

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 PM in the Javits Room by President Georges Fouron.

I. Approval of Tentative Agenda

The tentative agenda was passed unanimously.

II. Approval of minutes of November 20, 2006 meeting

Three minor amendments were made to the minutes. They were then passed unanimously.

III. Discussion of inclusion of Dean's pre-tenure review letter in the tenure dossier and the number of letters required in the promotion dossier (J. Davila)

Joanna Davila offered the PTC's proposal that a mid-tenure review letter from the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences should be available in candidate's PTC file for viewing by the committee. Dean Staros explained that this letter is written at the candidate's third-year reappointment. (Tenure review is made during the second reappointment, sixth year of employment.) A copy of the letter is sent to the Provost and to the candidate at the time of review. Some discussion ensued as to whether the letter could be used to hurt or help a candidate. Norman Goodman suggested that it would be useful for colleagues to know what the Dean was thinking about the candidate prior to tenure review. Joan Kuchner suggested that there might be a problem with including a letter that was written for audiences other than those who are conducting the tenure review. Phil Allen reminded the Senate that the candidate could already put this letter in the file if the candidate wishes to do so. Joanna Davila said that the PTC had decided to request such a letter in light of marginal cases in which a candidate had done more than average teaching or service and it was not clear how those decisions had been made. If suggestions regarding these issues had been made in the letter, it would help to see if advice had been given, followed, or rejected. Norman Goodman said that it would be helpful of the Dean to share this information that would have normally been confidential. Harriet Waters said that Norman's goal, which was to gather information that would help the candidate, may be different than the PTC's, since the PTC considers a candidate's entire record and not just the most recent two years. Joan Kuchner asked if withholding of tenure based on a file that contained such a letter would affect union grievance issues—for example, a candidate could grieve because he or she was refused tenure and his or her department had been asked to make adjustments to the candidate's service or teaching load that were disregarded. The Dean suggested that departments might be more apt to make those changes if they knew the letter would be included in the PTC file. A vote was called. The outcome was 6 yes, 14 no, and 2 abstentions. The proposal to make mandatory the inclusion of the Dean's 3-year reappointment letter in the PTC file was voted down.

The second item brought forth by the PTC was a discussion regarding the number of letters of recommendation required in the candidate's file that were not suggested by the candidate, but were solicited by the PTC). At present, the minimum number of letters is 2 from the candidate's suggestion and 3 solicited from outside sources. Norman Goodman suggested that the PTC require additional letters in those cases where they are needed to make a sound judgment of the candidate. It was suggested that some departments believe they are supposed to provide a maximum as well as a minimum of three letters. Hugh Silverman asked if the file contained information about how many letters were invited and how many were received. Joanna Davila stated that the file usually states this. She said that requests that were ignored were treated

neutrally by the committee, while refusals were documented in the file. It was suggested that it be made clearer to departments that they can solicit more than three letters for the candidate. Joan Kuchner suggested that the Senate representatives should go back to their home departments and gather more information about the process. She suggested that effort be led by the Arts and Sciences Senate Executive Committee. Joanna Davila agreed to take the information gathered at this discussion back to the PTC for further deliberation.

IV. Report of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Policy Committee/Discussion of Establishing an Arts and Sciences Senate “Senior Lecturer – Promotion Review Committee (H. Silverman)

Hugh Silverman brought to the table a proposal to create a new standing committee, the Senior Lecturer Promotion Review Committee (SL-PRC). This proposal came out of the FRRPC’s work on guidelines for Senior Lecturer Promotion Review. These guidelines based on a memo that had come out of a Provostial Committee in 2004. Before the discussion got fully underway, Dean Staros spoke. He stated that he had been asked to draft a (separate) response to this Provostial Committee memo. He had submitted this response to Provost Robert McGrath. He said that lecturer appointments were term appointments, and that any lecturer appointment follows a pathway that is markedly different than a tenure-track appointment; therefore, any promotion procedure that “mimics” tenure will likely kill the idea. Dean Staros said that he had previously tried to raise the idea of such a governance committee overseeing lecturer promotions and the idea was shot down by the upper administration. Norman Goodman stated that since there is at present no category of Senior Lecturer, no governance committee could be formed. He suggested that once issues are resolved with the union and the category is instituted, the FRRPC could make amendments and then submit them for approval. Hugh Silverman stated that the FRRPC had never seen the response from the Provost, and the Dean expressed some surprise at this; he said he had submitted the response to the Provost some time ago and assumed that the Provost had brought it before the Senate Executive Committee.

Several people moved to table the issue. Joan Kuchner suggested we should continue the discussion of the topic and table a proposal vote. She asked what could be done to move the discussion forward in the administration. She suggested asking the University Senate Executive Committee to ask Bernard Lane (University Senate President) to get the Provost’s response draft back from the UUP where it has been circulating for at least six months. Joan then stated that this should go on record as a first discussion of the issue, that further discussions should be held in the future, and a request had been made for the Arts and Sciences Executive Committee to gather information from the UUP via the University Senate Executive Committee.

Aimee de Chambeau asked if this issue affected other constituencies than Arts and Sciences, and if this Senate were the only one working on this issue. Norman Goodman stated that he felt it was a more general issue than one for Arts and Sciences and that the Health Sciences Center and Engineering School must also be involved. Joan Kuchner stated that each constituency could vary the guidelines to their needs. The Dean pointed out that teaching loads vary for lecturers in different parts of the campus. Hugh Silverman pointed out that four deans are involved in the Senior Lecturer promotion issue: Arts and Sciences, Journalism, Marine Sciences, and Engineering.

V. Report of the A&S Senate President (G. Fouron)

The President had no news to report.

VII. Old Business

There was no old business.

VII. New Business

There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at about 5:00 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Cynthia Davidson, Arts and Sciences Senate Vice-President

Arts and Sciences Senate Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Policy Committee

Rationale for the Senior Lecturer-Promotion Review Committee

The Arts and Sciences Senate Senior Lecturer - Promotion Review Committee (SL-PRC):

- (1) Establishes a component of the review process that is independent from the Department / Program but also independent from the Dean's Office.
- (2) Provides checks and balances (and comparisons) across the whole A&S Senate Constituencies to assure just and fair grounds for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer.
- (3) Validates the promotion itself since it is evaluated by peers across a range of disciplines in the CAS, SOJ, MSRC, SBS areas.
- (4) Confirms that the promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer is taken very seriously and has significant value and legitimacy when achieved.
- (5) Provides a separate review of full-time term renewable faculty appointments (3 yrs max) in a completely separate track from tenure or tenure track faculty who are evaluated according to different criteria.

THE ARTS AND SCIENCES SENATE "SENIOR LECTURER - PROMOTION REVIEW COMMITTEE" (SL-PRC)

shall be a Standing Committee of the Arts and Sciences Senate. It shall review all cases of promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer as recommended by Departments or Programs. Its decisions shall be submitted to the appropriate Dean who makes a recommendation to the Provost and President.

The SLPRC will follow specific Guidelines as formulated by the Arts and Sciences Senate Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Policy Committee.

The SLPRC shall include two members from each of the three areas:

- (1) Humanities and Fine Arts (including Journalism),
 - (2) Social and Behavioral Sciences (including Stony Brook Southampton), and
 - (3) Natural Sciences and Math (including the Marine Sciences Research Center).
- From each area, one of these members shall be a Senior Lecturer. In the absence of available Senior Lecturers, these positions shall be filled by tenured faculty members from the respective areas.