

Arts and Sciences Senate Meeting
March 20, 2006

The meeting, presided by Georges Fouron, convened in the Javits Room at 3:30 pm.

I. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved and seconded.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the February 27, 2006 Meeting

Approval of the minutes was tabled pending the Dean's review of the State of the College report for accuracy on budget information.

III. Report of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (J. Staros)

The Dean repeated his report from the previous general meeting, accompanied this time by a slide presentation with graphs and charts. See the Feb. 27, 2006 general meeting report for details.

IV. Report on Journalism (K. Gillespie)

The Journalism major, which has been approved by the University Senate, was proposed for approval by the A&S Senate. K. Gillespie explained that many courses had been proposed, 16 of which had been approved by the curriculum committee. Some others of these courses do not yet have faculty to teach them, so the committee did not yet approve them. K. Gillespie asked if we thought these should be listed in the bulletin now (which was Howard Schneider's request), or if this should be held back until the next one. One of the courses in question is a requirement for the major, but they do not yet have faculty to teach it. N. Goodman suggested that a note be put in the bulletin that additional courses are being planned, approval is pending, and interested persons should see the department for details.

K. Gillespie said that that curriculum committee had discussed the request of the proposal to set up GPA requirements different from the rest of the College of Arts and Sciences. (The undergraduate major will be housed in CAS, according to Dean Staros.) It was pointed out by F. Myers that Pharmacology is the only major in A&S that has a 3.0 GPA requirement for graduation. He suggested that the senate revisit this requirement.

There was discussion of where the funds for the Journalism major (and proposed school) will come from, since they eventually will not be a part of Arts and Sciences. Also, F. Walter raised the point that since about 2/3 of the coursework for the Journalism major will be in the college, A&S will need more resources.

The proposal for the Journalism major passed unanimously, with the proviso that the non-approved courses would be noted in the undergraduate bulletin (as up for approval in the future and students should contact their advisors for more information) and the 3.0 GPA cut-off had been stricken from the proposal.

V. Promotion and Tenure Committee Report (J. Davila)

This was the third and final reading of proposed changes to the constitution regarding the addition of a 7th member to the committee when a non-tenured member was not available to fill the position. After noting a grammatical change in the wording, a vote followed. The proposal was unanimously passed.

A second item was the proposal to change PTC guidelines regarding deadlines for the submission of promotion/tenure review files. It was pointed out that the new proposed deadlines pushed up the mandatory cases by six weeks and cuts out preparation time during the summer. Discussion ensued about the logistical problems encountered by faculty, committee, and administrators in preparing and reading

the files according to these deadlines. N. Goodman asked if it would be possible for the committee to meet with the Dean to discuss whether there is any way to give junior faculty more time to work on the files. Dean Staros suggested tabling this second proposal until it was possible to have such a meeting. The proposal was remanded to the PTC.

VI. Elections Update (G. Fouron)

Members were encouraged to talk to colleagues about running for the vacancies for the senate offices, senators-at-large, and on the standing committees. Students should be encouraged to contact the presidents of the GSO (for graduate students) or student government (for undergraduates) if they are interested in serving.

VII. President's Report (G. Fouron)

The president had nothing to report.

VIII. Old Business

F. Walter said he had received no comments from members on the ad-hoc committee on enhanced enrollment. He said he would write up a report for the next senate meeting.

IX. New Business

Dean Staros announced the second end-of-year meet the Senate social gathering at the University Café on April 25, 5:00 to 6:30 pm.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Cynthia Davidson, Arts and Sciences Secretary

**Report of the CAS Promotion and Tenure Committee
April 2006
Prepared by Joanne Davila, Chair PTC**

Committee:

- Joanne Davila, Chair – Psychology (Social and Behavioral Sciences)
- Clare Grey – Chemistry (Natural Sciences)
- Hongkyung Kim – Asian and Asian American Studies (Humanities and Fine Arts) – non-tenured member since January 2006
- Manuel Lerdau – Ecology and Evolution (Natural Sciences)
- Peter Manning – English (Humanities and Fine Arts)
- Timothy Mount – Music (Humanities and Fine Arts)
- Michael Schwartz – Sociology (Social and Behavioral Sciences)
- Gene Sprouse – Physics (Natural Sciences) – temporary member November 2005 replacing Lerdau who was on leave

Organization and functioning:

The committee has met regularly, typically bi-weekly, during the 2005-2006 academic year, with excellent attendance. All committee members are dedicated and hard working. They take their position seriously and behave in a professional, ethical manner. The committee functions very well as a group, demonstrating cohesion and respect for all members.

Philosophy and process:

The PTC plays an important role in the College of Arts and Sciences as an advisory committee to the Dean and as a means for providing quality control for the faculty. The faculty members who make up the committee are critical to its functioning and success and it is important to continue to elect strong members to serve on the committee.

The PTC has maintained a strong level of continuity in process with prior years. We continue to adhere strongly to the Policies of the Board of Trustees, and to focus decisions on scholarship, teaching, and service. We recognize that every case is different and make certain that we take into account diversity across departments and types of scholarly achievements.

In making decisions, the main question that we focus on is whether the candidate's scholarship is having an impact on their field. Our ability to assess this relies on the clarity with which this is presented in the dossier, and we rely heavily on the views expressed in outside letters and in the chair's letters. A few comments about each are in order. Regarding outside letters, those that come from individuals who do not have a close professional relationship with the candidate are essential, as they are likely to be least biased by personal connections. In addition, although the PTC provides guidelines for the minimal number and type of letters, cases with only the minimum sometimes are harder to evaluate. Regarding the chair's letters, it is critical that they express and discuss both the strengths and weaknesses of the case, particularly those pointed out by outside letter writers. Providing a clear rationale for the departmental vote is also extremely important. If there were "no" votes or abstentions, it is important to clarify the reasons for such votes. Chair's letters that simply reiterate or quote from outside letters, or that present a run-down of the faculty discussion of the case are least helpful to the PTC and are a disservice to the candidate.

Regarding the assessment of scholarly ability for promotion to Full Professor, the PTC feels that promotion should not be awarded just for significant administrative or other accomplishments, but should be awarded only to those who show true excellence and a strong reputation in creative and scholarly activities. However, teaching and service do matter, and weight is placed on the extent to which candidates for full professor have shown initiative in contributing to the future of their department and their field.

Caseload and actions:

Since the beginning of Fall 2005, the PTC has acted on 19 cases, and will act on 2 more on 4/24/06. Of these, 10 will have been cases for promotion with tenure, 10 will have been cases for promotion to full professor, and 2 will have been new appointments (1 to Associate, 1 to Full).

Of the promotion cases that have been acted on (excluding the new appointments), the departments have been in favor of promotion and the PTC has agreed with the departmental recommendation in all cases except for one.

Of the 8 cases that have been acted on by the Dean, he has agreed with the PTC in all cases. Two of those cases have progressed to the Provost and President, and both have agreed with the prior recommendations. The remainder of the cases are in progress.

Other:

1. An amendment to the constitution regarding the 7th member on the committee was proposed and passed this academic year. The rationale and change was as follows:

Current policy states that the PTC will consist of 7 members, one of whom is a non-tenured member who serves a one-year term. This policy was re-affirmed by the PTC and the Senate in May 2005. However, the Senate was unable to successfully recruit a non-tenured member for the PTC for Fall 2005. Because of this, and because the reasons for it are likely to be ones that persist into the future (e.g., few junior faculty,

low motivation for participation), the PTC would like to have the option to have the 7th member be an additional tenured member. The PTC prefers a 7-member committee so that there can never be a split (i.e., tie) vote. As such, the PTC proposed the following addendum to the constitution, to be added at the end of the PTC section, Article C, section 3, point (2):

"In the event that it is not possible to find a qualified non-tenured faculty representative, the Senate Executive Committee shall appoint, with the consent of the Senate, a tenured faculty member to fill out the term. That faculty member may be from any department not represented on the PTC that term."

The PTC proposed that a non-tenured member must be appointed no later than May for the following academic year. If a non-tenured member cannot be secured by that time, then the tenured faculty person elected, during regular elections, as PTC "alternate" would serve a one-year term. That is, during regular yearly elections for positions on the PTC, the runner-up candidate would be elected as an "alternate" to serve if needed. This does away with the need for any additional elections. Should there be no "alternate" (i.e., one candidate was running unopposed), then the Senate shall appoint a member in consultation with the PTC.

2. The PTC was asked to consider changing the format and wording of the biographical file so that it is more amenable to accomplishments by faculty in the humanities and arts. The PTC believes this to be an excellent idea. The faculty addendum is currently undergoing a similar change and once that is done, the PTC will adopt a format similar to the new faculty addendum. It should be noted that, regardless of the format of the biographical file, the PTC makes decisions that are informed by the local culture and expectations for promotion of the department to which the candidate belongs. As such, there is no reason to believe that the format of the biographical file leads to any bias in PTC recommendations.

3. The PTC was alerted to the fact that the Provost may want the Business school to send their promotion files through our PTC despite the fact that they run other business through the CEAS committees. This has not yet come to pass, but the PTC is opposed to this on two grounds: (1) we have no expertise overseeing a professional school and (2) the business school should decide with which single branch of governance they will align.

4. The PTC chair consulted with Howie Schneider regarding use of the CAS PTC for promotion and tenure in the new journalism department. The journalism faculty will be reviewed by the CAS PTC. The PTC chair provided Schneider with the PTC guidelines and agreed to consult on the department's development of promotion and tenure guidelines for faculty.

5. The PTC was asked to comment on whether departments are required to provide sub-committee reports (in addition to the chair's letter) in promotion and tenure dossiers. PTC guidelines currently do not require the inclusion of such sub-committee reports, and it has been the position of the PTC that all formal written documents must be provided if requested by the PTC, Dean, Provost, or President. If departments do not want to have to include sub-committee reports, then formal written documents should not be prepared and kept on record. The PTC is currently preparing an amendment to the PTC guidelines that will require all formal written documents to be included in the dossier.

6. The PTC and Dean's office will propose revised deadlines for submission of tenure and promotion cases in order to place all assistant professors on the same tenure clock and to provide more time for review. This amendment will be presented to the Senate in April 2006.

Amendment to PTC Guidelines for file submission deadlines

Prepared by Joanne Davila

4/17/06

An amendment is being requested due to difficulties in completing review of files in a timely fashion, particularly those files in which the final term appointment expires at the end of a fall semester. New

deadlines are necessary because review of promotion with tenure files must be completed (by the university) by contractual deadlines.

More importantly, the new deadlines now place all assistant professors on the same tenure clock. The prior deadlines required those faculty members who began their position in September to submit their dossiers 7 months prior to the required contractual decision date. However, those faculty members who began their position in January were required to submit their dossiers only 3 months prior to the required contractual decision date. The new deadlines will remedy this situation, such that all assistant professors will submit their dossiers 7 months prior to the required contractual decision date. This provides a more fair set of procedures that will also allow the Dean's Office and PTC to complete review of files in a timely manner.

The following section of the PTC guidelines is affected:

Section 2.6.4

Current wording:

October 1 is the deadline for submission of all cases involving promotion to full professor and for submission of all cases in which the final term appointment (see section 1.2) expires at the end of a fall semester. February 1 is the deadline for submission of all other cases. Departments and Programs have the obligation to observe these deadlines. Only in the case of competitive offers will the Committee consider extensions of the deadlines. New appointments are not subject to the deadlines for internal cases.

Suggested revised wording:

September 15 is the deadline for receipt by the Dean's office of all cases involving promotion to full professor. May 15 is the deadline for receipt by the Dean's office of all cases in which the final term appointment (see section 1.2) expires at the end of a fall semester. January 15 is the deadline for receipt by the Dean's office of all other cases. These deadlines reflect the time needed for files to be vetted by the Dean's office, in accordance with section 2.5.8 of these guidelines, revised (as necessary) by the submitting department, and forwarded to the PTC. Departments and Programs have the obligation to observe these deadlines. Only in the case of competitive offers will the Committee consider extensions of the deadlines. New appointments are not subject to the deadlines for internal cases.

Amendment to PTC Guidelines regarding inclusion of formal written documents

Prepared by Joanne Davila

4/19/06

An amendment is being requested to clarify PTC guideline around the inclusion of formal written documents that are relevant to the candidate's file. The PTC recently was asked to comment on whether departments are required to provide sub-committee reports (in addition to the chair's letter) in promotion and tenure dossiers. PTC guidelines currently do not require the inclusion of such sub-committee reports, but it has been the position of the PTC that all formal written documents must be provided if requested by the PTC, Dean, Provost, or President. If departments do not want to have to include sub-committee reports, then formal written documents should not be prepared and kept on record.

The PTC would now like to formalize their position by updating the PTC guidelines to require that all formal written documents collected and/or prepared as part of the tenure and/or promotion process be included in the dossier as part of the special evaluative file, so that names do not need to be removed from the documents.

We propose inclusion of the following new sub-section in Section 2.4.5 The Special Evaluative File:

2.4.5.7 All additional formal written evaluations of the candidate that are solicited, collected, or prepared as part of the tenure and/or promotion process must be included in the special evaluative file. This includes formal written reports prepared by sub-committees within the department or university that have been assembled to review, in writing, the candidates scholarly achievements, teaching, and/or service, even if the contents of these reports have been documented in the chair's letter.