

Promotion, Tenure, & Post-tenure review Taskforce  
Meeting notes 10/10/23

Attendance: Dr. Michelle Taylor, Dr. Terene Stiltner, Dr. Darrell Thompson, Dr. Amanda Matoushek, Dr. Joe Beckett

Dr. Beckett said that the President would like 2 weeks to review P&T portfolios and requested the timeline be updated. Waiting for a date from Dr. Rhonemus to add to the P&T timeline.

Academic sub-committee of BOG meets 10/26 at 3pm. The Board wants to be aware of faculty concerns.

Dr. Beckett responded to the taskforce's list of questions:

1. Last year, Dr. Lewis assured the faculty that post-tenure review is not meant to be punitive, however it seems to have been designed that way. Can we remove the punitive component (i.e. faculty losing their positions or losing tenure)?
  - a. The review is not meant to be punitive. We should make recommendations for changes to the policy to remove punitive language. Possibly change "improvement plan" to "faculty development plan"
2. Will there actually be salary enhancements available every year for successful post-tenure reviews? If salary enhancements are not guaranteed can we remove it from the policy/procedure?
  - a. We should talk to Ronnie Hypes to find out if money will be available annually.
3. In AP-FC-001 section 3.2.2 it states that a Dean may issue a satisfactory determination when a faculty only minor improvements in 3 or less areas – what is considered minor improvement? This doesn't seem to have been followed last year (as evidenced by the School of Business Faculty decisions).
  - a. Dr. Rhonemus told Dr. Beckett faculty should meet or exceed 70%.
4. In AP-FC-001 section 2.3.14 what is the definition of "special competence earned from professional experience"? Who determines this? We need this to be measurable...can you quantify this?
  - a. Dr. Rhonemus provided Dr. Beckett with documents to measure tested experience. Dr. Beckett will share with the taskforce.
5. For the Schools of Education and Criminal Justice, they do not report to a Dean, so how does this work in the evaluation process? Do they skip the Dean's evaluation? Does the program director/Chair conduct evaluate faculty? How will this be equitable with the Colleges?
  - a. Organizational Chart needs to be updated and finalized to determine who will conduct evaluations.
  - b. This brings forward issues created by the organizational chart related to issues in terms of supervision, evaluation, equity, etc.
6. Who will be notifying faculty that are up for post-tenure review this year? Can a master list be created so all tenured faculty know when they will be going up for review?
  - a. Dr. Rhonemus has a list of faculty up for post-tenure review this year and for 2024-2025. Will be shared with faculty next week.
7. Can we get rid of redundant areas in the portfolio?
  - a. "We are fans of reducing redundancy." Taskforce should make recommendations on how to do this.

8. Do transcripts need to be included in the portfolio? Obviously we had them to get the job and to be granted tenure, do they need to be revisited? They exist in our personnel files which are housed in Human Resources.
  - a. Transcripts can be taken out unless additional courses/credentials have been earned.
9. AP-FC-001 section 6.3 indicates that appeals go to the President who made the determination in the first place. Can an appeals committee be created for this consisting of one BOG member and a tenured faculty member from each College/School?
  - a. It is logical to create an appeals committee. May want to suggest change to P&T to include appeals committee as well.
10. AP-FC-001 section 2.4 on Faculty comments – anonymous submissions are not allowed, therefore the Dean knows who the comments are from, and the Dean is part of the post-tenure recommendation process. Is this not a conflict? Also, comments should only be allowed from tenured faculty members, however this is not stated in the procedure.
  - a. Agreed that someone not in the evaluation chain could remove names from comments and ensure comments are only from tenured faculty.
11. Can we create a peer committee (or use the existing P&T committee) to make a recommendation on post-tenure? Can we make the P&T and post-tenure processes as similar as possible?
  - a. Would like to P&T and Post-tenure processes to be as similar as possible. Taskforce should recommend adding P&T committee to post-tenure.
12. Can we include that an unsatisfactory determination at any level (Dean, Provost, President) must be accompanied by a written rationale with evidence?
  - a. Rationale should be provided from all levels of evaluation. Scored rubric with rationale should be returned to applicant.
13. Can we move post-tenure review to a 5-year cycle instead of 3 years?
  - a. Find out what other schools do, make a recommendation. Possibly 5-year cycle with monetary incentive.
14. Are there any other schools in the state that conduct post-tenure reviews?
  - a. The taskforce should research this. Sarita has a list of peer institutions we should compare to.
15. As noted in the state news cycle, the WVU Faculty Assembly voted down the post-tenure review process and President Gee followed that advisory action. We were never given an opportunity to vote on it or be a part of its creation. As you will see the AAUP said that the process should be faculty led and peer reviewed (neither have happened in its creation by the President and the BOG). Can we (the faculty) take a vote to determine if faculty support continuing post-tenure reviews in current/any form?
  - a. Taskforce should provide evidence to BOG (or BOG academics sub-committee) that annual evals are conducted and include most of the info for the post-tenure review. Demonstrate redundancy and waste of time for faculty and admin.