

## UPDATE: OUTCOMES OF 1-18-2018 MEETING AT UA SYSTEM OFFICE REGARDING 405.1 REVISIONS

The meeting began with a brief visit from Dr. Bobbitt. We discussed what was the goal of this meeting was today because we (Academic Senates in UA System) have had limited information from UA Systems despite our repeated efforts to communicate. He indicated it was to work together on this policy revision. JoAnn Maxey lead the meeting, also present Ben Beaumont--UA Systems office rep; Michael Moore-Academic Affairs; Bill Kincaid, Gen Counsel at UAF; Kevin Hall-UAF; Andrew Weber.-UALR; Carolyn Strong-UAM; and Penny Ludsford-Mena. All of the AS representatives were in agreement with all of the items detailed below. We were there for 4 hours.

*Important to note that this summary is according to Leanne Lefler's perception of the conversations:*

- 1) Asked the “why” question, why revision, what are the issues, we think the policy is sufficient as is. Although received the same information on “reviewing all policy to align...”; later it came out that there were issues related to employees that spurred some of the revisions. Did not feel that we ever received an adequate answer to this question.
- 2) Time was spent in discussing revision process and how this process has been gravely unacceptable. We criticized the overall language of the document and how it reads punitive, negative, and unappealing. How a document such as this will affect recruitment and retention. How this document assumes that all faculty are not doing a good job and is threatening and demeaning to faculty as it currently reads. Requested that it be completely overhauled with regard to tone & language. Was given no indication that they agreed with us or that they intend to make this change.
- 3) Spent an inordinate amount of time on the term “unsatisfactory performance” I urged that it be stricken from the document entirely. They compromised by planning on defining this term as the outcome of the annual performance review; *this is typically defined at the College/Department levels.*
- 4) The “Cause” paragraph and description were discussed at long length, we are hopeful that some this language will change (see below).
- 5) Lots of time/discussion on “pattern of disruptive conduct...unwillingness...” the collegiality phrase. We requested this be removed from the document entirely. They will consider. [*we am hopeful that we will see the collegiality language related back to 'informing' annual ratings on teaching, research, and service - rather than a stand-alone (fourth) criteria.*]
- 6) We will see changes to the language related to multiple requests for delaying the tenure clock. [*see language about extensions will be highly unusual, and the FMLA paragraph...they indicated that this language will be removed*].
- 7) Criteria and procedures for initial appointment & successive appointment...( II. Appointments, #1, 3<sup>rd</sup> para). To delete second sentence that implies faculty do not have input on initial appointments/successive appointments) also repeated type language on IV. Tenure, #7.
- 8) “Salaries for tenured faculty may be adjusted based on job duties and performance” requested this be stricken (in the document twice), doesn't belong in this document,

belongs in HR policies on salary. We were given no indication that they will make this change.

- 9) #14 Academic Freedom restricted—Spent much time on this section. Requested that university policy/service be added. Indicated that this will be changed to include service activities at the very least.
- 10) Informal panel/committee with regard to dismissal- We are hopeful that this will be changed back to allow an informal panel at employee and/or administrator request after faculty are notified they are “unsatisfactory and at risk for dismissal”.
- 11) Per Dr. Hall & edits by Leanne: we will 'probably' see changes to post-tenure review; my impression is that, rather than one-year-to-get-a-satisfactory, we'll see language related to showing "...substantial progress..." and the “1 year timeframe removed” as toward remediation of the unsatisfactory.

This document is posted to share information and taken from my notes. Hopefully, I didn't miss something important. –Leanne Lefler, PhD, Academic Senate President, UAMS