

Report on Post Tenure Review

January 29, 2004

Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee

Introduction

On September 18, 2003, the Academic Affairs Committee of Faculty Senate was asked to review the university Post Tenure Review (PTR) Policy. This policy is formally referred to as Academic Policy 9980204, Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (PETF). The PETF policy is currently in its active review cycle; other administrative committees are concurrently considering this policy. The intent of the Committee charge was to assist the executive officers in discussions with the administration. The Committee's charge was to establish background documentation in support of the current policy, to identify "problems" or deficiencies, and to provide supportive information for any proposed changes to the policy.

In consideration of this charge the Committee elected a broad perspective rather than focusing on procedural implementation or evaluation standards or other responsibilities addressed at the departmental level. The Committee elected to begin its work as follows:

- evaluation of the foundation document, Senate Bill 149 (SB 149), which subsequently became Section 51.942 of the Texas Education Code (Sec. 51.942),
- consideration of the evolution of the initial policy at Sam Houston,
- consideration of data relating to PTR such as recent Faculty Senate Survey results or findings from the American Association for Higher Education New Pathways II projects, and
- assessment of the appropriateness and effectiveness the current PTR policy using these three sets of information as well as various other campus documents associated with PTR.

The committee findings and recommendations constitute the body of this report.

Committee's Process

Committee activities that provided the background for its findings and recommendations included the following:

- General Planning Meeting
- Focused meetings with Dr. Frank Fair (invited) and Dr. Debra Price (Committee member)
- Meetings for discussion, summation and review of the draft Committee report
- Review of:
 - SB 149
 - Academic Policy 9980204, *Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty*
 - Academic Policy 823017, *The Faculty Evaluation System (FES)*
 - Faculty Senate Survey questions from 2001-2001 and 2002-2003
 - American Association for Higher Education New Pathways II project findings as reflected in: *Survey Results Concerning Post Tenure Review at Sam Houston State*

University; Post Tenure Review in the Texas State University System; "Tracking Results of PTR in Texas State-Supported Universities: How Texas is Responding to the Challenge;" "Tracking Results of PTR in Texas State-Supported Universities: How Texas is Responding to the Challenge;" "Tracking Results of PTR in Texas State-Supported Universities: How Texas is Responding to the Challenge;" and

- *Final Report of the Post Tenure Development Review Committee as well as an associated, reflective private communication to the committee from Dr. Frank Fair (10/10/97).*
- Consideration of the *Response to the Reaffirmation Committee Report (8/9/99)* in reference to selected recommendations of the Southern Association Visiting Committee relating to faculty evaluation and professional responsibilities.

The structure of this report follows this review process. Conclusions and recommendations are included in the final section. Included after the conclusions is an executive summary.

Senate Bill 149

On May 31, 1997, the Texas legislature mandated that a system PTR be established and take effect on January 1, 1998, with the initial PTR evaluation cycle completed no later than January 1, 2004. This legislation became Section 51.942 of Subchapter Z, Chapter 51, of the Texas Education Code. Senate Bill 149 is considered by the Committee to be the principal document relating to PTR. The requirements of the university's PTR process can be found in the details of Section 1.

The requirements of SB 149 are clearly stated. These constitute the four fundamental elements to be considered in comparing the university policy with SB 149. Some of the specific requirements may relate to multiple elements as arranged in this case. Elements of these requirements can be grouped as follows:

1. Requirements that tell us about the general intent of PETF.
 - a. The process is to "be directed toward professional development."
 - b. The process relates to "professional responsibilities."
 - c. The process focus is "incompetency" or "neglect of duty."
2. Requirements that tell us how the institution's PTR process should be developed.
 - a. Adoption of rules for PETF requires "advice and comment" from the faculty.
 - b. The process must incorporate "academic due process" and "notice of specific charges."
 - c. The PTR review cycle must be between one and six years.
3. Requirements that tell us who is subject to PTR.
 - a. The process requires participation by "all tenured faculty at the institution."
 - b. The PETF process "may not [be] waived" for any tenured faculty member.
 - c. The evaluation must be based on "teaching, research, service, ... and administration."

4. Requirements that tell us about the evaluation process, what is evaluated, and upon whose judgment the evaluation is based.
 - a. The process relates to "professional responsibilities." (Also as 1.b.)
 - b. The process focus is "incompetency" or "neglect of duty." (Also as 1.c.)
 - c. The evaluation must be based on "teaching, research, service, ... and administration." (Also as 3.c.)
 - d. The evaluation must be based on "peer review."

5. Requirements that tell us about the possible negative outcome of the PTR evaluation.
 - a. The result of the process may be "revocation of tenure."
 - b. A recommendation for revocation can result from a finding of "incompetency, neglect of duty or other good cause."
 - c. A recommendation for revocation must afford the opportunity for "nonbinding dispute resolution."

In summary, SB 149 dictates the development of a university PTR or PETF policy whose intent is two fold. Primarily the purpose is to facilitate continued faculty development, consistent with the needs and mission of the academic unit, and secondarily, to insure professional accountability through periodic, comprehensive evaluation of faculty, in order to assist the administration in identifying faculty who have been negligent or allowed to become incompetent over time. The PETF process must originate and function through peer review, presumably by the faculty of the tenure unit. The PETF procedure should apply to all faculty holding tenure at the institution, in as much as the legislature specifically included responsibilities beyond those commonly recognized to apply to the regular faculty, these being teaching, scholarship and service. The PETF standards associated with professional responsibilities must be directed by faculty peers, and the standards established by this community of peers must delineate incompetence and competence, through a set of minimum professional standards. Finally, the institution's PETF policies should reflect the seriousness of a potential outcome, dismissal from the university, which will require the additional burden on the institution of demonstrated due process throughout each step of the procedure.

Evolution of Academic Policy Statement 980204

Final Report of the Post Tenure Development Review Committee

The charge to the original Post Tenure Development Review (PTDR) Committee (Nov 25, 1996) was that the institution's processes should have a developmental orientation, avoid restriction of academic freedom, include sufficient appeals to ensure fairness, be designed primarily by the faculty and should not represent a threat to tenure. Thus the global intent was to strengthen the tenure system, not weaken or abolish it. In the end, the intent of the institution's proposed PTR policy was to allow for the formative development of faculty and summative documentation for the dismissal process. The PTDR committee proposed a periodic review process which was comprehensive, based on professional responsibilities, directed toward professional freedom, protective of academic due process, and included peer review.

The PTDR committee worked with Fernando Gomez, the Texas State University System Attorney, who endorsed the requirement for PETF standards being generated by the faculty as

well as specific departmental standards and the peer review process being driven by departmental faculty. A survey of the faculty by the PTDR committee revealed that the significant majority of SHSU faculty (83.4%) were in favor of the peer component. Specific administrative concerns arose during the development of the draft policy: (a) that the Vice President for Academic Affairs be given final approval of performance standards, (b) that specific participant responsibilities and definite timelines be established and (c) negligent faculty should "not be allowed to drag on." The PTDR report referred to numerous external documents which warned against "cookie cutter," "one size fits all" performance standards, thus further endorsing the need for peer participation at the departmental level. The report also addressed the distinction between "appropriate minimum" standards and "aspirational standards" focusing on "relevant standards of acceptable performance," presumably in an effort to define the border between minimally acceptable and negligent or incompetent performance. The PTDR committee concluded that the annual performance review system, known as the FES process, can provide comprehensive, retrospective information for consideration during an individual PTR review but recommended that a formative self-evaluation statement and a statement of developmental plans, scholarly goals, and instructional objectives be included as PETF documentation.

The PTDR committee submitted an inquiry to Fernando Gomez asking "if indeed every tenured faculty member had to be subjected to peer review." The General Counsel for the Texas State University System responded that such was "the obvious sense of the law." Because a PTDR objective was to maintain a developmental purpose, a group of "peer consultants" was conceived to provide "expert" advice, presumably again placing emphasis on faculty improvement through peer interaction for all faculty in a tenure unit, not merely focusing on remediation for faculty who fail to meet the appropriate, defined minimum PETF standards. The remediation process was addressed with a proposed inclusion of a "Plan for Assisted Faculty Development" (PAFD) and peer mentoring in "hope of rescuing a colleague."

Additional insight into the PTDR committee's intent in relation to the final PETF policy was provided by Dr. Fair. His assessment augmented much of what was provided in the PTDR Report. A summary of his points are as follows:

- The PETF procedures should have different standards and that a "one size fits all" approach would not work. This is pragmatic in that academic units are so diverse.
- The standards should be minimum standards not performance goals that reflect "average" performance.
- In addition to a normal cycle of PTR there should be a "triggered PTR."
- The legislature "mandates" peer review using an academic model similar to peer review of research.
- To accomplish this, large departments could establish a committee, selected from nominations from both chair and the faculty member undergoing review, while small departments might employ the entire faculty.
- The PETF policy and the outcomes are for professional development; the PTR is not a "re-tenuring" process.

In concluding his remarks Dr. Fair expressed his disappointment that our PETF policy did not allow for "meaningful peer review" or "career assessment" with a focus on improvement

for all faculty, including the minimally productive to the exceptionally meritorious, thus encouraging faculty development for those with a positive outcome.

Faculty Senate Survey Results

Recent Faculty Senate survey results address issues relating to PTR. The surveys from the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 academic years were considered because most faculty would have participated in the PETF process by spring 2003. Obviously, PTR is a part of the global tenure issue and faculty attitudes relating to the "tenure system" are associated with those of PTR. In addition, the PETF policy establishes the FES system as the basis for review and because the results of annual FES performance review are reflected in the university merit system, it is logical to consider four questions relating to these issues.

The Committee felt that the university (Univ.) means were the data of interest but that the responses from all colleges and the library are included for reference. It is noted that the number of respondents from the larger colleges, Arts and Sciences (A&S), Business Administration (COBA) and Education and Applied Sciences (Ed&AS) was far greater than those from the College of Criminal Justice (CJ) or the Newton Grisham Library (NGL).

For this series of questions the respondent faculty rated each of the activities using the following scale:

5 = much more than satisfactory

2 = less than satisfactory

4 = more than satisfactory

1 = much less than satisfactory

3 = satisfactory

NA = unknown or not applicable

In Table 1 note the consistent trend in both years of Univ. means for all four questions and, in particular, the question relating to performance evaluation which displays the greatest increase in positive attitude. Faculty attitudes toward performance evaluation in each year are satisfactory to more than satisfactory (3.29 and 3.63). Table 1 reports that the mean for each respective area is higher in the second year, with that of PETF displaying the greatest increase. It should be noted that respondent faculty include tenured and non-tenured faculty and that non-tenured faculty are excluded from participation in the PETF system. This could potentially impart a systematic negative error in the reported data especially if non-tenured faculty feel disenfranchised or discriminated against. Thus, it is possible that faculty attitudes of those who have been subjected to the PTR cycle could be more satisfactory than those reflected by the 3.29 and 3.63.

Perhaps another way generating a sense of faculty attitude toward the current systems in a relative manner is to compare means for merit and promotion (questions 1 and 2) to those of tenure and PETF (questions 3 and 4). Responding faculty apparently are more satisfied with tenure and PTR than merit and promotion by approximately 1.5 units on this 5 point scale.

This descriptive analysis suggests to the Committee that the Sam Houston faculty is fundamentally satisfied with PTR and the PETF policy.

Table 1. A Comparison of Overall University Faculty Responses to PTR

	2001-2002	2002-2003	+/-	Mean
--	-----------	-----------	-----	------

Merit System	2.46	2.74	+ .28	2.60
Promotion System	2.80	2.82	+ .02	2.81
Tenure System	3.42	3.46	+ .04	3.44
Performance Evaluation	3.29	3.63	+ .34	3.46

Faculty Senate survey data are as follows:

College Comparison (2001-2002)

- The merit system (as stated in the Faculty Handbook) is applied fairly.
Univ. (2.46) A&S (2.26) COBA (3.32) CJ (2.71) Ed&AS (2.33) NGL (3.00)
- The promotion system (as stated in the Faculty Handbook) is applied fairly.
Univ. (2.80) A&S (2.56) COBA (3.37) CJ (2.67) Ed&AS (2.89) NGL (3.00)
- The tenure system (as stated in the Faculty Handbook) is applied fairly in my department.
Univ. (3.42) A&S (3.19) COBA (4.00) CJ (3.17) Ed&AS (3.53) NGL (3.33)
- The performance evaluation (post tenure review) of tenured faculty (as stated in the Faculty Handbook) is applied fairly in my department.
Univ. (3.29) A&S (3.17) COBA (4.00) CJ (3.00) Ed&AS (3.28) NGL (-)

College Comparison (2002-2003)

- The merit system (as stated in the Faculty Handbook) is applied fairly.
Univ. (2.74) A&S (2.44) COBA (3.55) CJ (2.71) Ed&AS (2.00) NGL (4.33)
- The promotion system (as stated in the Faculty Handbook) is applied fairly.
Univ. (2.82) A&S (2.34) COBA (3.52) CJ (3.02) Ed&AS (3.00) NGL (4.33)
- The tenure system (as stated in the Faculty Handbook) is applied fairly in my department.
Univ. (3.46) A&S (3.09) COBA (3.95) CJ (3.70) Ed&AS (4.00) NGL (4.33)
- The performance evaluation (post tenure review) of tenured faculty is applied fairly.
Univ. (3.63) A&S (3.29) COBA (4.00) CJ (3.89) Ed&AS (3.00) NGL (4.50)

Post Tenure Review: Survey Research Supported by American Association for Higher Education New Pathways II Project Grants

Two detailed studies were conducted by faculty at Sam Houston. Faculty members associated with these survey projects were: Frank Fair, Bill Fleming, Dennis Longmire, Debra Price, Jo Ann Duffy, Paul Reed and Laverne Warner. The Committee was provided final reports associated with each study as well as a chapter from *Post-Tenure Faculty Review and Renewal II: Reporting Results and Shaping Policy*, "Tracking Results of PTR in Texas State-Supported Universities: How Texas is Responding to the Challenge," which discusses these findings. The Committee felt that these findings were of significance in evaluating the relative effectiveness of PTR and in assessing existing problems and potential shortcomings. It is instructive to note that Dr. Price, co-principal investigator, is a member of the Committee and that Dr. Fair, the other co-principal investigator, was an invited participant to two meetings.

The post-tenure review research group conducted two surveys, one in 1998-2000 and one in 2000-2002. The first study included six system schools and the second included three

University of Texas schools (excluding the Austin campus) and the main campuses at the University of Houston, Texas Tech and Texas A & M Systems. Questions in the survey addressed eight issues:

- Standards, boundaries and variations, and faculty input as directed by the legislature.
- Selection of groups for PETF,
- “Pruning of deadwood” and early separation,
- Developmental aspects of PTR focusing on teaching, research and service,
- Variations in faculty development plans,
- Implementation of the peer review as mandated by the faculty,
- Concerns about academic freedom, and
- Other issues.

The surveys also addressed faculty perception of several related issues, including importance of tenure, reasons for implementation of PTR, problems and benefits of PETF systems, and impact of PTR on professional activity.

Obviously, the findings of these projects are quite comprehensive. Some of these have direct bearing on an assessment of the PETF system at Sam Houston. A significant majority of respondents (83.7%) agreed that tenure is the foundation for academic freedom. Most respondents felt that PTR was created due to pressures to increase faculty accountability (88.1%) and to weed out deadwood (61.7%). Many (63.1%) felt that PTR was only appropriate through a “triggered” PTR process, and that it is only for those who failed to meet minimum standards. The majority (85.6%) felt that PTR should focus on teaching, research, and service collectively. Clearly, 93.3% said that PTR had no effect on professional habits, yet 5.8% indicated that PTR encouraged early retirement and 10.2% indicated they would contemplate other employment.

It is interesting to note that the state senator who sponsored PTR legislation “bluntly stated that 6% of the faculty were likely to be incompetent.” Given that 5.8% to 10.2% of the respondents contemplated “packing” their academic bags, it strongly suggests PTR in Texas has met his expectations. In other questions relating to the impact of PTR on professional habits in the areas of teaching, research, and service (activities not altered, increased or decreased) net increases of 8.4%, 55.7% and 9.4% were found. In addition, of the faculty who had participated in the PTR cycle, reviewers and those reviewed, the majority felt the process was fair (80.7% and 72.7% respectively). However, only 51.7% of those reviewed had received formal feedback; hence, 69.7% reported the process of “little value.”

The findings of the Committee can be summarized by the testimonies of both Drs. Debra Price and Dennis Longmire before the Texas House Higher Education Committee in 2002. Their three assertions are summarized below:

- Post-tenure review is working as expected because of significant rigor in academic pursuits, credential screening, and the tenure process. Only a small number of tenured faculty would be found to be incompetent.
- Overall, the PTR system is well accepted and fair and has significant positive impact on the professional habits of faculty.

- Texas institutions should be prudent when addressing issues relating to PTR. Tenure is the most significant non-financial incentive in competing for faculty and the perception of tenure should not be jeopardized.

Institutional Response to the Southern Association

In a document titled *Response to the Reaffirmation Committee Report*, the administration responded to various recommendations by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Visitation Committee. Several of these responses related to faculty development, faculty evaluation, and faculty responsibilities. These issues are obviously of interest to those reviewing the institution's PTR system and the intent and substances of these responses are generally or specifically related to PTR or outcomes of the PETF process.

Recommendation #6 stated that the institution should demonstrate that it uses results of evaluation of instruction to ensure quality instruction. The administration's response admitted that "the annual evaluation and goal setting conference" (part of FES and thus PETF) occasionally did not "give the faculty member complete enough feed back to ensure quality instruction and improvement of instruction." It asserted, however, that the annual review demonstrated the use of evaluation materials. The administration provided a summary of other assessment activities which directly address this issue. In this summary are professional development plans (used in 21 of 26 departments), and "[beginning] fall 1999 all departments will include such faculty development plans as part of the annual review." The response added professional faculty portfolios (21 departments) and faculty mentoring (22 departments) to include "the recent development of the Post Tenure Review process."

Recommendations #16 and #17 are relevant to PETF because the review is an assessment of professional responsibilities. Recommendation #16 suggested "that the University must develop, implement, and communicate a written institutional policy regarding the appropriate balance between grant and contract activity and instruction." The university responded, "[it] is apparent...that the visiting team missed this document" (Academic Policy Statement 820317) regarding scholarly, instructional and service activities. It acknowledged the need for wider and fuller communication, but that the "appropriate balance" is defined in departmental documents. Recommendation #17 suggested "that the University publish its policy concerning a faculty member's division of obligations between research and other academic activities..." The institution again responded that this information, although it could be more fully communicated, was contained with the "desired detail" in policy statement 820317. The institution has stated to the Southern Association that policy statement 820317 defines these responsibilities and has asserted that the appropriate balance of professional responsibilities is defined at the departmental level. These are fundamental tenets of PETF.

Conclusions

The Committee clearly sees a distinction between the PETF policy, the procedures resulting from that policy, and the implementation of those procedures. The Committee finds that the institution's PETF policy resulted from thorough and scholarly work by the original PTDR committee. This carefully crafted policy meets the requirement of SB149 and Sec. 51.942, namely:

- periodic comprehensive performance evaluation,
- evaluation based on professional responsibilities of teaching, scholarship, service, and administration,
- evaluation based on peer review,
- process directed toward professional development, and
- process incorporates academic due process rights.

In addition, the policy bases the PETF review process on annual review documentation compiled through the FES system along with "appropriate minimum standards" defining "continuing or repeated substantial neglect of professional responsibilities." Note that the FES system contains the requirement that individual professional evaluations include self-assessment as a part of this documentation. The institution's PETF policy affords a formal Plan for Assisted Faculty Development (PAFD). Neither the PETF nor the FES systems preclude the inclusion of additional documentation provided by the faculty member thus material such as teaching portfolios, or self-assessment reflections or individual development plans could be included in the review. The Committee finds that the policy is substantially complete and appropriate, thus recommends that no significant changes be made to Academic Policy Statement 980204.

However, the Committee has various recommendations concerning the procedures and current practices relating to implementation of PETF. All PETF systems should have faculty development as the primary goal. In as much as a significant majority of faculty will "pass" PETF review, the procedures should be amended to extend faculty development to this group. This can be accomplished by:

- a formal response from the administration (Vice President for Academic Affairs) which acknowledges the "pass,"
- a formal report from the peer review committee and the chair outlining potential goals or objectives and including suggestions for improvement,
- funds designated for development plans (which could result from PETF reports for all faculty, not just those who fail to "pass" PETF review) and
- funds and release time for mandated PAFD activities.

The Committee recommends that the university adopt procedures which address these issues.

The final recommendation of the Committee reflects the value of the survey results provided by the PTR studies. It is the Committee's suggestion that the Faculty Senate recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs that his office sponsor a third PTR survey. Minimally the study should be conducted at SHSU, ideally through the Texas State University System or state wide. It should employ a survey instrument substantially the same as used in previous studies. It should have its results reported through Faculty Senate.

The Committee did identify several potential problem areas that need to be considered. The most obvious may be the standards associated with PETF review. The second is the disenfranchisement of tenure-track, non-tenured faculty. The third is the institution's practice of exempting tenured faculty from PETF review. The fourth is the composition of the prescribed PETF review committee.

Section 2.02 of Academic Policy 980204 indicates that "standards shall be subject to periodic review and modification by the tenured faculty in the tenure unit." Thus, it is appropriate that the question of standards should be a part of this review cycle for each tenure unit. However, changes should be made judiciously within the framework of the well documented opinion that the present system "is fair," and that any set of standards should reflect minimum performance standards. The PETF cycle is not a re-tenuring cycle in which PETF standards are effectively the same as performance standards for attainment of tenure. A system of PETF standards linked to tenure (and promotion) standards would for all intents and purposes abolish tenure at the institution. Current standards are perceived as "fair" and appropriate within this context.

Currently, non-tenured faculty members are excluded from participation in PETF review. It is a finding of the Committee that this has several adverse implications. One is simply that PETF is not a re-tenuring process and a simple yes or no vote of the tenured faculty exposes a problematic parallel. In the ongoing effort of the university to instill democratic principles and to create communities of individuals dedicated to self-improvement, it seems incongruous to exacerbate the division between tenured and non-tenured faculty. Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty members are departmental colleagues who offer valuable insight and make numerous, unique contributions. Non-tenured faculty members are in exceptionally productive phases of their careers; thus, would bring perspectives that would automatically raise expectations of the tenure unit. The question of disenfranchisement is real and the PETF system should afford these faculty members a voice, if not a vote. The Committee discussed various issues such as conflict of interest, *quid pro quo*, retaliation, etc., so universal participation or generation of a procedure for participation are not simple questions. Real questions, in need of consideration, exist. Should all departmental faculty be a part of the review committee or subject to selection for a review committee? Should communication of non-tenured faculty be anonymous or held in confidence by the chair? Should non-tenured faculty be given a vote? The Committee would be encouraged by further discussion and systematic examination of this issue.

The Committee observed that it is common practice at this institution to exempt from the PETF process all tenured faculty above the level of chair. It appears that this practice is out of compliance with SB 149 and Sec. 51.942. The intent of the legislature was clearly that individuals holding tenure should be a part of the process. At Sam Houston, some tenured individuals have professional responsibilities that include significant administration. However, administration is specifically included in the list of professional duties by the legislators. "Administrators" often are afforded tenure in a specified tenure unit and they frequently return to the "teaching" faculty. Fernando Gomez responded affirmatively to this specific question when it was presented by the PTDR committee. Additional benefit of the inclusion of all individuals holding tenure is that such action would further demonstrate democratic principles and a commitment to community as important precepts. Inclusion would serve to raise the perceived expectations of the peer review committees within the given tenure units.

As stated previously, according to the institution's policy, the PETF review committee consists of participating faculty in a tenure unit. Those not in attendance are extended an opportunity to provide input. The policy suggests that participation could be construed as voluntary. The lack of a formal review committee, or subcommittee, consisting of relatively few faculty precludes the opportunity for peer mentoring in professional development. It seems that a constructive, iterative loop in the process is missing. What is often missing in PETF procedures is a structure that would promote faculty-faculty interaction with the specific goal of improving professional attitudes within the tenure unit. Formal committee structure and a requirement of mandated participation by its participants would emphasize the seriousness of the PETF process. Formal structure for PETF review committee would facilitate creation of a report from the committee to the faculty member under review and provide opportunity for mentoring interactions directed toward faculty development.

In conclusion, the Committee finds that the policy is substantially complete and appropriate, thus recommends that no significant changes be made to Academic Policy Statement 980204. The Committee recognizes areas in which procedures and practices associated with the PETF process can be improved such that the outcomes are more closely directed toward faculty development and recommends that the university act to strengthen this component. The Committee acknowledges the need for periodic evaluation of the PTR system and supports the use of statistical rather than anecdotal information in making related decisions, thus it recommends that the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Academic Vice President sponsor the required PTR study. Finally, the Committee would encourage open, constructive dialogue that addressed several issues of concern.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Paul A. Loeffler, Chair
Academic Affairs Committee
University Faculty Senate

Committee Members

Steven Cuvelier
Joe Kirk
Paul Loeffler
Valerie Muehsam
Debra Price
Patricia Williams