

FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY 

---

Post Tenure Review

Final Report

## **POST-TENURE REVIEW TASK FORCE REPORT**

Post tenure review was initiated in 1998-99. All faculty tenured at that time will have participated in the evaluative process by the end of 2001-2002. Since this is the end of the first cycle of post tenure review, Vice President Chapman determined that it was appropriate to conduct an evaluation of the process. As a consequence, the Vice President appointed the Post Tenure Review (PTR) Evaluation Task Force in August 2001. The Task Force met with Vice President Chapman on August 22, 2001 and received its charge.

The PTR Evaluation Task Force was comprised of three faculty recommended by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, three academic administrators appointed by the Vice President and an administrator from the VPAA's office. The task force members are:

- John Conati, Associate Professor, Printing and Imaging Technology Management
- Nancy Cooley, Dean, College of Education and Human Services
- Don Flickinger, Department Head, Humanities
- Sue Hammersmith, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
- Gary Huey, Professor, Humanities
- Cindy Konrad, Associate Professor, Medical Records and Academic Senate President
- Tom Oldfield, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chair

The Task Force was charged with conducting a thorough evaluation of the PTR processes and procedures. The evaluation was to include:

- Reviewing the current PTR Policy and Procedures document
- Obtaining input/feedback from all faculty and administrators who have participated in the PTR process (including faculty who were reviewed during 2001-2002)
- Reviewing PTR policies and procedures from other universities
- Drafting recommendations for clarification/revision of the Ferris State University PTR policies and procedures
- Sharing preliminary draft recommendations with all faculty and academic administrators for review and comment
- Forwarding final recommendations to the VPAA by April 1, 2002

At the first meeting, the Vice President expanded the charge to the Task Force to include the development of a preamble for the PTR Policy and Procedures that would elucidate the purpose of post tenure review. Vice President Chapman also informed the task force that a separate task force was being formed to review the Student Assessment of Instruction Policies and Procedures.

The PTR Task Force determined that a list of tasks and assignments must be completed to address the charge. The following lists the charge and the members assigned to each task:

- Review of the policies and procedures, including any preambles, from other universities. This included review of the American Association for Higher Education publication *Post-Tenure Review: Policies, Practices, Precautions* Assigned to Don Flickinger, Sue Hammersmith and Gary Huey.
- Review of the status of the current process through a survey of faculty and administrators who have been involved with the PTR process. Development of the survey was assigned to John Conati, Nancy Cooley and Cindy Konrad.
- Review of current portfolio requirements for each college. Assigned to all members of the task force.
- Review of the current document for updating. Assigned to Tom Oldfield.

It was determined that the PTR Evaluation Task Force and the SAI Evaluation Task Force would develop a survey instrument for faculty and evaluators (appendix A) with the assistance of Kristen Salomonson, Assistant Dean of Enrollment Services, Institutional Research and Testing. The survey was distributed to faculty and evaluators on October 16, 2001. The surveys were returned to the Office of Institutional Research and Testing for tabulation and analysis of the quantitative responses. The research staff also transcribed the comments from the survey. The Executive Summary from Dr. Salomonson can be found in appendix B. Complete results of the survey are available on reserve in FLITE and in each dean's office. A total of 170 faculty and 19 evaluators returned completed surveys. The results were forwarded to the task force members in January for their review.

After review of all data and information, the PTR Evaluation Task Force determined that post tenure review policies and procedures at other institutions are extremely varied and that the FSU Post Tenure Review Policies and Procedures are appropriate for the institution with the following recommended modifications/alterations:

### **Recommendation 1: The Preamble**

After review of the post tenure review preamble from a sample of six other universities, the PTR Evaluation Task Force recommends the following preamble be considered for inclusion in the Post Tenure Review Policies and Procedures document.

## **Preamble**

Ferris State University affirms its commitment to tenure, recognizing that the public interest is best served in a climate in which faculty members are free to pursue the creation and dissemination of knowledge and the conduct of their professional responsibilities.

Ferris State University's post-tenure review process is intended to ensure a professional level in teaching, scholarship and service by its tenured faculty members; to provide for ongoing faculty development; and to promote a mentoring environment between faculty and supervisors regarding professional activities and responsibilities.

### **Recommendation 2: Update of the current Post Tenure Review Policies and Procedures**

The current Post Tenure Review Policies and Procedures document included language that outlined the procedures and timelines for the initial implementation of the post tenure review process. Since the process is now in the second cycle, this language is no longer necessary; therefore, the Task Force recommends the changes in language as indicated in the document in appendix C.

### **Recommendation 3: Articulating the value of post tenure review**

The quantitative and qualitative results of the faculty survey indicate that the faculty have concerns about many of the intended benefits of the post tenure review process including stimulating improved performance and encouraging faculty excellence. Many faculty feel that the process threatens tenure, is cumbersome and of little value. These comments indicate that there has not been sufficient dialogue between faculty and evaluators on the merits of post tenure review.

To address this, the PTR Evaluation Task Force recommends that evaluators meet with faculty in their department/college to discuss issues related to post tenure review. There should also be discussions pertaining to the formative aspects of post tenure review. These would include professional development opportunities that are identified when the faculty member develops professional goals as a consequence of the review process. To provide for the review, revision, and/or updating these goals, the Task Force recommends that these discussions occur on an annual basis. When appropriate, these goals should be supported through department/college initiatives or in conjunction with the Center for Teaching, Learning and Faculty Development.

The Task Force also recommends that evaluators meet at least twice a year to discuss the issues pertaining to post tenure review, including the value of post tenure review to the faculty, the students and the university.

#### **Recommendation 4: Consistent evaluation process across all units**

Review of the comments on consistency of implementation of the process across the units indicates that there is at least the perception that post tenure review standards are not applied uniformly across the departments/colleges. The Task Force recommends that the Vice President continue to conduct evaluator training sessions each fall semester to provide evaluators with expectations for post tenure review. It should be stressed that evaluators use the standard institutional portfolio evaluator review form and that the evaluator should not place a disproportionate weight on the information in the SAI. Written comments regarding faculty strengths and development needs must be included in the evaluation. It is also recommended that consideration be given to modifying the form to collapse the options to "does not meet" expectations or "meets" expectations.

#### **Recommendation 5: Consistent portfolio content across all units**

The Task Force determined that there is some inconsistency in the requirements for portfolio contents between departments/colleges. The Task Force recommends that portfolios have minimum standard components across all departments/colleges that will include the following:

- curriculum vitae (vitae should include dates when activities occurred)
- comments from colleagues
- relevant information from the student assessment of instruction
- assessment of progress in achieving professional goals identified in the previous post tenure review
- documentation of service to the department, college, university, community or the profession (may be included in the curriculum vitae)
- statement of faculty member's scholarship (may be included in the curriculum vitae)

The portfolios may also include other components such as:

- a statement of the faculty member's educational/professional philosophy
- course syllabi
- examples of student work
- examples of instructor evaluation of student work

#### **Recommendation 6: Weighting of the PTR evaluation process**

To reflect the importance of teaching and student learning at FSU, the task force recommends that teaching be identified as the most significant component of the evaluation. To that end, the relevant contribution of each component of the evaluation could be as follows: 60% teaching, 20% scholarship, and 20% service. One concern with this approach is that many faculty have non-teaching assignments that reduce their

teaching load. This may necessitate a variation in the relative contribution of each component of the PTR evaluation process for these individuals.

**Recommendation 7: Alterations to the evaluation cycle**

Based on the survey data, the Task Force recommends that the Post Tenure Review evaluation cycle be changed. The maximum time of Post Tenure Review should be increased from four to five years. The Task Force also recommends that this should be implemented for the 2002 – 2003 review cycle.

The Task Force recognizes that, on occasion, a faculty member may have extenuating circumstances, such as sabbatical, family leave, medical emergencies, that would preclude the faculty member from developing a thorough portfolio. As in the past, it is recommended that faculty have the opportunity to request a one-year delay in the PTR evaluation under unusual circumstances. Written requests for a one-year extension should be submitted to their dean for approval.

**Recommendation 8: Student Assessment of Instruction**

The Task Force supports the recommendations of the Student Assessment of Instruction Evaluation Task Force.

## **Appendix A**



# FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY

October 16, 2001

Dear FSU Administrators:

The Office of Institutional Research and Testing (IR&T) is conducting a survey regarding your experiences with the **Post-Tenure Review and SAI Processes**. Your thoughts and opinions are very important to us and we encourage you to thoughtfully complete the enclosed questionnaire. In addition to the close-ended questions, there are many places on the survey where your comments are solicited. Please include your own comments about all aspects of the process.

We want everyone to feel comfortable sharing information with us. An IR&T staff member will process the completed survey - no one else will view the survey forms except for those involved in data entry. Your responses will be completely confidential as there is no identifying information on the questionnaire. Please seal your responses in the envelope provided and place them in the **campus mail by October 25, 2001**.

If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Institutional Research and Testing. Thank you for helping us by providing your valuable insights.

Thank you,

Kristen E. Salomonson  
Assistant Dean of Enrollment Services  
Director of Institutional Research & Testing

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH  
410 Oak Street, ALU 117, Big Rapids, Michigan 49307-2022  
Phone 231 591-3801 Fax 231 591-2643

# FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY

## *Faculty Post-Tenure Review/Student Assessment of Instruction Survey*

**Please take a few minutes to fill out this survey about your opinions on the Post-Tenure Review Process at Ferris State University. The survey pertains to the process in general, and a series of specific questions about the SAI Instrument. Your responses will help us to improve the process. All of your responses will be kept strictly confidential, and there is no name identification possible with this survey. Please mark an “X” through the square that corresponds to the response to each question that best represents your opinion. Be sure to include comments about your own experiences. We appreciate your time in completing this survey. Write additional comments on the lines provided or attach comments on a separate sheet of paper.**

### **General Post-Tenure Review:**

1. What do you believe **is** the primary purpose for the post-tenure review?

- 9 Assess individual performance to recognize excellence
- 9 Assess professional career development goals and establish plans for continued growth
- 9 Increase program effectiveness
- 9 Assess individual performance to identify areas for improvement
- 9 Other

---

---

---

2. What do you believe **ought to be** the primary purpose for the post-tenure review?

- 9 Assess individual performance to recognize excellence
- 9 Assess professional career development goals and establish plans for continued growth
- 9 Increase program effectiveness
- 9 Assess individual performance to identify areas for improvement
- 9 Other

---

---

---

3. Have you ever been through a Post-Tenure Review ? 9 Yes 9 No (*If “no” please go on to Question 17 for SAI related information*)

4. Were the established Post-Tenure Review policies & procedures followed throughout your evaluation? 9 Yes 9 No

5. Did you have a classroom visit by your evaluator? 9 Yes 9 No

6. How important do you believe it is to have a classroom visit from your evaluator?

9 Very Unimportant 9 Somewhat Unimportant 9 Somewhat Important 9 Very Important

7. Did you have a faculty peer evaluation ? 9 Yes 9 No

8. How important do you believe it is to have a peer evaluation?

9 Very Unimportant 9 Somewhat Unimportant 9 Somewhat Important 9 Very Important

9. Which of the following do you believe was the most important criterion used in your Post-Tenure Review?

9 Teaching 9 Scholarship 9 Service

10. Please indicate the percent contribution each of the 3 areas should be on Post-Tenure Review. (*All 3 should total to 100%*)

\_\_\_\_% Teaching \_\_\_\_% Scholarship \_\_\_\_% Service

11. Please indicate how each (teaching, scholarship, & service) are impacted by the Post-Tenure Review Process.

---

---

---

12. For each of the following elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process, please indicate your level of agreement with each. Mark an “X” in the box that best represents your opinion.

Post Tenure Review process...	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Stimulates Improved Performance	9	9	9	9	9
b. Increases Faculty Accountability	9	9	9	9	9
c. Encourages Faculty Excellence	9	9	9	9	9
d. Involves Cumbersome Preparation	9	9	9	9	9
e. Links Departmental/Program Goals with Personal Professional Plans	9	9	9	9	9
f. Process Threatens Tenure	9	9	9	9	9
g. Establishes Development as a Continual Expectation for all Faculty	9	9	9	9	9
h. Creates Worry and Anxiety Among Faculty	9	9	9	9	9
i. Deadlines are Manageable	9	9	9	9	9
j. Standards are Applied Consistently Across Colleges	9	9	9	9	9
k. Negatively Impacts Pursuit of Controversial Areas of Study	9	9	9	9	9
l. Insufficient Evaluator Training	9	9	9	9	9
m. Sufficient Funds to Support Faculty Development Initiatives	9	9	9	9	9

13. Have you requested funds from your College/Department for professional development plans?

9 Yes      9 No (If 'NO' skip to Question 15)

14. Were these funds sufficient for your request?

9 Yes      9 No

15. What word best describes your experience with Post-Tenure Review?

\_\_\_\_\_

16. Please provide any additional comments you have about the Post Tenure Review Process.

---

---

---

---

---

---

There are only a few more questions on the survey. Thank you for your patience. The last series of questions concerns your opinions on the SAI instrument.

**Student Assessment of Instruction Information:**

17. For the next series of items, please indicate the level of significance for each factor.

	Very Insignificant	Somewhat Insignificant	Neither Significant nor Insignificant	Somewhat Significant	Very Significant
a. Numerical Results in Improving Your Instruction	9	9	9	9	9
b. Written Comments in Improving Your Instruction	9	9	9	9	9
c. Numerical Results in Your Supervisor's Evaluation of Your Instruction	9	9	9	9	9
d. Written Comments in Your Supervisor's Evaluation of Your Instruction	9	9	9	9	9

18. Have you used the results of the SAI to improve your teaching in your classes?

9 Yes    9 No (If "No" skip to question 20)

19. In what ways have you used the SAI to improve your teaching in your classes?

---



---



---

20. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current SAI process?

---



---



---

21. In your view, are the policies/procedures for giving the SAI followed?

9 Yes (If “Yes” skip to question 22) 9 No

22. If you answered “No”, what was done differently?

---



---

23. For non-tenured faculty in your department, what evaluation instrument is used?

9 SAI 9 Another Instrument \_\_\_\_\_(Please Specify)

24. For both tenured and non-tenured faculty in your college, what other teaching evaluation methods are used?

*(Please Indicate all That Apply)*

- 9 Direct Classroom Observation
- 9 Peer Review
- 9 Review of Syllabus/Course Materials
- 9 Review of Samples of Student Work
- 9 Teaching Portfolio
- 9 Other

---

25. For each of the following questioned from the SAI Instrument, please indicate how important each element is for you. Mark an “X” in the box that best represents your opinion.

	Very Unimportant	Somewhat Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Very Important
a. Expectations about graded assignments were clearly communicated	9	9	9	9
b. Course Activities helped me learn course material	9	9	9	9
c. Exams, papers, and other graded projects were				

	Very Unimportant	Somewhat Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Very Important
returned in a reasonable amount of time	9	9	9	9
d. Course was well-organized	9	9	9	9
e. Instructor helped me to make connections between the content of the course and real life situations	9	9	9	9
f. Instructor generally followed the course outline	9	9	9	9
g. Instructor presented material in a clear and understandable manner	9	9	9	9
h. Graded materials and activities covered the major points of the course	9	9	9	9
i. Instructor gave helpful illustrations/examples in explaining course materials	9	9	9	9
j. Instructor was genuinely interested in what they were teaching	9	9	9	9
k. Instructor was well-prepared for class	9	9	9	9
l. I was able to get help in this course if I needed it	9	9	9	9
m. I felt the instructor put considerable effort into teaching this class	9	9	9	9
n . Instructor was available outside of the regularly scheduled class time	9	9	9	9
o. Instructor displayed interest in students and their learning	9	9	9	9
p. I really had to work hard to successfully	9	9	9	9

	Very Unimportant	Somewhat Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Very Important
complete the requirements in this course				
q. Instructor was enthusiastic about the subject matter of this course	9	9	9	9
r. Instructor was receptive to the expression of student views	9	9	9	9
s. Instructor stimulated my interest in the subject	9	9	9	9
t. The subject matter in this course is difficult	9	9	9	9
u. I was interested in the subject matter before I took the course	9	9	9	9
v. Overall, I rate this an excellent course	9	9	9	9
w. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher	9	9	9	9
x. I was required to take this course	9	9	9	9

26. If you have any additional comments about the SAI, we would love to hear them.

---



---



---



---



---

**Demographic Information:**

27. How many times have you been through the PTR process? \_\_\_\_\_

28. What year(s) did you go through the process?

- a. 1998 - 1999
- b. 1999 - 2000
- c. 2000 - 2001
- d. 2001 - 2002

29. What was the title of the person who conducted your evaluation?  
\_\_\_\_\_

30. What College or Academic Unit are you from?  
\_\_\_\_\_

31. How long have you been employed at FSU? \_\_\_\_\_ (# of Years)

32. What is your Gender?    9 Female 9 Male

33. What is your Age? \_\_\_\_\_

34. What is your racial/ethnic category?

9 White    9 African-American    9 Asian/Pac. Islander    9 Hispanic    9 American Indian    9 Multi-Racial

**Thank you for participating in the survey.**

# FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY

## *Evaluator Post-Tenure Review/SAI Survey*

**Please take a few minutes to fill out this survey about your opinions on the Post-Tenure Review Process at Ferris State University. The survey pertains to the process in general, and a series of specific questions about the SAI Instrument. Your responses will help us to improve the process. All of your responses will be kept strictly confidential, and there is no name identification possible with this survey. Please mark an “X” through the square that corresponds to the response to each question that best represents your opinion. Be sure to include comments about your own experiences. We appreciate your time in completing this survey.**

### **General Post-Tenure Review:**

11. What do you believe **is** the primary purpose for the post-tenure review?

- 9 Assess individual performance to recognize excellence
  - 9 Assess professional career development goals and establish plans for continued growth
  - 9 Increase program effectiveness
  - 9 Assess individual performance to identify areas for improvement
  - 9 Other
- 
- 
- 

12. What do you believe **ought to be** the primary purpose for the post-tenure review?

- 9 Assess individual performance to recognize excellence
  - 9 Assess professional career development goals and establish plans for continued growth
  - 9 Increase program effectiveness
  - 9 Assess individual performance to identify areas for improvement
  - 9 Other
- 
- 
- 

13. Have you ever been an evaluator in a Post-Tenure Review ? 9 Yes 9 No (*If “no” please go to Question 15*)

14. Were the established Post-Tenure Review policies & procedures followed throughout the evaluation? 9 Yes 9 No

15. Did you perform a classroom visit with the faculty you were evaluating? 9 Yes 9 No

16. How important do you believe it is to have a classroom visit when evaluating faculty?

9 Very Unimportant 9 Somewhat Unimportant 9 Somewhat Important 9 Very Important

17. Did you include a faculty peer evaluation when evaluating faculty? 9 Yes 9 No

18. How important do you believe it is to have a peer evaluation when evaluating faculty?

9 Very Unimportant 9 Somewhat Unimportant 9 Somewhat Important 9 Very Important

19. Which of the following do you believe was the most important criterion for Post-Tenure Review?

9 Teaching 9 Scholarship 9 Service

20. Please indicate the percent contribution of each of the 3 areas on Post-Tenure Review. (*All 3 should total to 100%*)

\_\_\_\_\_% Teaching \_\_\_\_\_% Scholarship \_\_\_\_\_% Service

13. Please indicate how each (training, scholarship, & service) are impacted by the Post-Tenure Review Process.

---

---

---

14. For each of the following elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process, please indicate your level of agreement with each. Mark and “X” in the box that best represents your opinion.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Stimulates Improved Performance	9	9	9	9	9
b. Increases Faculty Accountability	9	9	9	9	9
c. Encourages Faculty Excellence	9	9	9	9	9
d. Involves Cumbersome Preparation	9	9	9	9	9
e. Links Departmental/Program Goals with Personal Professional Plans	9	9	9	9	9
f. Process Threatens Tenure	9	9	9	9	9
g. Establishes Development as a Continual Expectation for all Faculty	9	9	9	9	9
h. Creates Worry and Anxiety Among Faculty	9	9	9	9	9
i. Deadlines are Manageable	9	9	9	9	9
j. Standards are Applied Consistently Across Colleges	9	9	9	9	9
k. Negatively Impacts Pursuit of Controversial Areas of Study	9	9	9	9	9
l. Insufficient Evaluator Training	9	9	9	9	9
m. Sufficient Funds to Support Faculty Development Initiatives	9	9	9	9	9

25. What word best describes your experience with Post-Tenure Review?

\_\_\_\_\_

26. Please provide any additional comments you have about the Post Tenure Review Process.

---



---



---



---



---

There are only a few more questions on the survey. Thank you for your patience. The last series of questions concerns your opinions on the SAI instrument.

**SAI Information:**

27. For the next series of items, please indicate the level of significance for each factor.

	Very Insignificant	Somewhat Insignificant	Neither Significant nor Insignificant	Somewhat Significant	Very Significant
a. Numerical Results in Your Evaluation of Instruction	9	9	9	9	9
b. Written Comments in Your Evaluation of Instruction	9	9	9	9	9

28. Do you communicate regularly with faculty regarding SAI results other than as part of the PTR process?

9 Yes    9 No (If “No” skip to question 18)

29. How do you communicate with faculty regarding SAI results?

- 9 Written Note/Memo
  - 9 Casual Conversation
  - 9 Special Meeting
  - 9 Special Meeting with Written Follow-up
  - 9 Other
- 
- 

---

30. What kinds of issues do you address with faculty in meetings or other communications?

---

---

---

31. In your college or department, is the space for additional items on the SAI used?

9 Yes 9 No (If “No” skip to question 21)

32. If you answered “Yes”, what are these additional questions?

---

---

33. What questions on the SAI form are most important to your evaluation of instruction?

---

---

34. What elements of the PTR portfolio are most important to your evaluation of instruction?

---

---

35. Who selects the courses where the SAI will be given?

Instructors     Department Chairs/Heads     Deans

36. For both tenured and non-tenured faculty in your college, what other teaching evaluation methods are used?

*(Please Indicate all That Apply)*

- Direct Classroom Observation
  - Peer Review
  - Review of Syllabus/Course Materials
  - Review of Samples of Student Work
  - Teaching Portfolio
  - Other
- 
- 

37. For non-tenured faculty in your college, what evaluation instrument is used?

SAI     Another Instrument \_\_\_\_\_ *(Please Specify)*

38. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current SAI process?

---

---

---

26. For each of the following questioned from the SAI Instrument, please indicate how important each element is for you. Mark and “X” in the box that best represents your opinion.

	Very Unimportant	Somewhat Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Very Important
a. Expectations about graded assignments were clearly communicated	9	9	9	9
b. Course Activities helped me learn course material	9	9	9	9
c. Exams, papers, and other graded projects were returned in a reasonable amount of time	9	9	9	9
d. Course was well-organized	9	9	9	9
e. Instructor helped me to make connections between the content of the course and real life situations	9	9	9	9
f. Instructor generally followed the course outline	9	9	9	9
g. Instructor presented material in a clear and understandable manner	9	9	9	9
h. Graded materials and activities covered the major points of the course	9	9	9	9
i. Instructor gave helpful illustrations/examples in explaining course materials	9	9	9	9
j. Instructor was genuinely interested in what they were teaching	9	9	9	9
k. Instructor was well-prepared for class	9	9	9	9
l. I was able to get help in this course if I needed it	9	9	9	9
m. I felt the instructor put considerable effort into teaching this class	9	9	9	9

	Very Unimportant	Somewhat Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Very Important
n . Instructor was available outside of the regularly scheduled class time	9	9	9	9
o. Instructor displayed interest in students and their learning	9	9	9	9
p. I really had to work hard to successfully complete the requirements in this course	9	9	9	9
q. Instructor was enthusiastic about the subject matter of this course	9	9	9	9
r. Instructor was receptive to the expression of student views	9	9	9	9
s. Instructor stimulated my interest in the subject	9	9	9	9
t. The subject matter in this course is difficult	9	9	9	9
u. I was interested in the subject matter before I took the course	9	9	9	9
v. Overall, I rate this an excellent course	9	9	9	9
w. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher	9	9	9	9
x. I was required to take this course	9	9	9	9

27. If you have any additional comments about the SAI, we would love to hear them.

---



---

---

---

---

**Demographic Information:**

28. How many times have you evaluated faculty in the PTR process? \_\_\_\_\_

29. What year(s) did you evaluate the faculty? \_\_\_\_\_

30. What is your title? \_\_\_\_\_

31. What College or Academic Unit are you evaluating faculty in?  
\_\_\_\_\_

32. How long have you been employed at FSU? \_\_\_\_\_ (# of Years)

33. Have you participated in PTR training?  No  Yes Who did the training?  
\_\_\_\_\_

34. What year was the training? \_\_\_\_\_

35. What is your Gender?  Female  Male

36. What is your Age? \_\_\_\_\_

37. What is your racial/ethnic category?

White  African-American  Asian/Pac. Islander  Hispanic  American Indian   
Multi-Racial

**Thank you for participating in the survey.**

## **Appendix B**

# FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY

## *PTR-SAI Faculty and Evaluator Survey Results* **Executive Summary**

In the fall semester of 2001, the faculty and evaluators at Ferris State University participated in survey focusing on their opinions about the Post-Tenure Review Process and the Student Assessment of Instruction Instrument. The survey was developed by two committees charged with providing recommendations on improving the University's processes to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Barbara Chapman. A total of 170 faculty and 19 evaluators completed the survey. A large number of the faculty surveys had over 20% of the responses missing (they had not been filled in). Surveys were returned from all the colleges; about two of three respondents were male. In order to ensure data reliability, these surveys were not included in the analysis. In addition to the quantitative responses, all of the comments from the survey were transcribed for easier reading, and to ensure that no survey would be examined by anyone except for the research staff. The complete version of the PTR/SAI report includes frequency distributions, and percentages for both the evaluators and the faculty, and those who have and have not participated in the process.

In order to gain a clearer understanding of the results, a comparison between the faculty and evaluator results appears useful. Please note that these are only selected portions of the data relevant to a wide audience.

### ***Selected Results***

Overall, the results indicate that there are some real differences in the perceptions of the evaluators and the faculty with regard to the PTR/SAI processes. There were some areas where the two groups were largely in agreement. The percentage of both groups responding similarly was large.

### **Areas of Congruence**

The Primary Purpose of the PTR Process

The Most Important Criterion Used in PTR

The Percentage Teaching, Scholarship & Service Contributes to the PTR Process

<b>Means % Contribution</b>	<b>Teaching</b>	<b>Scholarship</b>	<b>Service</b>
Faculty	64%	17%	19%
Evaluator	60%	18%	23%

Opinions about a Majority of the Items on the SAI

- While there was a greater percentage of faculty selecting the three lowest category responses than evaluators, there was consistency in terms of items being high-rated or low-rated by both groups.

*Lowest Rated SAI Items by Both Faculty & Evaluators:*

Instructor Followed Outline  
Instructor Put in Considerable Effort  
I Really Had to Work Hard  
Subject Matter is Difficult  
Interested in the Subject Before Took the Class  
Is This a Required Course

*Highest Rated SAI Items by Both Faculty & Evaluators:*

Exams, Papers, and Graded Projects Returned  
Course Well-Organized  
Graded Materials Covered Major Points  
Instructor Gave Helpful Examples  
I was Able to Get Help

Opinion on the Grand Mean Figure from the SAI

- Evaluators found this less useful than did faculty; but no one in either group indicated it was very important, and only seven (7) listed it as somewhat important.

**Areas of Disagreement**

More evaluators than faculty believe a classroom visit is Very Important (39 to 17%)

A Greater Percentage of Faculty Disagree with the Following Statements about PTR:

Stimulates Improved Performance  
Increases Faculty Accountability  
Encourages Faculty Excellence  
Standards Applied Consistently Across Colleges  
Evaluators are Aware of Guidelines and Procedures

A Greater Percentage of Evaluators Disagree with the Following Statements about PTR:

Involves Cumbersome Preparation  
Threatens Tenure Process  
Negatively Impacts the Pursuit of Controversial Subject Matter

Evaluators Find Both the Written and Quantitative Portions of the SAI More Significant than do the Faculty

There is a Large Disparity in the Perception of What other Methods Have Been Used for Faculty Evaluation. Evaluators are more likely to Report using all Alternative Methods

## **Appendix C**

**Post-Tenure Review  
Policy and Procedures  
Revised 03-22-02**

**Preamble**

Ferris State University affirms its commitment to tenure, recognizing that the public interest is best served in a climate in which faculty members are free to pursue the creation and dissemination of knowledge, and the conduct of their professional responsibilities.

Ferris State University's post-tenure review process is intended to ensure a professional level in teaching, scholarship and service by its tenured faculty members; to provide for ongoing faculty development, and to promote a mentoring environment between faculty and supervisors regarding professional activities and responsibilities.

The post tenure review policy defines the university-wide standards for performance appraisal and the procedures for review of the teaching, scholarship and service responsibilities of faculty members using those standards

**A. Standards and the Post-tenure Review Process**

1. The university-wide standards describe the level of performance expected of faculty members in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. It is recognized that there are variations in faculty assignments, teaching styles and interests. Moreover, it is recognized that pedagogy and methodology may differ between departments. For that reason, not all of the standards may be applicable for review of a given faculty member. However, because of the importance of the tenured faculty to the University, these persons should demonstrate capability in the three areas previously mentioned using the unit-specific standards derived from the university-wide standards given below:

Teaching -

Meets expected program/departmental outcomes/objectives for the course taught.

Is knowledgeable of current developments in one's discipline and retains clinical/professional competence as appropriate.

Demonstrates consistency in the application of a defined teaching methodology.

Meets individual student needs through established office hours and advising of designated student advisees.

Presents material in an organized fashion.

Provides course guidance by a syllabus with course outline, objectives, basis for evaluation, and grading policy.

Evaluates student learning consistent with course objectives.

Provides timely and corrective feedback to students.

Maintains a classroom atmosphere that is conducive to learning and respectful of differences.

Participates in departmental deliberations on curricular and pedagogical matters.

Scholarship –

Participates in curriculum innovation and development.

Demonstrates evidence of scholarly activity including research, creative activity, or application of research or pedagogy in one's discipline or area of professional responsibility.

Remains current in the field as evidenced by attending professional meetings, giving presentations, or publishing papers.

Participates in professional development activities and demonstrates continued professional growth.

Service –

Serves on departmental, college and University committees.

Is a member of appropriate professional organizations.

Participates in community activities that are professionally related.

Engages in voluntary service to the University community including student organizations.

2. Colleges/departments have adapted, in some cases with modifications, the university-wide standards of performance to reflect the specific needs of the college/department. If the college/department chooses to make further modifications to their current standards of performance, the department head or equivalent, providing an opportunity for input from the faculty, will submit proposed modifications to the standards for approval to the dean or VPAA, if there are no department heads. If the majority of the faculty agree on the unit specific adaptations, that information shall be forwarded to the dean by the faculty. The dean or VPAA shall approve or modify the unit-specific standards. The dean or VPAA must inform the faculty, in writing, of the reasons if the standards adapted by the faculty are not adopted.
3. The minimum standard portfolio components across all departments, colleges will include the following:
  - Curriculum vitae (vitae should include dates when activities occurred)
  - Comments from colleagues
  - Relevant information from the student assessment of instruction
  - Assessment of progress in achieving professional goals identified in the previous post tenure review
  - Documentation of service to the department, college, university, community or the profession (may be included in the curriculum vitae)
  - Statement of faculty member's scholarship (may be included in the curriculum vitae)

The portfolios may also include other components such as:

- A statement of the faculty member's educational/professional philosophy
- Course syllabi

- Examples of student work
- Examples of instructor evaluation of work

The department head or equivalent may determine modifications of the optional portfolio components after actively seeking input from the faculty. If the majority of the faculty agree on the modifications to the components of the portfolio, that information shall be forwarded to the department head or equivalent by the faculty. The department head must inform the faculty, in writing, of the reasons if the list of portfolio components adapted by the faculty is not adopted.

4. All tenured faculty members will be reviewed once within a five-year period Unless additional reviews are required as a consequence of post-tenure review. As additional faculty members become tenured, they will be added to the list so that they are reviewed in the fifth year after their tenure becomes effective.
5. By May 1 of each year, their respective deans will officially notify faculty members scheduled for post-tenure review during the next academic year. The faculty members will receive a copy of the university-wide standards. They will submit portfolio materials as defined in this policy and as modified by the college/department.
6. On or before December 1, the faculty member being reviewed shall submit his/her portfolio to the evaluator. In many cases, the evaluator will be the department head. In those colleges where there are no departments, the dean or another administrator designated by the dean will be the evaluator.
7. On or before January 30, the evaluator will meet individually with faculty members to discuss the post-tenure review evaluation. The individual faculty member shall receive a preliminary copy of the post-tenure review evaluation at least ten working days before the meeting is scheduled. This session will include a discussion of progress toward meeting program/departmental/ college goals and exploration of faculty development opportunities that might be appropriate.

The review will indicate the faculty member's strengths and development needs. The evaluator may state that the performance exceeds department/unit expectations.

Each faculty member will develop a written document outlining goals for the coming year(s) and a mechanism for determining progress toward those goals. This document will be developed in conjunction with the faculty member involved. This information in the development plan will be used as the basis for the next evaluation. If performance in a given area is deemed deficient, the next review may be scheduled as soon as one year or up to four years in the future. The faculty member will receive a copy of the plan and will sign the development plan indicating that the plan has been discussed with the faculty member. A faculty member may request that another faculty member attend the discussion of the post-tenure review evaluation. The faculty member who disagrees with all or part of the evaluation has fifteen working days from the date of the meeting to respond to the evaluation in writing to the

evaluator. The post-tenure review evaluations and written responses, if any, will be forwarded to the dean or the next highest administrator on February 21.

Also if the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, he/she may request a meeting with the next highest administrator. This request must be made within 15 working days of the meeting with the evaluator. Upon such a request, the administrator shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review within 15 working days of the request. The administrator will give the faculty member a written response to his/her areas of disagreement within 15 working days of the meeting. . Final appeal may be made to the VPAA.

8. The dean shall submit his/her report on the post-tenure review process to the VPAA on or before March 15. On completion of the process, the portfolio is returned to the faculty member. The Office of Academic Affairs will forward the post-tenure review evaluation and the faculty response, if any, to HRD for placement in the faculty member's official file. All correspondence resulting from review by the next highest administrator will also be placed in the official file in HRD. The original evaluation and all subsequent correspondence will be considered to be the post-tenure review.
9. On or before April 15, the VPAA will report on the post-tenure review process to the President.

## **B. Summary of Calendar**

May 1 – The dean notifies faculty members that they will be reviewed the following year and provides them with a copy of the departmental/college expectations and a list of material to be included in the portfolio.

December 1– Portfolios for evaluation are submitted to the evaluator. Data from student assessment of instruction must be considered in the evaluation.

January 30 – Last day to hold the meeting between administrator and faculty member to discuss post-tenure review evaluation. Faculty member must receive a preliminary post-tenure review evaluation at least ten working days prior to the scheduled meeting. Faculty member must submit written response within fifteen (15) working days of the meeting to be included as part of the post-tenure review evaluation.

February 21 – Evaluator forwards post-tenure review evaluation and the written response of the faculty, if one exists, to the Dean or VPAA if appropriate.

March 15 – The Dean forwards his/her report on post-tenure review to VPAA.

April 15 – The VPAA will report on post-tenure review process to the President.