Faculty Senate Resolution

To: SCSU President Mary Papazian

From: William Faraclas, President of the SCSU Faculty Senate

The attached Resolution of the Faculty Senate regards: Resolution to Alter Recommendation Language in Promotion and Tenure Committee’s Decision Letters

The Resolution is presented to you for your [X] APPROVAL
[ ] INFORMATION

After considering this resolution, please indicate your action on this form and return it to the President of the Faculty Senate.

In accordance with the CSU-AAUP Contract (Article 5.10), the President of the University will return the Resolution to the President of the Senate within 15 school days of the receipt of the Resolution.

cc: Dr. Marianne Kennedy, Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs and Interim Provost

[Signature]
William Faraclas, President, Faculty Senate

4-28-14
Date

ENDORSEMENT of Faculty Senate Resolution, S-14-09

To: William Faraclas, President SCSU Faculty Senate
From: Mary Papazian, President of the University

1. Motion APPROVED
2. Motion DISAPPROVED (attach statement)
3. Motion NOTED
4. Comments

[Signature]

5-22-14
Date

Signature
Senate Resolution Number S-14-09

Resolution to alter recommendation language in Promotion and Tenure Committee’s decision letters

Whereas SCSU exists for the primary purpose of furthering academic excellence;

And whereas the current promotion and tenure process requires decision letters from the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee to the candidate and the Provost to include the candidate’s average score, standard deviation, and group average for each of the four categories of evaluation;

And whereas these numbers are used by the P&T Committee for deliberation purposes only and do not accurately represent the end results of the committee’s decision-making process;

And whereas the presentation of these numbers in letters to candidates and to the Provost is decontextualized from their actual use in the P&T Committee’s decision-making process and therefore gives an inaccurate impression of the P&T Committee’s final decisions;

And whereas the P&T committee uses only the yes/no count to make final recommendations to the Provost;

Therefore be it resolved that the decision letters to the candidate and Provost include the yes/no count instead of the numeric scores.