



# Texas Tech University

LUBBOCK, TEXAS 79409 / (806) 742-3856

## THE FACULTY COUNCIL

November 4, 1977

TO: MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
FACULTY COUNCIL

FROM: Clarence A. Bell, Chairperson

SUBJECT: Agenda for meeting #88, November 9, 1977

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Council will meet on Wednesday, November 9, 1977, at 3:30 p.m. in the Board Room of the Administration Building. The agenda is as follows:

- I. Minutes of the October 7, 1977, meeting
- II. Announcements
  - a. Academic Council Minutes
  - b. Meeting of the Deans Minutes
  - c. Report of status of the proposal for a Faculty Senate
- III. Report of ad hoc Committee to Review Tenure Policy - Dr. Jacquelin Collins
- IV. Report on the Grade Appeals Policy and Procedures - Dr. Charles Hardwick
- V. Plan for Review of Tenured Faculty - Dr. Charles Hardwick
- VI. Other Business

## PLAN FOR REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

The history of higher education has demonstrated a need for a system for protecting academic freedom for scholars. At various times the courts have been involved in determining the limitations of academic freedom, but whether these actions have provided adequate safeguards is questionable. The traditional system used within higher education has been that of academic tenure.

Academic tenure specifies conditions and circumstances under which the faculty member who has earned the designated status by meeting certain institutional standards of performance and service may be continuously employed until retirement, but the faculty member is subject to dismissal for adequate cause as specified in the institution's tenure policy. The term "adequate cause" includes incompetence, physical disability, immoral conduct, and institutional financial exigency.

An important element of academic tenure is an assurance of academic due process, which provides generally for a statement of charges, the opportunity of a hearing before one's peers, the right to present evidence and conduct cross examination, a record of the hearing and decision, and for appeal from a dismissal judgment. Essentially, the academic tenure and due process system provides a regulatory process through which a tenured faculty member who fails to meet or maintain standards of performance or who suffers mental, moral, or physical disabilities that preclude his or her effectiveness can be considered with fairness and be separated or dismissed as necessary. The tenure system also provides for a reduction of faculty in financial exigencies. While tenure provides certain safeguards, there is no guarantee that employment is permanent.

Academic tenure has been curtailed at many institutions at the application stage, is denied in many cases, and tenured faculty may be dismissed under due process where tenure policy and specifications are violated. In order that tenure policies may be appropriately applied, it is incumbent upon the university to engage in appropriate review processes.

The granting of tenure at Texas Tech University follows established policy and procedure. As within many other tenure policies employed throughout the United States, peer evaluation and administrative review are made during the specified probationary periods before tenure is granted. This report is not related to the original granting of tenure but to the review of faculty performance.

### Present Procedure

There is an established and continuing system for review of faculty, whether tenured or non-tenured. These reviews are scheduled and occur for different time periods and intervals. Elements of the system will be described individually.

One of the primary review sources for faculty is the annual faculty report, prepared by the calendar year. This report is intended to require a thorough self-assessment and identification of various activities and major contributions to the University. This report requires the faculty member to furnish information in the following form:

1. Instructional activities (hours spent in a typical week \_\_\_\_\_).
- a. Undergraduate (report on any innovations or special awards for undergraduate teaching).

- b. Undergraduate student advisory responsibilities (report number of students and average time devoted per week).
  - c. Graduate (list completed theses and/or dissertations supervised and mention any innovative or special projects attempted and/or any special awards for graduate teaching responsibilities and report graduate student advisory responsibilities.
2. Research and/or performance-related activities (hours spent in a typical week \_\_\_\_\_).
- a. Publications (report books, monographs, or articles published and/or indicate manuscripts accepted or in press).
  - b. Papers delivered at professional meeting (Title, organization, date) and/or professional performances (concerts, recitals, exhibitions, etc.).
  - c. Research completed and unpublished and/or in process.
3. University service (hours spent in a typical week \_\_\_\_\_).
- a. University Committees
  - b. College and/or Departmental Committees
  - c. Administration
  - d. Other University Services (including sponsorships of student groups) and Continuing Education activities (instruction in short courses, workshops).
4. Professional Services (hours spent in a typical week \_\_\_\_\_). Consultancies, offices or committee memberships held in state, regional or national professional organizations, or other activity considered to be related to professional responsibility.
5. A statement summarizing primary contribution to the department, college, or University, including leadership provided and/or ways performance in a given year differs qualitatively or quantitatively from prior years.

Space for additional information also is provided and faculty members are asked to describe grants proposed and received for the calendar year. Used only for the past few years, this annual report requires the faculty member to review his or her performance and to comment about each of these items indicated above in writing. Copies of these report forms go to the chairperson or coordinator of the department or area, the dean of the college or school, and the Academic Vice President. The reports are reviewed at each of these levels and provide useful background information for assessing faculty personnel in regard to assignment of equitable loads for teaching, University service activity, faculty productivity, and of the extent and kind of activities performed by individuals as well as for consideration for merit salary increases.

A primary use of the annual faculty report is to provide a basis for discussion of individual faculty performance by the chairperson with the faculty member, by the dean with the chairperson and by the Academic Vice President with the dean and/or chairperson regarding extent and level of faculty involvement in teaching, research and service.

The second element in annual reporting process is the Chairperson's Review of individual faculty members, also made on an annual basis. The chairperson's review of the annual faculty report is made upon receipt of the individual faculty report and copies of the review are forwarded with that report. Chairpersons are urged to share their reviews with faculty members and to initiate directly development and/or improvement activities. The chairperson's review contains the following items, requiring written evaluation of each individual faculty member:

1. Instructional activities
2. Research and/or performance related activities
3. University service, including committees, administration, etc.
4. Professional service
5. Summary of primary contributions to the department, college, or University.

Distribution of the chairperson's review includes the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Dean, and the faculty member.

Texas Tech University's annual faculty report and accompanying chairperson's review represent a more thorough and systematized review of faculty performance than is made at most institutions of higher learning. There is also the cumulative effect of annual reports and reviews by chairpersons over a period of years. These documents can be used to judge whether productivity in research, teaching, and related activities is sustained.

While this rather comprehensive system is subjective in nature, it does allow some comparative data to be obtained on persons within the same area of instruction. This reporting system has been developed and operated only during the past three years, and some elements of the review form may be revised as need arises.

Another annual review, varying in degree of formality depending on the department and college, but which in general utilizes the faculty report and the chairperson's review, is the review related to recommendations for merit increases in salary. Traditionally, the legislature has appropriated funds to the institution with at least some allowance for provision of merit salary increases as funds are available. The availability of funds on a merit basis for salary increases is believed to stimulate productivity on the part of the faculty. There is an on-going review of all faculty members in order to see that these funds are expended equitably on a merit basis. These evaluations are carried out by departmental and collegiate committees and by chairpersons and deans. Evaluations are made according to criteria developed by faculty of the departments and/or colleges and schools. Merit recommendations are based upon the quality and quantity of productivity, and are translated into specific salary increases.

Within the past two years a number of the academic units have begun to use teacher evaluation instruments. While the instruments vary, they are useful in making clear criteria whereby a person's performance for salary increases and promotion may be ascertained.

Negative assessment with regard to merit increases in salary is a communication of significance to a member of the faculty. For example, for the coming year in which merit

funds were available within an estimated range from 2-8% per faculty member, those faculty, tenured or untenured, who were recommended for no salary increases were clearly receiving information from their respective deans and chairpersons. It is common knowledge that no salary increase is indicative of a low-level of performance and of needed improvement. The Academic Vice President has asked each dean to talk with each faculty member who was not recommended for an increase for the coming year to relate the reason why no increase was recommended.

The time frame for the merit increase evaluation is different from the annual faculty report in that the latter is on a calendar year basis whereas the merit assessment is ordinarily from the beginning of the fall semester until late spring, thereby encompassing most of the current academic year. The faculty report form and the chairperson's review also may be used in evaluation of merit.

#### Program Reviews

Academic programs at Texas Tech University are reviewed on a ten-year cycle. After an initial review, a five-year status report is required to determine the extent to which the program is progressing toward the findings outlined in the initial report. In effect, then, each program receives a careful review every five years.

Originally, the reviews were initiated at the graduate level, but, after the first year, it was recognized that graduate programs needed to be evaluated in the light of the supporting undergraduate programs. For the past several years, entire departments, and in some cases entire colleges, have been reviewed at the same time. The evaluation of faculty is an important element of these program reviews.

Evaluation of faculty, both tenured and non-tenured, is accomplished in three categories. The department prepares a self-evaluation, including the collection of vitae and data related to faculty teaching and productivity. There is an internal committee made up of faculty members from other departments within the University who view the department's activities, including faculty contributions, and there are external reviewers who are brought to campus to provide an impartial assessment. The external reviewers are experts in the field under review, and are selected by the department and by the Graduate School and Office of Academic Affairs. The external reviewers are asked to assess the quality of faculty in general (in light of the reviewer's knowledge of faculties of other institutions and of programmatic needs). The quality of faculty and the applicability of faculty expertise in terms of programmatic needs is of primary concern of the reviewers, both internal and external. A series of questions are posed to the reviewers in writing which require statements in regard to faculty quality and productivity.

These review processes are related to consideration of faculty according to criteria accepted within the department and/or college.

#### Graduate Faculty Review

At Texas Tech University, faculty members traditionally have been reviewed, at each member's request, for admission to graduate faculty status. In past years there was a bipartite graduate faculty consisting of members and associate members. Members, who were recognized on the basis of their own scholarship and productivity, were participants in graduate affairs and were allowed to serve as chairpersons of theses and dissertations committees. Associate members of the graduate faculty were not allowed to serve as committee chairpersons, but otherwise participated in graduate affairs. Within the past

two years, the faculty agreed to a single graduate faculty membership and all members of the graduate faculty were reassessed. That is, all faculty members who desired membership on a reorganized graduate faculty submitted their credentials for review by the Graduate Council. This resulted in some pruning of the graduate faculty and established criteria for appointment to the graduate faculty in the future. Since there were some previous members of the graduate faculty who were not returned to that faculty and since several of those members were members of the tenured faculty, this served notice that enhanced productivity was required if those faculty wished to continue to be involved in the graduate program.

#### Proposed Plan

The foregoing formative evaluation should be recognized as efforts to cause faculty members to be aware of responsibilities and of the types of contributions expected in a given area. The system is relatively new, and there have been errors and lack of complete information. The early program reviews focused on faculty in general rather than on specific faculty members' performance.

It is proposed that the current and existing system for review of faculty, which includes tenured faculty, be continued. These elements provide data cogent to the needs of the University, utilize criteria established within the faculty, and have a history of useful development.

The following proposed plan is developed to provide an enhanced procedure for periodic review of tenured faculty in terms of quality of teaching, productivity, and contribution to the faculty member's area of assignment.

The first step in the process is the continuous improvement of the annual faculty review. The annual faculty report, the chairperson's review, and the merit evaluation will be developed so that they utilize appropriate criteria and provide feedback to the faculty for continued development. Improvement of evaluation instruments, appropriate to particular departments or areas, will be continued within the faculty. The Office of the Academic Vice President will continue to assist in the development of appropriate evaluation procedures.

The chairperson's review of the annual faculty report will be an important link in the procedure. Chairpersons will discuss their evaluations with each faculty member. Such a discussion will allow positive assessment of the faculty member's contributions, and, where necessary, areas which may need further development or improvement. The evaluation procedures will also include a system whereby an instructor who recognizes need for improvement in his or her teaching capabilities can obtain assistance in confidence. At least one of the colleges is already attempting this approach.

A second step in the process is to enhance the system of program reviews. Within this system there can be a comprehensive review each five years of faculty. Chairpersons can discuss with individual faculty their long-range plans and current areas of strengths and weaknesses. The chairperson can initiate these discussions when members are granted tenure, and the regularly scheduled reviews will be used to provide for periodic check points and renewal of the continued improvement effort. Each chairperson and/or area coordinator will be responsible for discussing the various elements of performance including instruction, research and service. The process of identifying the areas of concern and assisting with improvement requires continuing personal communication between the chairperson and faculty member.

The chairperson of the department or area involved will be responsible for planning, with the dean and Academic Vice President, the appropriate developmental activities designed to improve the performance of those faculty for whom improvement is indicated. As a professional person, it is a faculty member's responsibility also to maintain or improve his or her performance. Careful records should be maintained and academic due process assured in the review process.

#### Summary

The fact that the administration and the Board of Regents are concerned about the quality of education and are willing to take significant steps to improve that quality is indicative that Texa Tech University seriously holds to its goal of becoming an institution of the highest quality.

The current system provides valuable information and basis for self-improvement and assistance. Implementation of the extended practice to provide more comprehensive individual reviews at periodic intervals will be time demanding of faculty and chairpersons and should not be undertaken without institutional participation and clarification.

In summary, the University-wide self study and evaluation is considered a significant step in faculty personnel administration. Extension of current practice should only be made after careful study and with participation of the faculty. A key element in developing a review process is the Faculty Council. Safeguards must be employed so that academic freedom is not infringed upon and academic due process is observed.