brow beaten enough so as to change our retirement plans. The goal is obvious; get the faculty to turn over and retire. Shame on you. Meanwhile, the Chancellor is embroiled with her Provost Vitter is outrageous scandals on campus: student sexual harassment charges, racism, curtailment of academic freedom on campus, and even a left-over scandal from UNC wherein class credits were given away. Did the Chancellor come clean on what she knew and when? Did her husband, Shade? Of course not! And yet she gets a pass. Looks like evaluation is only for the indentured servants and students, not the regal administration. In all the time at KU I have noted that KU faculty are paid at or close to the bottom of their peer institutions but when comparisons are made between administrators at those same peer institutions KU Administrators come out near or at the top of the pack. So, the faculty are unworthy but the administration is wonderful. The emperor has no clothes and it is becoming clearer and clearer to faculty even to ones who are apathetic, brow beaten or otherwise disassociated from the institution. This is no way to energize faculty if that is even the goal. It is a great way to just engender more disdain toward the uncaring administration who have demonstrated that they not only do not care about faculty but now they do not even care about the very ones we should all be here for, the students. Once again, shame on Vitter and Gray-Litter. Good riddance to Vitter and now we should all be asking, "When will the Chancellor retire?" Not soon enough for me and many others.

In many ways this post tenure review is an attack on Academic Freedom, and is primarily a way of rubber stamping administrative decisions that have previously been made.

The exercise is a waste of time and will ultimately be used to eliminate tenure.

I am unsure of the purpose of the PTR, given the fact that faculty already undergo yearly evaluations at the department level. The PTR is an extra layer of work in the system. However, its only value to me was that it helped me look at my career over time, in a comprehensive way.

In my case, a favorable outcome was not in doubt, and the process was to a large extent pointless. Although it provided an opportunity to get some positive feedback, the outcome of the process was not helpful in any respect. I did not receive any additional resources or support and there was no real collegial discuss of my career (which was partly how the PTR process was billed). Thus, a fair amount of time and effort—not only mine, but also that of the members of the committee, was spent for no apparent reason. Spectacular waste of time and resources. Yes, let's improve people's performance by making them do even more paperwork (and then fill out a survey about the experience of filling out more paperwork). I have nothing positive to say about the process, and I gained nothing from the process. So by all means, let's keep doing this. (To be clear, I received a positive assessment in all categories.)

No

I have participated in annual reviews (School of Engineering Faculty Activity Reports) since at least 1990, 25 years. The EECS Department and the School of Engineering has a record of my performance. The PTR adds nothing but additional work to this established process and record. The PTR process basically says, "We (KU) do not trust you (schools, departments, and faculty) to monitor faculty on a regular basis and
take appropriate action." The EECS Department has an established Faculty Evaluation Plan filed with the Office of the Provost. Why is this not sufficient?

I underwent three simultaneous reviews last year. I honestly believe this was an excessive burden. Many schools such as mine already do post-tenure reviews, and in these cases, there is no need to add another one.

Fortunately, the Dean and Provost accepted the recommendations of the departmental review committee and ignored the arbitrary violation of departmental and university regulations by the chair.

Having this due at the same time as annual merit evaluations is extremely poor timing.

As implemented, it is not clear to me that the post-tenure review assembled any information that is not readily available from the annual performance evaluations. In which case, there seems to be little, if any, justification for the exercise. Many faculty members are specialized in their areas of teaching and research. I am among them. The only people qualified to assess my performance are people in my areas of teaching and research outside of KU. We recognized this with P&T review by drawing upon external reviewers. Thus, if there is a need for post-tenure review, the process needs to