

## **Motions for University Senate Consideration from the Social Sciences Department**

### MOTION 1:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FACULTY HANDBOOK, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT ALL DEPARTMENTS THAT HAVE NOT ALREADY DONE SO ESTABLISH EXPECTATIONS FOR RENEWAL, TENURE, AND PROMOTION TO EACH ACADEMIC RANK. THESE EXPECTATIONS WILL BE INCLUDED IN ALL DEPARTMENTAL BYLAWS BY OCTOBER 2005.

Rationale: These expectations will allow P&T members to better assess whether or not a candidate for renewal, promotion or tenure has met the expectations established by his or her department. This provision is already included in the faculty handbook.

### MOTION 2:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE (P&T) DETERMINE IF THERE ARE UNIVERSITY-WIDE EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION BEYOND THOSE ESTABLISHED BY DEPARTMENTS. IF THESE EXPECTATIONS ARE SEEN AS EXISTING, P & T SHALL SUBMIT THESE FOR SENATE APPROVAL BY OCTOBER 2005.

Rationale: It remains unclear to many candidates for promotion and tenure whether or not they are being held to expectations beyond those established by their department. If such expectations are seen by P&T as existing, they should be articulated.

### MOTION 3:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE DEVELOP EITHER A NUMERICAL OR NARRATIVE EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK SYSTEM FOR CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND SUBMIT THIS SYSTEM FOR SENATE APPROVAL BY OCTOBER 2005.

Rationale: Under the current system candidates may be unsure of the areas where they failed to meet established expectations or how their activities have been weighted in accordance with the AAUP contract. These issues are particularly problematic in instances where candidates receive positive evaluations from DEC's and Deans but are subsequently not recommended by P&T for promotion or tenure.

MOTION 4:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE ESTABLISH A PROCESS THAT WOULD ALLOW, AT THE CANDIDATE'S DISCRETION, A MEMBER OF THE CANDIDATE'S CHOOSING TO BE PRESENT AT P&T MEETINGS FOR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WHEN A CANDIDATE IS REVIEWED FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE. THIS PROCESS WILL BE INCLUDED IN P&T BYLAWS BY OCTOBER 2005.

Rationale: If questions arise about a candidate's file there may not be anyone available to answer them unless a member of P&T happens to be from the candidate's department. Such an arrangement could advantage or disadvantage those with a departmental member serving on P&T. In addition, while candidates have the right to personally appear before P&T, the purpose is usually not to answer specific questions arising from deliberations on their files.

MOTION 5:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE DEVELOP A SYSTEM FOR STAGGERING ITS MEETING DAY AND TIME. THIS SYSTEM WILL BE INCLUDED IN P&T BYLAWS BY OCTOBER 2005.

Rationale: Given the vital importance of this committee to the university, all reasonable attempts should be made to avoid a "selection bias" that may result from always holding meetings on the same day and time. A staggered system would insure that this would not happen.

MOTION 6:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE RECONSIDER THE CONTINUED USEFULNESS OF THE CATEGORY OF "HIGHLY RECOMMEND" WHEN REVIEWING A CANDIDATE FOR PROMOTION. THE OUTCOME OF THIS RECONSIDERATION WILL BE REPORTED TO THE SENATE BY OCTOBER 2005.

Rationale: The current categories of "highly recommend," "recommend," and "not recommend" may not give candidates a clear indication of the status of P&T's assessment of their candidacy. For example, over the last few years, receiving a "recommend" assessment has generally meant that the candidate would not receive

promotion. Removing the “highly recommend” label may provide a clearer indication to the candidate of P&T’s assessment and recommendation to the president.

MOTION 7:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE LIMIT MEMBERS TO SERVING TWO CONSECUTIVE TERMS. THOSE WISHING TO SERVE AGAIN MUST WAIT AT LEAST ONE TERM BEFORE SERVING AGAIN. IF THIS IS VIEWED AS UNTENABLE, P&T SHOULD ESTABLISH OTHER APPROPRIATE MECHANISMS FOR MAXIMIZING THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR FACULTY MEMBERS TO SERVE ON THE COMMITTEE. THE ABOVE POLICY (OR OTHER APPROPRIATE MECHANISMS) WILL BE INCLUDED IN P&T BYLAWS BY OCTOBER 2005.

Rationale: As with term limits in other, larger political venues, this action, along with Motion #5, is to ensure that a wide variety of eligible faculty members are given the opportunity to serve on this key committee.