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# Opening Remarks

 **Welcome – Todd Harper**

This is a special faculty senate session to look at the PTR document, and hopefully to make revisions suggestions to that document.

For the review PTR there essentially were two committees, one that oversaw Administrative Review, and that was focused exclusively on that. And the other focused on everything else, which included student success.

They made several changes to section three of the Faculty Handbook The five major changes include:

They added student success as a criterion.

They added a five point, or they replaced the three-point evaluation scale with a five point scale for both annual reviews and for post tenure review.

They made revisions post tenure review process, especially for a field PTR. A PTR that is one that has an overall rating of below three will now lead to a performance improvement plan.

They also made revisions to the annual review process, a field annual review, that is one that has a single rating of three in the category by a tenure track to never leads to a performance remediation plan or PRP, except consecutive field annual review, that is a single rating of less than three in the same or a different category by tenured faculty member leads to a corrective post tenure review.

Failing on Post tenure review will trigger a performance improvement plan.

A 360-degree administration review.

Minor gains made:

We operated within very strict guidelines. There was not a lot of room for movement, which at times was extremely frustrating.

 The gains were in these four areas.

We were able to give a very broad definition of students’ access, one that would allow for a variety of practices such as high impact practices to count towards students’ success for the faculty member.

 We also embedded students’ success as a as an element within teaching, scholarship and or service rather than as its own separate pillars.

We created more extensive list of possible consequences for an unsuccessful performance improvement plan than what the BOR had given. We created the list that was much more considerate before revocation of tenure, and loss of jobs is considered as an option.

Finally, we gave a one-time monetary bonus for a successful PTR. So, every time a faculty member has successful PTR within the kind of traditional cycle if every five years, they'll get a reward if they score four or five. If they score four, it's $2,000. If they score five, it's $5,000.

Here are some of the things that we did suggest that have already been rejected by the USG:

We had included a department of appeals committee that could review a negative annual review score given by the chair.

The PTR committee would be the main determiner as to whether a faculty member could receive a one or two on a PTR portfolio.

We had included a set of consequences for an unsuccessful performance improvement plan that laid out in greater detail than what we have now what the consequences for non-successful attempt. We had a graded version of the consequence list.

**Open for Questions:**

**These were the senators who asked the questions, and these were the following questions:**

Susan Smith(Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology): Concern in section 3.2. Documents say must be noteworthy in atleast2 areas instead of being satisfactory.

Steven: Ivan seemed to be open to removing that language and so I would think that would be an uncontroversial change.

Dabee Lee (Department of Instructional Technology): Will this affect the pre-tenure process? Will the bonus be available for early PTR application? What is the difference between 4 and 5 rating?

Todd: No, No, We trued to make it general such that colleges and departments can be specific on their interpretations of 4 and 5 ratings.

Jeff:Yunek(Department of Music): Can the review process be terminated at the provost level while the appeals process went to the Presidents level.

Todd: Please send the proposed revision.

Noah McLaughlin (Department of Foreign Languages): this will only apply to the annual review documents and to post tenure review but won't necessarily apply to the third year pre tenure review or the application for tenure and promotion.

Better understand the philosophy behind having a five-point scale

Todd: it gives them more leeway, more numbers to work with. Doesn't necessarily solve the problems that are at three points scale.

Stephen Collins (Government and International Affairs): Provost put up the idea of positive PTR and supported student success metric be embedded.

One idea is in line with University of Georgia's proposal and their proposal for what faculty would need to submit for a PTR. “That if a faculty member received evaluations of Meets Expectations above in each category of their annual evaluation for five consecutive years. The combined annual reviews shall serve as their PTR materials.” So essentially all you will have to do if you receive positive meets expectations or above every year. Just turn in the ARs. Also, if you have three positive annual reviews in five years then that is sufficient for a successful PTR.

Michael: If a score of 3 is considered successful, it should have a monitory reward as well.

Minhao Dai (Communication and Media): Can there be college level committee to resolve score difference between faculty and chair?

Todd: That was tried unsuccessfully.

Jillian Ford (Social Studies Education): slow process down, have townhall meetings, add faculty to every AR decision, add faculty member to president’s cabinet.

Tom Okie (History and Philosophy) : can department committee be added to PTR process.

Karim: All scores of 3’s should be rewarded. Any deadline for the feedback process?

Todd: end of the week.

Heather Pincock (Conflict Management, Peacebuilding and Development): We do not have to accept the PTR at the FS.

William Griffiths (Mathematics): The point s proposed by the PTR committee should be added back to the agenda for voting, also we do not have to accept the PTR at the FS.

Rebecca Hill (American Studies): Supports rejection.

Stephen Collins (Government and International Affairs): Consider both the options.

Daniel Ferreira (Environmental Science): Supports rejection.

Humayun Zafar (Information Security and Assurance): vote today?

Motion to adjourn: William Griffiths