I. Call to Order
Dr. Lezotte called the meeting to order at 11:35 a.m., as well as thanked all participants for coming. The Minutes from March 2006 were approved.

Sign-in sheet attendance: Dennis Lezotte, Colleen Conry, Marie Hastings-Tolsma, Jeff Holt, Leslie Jameson, Marilyn Krajicek, David port, John Sbarbaro (Fitzsimons), Clyde Tucker, Sheryl Follin Vondracek, Jay Gershen,

Guests: Louise Vale, Lori Mettler, Mark Heckler, Howell Estes, Rick Forsman, Marguerite Childs

Louise Vale and Lori Mettler provided a UCDHSC budget update which included the following information: A 2006 - 2007 Uses of New Revenue spreadsheet was distributed and is attached as part of the minutes. Undergraduate Nursing and Dental Hygiene will receive College Opportunity Fund (COF) stipends instead of fee for service. Non-residency status for Dentistry and Medicine students are now going to become accountable students as a result of 2006 legislation. A student enrolled as an Accountable Student must agree to pay the resident tuition rate approved by the Board of Regents plus an annual program support fee (Accountable Student Fee) set annually by the Board of Regents which shall be determined by the Board to reflect the difference between the actual cost of education and resident tuition. There is a new SOM IT fee. Patient Revenue and Miscellaneous Revenue were flat. Facilities Administration will experience a 5% increase.

Below is the transcript from the open forum on ACTRP:

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO HSC OPEN FORUM AND FACULTY ASSEMBLY
May 30, 2006

Associate Vice Chancellor Marguerite Childs introduced Provost Heckler and General Estes.

Provost Heckler gave a brief overview of the process and introduced General Estes.

General Estes gave a top line review of the report.

Comment/question: . . . where is the definition of primary unit?

General Estes: I know in the School of Medicine it’s different.

Comment/question: . . . infrastructure of the campuses, where would responsibility lie? The Regents have given, by law, the authority for hiring, firing, promotion, tenure to the faculty, and this could be done through faculty assembly on a seven-year basis and become part of their charge or part of their by-laws to do reviews of criteria across campus, would it be done there or would it be done at the Regents’ level or do you have any sense of where you’d like to see that happen?

General Estes: The actual criteria are set at the primary unit level. Then it’s reviewed up through the dean and chancellor level and that’s by Regent Law. It’s not just set and not reviewed. There’s a multi-level review like there is with lots of things. So, we think that’s the right thing to do. We think multi-level review is correct because while the department may view a set of criteria as reflecting the goals of the university and what they want in their department, for example, the dean and the chancellor may have a different view as they look at it and say this doesn’t really reflect the goals of the university. One of the things we found is when we say the goals of the university, if you can find those written, you’re doing something we couldn’t do. We’ve not found the goals of the university written anywhere. So, when we say that the primary unit criteria ought to reflect these goals, the Regents have really got to set those goals, and that’s one of the important reasons for having the Regents participating in these sessions is they’ve heard this conversation, and it’s an issue they’re going to have to take on. They really do need to set these high level goals for what the university is looking for from the tenured faculty, and really for the faculty
throughout because there are other parts of this study that recommend not just using the criteria for the three major criteria for teaching, research, and service, just using those for the major reviews like the comprehensive review or tenure review or the post-tenure review, but also using it as the criteria for evaluating the annual reviews and not just making those merit reviews. And so, if you’re going to do that, that criteria is set. There’s also the Regents’ law that allows for additional criteria to be included and that’s where the goals of the university would be reflected more clearly especially as it relates to diversity issues. Let me talk around this a little bit. There are two places we were asked specifically to address the issue of diversity in the way most of us would think about it. The issue of intellectual diversity has come up in a number of other forums, and there are people who are pushing that very hard, and my view is, that may or may not make any sense, and it’s something the Regents are going to have to take a look at. To be candid with you, where this came up was in a caucus at the legislature with the Republicans who have a very definite agenda and that’s fine if they want to do that. But, in terms of what the university is looking for, diversity in the classroom in terms of the person who is standing there doing the instructing is one issue. Another issue might be what are you trying to teach in terms of this diversity issue? Are you trying to give people a perspective in which they can in fact make their own judgments about issues? In other words, if you’re trying to teach them how to sort through an issue to make up their own minds about what they believe in, or are you trying to ensure that in the classroom you’re teaching the wide range of political views that are out there? For example, if you’re dealing with intellectual diversity. It’s clear to me that listening to this caucus, they clearly were looking for the wide range of views to be presented; whereas, some, I think, feel that you’re trying to give students the skills to make the determination about those things and to be able to research them themselves and be able to make up their own minds. It’s a very different sort of view on this thing, and it’s something the Regents, I think, are going to have to address. They’ve all heard this discussion, but to be candid with you, we ought to be straight forward about what the issue is here, and why it’s come up. Anymore on this issue of the primary unit criteria?

Comment/question: Just out of curiosity, where were you on the continuum when you started and second, is this going over well with people you’re presenting to outside the university system? Do they understand this or have they said anything?

General Estes: We’ve had some good comments, specifically about this chart [slide 8]. People have looked at it and said; now we sort of get it. To be candid with you, people who are pushing on this issue of tenure don’t care about this chart. They’re working a different set of problems. They view this as an excuse, now I’ve taken this away, so they have to come up with some other way to attack the issue and post-tenure review is it, and we’re going to talk about that in just a second. So, that’s the other area that’s getting a lot of attention in the public. But, I will tell you, when I tell people about this, and I’ve had people from around the country, not just people in Colorado call me on this issue, and when I raise this issue with them and tell them about it, they’re surprised. They didn’t understand. They had misconceptions that are formed in whatever way, but it’s obviously through misinformation. So, I really think it’s important for the university to push this. Now, where was I when this thing started? I knew it wasn’t 7 for 7, but I didn’t know that it was possible as many as 100 applicants for each position; 1,000 for every 10. I didn’t realize it was that rigorous. The more that I’ve talked to faculty members on various campuses and got tremendous help from the internal working group, which is made up of faculty members, this is a very rigorous process.

Comment/question: At the hiring, one of the things that happens at the hiring stage is there is a screening process that’s going on. If you were hiring people with the intent that this person is going to get tenure, so we’re hiring with bias, that that person is going to fit in with the community of faculty . . . you don’t randomly hire here and hope that they don’t get tenure. You hire with the clear distinction that these people are tenurable.

General Estes: Those 10 are expected to get tenure. You can see, even with that, where you hire them and expect them to be able to succeed, you still lost 30% in these 10 cases. This is based on 10 actual cases that we looked at. I think what we’re finding is, and Mark has raised this a couple of times, in fact I’ll let him make the point, at the Denver campus, which you all are part of now, the numbers are even lower in this last year in terms of people who are actually getting tenure.
Provost Heckler: From the time of hire to the time of tenure, it was slightly over 50%.

General Estes: Now you can say that might be a cause for concern. Is it becoming so difficult and so hard to get tenure, people are just dropping out of it? They just don’t want to go through the process; they just don’t see the value of it. That could be part of the message, but I think the university has been trying over the years to react to this issue that tenure is not rigorous to attain. So, they may be tightening the process a little bit. The public doesn’t understand that. The public still doesn’t see the change, and yet it’s becoming more and more rigorous to gain tenure, to the point, maybe where you’re starting to not attract people who want to go into tenure track, to become tenured professors.

Comment/question: At the public schools, they call it tenure, and if you work at a place for three years, you’re considered tenured and go on, and I think that’s the perception that everybody has of the university, of higher education.

General Estes: Like I said, this is the kind of thing that the university ought to be actively pursuing to get out to the public, and really work hard with the reporters who have put this information out in the form of a press report to help them understand this, and we actually have taken the time to do editorial boards at both Rocky Mountain News and the Denver Post on exactly this issue.

Comment/question: I don’t think I’ve ever seen anything written in the paper. They’ve covered everything else.

General Estes: Remember what’s going on here, and Mark will talk to that a little bit because we were just talking before we started. One of the things that’s going to be awfully important as we get through this effort that Mark is going through with his committee now is to put together a summary in which we can show the recommendations and what was done about them in a format that the press will pick up on and put out there to the public. So, it’s going to be an important point.

Comment/question: Did you find any evidence of faculty in the post-tenure stage, essentially deficiencies there. . Churchill . . . which said we should have gotten rid of him before he said anything? How would we know that, but it seems like that’s what they’re trying to do, is say, you have to get rid of people before they do something that shoots the university in the foot. There’s no way, until somebody does it that you can evaluate it, so was there any evidence that post-tenure review is missing a lot of people, or is this just kind of a feeling that everybody has?

General Estes: The question was, was there any evidence that people were not paying attention to post-tenure review, and there’s this feeling that, from the public’s standpoint, that post-tenure review ought to catch people who will have problems before they do something stupid that’s going to create a problem, and specifically related to maybe Professor Churchill. Let me start out by saying we of course had nothing to do with the evaluation or looking at Professor Churchill’s case in particular. We were just looking at processes so let me just start with that. If you look at the report, there’s a section that deals with post-tenure review. There are some numbers in there about the number of post-tenure reviews that took place; how many people were found to be below expectations, and have to have some sort of remedial training done in terms of setting up a plan for fixing the fault. There are very few cases of that at the 5-year post-tenure review. As you all know, in the post-tenure review, the annual reviews are tied directly to, they’re all cumulative and added into, and they’re part of the 5-year post-tenure review as opposed to what happens pre-tenure. What we found was in talking to faculty members, we couldn’t look at evaluations specifically because those are private, but in talking to the faculty members who are doing this, they said, basically, what they’re using the annual reviews for is salary distribution. You all know this better than I, the Regents policy says you can’t give everybody the same percent raise. You have to split it, but if you look at the split that’s going on, say from a 2.8 to a 2.1, just a couple hundred bucks maybe at most, and so, it really doesn’t have any impact whatsoever. As a result of that, and since it doesn’t make much difference, people are really reluctant to put what people are doing right, their strengths and what they’re doing wrong, their weaknesses, into those reports. They just basically are used to do the salary distribution, and what we were told was very rarely do they document strengths and weaknesses. The other reason is that once you get a tenured faculty member, the last thing you want to do is lose them, and if you start telling them they’ve got
all kinds of problems, they might go somewhere else, and they may not be that bad. There may be some things that they need to do to improve, but you don’t want to have an adversarial relationship where you discourage someone to the point where they leave the university, and we actually had faculty members tell us that was another reason they don’t want to document. They’re reluctant to document weaknesses for tenured faculty.

Comment/question: One of the other problems is that a very rigorous review is very time-consuming on our colleagues. For every review you do, you have to get 3-5 letters, and we all review papers for journals as part of our professional responsibility and review other faculty’s review. If every university starts demanding this rigorous review, because there’s some pre-tenure you have to get letters from outside faculty several times and by the time we get through this process, our colleagues aren’t very happy writing letters every other year for us.

General Estes: The external letters, of course, apply, as you well know, to the comprehensive and tenure review, not always the comprehensive, all departments don’t require external letters for the comprehensive but they all do require them and require 6 is normally the number for tenure review. Post-tenure review is another kind, but for the annual reviews people don’t go out for external letters.

Comment/question: When you start talking about being rigorous, then you’re starting to go back into that and say, well, maybe we should have 5 external people review the publications and make sure they’re at the quality of when you were tenured and so forth. It can get very time-consuming.

General Estes: What we found is that the universities that seem to be having more success with post-tenure review are doing multi-level review of all the pieces – the annual reviews and the 5-year reviews. They’re doing that at a multi-level or they’re doing it with a group that is not directly associated with that particular faculty member. In other words, they are doing it with peer review but they’re doing it with outside people being directly associated with the particular individual that you’re looking at so you’re looking at them more broadly across the standards for the campus, for example, or a particular school rather than specific department. And they’re using such things as differential workload as incentives to encourage people to do better. The 40-40-20 split may not be the right thing to do although some people think it’s exactly the right thing to do, but there are people who are a lot better at teaching than they are doing research and they’d much rather be in the classroom and so, if that’s the case, then maybe you ought to be doing a 60-20-20 and that’s another thing we’re seeing some universities doing and it seems to be working well for them. To wrap it up now in the post-tenure business. It’s just an area that does require some attention. Whether or not you do it the way you’re doing it now or whether you can in fact come up with a series of incentives and sanctions that make sense that the faculty would recognize that this is serious business; that you can in fact do the annual reports in a way that’s not so time-consuming. As you point out, faculty workload is a very important area, and there are only so many hours in the day, and we’ve heard this, what are we not going to do if we’re going to do this? Giving people credit, there are people in administrative positions that do all this extra work, of course they’re getting credit for service toward the university, but what we kept hearing back is that if people are not doing research and they’re doing this work, they’re looked down on by their colleagues. They’re not viewed as being, as pulling their share of the load because they’re not out doing the research they ought to be doing and so, that perception has to change in the university. In fact, we’re going to increase the administrative workload of doing these kinds of things.

Comment/question: One thing that we have to watch out for, especially . . . with various grants, . . . if we’re doing even 10% teaching and 10% administration and getting 100% from the government for doing a grant, we’re in violation, and so, there’s got to be a trade-off; there’s got to be some mechanism that we can get by because most of the people down here are at least 80% of their salary if not more is generated from grants . . . so we have to be careful we don’t get ourselves in violation of . . .

General Estes: You bring up another interesting point and that is the grants issue. This is another huge area of public misperception. Their view is that once people get tenure, all they want to do is get out of the classroom and do research on things that they want to go do, and that they and their department all in this together, and they sort of go off and do this thing, and universities are paying these huge salaries to these people for doing this research, and of course what you just pointed out, what happens in the grants is,
most of the grants, the salary is included in the grant. The university is not paying the salary and the public doesn’t understand that. The public thinks that that research is being paid for by the university as payment for the work that they’re doing and they’re not teaching.

Comment/question: Where do you think the legislature is as currently as we’re discussing this? Are things shifting in your view? What are your thoughts on that?

General Estes: The question is where does the legislature stand on this and has anything changed? Again, I’m going to be very candid with you. I don’t think anything has changed. There’s an agenda there, and you can pick which ever one you want, but certainly there are some different agendas going on, and I stood up and explained this report. I spent a year doing this along with a lot of other people from both the internal and external groups. I’m convinced that what we have is based on fact; it’s not based on perception; it’s not based on hearsay; it’s based on facts that were gathered. That’s the point I keep making to these groups. I’m not so sure the statements you’re making are based on facts; they have a different agenda. They have an agenda that they’re trying to drive for whatever reason and whatever that agenda is, and we shouldn’t classify all people in either one camp or the other. There’s a large group that sort of sits there and listens and nods; there are a few people who get up and speak their minds and don’t like what they hear because they don’t think it was aggressive enough, for example, and this particular case some of the views were heard: it didn’t change anything, doesn’t make any difference, sort of pushes the ball down the road, doesn’t help anything, and my view back is, absolutely wrong. It doesn’t do maybe what you wanted to have done as a particular individual, but that’s OK. You didn’t spend a year of your life looking at this issue. You have perceptions about what ought to be, and that’s fine. This is a free country. We have free speech and can say what we want, but this report is based on fact, not based on somebody’s perception, not based on somebody’s thinking about something. We based this thing on fact and we’re convinced that if the university follows what we said in here and aggressively implements the recommendations, the university is going to be top tier of universities in this country when it comes to tenure. In fact, we’ll be the one everybody is chasing after, and that’s why it’s really important faculty grab hold of this thing and run with it. If everybody sits back and says, OK, we got by this one, nothing changes then you’re going to get other people who are going to come back and say, look, they did this report; it took a year; they put all these recommendations out there and nothing happened. Boy, could we have told you that was what was going to take place. That’s the danger in my opinion. Now, if there are some things in here, as Mark and his committee . . . if there’s a different way to approach them that might make more sense, by all means, you don’t have to do exactly what this report says, but . . . where additional work is required, and if there’s a better way to do it, go for it, but get engaged in this thing. It will absolutely make a difference in this university; it will make a difference in the public’s perception of the university, which, like it or not, is important in this state . . . . And I will tell you, it’s not going to be that hard because as I go around talking to people and talking to different groups about the report, it’s amazing how many people say, I really didn’t understand that. I didn’t know that was the case, or I have people say, you say that the processes are all working, but the implementation is a problem and then their answer is therefore the process is broken. I say, wrong, the process is right. The process is correct; it’s doing what it is designed to do; it’s just that the university needs to be sure that it’s being implemented and overseen properly so that you’re doing what it is the process says. It’s interesting how people can turn things very quickly and work it for their own purposes, which is OK. I don’t have a problem with that, and I sure don’t have a problem standing up and talking about this report. I think we did exactly what we were asked to do. I think the report is complete, and I think if the University implements, aggressively implements the recommendations, the University is going to be in great shape when it comes to this issue of tenure.

Does anyone have any questions on the issue of dismissal for cause that was raised in there? One of the things we found as we went around and talked to people was that there was a real feeling that if there is an issue which is headed for dismissal for cause; there’s a problem going on that relates to this issue, dismissal for cause; it’s very difficult to remove somebody who is tenured from the classroom, very, very hard. Criteria are so high and the bar is set so high that you could have a situation in which harm is being done to the students. I don’t mean physical harm.

Comment/question: Can you explain that? You’ve said that a number of times, you’ve been quoted as saying that the bar is high to get faculty out of the classroom. On the other hand when you live with the
criteria for getting somebody out, and it’s probably as much or more than I can get rid of somebody who is
cleaning my house, and so, I’m confused as to why you say the bar is so high to get rid of any state
employee or anything, we have to document. It sounds like you want to have some way to just reach in and
pull faculty out. . . . adverse affect.

General Estes: I want somebody; I want a group, I think, and it doesn’t say this in the report, but my
feeling is that a group of the person’s peers ought to look at the situation and determine whether or not
somebody ought to be removed from the classroom. Mark, do you want to use your example?

Provost Heckler: I’ve been in that situation where we have a faculty member who is not meeting any of the
tests for dismissal for cause but might be in an abusive situation; that is, the students are being abused in
the classroom, verbally, or harassed in the classroom. It doesn’t meet the bar for dismissal for cause, and
you sit in an administrator capacity, and you’re kind of stuck in that situation trying to figure out how to
address that faculty member without moving to the issue of dismissal. I think what Howell’s group was
trying to get at is there should be a peer process where you have these instances where it isn’t the judgment
or risk of the dean or provost in taking that person out because they are really kind of acting without any
kind of support of policy, that there might be a process for addressing those situations in those moments
where students might be placed at risk. So, that’s the instance that I experienced, but Howell heard this
from me after.

General Estes: This was after we did the report we heard this specific case, but we heard it enough from
faculty as we went around. It was an issue of concern raised by the faculty.

Comment/question: There are campus committees that students can appeal to whenever they think there is
a problem with the faculty individual, and bring up charges and then have to go through this whole process,
and we have the same thing for students, too, if there’s a problem. Is that group not effective . . . ?

Provost Heckler: You may be in a situation where things are moving very rapidly, and those processes take
a good deal of time and so, it’s trying to address those crisis situations that you come into beyond using a
workplace violence policy or discrimination policy or the things that are generally used.

Comment/question: . . . research ethics committee . . . if there’s any ethics violation or even a perception of
it between a graduate student and faculty, there’s a place that they can go to. It’s a matter of filing . . .
investigative committee. . . . we had those in place and I guess I don’t know why they’re not, maybe
they’re just not working and we need to . . . being able to reach into a classroom and pull somebody out
because a student got a C on a test or something. I think we’re moving toward that pretty quickly.

General Estes: That wasn’t our intent.

Comment/question: When you start linking merit and annual review to student evaluations, that’s what
you’re getting because we’re moving . . . and I think we want to avoid that.

General Estes: I would agree. We certainly don’t want a situation where a student getting a C, I’ll use the
example that you gave, is cause for moving somebody from the classroom. If we get to there, we’ve really
lost it, but evaluating teaching skills, that’s why you don’t want to just use student evaluations. There’s
actually an administrative policy on multi-level evaluation teaching and you ought to be using all the
various methods. We found again, and in this particular case since you just raised it, some departments are
using only one method of evaluation of teaching and that’s where you can get into trouble with that. If you
just use student evaluation, I’ve had a number of people call me and said the only legitimate evaluation of a
faculty member’s actions in a classroom is a student evaluation. I question it personally. I think that’s why
you have your administrative policy that says there’s multiple ways and you ought to be using all of those
ways to evaluate teaching in the classroom. OK, that’s enough from me. Mark, do you want to wrap up,
and then we’ll see if there are any more comments or questions?

Provost Heckler explained what the committee’s process will be.
Comment/question: The policies that you’re going to be writing, are they going to be recommendations because they come back to what we talked about . . . primary unit so it’s hard for me to imagine that a policy that you write is either going to fit with every single primary unit or are you going to in fact write the policy for each primary unit?

Provost Heckler: I think the policies at the level that we’re dealing with them are things like “the primary unit shall update its primary unit criteria every seven years.” So, what you're going to do in the primary unit, you folks are responsible at the primary unit level for those specific criteria. The committee doesn’t get into that level; that’s really not our purview.

Comment/question: As the process goes forward, I think everybody would agree that tidying up the process and making it more rigorous is beneficial for all the reasons that were stated today; that’s pretty clear, but as you go through reviews and implementations and recommendations and primary unit criteria change over time, some faculty may get caught in the middle where they were hired under one set of expectations and then a year prior to their tenure process, everything changes, or it’s post-tenure review and they received tenure ten years ago under one set and now things are changing and I would hope that the committee would address the privilege of faculty . . . incorporated . . . so that faculty aren’t caught in an untenable situation.

Provost Heckler: We’ve had this exact conversation. We’re very concerned now if we’re getting into a rotating 7 years, and we’ve been thinking about, for example, doing the primary unit updates when you do the program review so it’s an every 7 year process. We’re going to have to be very explicit in policy as to which criteria apply when and that this is something that emerged in our committee conversations.

Comment/question: From my own experience when I served as interim vice president for academic affairs in the President’s office, most of the third level reviews that came in were situations, . . . where one set of faculty in year one said this is what you ought to, then year seven the mix of faculty changed and they said no, this is what you got to do, and the faculty is caught and gee, I started down the path doing this and now I’m asked to do that. It’s very important to establish the culture of faculty and protecting rights and privileges is very important to work in.

General Estes: What we found was in some of the departments, I should say in some of the colleges and schools, they freeze the criteria at the 5 year point, and something like that makes sense. The other thing we found was, and we heard it from a lot of people, that the criteria, not only were they not sure what the criteria was they were going to be judged against the 7 year point, but the criteria changed as you went through the multi-level review. The department might have one set of criteria, the dean another, and the chancellor another, and they didn’t know what the heck they were supposed to be doing so, it’s really important that we keep the same set of criteria and as you move up through the system, let me say it a different way, it’s really important that the chancellor level and dean level insure that the primary unit criteria is the criteria that supports the university causes at-large and not just the department and that’s part of the multi-level review of the criteria itself. Once the criteria are set, that same criteria has to be used at all levels and that we found was not the case necessarily.

Comment/question: . . . split votes along the way and then pushed up to the president’s office for . . .

General Estes: Some work that needs to be done.

Provost Heckler: We have a member of the ACTRP, Bob Damrauer from the Denver campus, who has a comment.

Professor Damrauer: This is the point when I always say criteria don’t change; it’s how they are evaluated . . .

General Estes: And that’s OK. That’s the way it ought to be, but what we heard was people are injecting new criteria at varying levels, not always, but occasionally it happens and . . .
Comment/question: In summary, then, you were quoted as saying shortly after this that there were going to be major, sweeping changes. Is this what you’re talking about, these updated policies? Or are we expecting the other shoe to drop?

Provost Heckler: No, there aren’t any other shoes. When I got into the detail of Howell’s report, and really began to think about what it means and how we do business on a day-to-day basis, if we implement each of these recommendations, it has a substantial change in the way we do business. If, for example, we’re doing annual merit reviews right now, we’re checking whether the person exceeds expectations or meets expectations. If a year or two from now we’re actually giving that faculty member advice about where they sit in their progress to tenure, and whether their progress to tenure to date is meritorious, non-meritorious, or excellent; and if in your post-tenure review, you are getting similar feedback from a committee of your peers about how you are continually progressing in your ongoing professional development, that’s a big change in the way we do business. If the Board of Regents establishes goals for the university, and asks that those goals be imbedded in the primary unit criteria and that when you judge a faculty member at comprehensive review, you’re determining whether or not that faculty member is helping the department achieve university-wide goals. That’s a substantial change in the way we do business. So, my comments really reflected that. The scope of what you see in Howell’s report is really the scope of what we’re dealing with, but on the ground, it is going to change how we work. Marguerite?

Associate Vice Chancellor Childs: I have a technical question and that is one of the recommendations is that annual reviews should be conducted through peer review process consistent with policy, and right now the Regents’ laws have an exception for the health sciences center in terms of peer review. Have you guys talked about that or do you have an idea of how you’ll handle that in the future because I think the reason that exception was put in is . . . peer review doesn’t always work in this health sciences environment in the same way . . . traditional faculty.

Provost Heckler: I would assume when we start to work on the policies, because there will be a new policy statement for tenure accountability, and if it emerges in the light of that policy and we’ve neglected something that you’ve worked out that’s working efficiently, I think it’s got to be brought to that policy group and then it will come to the committee.

Associate Vice Chancellor Childs: . . . some give and take . . .

Provost Heckler: Absolutely. We’re anticipating in these areas we’re going to have give and take with the campuses and with the faculty, and we’re going to take the time to do that.

General Estes: Mark has raised the issue of implementation of these recommendations. The implementation is important if we write it into new policy or whatever it is, but that to me is not the implementation. Writing a new policy is not . . . and how are we ensuring that; that’s what’s going to be important. You know, again, we’re going to get one shot at this with the public, and I don’t just mean the public in this state, I’m talking about there are people across the nation watching this to see what happens, and we’re going to get one shot at saying we did this right or we didn’t make it, and so, it’s really important, I think that we do put the rigor into this up-front and that we try to the best of our ability, where it makes sense and where Mark’s committee says we’re going to forward these things, if we do put things in they are going to make a difference that people agree to and follow-up on because if we don’t, we’re going to be right back where we started. In fact, my statement when we started this was, if we don’t aggressively pursue these recommendations, wherever they happen to be when we get through with this, we’re going to be in worse shape than we were before we started in terms of public perception. Again, we’re not doing this just for public perception. I want to make that point clear. We’re doing this for the faculty and students, ultimately. There is an element of public perception.

Question/comment: . . . peer review . . . it seems like you put a lot of work into this and did an excellent job publishing . . . lessons learned or something in the Chronicle of Higher Ed or some other journal of education on the process, on the evaluation process . . . Right now is probably not the time to do it, but I’m thinking that down the line, lessons that are learned here and the work that you did . . .
General Estes: Lessons learned, one of the things that we’ve stayed away from is myths that we’ve killed because there are a lot myths out there. I say killed, that’s a categorical statement. You don’t ever kill it. Hopefully,

Question/comment: . . . lay it to rest.

General Estes: With some people you’re never going to get rid of it, but the point is going back out at some point after this whole thing is through and saying, “here’s what we learned from this process,” might be a worthwhile thing to do. The problem is once the report came out, people who had been writing on this, came out publicly and said . . . kind of a nothing report, doesn’t make any difference. My comment was, it’s easy for them to say, come over here and try to be the University of Colorado implementing these recommendations and tell me it’s going to be easy, or there’s nothing new there.

Question/comment: . One negative study . . .

General Estes: I still firmly believe that the basic way tenure is approached and post-tenure is approached, is good. It’s stood the test of time; it’s been out there for a long time. It’s the rigor behind the process. It’s what you make of it as a university.

Provost Heckler: I think there are several faculty members who are on the committee who have some interest in doing some additional writing afterwards so I think it will be pretty fair game for them. Thank you very much for the generosity or your time, and please do contact us if you’ve got more comments, we’ll welcome them.