



The topic of discussion at the last meeting, said Barbara Krieger-Brockett, was how faculty can retain the opportunity for salary adjustments if the administration, or the committee that is appointed, does not take the 10-year review as seriously as it should be taken. "I can vouch for previous 10-year reviews, for one reason or another, not having been taken all that seriously," said Krieger-Brockett. She posed the question to the group: Do you feel that Executive Orders are enough?

Luchtel said he would like to see the Program Review made part of the Faculty Code instead of an Executive Order. Olswang insisted that the Program Reviews are already in the Handbook since they are part of an Executive Order, and differed with Krieger-Brockett in that he believes the reviews have always been taken seriously. The difference, he said, is that there was never a reward issue attached as there is now with the Code changes on salaries.

Chip Haley said his perception of the reward issue is that "it's broader than salaries" and includes a survey of department needs. Olswang agreed, and added that there have always been resources attached to help departments improve deficiencies.

Haley queried the Council as to next steps in the process - does the membership wish to work on codifying the Review process, or appoint a subcommittee to see how the unit salary adjustment and Program Reviews should be connected, or not pursue the issue at all?

In the discussion that followed, some Council members saw the issue as primarily a salary issue and thought it was a bad time to revisit salary concerns. Others believed that allowing the Academic Program Review to exist only in the form of an Executive Order is not a good idea, and that both the requirement for a periodic Academic Program Review and its processes should be codified and tied to the unit salary adjustment.

Kate O'Neill asserted that widespread disclosure of the Academic Program Review, its importance, and its implications for departments may be preferable to adding mandates to the Code. She would like to see summaries of reviews disclosed and made widely available - perhaps on the Web, as Debra Friedman suggested at the Feb 7 meeting - and to track that over time to see what results the Reviews produce for units. Marilyn Roberts and Catherine Graubard agreed, commenting that disclosure would also give departments some idea of expectations for their reviews, plus a template of sorts to use as a guideline in the process. Krieger-Brockett observed that departments now have little idea of the positive outcomes that can result from their reviews.

Olswang agreed that departments may need more guidance in the 10-year review process, including Web access to summaries of prior reviews, published information about expectations and process, and widespread disclosure of potential benefits for departments - increased resources, unit salary adjustments for outstanding but underpaid units, and the like. Olswang will look into the materials that departments now receive to see if they answer all these concerns, and will assess what might need to be developed to meet deficiencies. He will advise the Council of his findings.

Graubard suggested that a routine be put in place to contact departments in the middle of the 10-year cycle, revisit their last 10-year Review results, and suggest they take time to internally assess their progress toward their goals and commitments. In this way, course corrections could be made while there is still time to do so.

Haley suggested that the Council treat this as a continuing issue; Olswang said he will bring back to Council more information on the 10-year Review, including copies of preparatory materials now being

sent to departments, so a revised document can be developed if need be. He will also supply the text of the present Executive Order that governs the 10-year Review.

### **Report on Chapter 24 Revisions and Discussion of Issues**

Haley reminded the Council that there are two more meetings before the next SEC agenda deadline; any Class A legislation that might be passed this academic year must be ready for the March 22 SEC agenda.

The Chapter 24 subcommittee reported that it has surveyed the faculty via WebQ as to how well the planning conferences mandated in Chapter 24 are working. O'Neill reported 164 responses via WebQ and email. The responses were fascinating, said O'Neill. She would like to see the information made widely available, if this could be done while retaining strict confidentiality - this may or may not be possible.

The survey clarified that the conference process works well in departments where the Chair or Dean takes it seriously - in these cases, faculty tend to find the conferences helpful and to be favorably impressed by the process. If not taken seriously, the conferences don't work and people find them a waste of time or even problematic.

The subcommittee proposed that Council discuss the possibility of recommending to Deans that they confer one-to-one with Chairs who neglect or misuse the conference requirement. In addition, the subcommittee would like to see Council recommend to the appropriate body that information on the Chapter 24 planning conference requirement be included in new faculty information programs. Olswang commented that this information is now given to new faculty at least twice.

The subcommittee identified two structural problems with the present process:

- The conference and report bind the Chair or Dean, but not the senior faculty who vote on promotion.
- Where the conference function has been delegated to division heads, some do not regard themselves as bound to file a report since the Code says the Dean or Chair shall file a report. In that case, no one files a report.

Olswang was appalled at this last finding, stating that there is no ambiguity that the person to whom the conference is delegated sits in the role of the Chair and should file the report.

"What the survey really pointed out," said Luchtel "is that some of the Chairs are just not educated as to what this review is about. When it's delegated to division heads, they don't know either - so the problem is even worse, since they tend not to follow the requirement that the review needs to be written up. So the person being reviewed doesn't get any feedback on paper."

Olswang again expressed his astonishment at the perceived lack of knowledge revealed by the survey, asserting that the administration sends out yearly letters to department chairs and deans reminding them of the requirements and regulations governing these conferences; in addition, they have held workshops on documenting the conference process for 120 department chairs. "But it [the survey] does show that more training is needed," said Olswang.

Beth Kolko said the subcommittee also concluded that letting the faculty know what conferences they should expect would be both appropriate and important. O'Neill said perhaps the Faculty Senate Office could notify faculty once a year, via Website or blanket email, that they are entitled to these conferences. Council members would also like to see faculty informed of what to do if no conference is forthcoming - e.g., request a conference and copy the Dean, file an adjudication request, etc. This kind of advice could

be given via a list of Frequently Asked Questions ("What do I do when Senior Faculty don't respond?") added to the Website and referenced in the yearly email to faculty.

Olswang commented these are helpful and timely suggestions he can act upon; since most new faculty come on board in September, or July in the case of the School of Medicine, the conference requirements can be stressed in their orientation information.

The subcommittee will work on the suggestions gathered from Council members, said O'Neill, but they do not feel it's a time-sensitive issue for legislation.

In introducing revised Code language for discussion, O'Neill reminded the Council that the subcommittee was charged to:

- Clarify that the regular conference is to be separate in both time and substance from the merit review
- Mandate that written records of the conference and any disagreement about the conference shall be created and maintained in a timely manner
- Provide some mechanism for dealing with disagreements about the conference or the conference record

The subcommittee has also concluded that the present description of the planning conference creates confusion because it includes some merit questions, and should be rewritten based on Haley's "Business 101" model - where are we now, where do we want to be, how will we get there?

Olswang commented that, from an operational perspective, it is not uncommon for one meeting to cover both planning and merit, though this differs from the Faculty Senate Chair's view. For a department chair with 65 faculty members, Olswang asserted, it adds "a serious amount of additional work" to have two meetings instead of one. He was curious about whether the subcommittee had considered this, and why the planning conference and merit review should not be the same meeting. He would like to see a statement that the two meetings could be combined into the meeting required in Code section 24.55, so long as both topics are covered.

O'Neill responded that the subcommittee's charge really was to separate the meetings, not to collapse them. Kolko asked whether there is actually a conference with faculty in merit reviews. Haley described the School of Business process, in which the department chair does not do independent meetings, but presents to the individual the results of senior faculty discussions. In the merit review, the department chair communicates the results of a process, but does not necessarily participate in a two-way dialogue with the individual about plans and goals.

Luchtel simplified the reason for requiring two meetings by differentiating between the goals of the two meetings: One is to evaluate, the other is to plan for the future. Planning for the future should be a much more open-ended, philosophical, goal-oriented conversation where both the chair and the individual discuss how the faculty member's work integrates into and furthers both personal goals and the goals of the department. Olswang said he could see no reason why this could not be done in one meeting.

Krieger-Brockett observed that the faculty survey results indicate that having two conferences allows the faculty member to bargain for resources, which is usually not the case in the merit review. "If you're being evaluated," O'Neill said in agreement, "you're not going to negotiate hard for things you need." Graubard also agreed that the merit review was not a good place to negotiate resources - "At that point," she said, "you're not being evaluated - you're being told the results of an evaluation, which is very different."

Haley speculated that perhaps the line should be drawn between tenured and non-tenured faculty, since tenured faculty members are in a much stronger position. Luchtel pointed out that there is already an appropriate distinction between senior and junior faculty, in terms of the frequency of conferences. Roberts commented that, in large departments, it might be better to have one meeting than burden the chairs with two meetings for each faculty member only to find that neither meeting is adequate. Kolko countered that chairs can - and do - delegate these meetings.

"I find it hard to accept," said O'Neill, "that we cannot find the resources to mentor faculty, whose lifetime careers may turn on these planning conferences and documents, to the extent of about two hours per year. That's a pretty shocking statement." Luchtel commented that O'Neill's statement was well put - a chair should be able to spend two hours per year, especially with junior faculty.

These views having been stated, there was still no clear consensus about whether the Code language should specifically require two separate meetings. O'Neill proposed a compromise - the Code might be silent on the number of meetings involved, but require that the documentation be separate and distinct. After discussion, it was agreed that this is a good avenue to explore. Graubard wants to see a more collaborative process stipulated - a shared interaction.

Council members spent about twenty minutes wordsmithing revisions of the language drafted by the subcommittee. At the close of this process, Kate O'Neill said she would take her notes from the earlier discussion, collate them with the suggested language revisions, and bring a new draft to the Council at the March 7 meeting for further discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 a.m. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*