

Charge to the committee:

The Academic Review Committee was convened as an ad hoc committee for the Spring 2018 semester to: 1) examine the integrity of the academic promotion and tenure review process as an instrument of faculty governance; 2) advise on streamlining the PTC guidelines for creating and delivering P & T files, and 3) recommend strategies to make files consistent and organized across the different constituent faculty bodies.

Membership of the Academic Review Committee:

Darren Chase (Library), Joanne Davila (Psychology, CAS), Axel Drees (Physics & Astronomy, CAS, Committee Chair), Charles Haddad (Journalism), Heather Lynch (Ecology & Evolution, CAS), Peter Manning (English, CAS), Anne McElroy (SOMAS).

The full committee met 7 times during the 2018 Spring semester. During these meetings multiple stakeholders were consulted, these included Associate Deans Ellen Broselow (CAS) and Allen Tucker (CEAS), and the chair of the A&S junior PTC Neta Dean. Smaller groups met separately with Deans Sacha Kopp (CAS), Larry Swanson (SOMAS), and Howie Schneider (Journalism). A meeting with Dean Constantia Constantinou (Library) could not be scheduled.

This report addresses the first charge separately from the other two charges.

Examine the integrity of the academic promotion and tenure review process as an instrument of faculty governance.

Findings:

The Art and Science (A&S) Senate serves as governance body for the faculty of 4 units, the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and 3 affiliated units the School of Marine and Atmospheric Science (SOMAS), the School of Journalism, and the University Library. The A&S Senate is an independent body and as such advises the Deans of its constituent units.

One of the important functions of the A&S senate is to provide an academic review of faculty promotions and tenure decisions through the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC). This review is independent of the department/unit of the faculty member being considered and independent of the administrative review by the corresponding Dean. Promotion and tenure files are compiled and reviewed according to the A&S senate promotion and tenure guidelines¹. The members of the PTC are elected by the faculty.

The current A&S senate procedures are approved by the board of trustees and are consistent with the guidelines of the American Association of University Professors' statement on government of colleges

¹ Link to the A&S senate promotion and tenure guidelines:

<https://www.stonybrook.edu/commcms/senatecas/key-senate-documents/ptc-guidelines.php>

and universities. These guidelines state that faculty status, including promotions and the granting of tenure, are the primary responsibility of the faculty and that this responsibility is based upon the fact that scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues. They further state that determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, and that the governing board and president should concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons. The full guidelines are included in Appendix A and can be also found at:

<https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>.

Currently the A&S Senate has two PTC committees, one responsible for reviewing file for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with tenure (PTCJ) and the other for promotions from Associate to Full Professor (PTCS). These committees review faculty files from all constituent units. The A&S Senate can, but has not, delegate the responsibility for the promotion and tenure review to committees formed within the constituent units. This is common practice in the other two faculty senates, one of the faculty of the Colleges of Engineer and Applied Science (CEAS) and the College of Business (COB) and the other of the faculty of the School of Medicine and all units associated with it.

Promotion files for A&S faculty are compiled by the home department/unit of the candidate and send for review by the PTC through the CAS Dean's Office. Files from CAS faculty undergo a lengthy technical review before being released to the PTC, files from the affiliated units are usually passed on without further technical review.

Discussion:

The A&S senate is often considered the senate of the College of Arts and Science (CAS), and as such viewed as being under the guidance of the CAS Dean. This miss conception has in the past years created significant confusion about authority and due process both on the side of the faculty as well as on the side of the administration.

Faculty of affiliated units (University Libraries, Journalism and SOMAS) have expressed concerns that promotion and tenure files submitted to the PTCs are handled with insufficient expertise and with lower priority. This perception is in part due to the current process in which all promotion and tenure files are submitted to the CAS Dean's Office as gate keeper to the PTCs. The concerns have sparked conversation to establish separate promotion and tenure reviews committees for the affiliated units.

While such a move may address some of the issues, there are potential drawbacks to establishing a separate process in each unit. Most importantly, the current process involves two independent reviews of a file by the A&S faculty: one by the faculty of the candidate's home department/unit, and a second one by an independent faculty committee (PTC) of the senate. Due to the small number of faculty in Journalism, Libraries and/or SOMAS, an alternative process to the A&S process could de facto eliminate the review of the file by a second committee that is independent of the candidates unit, leading to an increased role of the administration in the decision making process. This would be inconsistent with the AAUP statement on government of colleges and universities, which identifies promotion and tenure as a prime responsibility of the faculty.

Moving all promotion files through the CAS Dean's office has also been a concern for the CAS Dean in terms of staff workload and has triggered discussion between the Provost and involved Dean to separation of the review process of CAS faculty files and files from the affiliated units. It is important to underline that any changes to the established and approved procedure for promotion and tenure, including separating the review process for files from affiliated units from those of CAS faculty, need to be developed by the faculty and endorsed by the A&S senate. They cannot be made by directive of a Dean or the Provost.

The committee also learned of a number of potential overreaches or inappropriate interference with the due process, in particular by the CAS Dean. Issues discussed include holding promotion files in the CAS Dean's Office preventing review by the PTC, overruling the common assessment of the merit of a file made by the candidate's department/unit and the PTC, and interfering with the selection process of external reviewers to be contacted for an expert assessment of a candidate's achievements.

The Executive committees of the A&S and University Senates have issued a statement addressing in particular the overreaches and breaches of due process. The statement is included in Appendix B. Following the established and approved policy and procedures for the review of promotion and tenure files is central to meaningful and appropriate shared governance. Promotion files prepared and submitted by a department must be reviewed by the PTC and the Dean does not have the authority to withhold files from this review. It is acknowledged that the Dean has the authority to accept or to reject the recommendation of the PTC and the faculty review of the candidate's department. However, in accordance with the AAUP statement on government of colleges and universities, in cases where both faculty reviews result in the same recommendation the Dean should only in exceptional cases and for well-articulated compelling reasons deviate from the recommendation. It must remain the responsibility of the faculty to select appropriate external reviewers with care, with focus on expertise and stature in the field.

Recommendations to the A&S senate:

- **Affirm that it is central to meaningful and appropriate shared governance that it is the primary responsibility of the faculty to review promotion and tenure files following the established and approved procedures that are in accordance with the AAUP statement on government of colleges and universities.**
- **State clearly the role of the A&S senate and who it serves and the goal of PTC review process. Adapted the corresponding statements and sections on the A&S web-page on the PTC and possibly as a preamble to PTC guidelines.**
- **Affirm that the full authority for the selection of reviewers for promotion and tenure lies with the faculty and consider adding this explicitly to the A&S PTC guidelines.**
- **Address the concerns of faculty from affiliated units about the review process through establishing**
 - a. **a permanent members on PTC from SOMAS,**
 - b. **a process how to add adhoc PTC committee members that help review files if additional expertise seems needed to evaluate a file.**
 - c. **a procedure that faculty of affiliated units can follow if they desire to create an independent promotion and tenure review process for their units.**

Advise on streamlining the PTC guidelines for creating and delivering promotion and tenure files and recommend strategies to make files consistent and organized across the different constituent faculty bodies.

Findings

Problems to be addressed:

- Excessive length
- Poor organization
- Redundancies in the file
- Accessibility issues (ability for PTC members to easily access files)
- Ease of reading (ability for PTC members to locate and read relevant components of files)

Limiting factors:

- Requirement of a paper file
- Lack of uniform standards for electronic submission
- Lack of a dedicated technical review person

Discussion

The committee is aware of ongoing discussion at Stony Brook University to purchase a software product for handling of promotion and tenure process. Such a product could be of significant value and could go a long way to make the evaluation of files more efficient. It could alleviate many of the known issues of the current process discussed here, including the electronic submission process, accessibility of files, and lack of sufficient tracking of files. A more detailed review of software products was not part of the committee charge and the committee did not obtain detailed information of the status off the ongoing planning. It would be very important for the A&S senate and the university administration to work together moving forward to assure that the needs for improvement of the PTC review process are actually met.

The discussion focused on three major areas: (i) the need for uniform standards for e-submission, accessibility, and readability that could be implemented immediately, but could also serve as guiding principles for implementations in any new software product acquired by the university, (ii) areas that can be improved in the existing PTC guidelines, and (iii) the need for a standardized and streamlined technical review.

Proposed changes to how files are prepared and submitted:

- A standard electronic submission format is necessary. This format should require that each and every specific item be its own file with an appropriate label (details below)
 - In line with this, material should not be scanned into lengthy PDFs
- The e-file should begin with a “directory/table of contents” that links to each specific item
- The e-file should include links to published work/scholarly work examples rather than the works themselves

- The directory/table of contents should be as follows (with each entry, within each of the sections, being a separate file; NOTE: items in bold are the ones that are most important for PTC members):
 - Section 1: **Biographical file**
 - Identifying information, Education, Dissertation topics, Professional experience, Honors
 - Research grants and proposals
 - Publications, Invited Lectures and papers, Exhibits, Performances, Productions (list only)
 - Documentation of work accepted for publication or in press, etc.
 - Published reviews of scholarship (e.g., book reviews; if applicable)
 - Current research and other creative activities (description only)
 - Links to the scholarship that was provided to the external referees (separate files for each individual piece of scholarship, e.g., not one PDF with everything)
 - Teaching activity (list/description only)
 - Teaching goals
 - Graduate dissertations, Honors projects
 - Departmental service, University service, Professional service outside the university
 - Additional relevant information (if applicable)
 - References suggested by candidate
 - Signature page
 - Section 2: General Evaluative file
 - Announcement of candidacy
 - **Chair's letter** (with identifying information redacted)
 - Template of solicitation letter
 - **Summaries of course evaluations**
 - Evaluations for each and every course must be contained in a separate file labeled with the course number and semester (e.g., PSY 201 Fall 2017)
 - Syllabi
 - Syllabi for each and every course must be contained in a separate file labeled with the course number and semester (e.g., PSY 201 Fall 2017)
 - **Peer observations of teaching**
 - Each letter must be contained in a separate file (including confidentiality/permission to view sign-off sheet)

- Additional teaching evaluations (if applicable)
 - Published reviews of scholarship (e.g., book reviews; if applicable)
 - List of all letters for which authors have given permission for the candidate to view (organized by external, teaching, and other)
 - External letters for which authors have given permission for the candidate to view
 - Each letter must be contained in a separate file and labeled appropriately (e.g., External_Cooper; including confidentiality/permission to view sign-off sheet)
- Section 3: Special Evaluative file
- Chair's letter (non-redacted)
 - **Report(s) from tenure/evaluation committee(s)** (if applicable)
 - **Tally of departmental vote** (name, vote, signature)
 - **List of all solicited recommendations** organized by (a) those suggested by the candidate and (b) those selected by the department. The list should include the name of the referee, their position, their affiliation, whether they agreed to provide a letter or not, reason for declining (if applicable), and the key to their unique identifier (e.g., Prof. A, Prof. B, etc.)
 - Correspondence with referees
 - Correspondence for each and every referee must be contained in a separate file labeled with the person's name (e.g., Correspondence_external_Smith)
 - **CVs of referees**
 - CVs for each and every referee must be contained in a separate file labeled with the person's name (e.g., CV_Smith)
 - **Referee letters**
 - Each letter must be contained in a separate file labeled appropriately (e.g., External_Gomez)
 - **Solicited teaching letters**
 - Each letter must be contained in a separate file labeled appropriately (e.g., Teaching_Jones)
 - Correspondence with people writing teaching letters
 - Correspondence for each and every referee must be contained in a separate file labeled with the person's name (e.g., Correspondence_teaching_Jones)
 - **Additional unsolicited letters** (e.g., colleagues, students)
 - Each letter must be contained in a separate file labeled appropriately (e.g., Other_Student_Wang, Other_Colleague_Brown)

Possible improvements and clarifications to existing PTC Guidelines:

Possible changes to PTC Guidelines:

- Review of the guidelines revealed that there are some inconsistencies between what is described as going in the file in sections 2.4 and 2.5 and the suggested order of materials in section 8.4
 - It is proposed that those sections better match and perhaps be replaced by the order noted in the above section
 - This may address the issue of poor organization of the file
- With regard to excessive length of the files and redundancies, the following items appear multiple times in the file and/or may be unnecessary:
 - Inclusion of a CV – nowhere in the PTC Guidelines is a CV required, but all files seem to include them – a CV is redundant with the material in the biographical file
 - The PTC Guidelines offer no suggestions/rules for length of scholarship and teaching descriptions in the biographical file. Page limits could be considered to reduce length and enhance readability.
 - Solicitation letter – A template is required in the general evaluative file and then every solicitation letter sent to every referee is required in the special evaluative file
 - Syllabi – files often contain a syllabus for every course taught. Given that faculty often teach the same course numerous times, it may not be necessary to have copies of the same syllabus over multiple semesters (unless major changes were made). Perhaps it would be appropriate to require the syllabus from the most recent time a course was taught. Or, perhaps it would be appropriate to drop the inclusion of syllabi altogether.
 - The PTC Guidelines also suggest including copies of exams and/or projects. This may not be necessary (or appropriate in the case of exams).
 - Published reviews of scholarship – the biographical file requests inclusion of these and they are listed in section 8.4 as needing to appear in the general evaluative file as well. They should be eliminated from one of these sections.
 - External letters for which the authors have given permission for the candidate to review – these appear in both the general evaluative file and the special evaluative file. It is recognized that this is because candidates can view the general evaluative file, but not the special evaluative file. Moving to the e-submission approach proposed above would solve this problem at least for PTC members who would be able to view only those individual documents of relevance. Candidates could also be sent e-versions of only those materials they are allowed to view.
 - Chair's letter – appears in both the general and special evaluative file, although it is redacted in the general, but not in the special. Again, moving to the e-submission approach proposed above would solve this problem at least for PTC members who would be able to view only those individual documents of relevance.
 - Length of CVs from external referees – these are often lengthy. The PTC could consider setting a limit on pages and/or providing a template/instructions for a short bio that highlights key achievements

Points for clarification in the PTC Guidelines

- Exactly how many peer teaching observations are necessary?

- If a tenure/evaluation committee exists and they prepare a report, MUST that report be included in the dossier?

Potential addition to the dossiers

- Information about the department process
 - Was a tenure/evaluation committee convened?
 - Who wrote the reports contained in the dossier (e.g., the committee, the chair, both)?

Specific issues with regard to new hires

- Greater clarity is needed with regard to letters writers
 - In particular, can letters that were solicited by the candidate when they applied for the job be used in the file as referees named by the candidate?
 - If yes, can those letter writers simply submit an addendum to their letter that includes the relevant updated information (e.g., the response to the question “Would the candidate get tenure at your university?”)
- In general, the PTC should consider the extent to which files for new hires and continuing appointments should contain the same or different components and the rationale for such decisions, and, based on those decisions, provide greater clarity on what specifically should be in each file
 - It is noted that new hire files contain less information and are more streamlined. Might this be a better model for continuing appointments?
 - Overall, greater transparency is needed with regard to the contents of new hire files

Need for a dedicated technical review person

All files for CAS faculty undergo a technical review by a staff member in the CAS Dean’s office. This review is very time consuming and can often take multiple weeks to months. No similar review process exists for the affiliated units.

The need for a dedicated technical review person is clear. Having someone in this role would allow for the following:

- Consistency across review criteria
- Consistency across files
- Timely review of files – this is extremely important. One of the most significant complaints from faculty regards delays in the review process and lack of clarity about how to obtain information about the status of the file in the review process

It is also noted that, because the PTCs review files not just from CAS departments, the technical review person should be located and housed within the Arts and Sciences Senate and should be familiar with and able to interface with all departments and schools who are reviewed by the PTCs.

Recommendations to the A&S senate:

- **Implement the proposed file format to obtain a new and uniform structure for e-submission to facilitate accessibility and readability of promotion and tenure files.**
- **Work with the university administration towards to assure that any new purchase and implementation of a software system to handle promotion and tenure process can be adapted to support the key features of the proposed new format.**
- **Strongly encourage the PTC to evaluate the proposed changes to the PTC guidelines.**
- **Work with the Dean's of CAS and the affiliated units to establish a common submission process and technical review that is conducted by a dedicated person independent of the CAS Dean's office.**



Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities

The statement that follows is directed to governing board members, administrators, faculty members, students, and other persons in the belief that the colleges and universities of the United States have reached a stage calling for appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the components of the academic institution. The statement is intended to foster constructive joint thought and action, both within the institutional structure and in protection of its integrity against improper intrusions.

It is not intended that the statement serve as a blueprint for governance on a specific campus or as a manual for the regulation of controversy among the components of an academic institution, although it is to be hoped that the principles asserted will lead to the correction of existing weaknesses and assist in the establishment of sound structures and procedures. The statement does not attempt to cover relations with those outside agencies that increasingly are controlling the resources and influencing the patterns of education in our institutions of higher learning: for example, the United States government, state legislatures, state commissions, interstate associations or compacts, and other interinstitutional arrangements. However, it is hoped that the statement will be helpful to these agencies in their consideration of educational matters.

Students are referred to in this statement as an institutional component coordinate in importance with trustees, administrators, and faculty. There is, however, no main section on students. The omission has two causes: (1) the changes now occurring in the status of American students have plainly outdistanced the analysis by the educational community, and an attempt to define the situation without thorough study might prove unfair to student interests, and (2) students do not in fact at present have a significant voice in the government of colleges and universities; it would be unseemly to obscure, by superficial equality of length of statement, what may be a serious lag entitled to separate and full confrontation.

The concern for student status felt by the organizations issuing this statement is embodied in a note, "On Student Status," intended to stimulate the educational community to turn its attention to an important need.

This statement was jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). In October 1966, the board of directors of the ACE took action by which its

council “recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations,” and “commends it to the institutions which are members of the Council.” The Council of the AAUP adopted the statement in October 1966, and the Fifty-third Annual Meeting endorsed it in April 1967. In November 1966, the executive committee of the AGB took action by which that organization also “recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations,” and “commends it to the governing boards which are members of the Association.” (In April 1990, the Council of the AAUP adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.)

1. Introduction

This statement is a call to mutual understanding regarding the government of colleges and universities. Understanding, based on community of interest and producing joint effort, is essential for at least three reasons. First, the academic institution, public or private, often has become less autonomous; buildings, research, and student tuition are supported by funds over which the college or university exercises a diminishing control. Legislative and executive governmental authorities, at all levels, play a part in the making of important decisions in academic policy. If these voices and forces are to be successfully heard and integrated, the academic institution must be in a position to meet them with its own generally unified view. Second, regard for the welfare of the institution remains important despite the mobility and interchange of scholars. Third, a college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems.

2. The Academic Institution: Joint Effort

a. Preliminary Considerations

The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.

Joint effort in an academic institution will take a variety of forms appropriate to the kinds of situations encountered. In some instances, an initial exploration or recommendation will be made by the president with consideration by the faculty at a later stage; in other instances, a first and essentially definitive recommendation will be made by the faculty, subject to the endorsement of the president and the governing board. In still others, a substantive contribution can be made when student leaders are responsibly involved in the process. Although the variety of such approaches may be wide, at least two general conclusions regarding joint effort seem clearly warranted: (1) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and (2) differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should

be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand, as developed hereinafter.

b. Determination of General Educational Policy

The general educational policy, i.e., the objectives of an institution and the nature, range, and pace of its efforts, is shaped by the institutional charter or by law, by tradition and historical development, by the present needs of the community of the institution, and by the professional aspirations and standards of those directly involved in its work. Every board will wish to go beyond its formal trustee obligation to conserve the accomplishment of the past and to engage seriously with the future; every faculty will seek to conduct an operation worthy of scholarly standards of learning; every administrative officer will strive to meet his or her charge and to attain the goals of the institution. The interests of all are coordinate and related, and unilateral effort can lead to confusion or conflict. Essential to a solution is a reasonably explicit statement on general educational policy. Operating responsibility and authority, and procedures for continuing review, should be clearly defined in official regulations.

When an educational goal has been established, it becomes the responsibility primarily of the faculty to determine the appropriate curriculum and procedures of student instruction.

Special considerations may require particular accommodations: (1) a publicly supported institution may be regulated by statutory provisions, and (2) a church-controlled institution may be limited by its charter or bylaws. When such external requirements influence course content and the manner of instruction or research, they impair the educational effectiveness of the institution.

Such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis to be given to the various elements of the educational and research program should involve participation of governing board, administration, and faculty prior to final decision.

c. Internal Operations of the Institution

The framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility, should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community.

Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or university. The channels of communication should be established and maintained by joint endeavor. Distinction should be observed between the institutional system of communication and the system of responsibility for the making of decisions.

A second area calling for joint effort in internal operation is that of decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources. The board, president, and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.

A third area is budgeting. The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections. The function of each component in budgetary matters should be understood by all; the allocation of authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions.

Joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president. The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon a cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty, taking into consideration the opinions of others who are appropriately interested. The president should be equally qualified to serve both as the executive officer of the governing board and as the chief academic officer of the institution and the faculty. The president's dual role requires an ability to interpret to board and faculty the educational views and concepts of institutional government of the other. The president should have the confidence of the board and the faculty.

The selection of academic deans and other chief academic officers should be the responsibility of the president with the advice of, and in consultation with, the appropriate faculty.

Determinations of faculty status, normally based on the recommendations of the faculty groups involved, are discussed in Part 5 of this statement; but it should here be noted that the building of a strong faculty requires careful joint effort in such actions as staff selection and promotion and the granting of tenure. Joint action should also govern dismissals; the applicable principles and procedures in these matters are well established.¹

d. External Relations of the Institution

Anyone—a member of the governing board, the president or other member of the administration, a member of the faculty, or a member of the student body or the alumni—affects the institution when speaking of it in public. An individual who speaks unofficially should so indicate. An individual who speaks officially for the institution, the board, the administration, the faculty, or the student body should be guided by established policy.

It should be noted that only the board speaks legally for the whole institution, although it may delegate responsibility to an agent. The right of a board member, an administrative officer, a faculty member, or a student to speak on general educational questions or about the administration and operations of the individual's own institution is a part of that person's right as a citizen and should not be abridged by the institution.² There exist, of course, legal bounds relating to defamation of character, and there are questions of propriety.

3. The Academic Institution: The Governing Board

The governing board has a special obligation to ensure that the history of the college or university shall serve as a prelude and inspiration to the future. The board helps relate the institution to its chief community: for example, the community college to serve the educational needs of a defined population area or group, the church-controlled college to be cognizant of

the announced position of its denomination, and the comprehensive university to discharge the many duties and to accept the appropriate new challenges which are its concern at the several levels of higher education.

The governing board of an institution of higher education in the United States operates, with few exceptions, as the final institutional authority. Private institutions are established by charters; public institutions are established by constitutional or statutory provisions. In private institutions the board is frequently self-perpetuating; in public colleges and universities the present membership of a board may be asked to suggest candidates for appointment. As a whole and individually, when the governing board confronts the problem of succession, serious attention should be given to obtaining properly qualified persons. Where public law calls for election of governing board members, means should be found to ensure the nomination of fully suited persons, and the electorate should be informed of the relevant criteria for board membership.

Since the membership of the board may embrace both individual and collective competence of recognized weight, its advice or help may be sought through established channels by other components of the academic community. The governing board of an institution of higher education, while maintaining a general overview, entrusts the conduct of administration to the administrative officers—the president and the deans—and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty. The board should undertake appropriate self-limitation.

One of the governing board's important tasks is to ensure the publication of codified statements that define the overall policies and procedures of the institution under its jurisdiction.

The board plays a central role in relating the likely needs of the future to predictable resources; it has the responsibility for husbanding the endowment; it is responsible for obtaining needed capital and operating funds; and in the broadest sense of the term it should pay attention to personnel policy. In order to fulfill these duties, the board should be aided by, and may insist upon, the development of long-range planning by the administration and faculty. When ignorance or ill will threatens the institution or any part of it, the governing board must be available for support. In grave crises it will be expected to serve as a champion. Although the action to be taken by it will usually be on behalf of the president, the faculty, or the student body, the board should make clear that the protection it offers to an individual or a group is, in fact, a fundamental defense of the vested interests of society in the educational institution.³

4. The Academic Institution: The President

The president, as the chief executive officer of an institution of higher education, is measured largely by his or her capacity for institutional leadership. The president shares responsibility for the definition and attainment of goals, for administrative action, and for operating the communications system that links the components of the academic community. The president represents the institution to its many publics. The president's leadership role is supported by delegated authority from the board and faculty.

As the chief planning officer of an institution, the president has a special obligation to innovate and initiate. The degree to which a president can envision new horizons for the institution, and can persuade others to see them and to work toward them, will often constitute the chief measure of the president's administration.

The president must at times, with or without support, infuse new life into a department; relatedly, the president may at times be required, working within the concept of tenure, to solve problems of obsolescence. The president will necessarily utilize the judgments of the faculty but may also, in the interest of academic standards, seek outside evaluations by scholars of acknowledged competence.

It is the duty of the president to see to it that the standards and procedures in operational use within the college or university conform to the policy established by the governing board and to the standards of sound academic practice. It is also incumbent on the president to ensure that faculty views, including dissenting views, are presented to the board in those areas and on those issues where responsibilities are shared. Similarly, the faculty should be informed of the views of the board and the administration on like issues.

The president is largely responsible for the maintenance of existing institutional resources and the creation of new resources; has ultimate managerial responsibility for a large area of nonacademic activities; is responsible for public understanding; and by the nature of the office is the chief person who speaks for the institution. In these and other areas the president's work is to plan, to organize, to direct, and to represent. The presidential function should receive the general support of board and faculty.

5. The Academic Institution: The Faculty

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.⁴ On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board. Budgets, personnel limitations, the time element, and the policies of other groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice.

The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments.

Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.

The chair or head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of the department within an institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department and of related departments; appointments should normally be in conformity with department members' judgment. The chair or department head should not have tenure in office; tenure as a faculty member is a matter of separate right. The chair or head should serve for a stated term but without prejudice to reelection or to reappointment by procedures that involve appropriate faculty consultation. Board, administration, and faculty should all bear in mind that the department chair or head has a special obligation to build a department strong in scholarship and teaching capacity.

Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. An agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The structure and procedures for faculty participation should be designed, approved, and established by joint action of the components of the institution. Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.⁵

The agencies may consist of meetings of all faculty members of a department, school, college, division, or university system, or may take the form of faculty-elected executive committees in departments and schools and a faculty-elected senate or council for larger divisions or the institution as a whole.

The means of communication among the faculty, administration, and governing board now in use include: (1) circulation of memoranda and reports by board committees, the administration, and faculty committees; (2) joint ad hoc committees; (3) standing liaison committees; (4) membership of faculty members on administrative bodies; and (5) membership of faculty members on governing boards. Whatever the channels of communication, they should be clearly understood and observed.

On Student Status

When students in American colleges and universities desire to participate responsibly in the government of the institution they attend, their wish should be recognized as a claim to opportunity both for educational experience and for involvement in the affairs of their college or university. Ways should be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness. The obstacles to such participation are large and should not be minimized: inexperience, untested capacity, a transitory status which means that present

action does not carry with it subsequent responsibility, and the inescapable fact that the other components of the institution are in a position of judgment over the students. It is important to recognize that student needs are strongly related to educational experience, both formal and informal.

Students expect, and have a right to expect, that the educational process will be structured, that they will be stimulated by it to become independent adults, and that they will have effectively transmitted to them the cultural heritage of the larger society. If institutional support is to have its fullest possible meaning, it should incorporate the strength, freshness of view, and idealism of the student body.

The respect of students for their college or university can be enhanced if they are given at least these opportunities: (1) to be listened to in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal for the substance of their views, (2) freedom to discuss questions of institutional policy and operation, (3) the right to academic due process when charged with serious violations of institutional regulations, and (4) the same right to hear speakers of their own choice as is enjoyed by other components of the institution.

Notes

1. See the 1940 “[Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure](#),” AAUP, *Policy Documents and Reports*, 11th ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015), 13–19,, and the 1958 “[Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings](#),” *ibid.*, 91–93. These statements were jointly adopted by the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) and the American Association of University Professors; the 1940 “Statement” has been endorsed by numerous learned and scientific societies and educational associations. [Back to text](#)

2. With respect to faculty members, the 1940 “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure” reads: “College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution” (*ibid.*, 14). [Back to text](#)

3. Traditionally, governing boards developed within the context of single-campus institutions. In more recent times, governing and coordinating boards have increasingly tended to develop at the multi-campus regional, system-wide, or statewide levels. As influential components of the academic community, these supra-campus bodies bear particular responsibility for protecting the autonomy of individual campuses or institutions under their jurisdiction and for implementing policies of shared responsibility. The American Association of University Professors regards the objectives and practices recommended in the “Statement on Government” as constituting equally appropriate guidelines for such supra-campus bodies, and looks toward continued development of practices that will facilitate application of such

guidelines in this new context. [Preceding note adopted by the AAUP's Council in June 1978.] [Back to text](#)

4. With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process. [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 2002.] [Back to text](#)

5. The American Association of University Professors regards collective bargaining, properly used, as another means of achieving sound academic government. Where there is faculty collective bargaining, the parties should seek to ensure appropriate institutional governance structures which will protect the right of all faculty to participate in institutional governance in accordance with the "Statement on Government." [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 1978.] [Back to text](#)

Report Category:

- [Standing Committee and Subcommittee Reports](#)
- [College and University Government](#)

Appendix B

Statement from the Executive Committee of the University Senate and the Arts & Sciences Senate presented to and approved by the A&S Senate on February 19, 2018

The Executive Committees are concerned about an ongoing promotion and tenure case in a department of the College of Arts & Sciences. Being a promotion and tenure case, it involves policy and procedures that are central to meaningful and appropriate shared governance.

I'll set aside the specifics of the case to present the Senate ECs' position within a policy framework.

When the faculty of a department put forward a promotion and tenure file it is to go to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for review. It is a breach of CAS and Arts & Sciences Senate PTC policies for the CAS Dean or any individual to prevent a P & T file from being received by the PTC. The Senate ECs object in the strongest possible terms to any action on the part of any individual or group that would deliberately deny or prevent the appropriate review of a P & T file. The Senate ECs expect and demand that all appropriate P & T files duly put forward by the faculty of a CAS department be delivered to the Arts & Sciences Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee 1 for evaluation.

All promotions within the College of Arts & Sciences must adhere to the procedures laid out in the "Promotion and Tenure Committee Procedures" 2 of the College of Arts & Sciences, Arts & Sciences Senate, hereafter referred to as PTCP.

Requests for promotion are generally initiated by the Chair of the Department (PTCP, Section 2.2.2). In the ongoing case being reviewed by the Senate ECs, this was done (it is a mandatory promotion). Section

1.2.4 of the PTCP states "Assistant professors or instructors who have neither previously been reviewed for tenure at the State University of New York at Stony Brook nor submitted a letter of resignation, must be reviewed for continuing appointment not later than the sixth year of service in academic rank."

Following review by the Department, files are transmitted to the PTC. Section 2.6.1 of the PTCP states "The department chairperson or program director is responsible for forwarding the completed file with the recommendation letter to the Dean for transmission to the Promotion and Tenure Committee."

In practice, the files are routed through the office of the Dean of the College so that a technical review of the file may be done to ensure that the content is complete. Section 2.6.1 of the PTCP does not give the Dean an option; the Dean is required to send the file to the PTC for evaluation.

There is no provision in the PTCP that addresses a case of a tenure-track faculty member being non-renewed by the Dean as the promotion is in process. The closest provision we can find is in the PTCP Section 2.2.2, which deals with re-submissions:

"When a letter of termination of employment has already been received, when a letter of resignation has been submitted and accepted, or when a non-mandatory case is being brought forward as a re-submission, the decision whether or not to submit or resubmit the case to the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be made by the department." In any event, this provision appears to be overridden by Section 2.6.1.

It is clear from this language that the existence of a "letter of termination" does not supersede the rights of the department to submit the file to the PTC. It is also clear that the decision to submit the file to the PTC is made by the Department, and not by the Dean or any other individual.

It is acknowledge that the Dean has the authority to accept or to reject the advice of the PTC. In the case being considered by the Senate ECs, as in other cases, there may be compelling reasons to not offer promotion with tenure. But it is the position of the Senate ECs that all duly and appropriately forwarded P & T files (including the file in the case being considered by the Senate ECs) must be afforded the opportunity to be reviewed by the faculty of the College through the agency of the PTC.