Distributed at the January 17, 2013 AS Meeting

Comments Received During Revised E5.0 Review Period (6 DEC 2012 – 16 JAN 2013)

Note: All line numbers below refer to numbering within the 5 DEC 2012 E5.0 document.


Response: Editorial change – minimal impact on policy meaning


Response: Editorial change – improved reference accuracy

3. Lines 76 – 81: A request was received to review the 1970 update/info regarding the 1940 version of the AAUP Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

Response: The website with the 1940 version is at http://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure and there is a lengthy description of the 1970 interpretation of the 1940 principle. We did not locate a specific part of the 1970 interpretation that could be referenced.

4. Line 87: Within the preamble on line 87 “service” should be included - the three pillars of teaching, scholarship and service should be mentioned together here.

Response: Edit was made adding “service” into line 87.

5. Line 131-132: The new working does not leave room for any future institutes that the university may establish where tenure will be located.

Response: That was the point of the language as discussed in Academic Senate.

6. Line 146 (2.c.(2).i): Perhaps it would be easier to say that tenure track faculty may be granted up to 2 years of reduction in the probationary period based on equivalent teaching experience.

Response: Edit made to improve readability.

7. Lines 158-159: the end of spring term is too late to get this information to the Dean’s office. The committees have already been elected and formed by then, in most cases. A person dropping out could reduce the number of committees needed. I would suggest making it the beginning of spring term.

Response: We agree with the change to “beginning of spring term” in line 158.

8. Line 169: remove the word “automatic”. It’s not exactly automatic if they have to submit it in writing. Change it to “consideration will be granted…”
Response: “Automatic” means that the university doesn’t have a choice. We do not think that it is inconsistent to say that a faculty member must also state in writing that she/he has had/adopted a child to confirm the situation. Letting the university know this in writing does not remove the fact that the extension is automatic.

9. Line 169: Comment was made about line 169 stating that it worked against same sex couples since adoptions sometimes take a long time.

Response: The extension is intended to provide an extra year following the birth or adoption of a child. The intent was not to provide this extra time during the actual adoption process.

10. Line 171: The January 1 does not work if we’re speaking calendar year. If you define it as academic year, then it would be reasonable, assuming they could let you know of an impending birth (not one that has occurred already).

Response: Added “academic” before year in line 171.

11. Lines 277 – 288 (section 3.a.(1)) - There are a few issues with the documentation portion of the policy:
   a) It would be much easier to read if it were a bulleted list
      MBB: this could easily be done

      Response: Bullets would work here to improve readability and because they can be cited by the full section number reference.

   b) Line 279: Defining who submits what might be important. While this could be managed at the college level, I think there is an issue about what the faculty member submits vs. what the college dean’s office submits. Should annual evaluations and student teaching evaluations be submitted by the candidate or should it be the official copy on record? This could clear up a lot of confusion in the process. This also has repercussions for the “all documents provided by the candidate will be available to all reviewers…” clause. If the candidate submits their annual evaluations, any tenured faculty member within the department should be able to read it (regardless of what the appendix says)

      Response: There were two points raised here – the first one could be addressed partially be adding “on record” after “annual reviews” in line 279. In regards to the second point, the revised policy would allow for all tenured faculty to be able to review the annual reports for a tenure candidate.

   c) Lines 280-281: Although student and peer evaluation are listed previously in the policy, they should be also included in this list.

      Response: This list was not meant to be exhaustive and instead refers to “reliable documentation related to the faculty member’s teaching performance, academic and professional qualifications...”
d) Line 283: The Provost sent out a list this year of required documentation and the organization of it. It might be helpful to link to this document from the policy, and then perhaps expand on any of the items as necessary. While I understand that this is a faculty policy and process, from an admin assistant point of view, the Provost mandates what materials he wants to see. If you include this, you should also include a statement to the tune of “and any other materials requested in the college policy.”

Response: Rather than pointing to a specific website revision added to include “provost” in this listing.

e) Why would they need all the materials submitted from the mid-tenure review? The letters, I understand, but everything? That is extreme and will result in a lot of duplication within the binders. (Line 282 says that all materials submitted by the candidate for mid tenure review, however line 358 says only the letters)

Response: Lines 282 and 358 do not contradict each other because the letters described in line 358 are not items that the candidate submits. In regards to duplication, the mid-tenure binder(s) or electronic files already exist and additional information for tenure is required. Although this may lead to some level of duplication, we deem it useful to review the mid-tenure package as it was submitted.

12. Line 345: Is it necessary for both the department chair and the dean to meet with the candidate? Is this one meeting, or two separate meetings?

Response: This level of specificity can occur at the college level if helpful.

13. Lines 350-351: I would like to suggest that we use the words “unsatisfactory” and “satisfactory” instead of “unfavorable” and “favorable” in the reference to mid-tenure review evaluations in E5.0 to match language used in the process.

Response: Edit made accordingly.

14. Line 367: Perhaps “other support materials” needs to be clarified. Also, the candidate’s documentation typically is submitted to the Dean’s Office NOT the department chair, therefore they wouldn’t need to forward the materials with their letter.

Response: Not sure where this is referring to.

15. Lines 408-428: In regard to the college tenure committee structure, in lines 408 – 428 where the committees are described there is a section that deals with small colleges. We have a small college as defined, but have 6 units not four. Folks still interpreted the policy as stating that CHST could not use 6 of their own faculty 1 from each unit plus an outside member.

Response: Their interpretation is correct based on the revised policy out for review assuming that CHST has fewer than 18 tenured faculty and more than 4 units (see lines 416 – 419). Edits were made to allow colleges with less than 18 tenured faculty and with six or more units to have
representation from each unit (assuming that a tenured faculty member resides in each unit) with the remaining members appointed by Academic Senate.

16. Line 434: How is “conflict of interest” defined here?
   Response: The conflict of interest is the same as that stated in the policy on conflict of interest (C4.0); a reference was added to this policy for clarity.

17. Line 443: The committee does not forward the vote to the Dean AND the Provost. It goes to the Dean first; she/he makes their recommendation as well and THEN forwards everything to the Provost.
   Response: Edit was made.

18. Line 551: Should we change the May 2009 date to February 2013 now?
   Response: The May 2009 date is still relevant because prior to this date, mid-tenure review did not exist within this policy.

19. Appendix A: change “No” to “Yes” for “Department Tenured Faculty” accessing “External Review Letters”
   Response: Reflects reality in at least some colleges and several senators brought this up after the 6 DEC presentation

20. Appendix B: change “No” to “Yes” for “Department Tenured Faculty” accessing “External Review Letters”
   Response: Reflects reality in at least some colleges and several senators brought this up after the 6 DEC presentation

21. General Comment: Readability of this document would be much improved if it was written in chronological order. It jumps from the initial meeting in September to the Dean’s writing of his letter in February.
   Response: Perhaps the next revision can do this and please consider preparing a proposed charge to have this revision completed.