Information to Inform Discussion of S 14-19

BACKGROUND

The PRS was introduced into the Handbook as a generalized job description for all faculty in 1999. Its role in evaluations at all levels has grown. It is now time to take a look at how it is used and how it might be improved.

The Task Force Timeline

- Discussion between the Provost Office and the FS on the importance of the PRS in evaluation began Fall 2013. Major variability in the structure of PRSs across campus was identified as problematic. The logic for the need for changes is best described on pages 3-4 of the Task Force Report.
- Joint FS/Provost Task Force appointed Spring 2014; all colleges and ranks represented
  - The Task Force met weekly early Sept 2014 thru late Feb 2015
  - Discussion notes show diversity of opinions and consideration of issues from multiple perspectives. The discussion notes are on the FS web page.
- Task Force Final Report sent to FSEB in February 2015
  - summary of key points on pages 14-15
  - Appendix B outlines changes to the FH to implement the recommendations
- FSEB sent the report to FDAR

The Senate Timeline

- FSEB sent to FDAR
- FDAR revised Appendix B into what is now S 14-19
  - Appendix A, the draft PRS template was also revised
- FS 14-19 as New Business for the FS on April 21
  - immediate motion to postpone the vote until Fall 2015 passed
- Discussion/gathering of comments/concerns
  - FS April 21, May 5, Sept 16
  - FSEB April 28, Sept 8
  - individual faculty and group comments/concerns via email
  - FSEB seeking more input prior to revising S 14-19

PROPOSED REVISIONS in S 14-19

Four Relatively Non-controversial Changes Contained in S 14-19

1. inclusion of a formal review date for the PRS
2. more formal description of procedures involving PRS development
3. an explicit outline of information needed in a PRS
4. requirement for inclusion of an annotated template with the LOI; a sample of such a template is appended to the end of this document
   - the inclusion of the PRS template with the LOI has generated some opposition, but inclusion of a draft PRS template is in the current language
Five More Substantive and Controversial Changes Contained in S 14-19

1. Proposed Expansion of Areas of Responsibility
   Current FH language on the PRS (FH 5.1.1.5) does not explicitly mention any areas of responsibility, but teaching, research/creative activity, extension/professional practice, and institutional service are mentioned in conjunction with the PRS in FH 4.1 and FH 5.2.2.1. S 14-19 establishes seven possible areas of responsibility: teaching, research/creative activity, extension, professional/clinical practice, institutional service, professional service/engagement & outreach, and administration
   - What is to be included in each is described on pages 4 & 5 of FH 14-19.
   - The rationale for the areas is in pages 9-11 of the Task Force Report and pages 9-14 of the Discussion Notes.

Concerns/Comments/Questions:
- Specification of areas is limiting; it removes flexibility for individualizing a PRS
- Institutional service and professional service should be a single service category
  - If someone does service to the discipline, why also require service to the institution?
  - Service to the institution doesn't increase visibility
  - The current FH treats institutional service separately for promotion.
- Extension cannot and should not be separated from engagement and outreach
  - We have a VP of Extension and Outreach
- The three categories of scholarship in the handbook in FH 5 are not directly related to the PRS. If there is confusion, then FH 5 needs to be clarified, rather than adding PRS categories that confuse the issue.

2. Proposed Requirement for Percentages
   Current FH language on the PRS (FH 5.1.1.5) does not mention the use of percentages. Some current PRSs contain percentages, others do not. S 14-19 specifies percentages as representing expected proportion of effort over a calendar year. The percentages are to be guidelines, so they should be in increments of 5%. The proposed revisions make clear that percentages should be assigned with advancement criteria in mind.
   - The rationale for percentages is in the areas is in pages 9-11 of the Task Force Report and discussion is on pages 3, 6, 16, and 19 in the Discussion Notes.

Concerns/Comments/Questions:
- Percentages should NOT be required.
  - If percentages exist they will be treated as weights in evaluations and that is not appropriate
  - Percentages can be used against faculty; if someone does something in a 0% area, it can be held against them (they aren't doing as expected).
- Percentages should be required.
  - Percentages convey relative importance.
There cannot be accurate evaluation without them.

- Percentages should be required, but the increments should be in terms of 1%.
- Can one ask to be evaluated on/rewarded for activities in areas of responsibility with 0% expected proportion of effort?
  - if this is allowed, then it should be clearly stated in the FH
- Does the concept of proportion of effort instead of hours normalize a 60 plus hour workweek?
- How does proportion of effort fit into A base versus B base? This should be clarified in the Handbook.
  - Must B base expend some of their effort when they are not paid?
  - Can A base be required to continue their responsibilities during vacation?
- Can NTE faculty be expected to do service and advising if it is not listed in the PRS?

3. Standardization of Proportion Effort in Teaching
   The task force recommended that each college determine a percentage value for teaching a standard 3 credit course and the standard should be made explicit in college documents. The assumption is that the college percentage would be used as a guideline for the percentage in the teaching area in the PRS, allowing more equitable assignments and comparisons within and between units in the college. Because the college standard is not explicitly part of the PRS, it is not part of S 14-19, but is assumed.
   - The rationale for the college specification is in pages 12-13 of the Task Force Report and pages 3 and 6 of the Discussion Notes.

   Concerns/Comments/Questions:
   - Are cross-discipline or cross college differences in teaching expectations fair?
   - What about differences for faculty in the same department, but two different colleges?

4. Proposed Revision of Mediation
   A PRS mediation process exists for TTE faculty. Although current FH 5.4.1.2 states that NTE faculty will be part of a discussion at time of renewal, there is no mediation process. S 14-19 extends the mediation process to NTE faculty.
   - The rationale for the mediation is in pages 14-15 of the Task Force Report and there is discussion on pages 26 and 29 of the Discussion Notes.

   Concerns/Comments/Questions:
   - Why do lecturers need a mediation process? They are hired to teach specific classes. What can they negotiate?
   - Will NTE use a mediation process when they know they can be fired at the discretion of the chair?
   - How can NTE legitimately and safely say no to being asked to do unpaid work?

5. Proposed Reference to FH 7 (conduct) in the PRS
   Based on discussion with the University Lawyers, S 14-19 recommends that the PRS make explicit reference to Chapter 7, which describes expectations about faculty conduct.
S 14-19 also states that Colleges and Departments may include statements about collegiality.
  o The rationale is found on pages 15-17 of the Task Force Report and discussion is found on pages 5-6, 8, 22, 24, 30-31 of the Task Force Discussion Notes.

Concerns/Comments/Questions:
- Collegiality is different from areas of responsibility (conduct versus performance) and should not be part of a PRS.
- Collegiality should not be the basis of any evaluation.

**MISCELLANEOUS OTHER ISSUES RAISED/COMMENTS MADE**

- We KNOW what we are supposed to do, why explicitly quantify?
- What is the relationship of PRS categories to fiscal categories?
  o Extension is a fiscal category.
  o Is tuition money primarily teaching?
  o Is there a research budget other than external funds?
- Can someone whose salary comes from the extension line in the budget devote less than that percentage to extension?
- What is the relationship of PRS percentages to categories on the EASE forms?
- Where does mentoring of graduate students belong?
- Not all scholarship as defined by Boyer fits under research/creative activity
- FH 5 clarifies that the primary category for evaluation for promotion is excellence in scholarship and national and international recognition in field. So, what is the role of the PRS in evaluation for promotion evaluations?
- The PRS is to be used in annual evaluations in addition to promotions and renewals. Is this a good idea?