The New York University Faculty Senators Council (FSC) met at noon on Thursday, May 5, 2011 in Room 405 in the Kimmel Center for University Life.

In attendance were Senators Anton, Bogart, Capan, Cappell, Fernandez, Goldman, Hammack, Hutchins, John, Jones, Karl, Kovner, Lebowitz, Magder, Monaco, Moran, Nolan, Phillips, Raiken, Schacht, Simon, Sternhell, Thompson, Tranchina, Van Deranter, Wachtel and Zwanziger and Alternate Senators Hendin, Newman, Reiss, and Tannenbaum. FSC Consultant/Advisor Al-Askari attended as a guest. President Sexton attended as a special guest.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD APRIL 14, 2011

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the April 14, 2011 meeting were approved unanimously.

ELECTION FSC VICE CHAIRPERSON AND SECRETARY 2011-2012

The Candidates for Vice Chair, Senator Marie Monaco from the School of Medicine and Current Vice Chair Daniel Zwanziger from the Faculty of Arts and Science presented their vision statements.

Monaco stated her support of faculty working together to make a big impact. Her main priority is to ensure the administration meets its responsibilities to the faculty, and she expressed her willingness to collaborate with the administration on important issues.

Zwanziger noted the University is changing rapidly causing a re-examination of the governance structures. He supported the motion prepared by Governance Committee on shared governance and stated it’s a step in a long process. He also commented that in his research for the Governance Committee, he found other universities with better shared governance. He gave the example of Boston University, which develops policies through committees appointed jointly by the faculty and administration. In addition, the Chair of the Faculty Council is elected to the Board of Trustees.

The Candidates for Secretary, Senator Mary Ann Jones from the School of Social Work and Senator Nancy Van Deranter from the College of Nursing presented their vision statements.

Jones stated she has been a long-time Senator on the Council and has chaired the Administrative Issues Committee and more recently the Faculty Benefits Committee. She commented in her early years on the Council there was less contention with the Administration and within the Council. She noted at that time, finances were different, such as medical benefits and tuition remission reimbursement at 100% and an annual 3% raise. Jones noted that with changes in the University, there is a need for the FSC to adapt and best guard the interests of faculty. She stated the items she wishes to focus on in the coming academic year. For one, review rules of procedure and make adjustments as needed and conduct business in an orderly
fashion. Second, better advocacy for the faculty and to avoid a defeatist approach. Next, seek out and understand the important current issues. Finally, to tackle the issue of non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) representation and move this item off the agenda.

Van Devanter stated she is relatively new to NYU and governance, and finds this to be a great learning experience and is interested in giving back to the Council. She also commented she is impressed by Jones’ experience and dedication and supports her nomination.

The election of FSC Vice Chair and Secretary for the 2011-12 academic year took place by secret ballot. After collecting the votes of the 30 voting-eligible senators present, Chairperson Schacht announced Marie Monaco from the School of Medicine will serve as FSC Vice Chair and Mary Ann Jones from the School of Social Work will serve as FSC Secretary next year.

FSC COMMITTEE REPORTS

Tenure Modifications: Senator Monaco

Senator Monaco presented the Committee’s recommendations regarding the Institute of Fine Arts’ (IFA) and Institute for the Study of Ancient World’s (ISAW) Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. See attached Documents A and B. Upon a motion duly made and seconded the recommendations to the document provided by the Tenure Modifications Committee were approved unanimously by a vote of 30 senators in favor. See attached Document C.

Governance: Senator Kovner (on behalf of Senator Harrington)

Senator Kovner presented a document regarding revised shared governance resolutions presented by the Committee. The Committee stated five basic features of shared governance: representation, information, consultation, reasoned justifications, communications and also included an implementation process to revise the Faculty Handbook to incorporate the text of these resolutions. Kovner stated that the Committee found it important to outline these basic features after the Committee felt decisions by the administration were made without shared governance. Upon a motion duly made and seconded the resolution regarding shared governance was approved unanimously by a vote of 30 senators in favor. See attached Document D.

PRESENTATION BY SPECIAL GUEST PRESIDENT JOHN SEXTON

President Sexton discussed his recent activities, including taking part in a National Security Higher Education Advisory Board event. He also mentioned recent news including NYU Shanghai and the settled adjunct contract.

Alternate Senator Tannenbaum inquired about the NYC RFEI for a new applied science campus. Sexton explained that a number of responses were received including one from Stanford University. He believes NYU also had a strong proposal and will know more at the end of the year of the status of this proposal.

Senator Raiken asked what areas of education the federal government is focusing on, despite recent cut-backs. Sexton responded the current priorities in education include research and access. In terms of access he added that the commitment should not just focus on access but on quality education.

Senator Simon expressed his concern over lack of research funding and grants, which will also affect the recruitment of talented new people. Sexton acknowledged this challenge, yet stated the federal government accepts the major premise of the importance of research.
Senator Fernandez inquired about the recent memorandum of understanding regarding Madrid. Sexton, replied that the agreement says that by 2014 Madrid would provide NYU with space and a facility, which was the former summer palace of the queen. This will not be a portal campus, like NYU Abu Dhabi or Shanghai, but the new home of NYU Madrid.

Senator Newman commented on the slow process of absorbing Polytechnic Institute. Sexton responded that currently discussions over the tenure process are taking place. Yet, in many ways NYU has done a lot to absorb Poly. The student body, for instance, has had a dramatic transformation.

Senator Karl expressed her concern over the suppression of certain ideas in Abu Dhabi and asked how these idea capitals of the world are to operate within this suppression. Sexton stated the core of the global network university concept is to adopt humility when we embrace other cultures. There are certain core values that can not compromised, for instance, the ability to teach freely in the way done at the Square. This compromised situation has not been the experience with Abu Dhabi, including the conferences, courses, and students’ experiences. Sexton reiterated that NYU chose the right partner and other entities, including news organization, etc. operate without suppression in Abu Dhabi.

Senator Thompson asked for a clarification on the faculty raise and salary pool for next academic year. Sexton responded he would send this information. Update: in an email dated 5/6/11, Sexton stated:

The total pool for faculty salary action next year is 3.0%. That is divided into 2.5% for our annual merit increase and 0.5% to fund the one-time $1000.00 stipend. We decided to proportion 0.5% of the 3.0% pool as a one-time stipend and not salary because of our desire to express our appreciation for the fine work of the faculty during the difficult past few years while simultaneously maintaining our flexibility to be prepared for other economic threats in future budgets as the economy struggles to grow. We also used the stipend method because it is proportionally more generous to our lower paid faculty members.

Simply stated, NYU faculty will have an income that is 3.0% higher on average next year than this year. The faculty base salary will be 2.5% higher on average with the balance made up by the one-time $1000 stipend.

Senator Monaco inquired about the issue of freedom of expression in Abu Dhabi, specifically for young students. Sexton stated if the issue was about academic freedom, the university would pursue. He stated as students study around the world, they will face different laws, cultural practices, etc. including differences in criminal laws and freedom of expression. He has found the University’s relationship and experience in the Middle East to be positive and believes it will be the same for China.

Chair-Elect Magder commented that it would be valuable to faculty to establish a set of documents regarding shared values, within the context of the complexity of differences. Sexton responded there are certain values and core matters that needed to be met in these agreements. He agreed with the value of an outline of shared values and stated if there is an interest this could be added to the agenda for next year.

OLD BUSINESS

Secretary Hutchins presented, on behalf of the Executive Committee, the proposed resolution regarding motions and voting procedure. Alternate Senator Tannenbaum expressed concern that receiving documents a few days prior to the meeting may not allow enough time for discussion on
certain matters. Senator Monaco clarified the time frame is a minimum and if more discussion is required, the vote can be moved to a later date. Also the rules may be suspended if it is determined that a topic does not need prior notice or documentation to be voted on. Upon a motion duly made and seconded the resolution regarding motions and voting procedure was approved by a vote of 26 senators in favor, 3 senators opposed, with 1 abstention. See attached Document E.

NEW BUSINESS

Chairperson Schacht stated the Executive Committee will organize a FSC Committee focusing on 2031. Alternate Senator Reiss mentioned there currently exists a University Committee, which she serves on as a FSC representative. Chair-Elect Magder clarified this will not duplicate these efforts but serve as a way for the FSC to monitor the 2031 plan. He also asked if Senators had any ideas for discussion at the retreat, to contact him.

Senator Lebowitz thanked Schacht for serving as Chair and his dedication to the important issues this year.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:10 PM.
Promotion and Tenure

1. Introduction

The principles and procedures for tenure and promotion at the Institute of Fine Arts (IFA) of New York University (NYU) are designed to ensure high academic standards in awarding tenure and promotions and to provide a comprehensive, rigorous and fair review of the candidates. The successful implementation of these principles and procedures depends upon the leadership of the IFA Director in consultation with the tenured faculty of the IFA in conjunction with NYU’s Provost and President. IFA procedures will conform to the NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, which are available at http://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-and-guidelines/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines.html.

2. Standards

2.1. A high standard of excellence and effectiveness in teaching in the context of a research university, together with the promise of effective contributions toward the work and intellectual life of the IFA and NYU, are prerequisite for tenure and promotion at the IFA. Once these prerequisites are met, a candidate must have a record of outstanding scholarly research and publication, which may include distinguished curatorship and art criticism. In the absence of such a record, tenure or promotion will not be granted.

2.2. The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure and promotion is an inquiry. Is the candidate for tenure or promotion among the strongest in his/her field, in comparison with other scholars in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the IFA? It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement. Each case must be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses that may be improved.

3. Guidelines and Procedures

3.1. Promotion and Tenure Calendar

3.1.1. In any academic year in which the IFA expects to conduct a tenure and promotion procedure, the IFA Director will submit to the Provost a tenure and promotion process calendar at the beginning of the academic year. Relevant dates include those required to guarantee adequate consideration and those that ensure the timely progress of the inquiry. These include the date by which:

* The candidate submits dossier to the Faculty Review Committee (defined below in Section 3.3.1)
* The Chair of Faculty Review Committee prepares a tenure or promotion docket and solicits outside evaluators.
* The eligible voting faculty of the IFA meets to hear a report from the Faculty Review Committee and to vote on the case.
* The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee submits the full docket, including the report of the Faculty Review Committee and the vote of the faculty, to the Director of the IFA.
* The IFA Director informs the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee of his/her recommendation to the Provost, and the Chair informs the candidate of the IFA Director’s recommendation.
* In the case of a Director’s recommendation contrary to that of the IFA faculty eligible to vote, the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee has ten (10) working days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Director’s final recommendation is made to the Provost.
* The IFA Director sends his/her final recommendation to the Provost.

### 3.2. Mandatory Review

3.2.1. A docket and recommendation must be submitted to the IFA Director for all faculty in their mandatory review year, whether the recommendation is positive or negative. If, however, the candidate tenders a letter of resignation on or before August 31 of the year prior to the mandatory review, effective on or before August 31 of the final probationary year, a docket and recommendation need not be submitted. The letter must state explicitly that the resignation was freely tendered without duress. In this instance, the IFA Director must forward the letter of resignation to the Provost on or before August 31 of the year prior to the mandatory review year.

3.2.2. A candidate may choose to resign during the tenure decision year. The candidate ordinarily should notify the IFA Director of the decision to resign before the Director submits his/her final recommendation to the Provost. The letter must state explicitly that the resignation was freely tendered without duress. The IFA Director will forward the letter of resignation to the Provost.

### 3.3. Appointment of the Faculty Review Committee

3.3.1. In consultation with the IFA Deputy Director for Faculty and Administration and the tenured faculty, the IFA Director will appoint an ad hoc Faculty Review Committee for each promotion and tenure case. The Faculty Review Committee is made up of at least three (3) members selected from the entire tenured faculty (which is authorized to vote for or against tenure at the rank of associate professor), or from among the ranks of full professors, (who are authorized to vote for or against promotion from associate to full professor). The Committee must not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate; such colleagues may, however, participate in the eligible voting faculty discussion and vote on the Committee report.

3.3.2. The Deputy Director for Faculty and Administration will chair the Faculty Review Committee. If the Deputy Director for Faculty and Administration is not eligible...
to serve on the Committee, the Director of Graduate Studies will chair the Faculty Review Committee.

3.3.3. The Chair of the IFA Conservation Center serves *ex officio* on each promotion and tenure Faculty Review Committee for Conservation Center faculty. In the case of a Joint Appointment between the IFA and another school of NYU, the composition of the Faculty Review Committee must include members of both units.

3.4. Responsibilities of the Candidate

3.4.1. The candidate must submit a dossier, which includes a *curriculum vitae* and a personal statement, to the Faculty Review Committee. The candidate’s personal statement should narrate the trajectory of his/her career. The personal statement should include a description of the relationship among works already published or distributed and a description of new projects planned or under way and should address the candidate’s teaching philosophy and the role that teaching (including particular courses) occupies in her/his career.

3.5. Promotion and Tenure Docket

3.5.1. The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee must prepare a Tenure or Promotion docket for examination by eligible faculty voters and for subsequent forwarding to the IFA Director and the Provost. The docket will include the candidate’s dossier and must be made available for inspection well in advance of the meeting of the eligible faculty at which the case will be reported and discussed and the vote taken.

3.5.2. The docket must address the prerequisites for tenure and promotion, *i.e.*, the candidate’s teaching performance and teaching potential within the context of a research university and his/her record and promise of effective contributions toward the work of the IFA and the intellectual life of the IFA and NYU. Supporting evidence and documentation should take the form of a teaching and service portfolio, which may include:

* Candidate’s statement of his/her teaching philosophy
* Course syllabi
* Student evaluations
* Reports of peer observations, including formal assessments of teaching effectiveness
* List of IFA and other NYU advisees
* List of PhD dissertation candidates supervised
* List of MA qualifying papers and theses supervised
* List of comprehensive PhD examination committees
* List of PhD defense committees
* The candidate's service record and potential contributions toward the work of the IFA and the intellectual life of NYU and the academic community.
3.5.3. Once the prerequisites as demonstrated in teaching and service are met, tenure or promotion will be judged and granted on the basis of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research, including, if relevant, curatorial accomplishment and leading art criticism. As evidence of such leadership in the field, the docket must include:

* Copies of the candidate’s scholarly work, curatorial publications, and/or art criticism
* Evidence of the quality of the scholarly work as appropriate, including academic book reviews, exhibition reviews in journals and newspapers of record, readers’ reviews of manuscripts, assessment of the candidate’s research, curatorship, and/or art criticism, and assessment of the candidate’s teaching as shaped by his/her scholarly and/or curatorial and critical work
* Copy of the candidate's Third-Year Review
* A list of outside evaluators, together with their scholarly credentials and an explanation of why they were chosen

3.5.4. The docket must include specific explanations for the choice of particular outside evaluators contacted, including the CVs of the evaluators and a brief statement of why the particular evaluator’s opinion matters (e.g., the evaluator is the most widely published author in the candidate’s field; the evaluator is in a different discipline but edits the premier journal in the candidate’s field, etc.). All Faculty Review Committee invitations to potential evaluators must be documented and included in the docket, as well as an explanation for each of the declinations.

3.5.5. Dockets can, and often must, include supplemental information about the candidate’s work that may not be evident from the rest of the record. Examples might be reader’s reports for unpublished works, reports of grant review panels, published reviews of scholarship or curatorial works, etc. The Faculty Review Committee and/or the IFA Director may submit additional materials considered informative and relevant to the assessment of the case, under a section of the docket titled “Supplementary Materials”.

3.6. Solicitation of Outside Evaluators

3.6.1. The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee will obtain at least five (5) letters of evaluation from highly qualified external evaluators. These primary evaluators may not be scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a dissertation or thesis advisor, co-author, co-curator, or other close associates. Nor can they be scholars who have been suggested by the candidate to serve as evaluators, although they can be solicited to provide supplementary material. If the Chair inadvertently solicits an opinion from someone he/she later learns is close to the candidate in any way, this circumstance must be noted in the Faculty Review Committee report.

3.6.2. Evaluators selected normally will hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction, such as a research university, a position of equivalent rank in an
academic unit that does not grant tenure, or a position of equivalent rank in a non-
academic institution (e.g., museum, conservation center, or research institute).

3.6.3. Evaluators must be recognized leaders in the candidate’s discipline. Evaluators
must be representative of their subject, broadly defined, and not be drawn exclusively
from narrow specializations. At least one of the evaluators must be a scholar identified
with broader sectors of the discipline in question. The list of evaluators need not be
restricted to those at United States institutions; whenever appropriate and possible,
evaluations must be solicited from abroad.

3.6.4. The letter of solicitation must follow the prototype set forth in Section 7 below.
The letter must explicitly request comparative rankings with the candidate’s peers, and it
must not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is
desired.

3.6.5. All evaluators must be provided with the same curriculum vitae, personal
statement, and copies or descriptions of the candidate’s work. If unpublished work forms
a part of the docket, the IFA must ask all evaluators to comment on its quality.

3.6.6. The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators must be preserved; only the
Faculty Review Committee, the eligible voting members of the IFA faculty, the IFA
Director and the Offices of the Provost and the President of the University must be
allowed access to the letters, and they should be advised of the importance of maintaining
confidentiality. In all communications with them, writers of letters must be assured that
their letters will be held in such confidence, except as required by law.

3.7. Responsibilities of the IFA Faculty Review Committee

3.7.1. The Faculty Review Committee must present a detailed oral report on the
candidate for the eligible voting faculty of the IFA. In arriving at its recommendation to
the eligible voting faculty, the Faculty Review Committee must take with utmost
seriousness the processes of scholarship review, comparative evaluation, peer review,
teaching evaluations and excellence, and faculty colleague consultation.

3.7.2. The evaluation by the Faculty Review Committee must not ignore candidates’
defects. It must strive to provide a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the
candidate. Lack of perfection is not a bar to tenure or promotion, and “advocacy”
assessments that attempt to gloss over imperfections are more likely to arouse suspicion
than support. It is far more helpful to the candidate, the voting faculty and the IFA
Director to have a balanced discussion of a candidate’s strengths and weaknesses.

3.7.3. The Faculty Review Committee’s assessment of a candidate’s scholarly research,
curatorial contributions, or art criticism must address issues of intellectual and scholarly
quality, significance, impact, and future development. The quality and significance of the
journals or venues of distribution or exhibition in which the candidate’s work has
appeared must be appraised. The assessment must indicate what parts of the candidate’s
work are based on the dissertation, and for such work, what advances have been made after the dissertation. In fields where external funding is important and generally available, the candidate's success at securing grants must be evaluated in relation to reasonable expectations for scholars in the same field and at the same stage of professional development. The assessment must list and appraise the relative competitiveness of grants and fellowships received by the candidate.

3.7.4. The Faculty Review Committee’s assessment must explain the importance of the candidate's field of expertise to the fields of art history and/or archaeology and/or conservation. In what ways does the strength the candidate offers in the relevant field advance the IFA’s mission and ambitions? How does the candidate’s field supplement other strengths in the IFA, and vice versa? How does the candidate’s field and performance affect the standing and visibility of the IFA, along with its attractiveness to top graduate students in the field?

3.7.5. The candidate’s position in the field and the discipline as a whole must be described as precisely as possible. This appraisal must include comparisons with other scholars both within the IFA and in the discipline at large. While most comparisons should focus on scholars at a similar career stage, promise to match the accomplishments of more senior scholars may be addressed.

3.7.6. The Faculty Review Committee’s assessment of teaching performance must appraise the quality and pertinence of courses developed, provide an assessment of teaching performance, and evaluate the candidate's contributions to the teaching program of the IFA. Specific evaluation and an analysis of the effectiveness of graduate teaching must be provided in narrative form. Evidence may be obtained both through the judgments of faculty (e.g., evaluation of course syllabi, first-hand evaluation of class sessions by either a member of the Faculty Review Committee or another tenured colleague) and through student evaluations. A list of all PhD dissertations and MA Qualifying Papers and theses supervised by the candidate, including those in progress, should be appended. A list of all the examination and PhD defense committees that the candidate has served on must also be supplied.

3.7.7. The Faculty Review Committee’s assessment of service must indicate the quality and significance of service to the IFA, NYU, and the professions of art history and/or archaeology and/or conservation. Specific comments, including testimony from fellow committee members, specification of authorship of particular reports and the like, are helpful. The Assessment of Service should also include a discussion of participation in professional organizations and institutions in the candidate’s field.

3.7.8. The Report of the Faculty Review Committee must include a list of all potential evaluators who were asked to write on behalf of the candidate, including those who declined. Declinations are not necessarily a weakness: many scholars default on these responsibilities because of time pressures, even once they have agreed to evaluate.

3.8. Responsibilities of the IFA Faculty
3.8.1. The duty of the tenured faculty to give advice on tenure and promotion decisions is perhaps their highest responsibility, and the process is highly dependent upon their thoroughness, fairness, and rigor.

3.8.2. It is essential that tenured faculty members who participate in the tenure and promotion process uphold high standards of responsibility and ethical behavior. Responsibility includes the obligation to give careful attention to the materials of a tenure and promotion case and to share the results of that deliberation with eligible IFA colleagues. Ethical behavior includes a clear obligation to maintain the confidentiality of all proceedings, since confidentiality makes honest and open discussion possible.

3.8.3. The entire tenured faculty of the IFA is authorized to vote and to make a collective recommendation for or against tenure at the rank of associate professor. The vote should be reported by numbers. Faculty having attained the rank of full professor are authorized to vote and to make a collective recommendation for or against promotion from the rank of associate professor to full professor.

3.8.4. A reasonable effort must be made to enable eligible faculty on leave to receive all relevant materials and to participate in the discussions and vote. When a faculty member is unable to attend the meeting because of a leave or other excused absence, he or she may make his/her views known to the other eligible faculty through written communication and cast his or her vote in absentia. Such communications and votes are to be gathered and communicated to the Faculty Review Committee and the eligible voting faculty by the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee.

3.9. Presenting the Faculty Review Committee Report for a Faculty Vote

3.9.1. The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee must present the case to a full special meeting of those IFA faculty members eligible to attend and vote. The Director of the IFA may attend the meeting, but should not take part in the deliberations. After a discussion, a vote must be taken and tallied. The administration of the vote is the responsibility of the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee. As the IFA faculty cherish their tradition of consensual tenure and promotion decisions, the vote ordinarily will be open. As a matter of procedure, however, the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee will offer the possibility of a secret ballot and provide materials to conduct one if the faculty decide that such a procedure would be necessary to the integrity of the decision-making process. Votes of absent members must be recorded as well.

3.9.2. Reasonable doubt for granting tenure or promotion precludes a favorable faculty recommendation. If a reasonable doubt exists, the IFA Faculty Review Committee and IFA Director must indicate as much to the Provost. While straw votes may be taken during the consensual process, a non-unanimous official vote must not be retaken for the sole purpose of avoiding a split IFA faculty vote.
3.9.3. After the meeting and the vote of the IFA faculty members eligible to attend and vote, the Faculty Review Committee will produce a detailed, written report on the case, including a discussion of the conclusions of the faculty and a numerical record of the faculty vote. The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee will forward the report of the Faculty Review Committee to the Director of the IFA.

3.10. Responsibilities of the IFA Director

3.10.1. The report of the Faculty Review Committee and the vote by eligible faculty are advisory to the Director. The IFA Director may solicit additional outside letters of evaluation for his/her own use.

3.10.2. The Director will inform the Chair of the IFA Faculty Review Committee of his/her own proposed recommendation to the Provost. In the case of a Director’s recommendation contrary to that of the IFA faculty eligible to vote, the Director will provide the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee with the reasons. The Chair will then have ten (10) working days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Director’s final recommendation is made to the Provost.

3.10.3. The Director must forward the report of the Faculty Review Committee and vote (including the number of positive and negative votes and abstentions, if any) to the Provost with his/her own recommendation and the docket.

3.10.4. The Director’s recommendation must include a description for non-specialists of the place the candidate’s work occupies in the relevant discipline or field, and explain why it is important to the IFA that this field be represented on its faculty. It may also be helpful for this statement to include information about the usual criteria for excellence in the candidate’s discipline (e.g., quality of venues within which the work appears).

3.10.5. The Director will submit these materials along with the Report of the IFA Faculty Review Committee and the Director’s Recommendation to the Provost. This will constitute the definitive recommendation and will be accompanied by the docket and the Report of the IFA Faculty Review Committee and the faculty vote. If the date provided in the calendar submitted in accordance with 3.1.1 proves unfeasible for any reason, the Director will notify the Provost well in advance of the missed deadline.

3.10.6. Upon notification of the Provost’s decision, the Director will write to the IFA faculty eligible to vote and to the candidate to inform them of the decision.

3.11. Joint Appointments

3.11.1. In the case of a Joint Appointment between the IFA and another school of NYU, the composition of the Faculty Review Committee must include members of both units. Both units must vote on the report of the Faculty Review Committee, with the guidelines herein outlined concerning procedures and reporting applying to both. The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee and the other unit Chair must forward his or her unit’s
recommendation to the IFA Director and to the appropriate Dean only after consultation with the other unit. If the IFA faculty and the other unit arrive at significantly different judgments, the IFA Director and the Dean ordinarily will invite the IFA Faculty Review Committee Chair and the Chair of the other unit to discuss the case together. The IFA Director and the appropriate Dean will forward a joint decision to the Provost; if the IFA Director and the appropriate Dean find themselves in disagreement, they will discuss the case jointly and individually with the Provost.

3.11.2. When the candidate has an Associated or Affiliate Appointment in a secondary department or program, the IFA Faculty Review Committee must present the entire IFA tenured faculty with a written evaluation from the secondary department explaining, among other matters thought relevant, the particular contribution of the candidate to that program’s mission and to its administration. This evaluation may be written by the Chair of the secondary department after formal consultation with departmental or program members. The written evaluation must also be included in the IFA Faculty Review Committee’s final written report to the IFA Director.

3.12. The Role of the Provost

3.12.1. The Provost will evaluate each tenure and promotion docket and recommendation submitted by the IFA Director. In doing so, the Provost may solicit additional information and/or letters of evaluation and may in unusual cases appoint an ad hoc advisory committee composed of tenured faculty in the history of art and archaeology, conservation or closely related humanities fields to seek further counsel of an advisory, non-binding character.

3.12.2. The Provost will support or oppose the IFA Director’s recommendation in his/her final decision. The Provost will inform the Director of his/her pending decision. In those cases in which the Provost’s decision will be contrary to the recommendation of the Director, the Provost will provide the Director with the reasons and give the Director an opportunity to provide further information or counter-argument before the Provost’s final decision. The Provost will notify the Director of the final decision, along with reasons thereof if the Director’s recommendation is disapproved.

4. Guidelines for Appeal

In the event of a negative decision, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of NYU’s Faculty Grievance Procedures appearing at pp. 56-58 of the Faculty Handbook (2008 ed.), available at http://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/FacHbk2008.pdf.

5. Tenure Clock

The tenure clock for faculty is set forth in formal NYU rules adopted by the Board of Trustees. The current rules are found in the University’s statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Title I and II reprinted in the Faculty Handbook (2008 ed.) at pp.
5.1. Acceleration of Schedule

5.1.1. Proposals for early promotion to associate professor and for tenure must be considered extraordinary actions. Indeed, it is not normally in the best interest of a candidate or of the institution to propose candidates for tenure ahead of schedule. The Provost must be consulted prior to the preparation of an early case. The best reason for proposing early consideration is a record of extraordinary accomplishment that can be readily distinguished from strong cases. External letter writers must be asked to comment specifically on the special grounds for an early decision. The Faculty Review Committee must also specifically address this issue. Even with these affirmative recommendations, the Director will not recommend early tenure unless the case is extraordinary and compelling in relation to the already high expectations for candidates reviewed under the usual schedule.

5.2. Stopping the Tenure Clock

5.2.1. Policies for tenure clock stoppage are set forth in formal NYU rules adopted by the Board of Trustees. These rules are found in the Faculty Handbook (2008 edition) in the Work Load Relief Policy (pp. 53-54) and the statement on Tenure Clock Stoppage for Personal Reasons (Faculty Handbook (pp. 54-55), available at http://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/FacHbk2008.pdf.

6. Additional Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor and for Tenured External Appointments

6.1. Promotion to Full Professor

6.1.1. The procedure for promotion to the Full Professorship is essentially the same as for a tenure candidate: Is the candidate for promotion among the strongest in her/his field, in comparison with scholars at similar points in their careers at other comparably prominent institutions or in other relevant settings? There is an additional presumption that the candidate will have achieved a significant milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of awarding tenure. The normal expectation will be published and recognized work that marks significant new scholarly research and/or curatorial achievement and/or archaeological achievement and/or distinction in conservation since the conferring of tenure. The docket must clearly indicate which work distinguishes the candidate’s achievements since the last review for promotion.

6.2. Tenured External Appointments

6.2.1. For appointments at the rank of full professor with tenure, the vote and authority reside with the full professors in the IFA. For appointments at the rank of associate professor with tenure, the vote and authority reside with all tenured faculty members in
the IFA. The vote should be reported by numbers. While the IFA Faculty cherishes its long and productive tradition of consensual decisions and open, recorded votes on tenured appointments, the IFA Director will offer the option of a secret ballot, and provide materials to conduct such a procedure if the faculty decides to exercise that option.

6.2.2. The IFA Search Committee which shall have been appointed in accordance with IFA policy will obtain at least five (5) letters of evaluation from highly qualified external evaluators selected according to the principles outlined in Sections 3.5 above. The Search Committee and/or the IFA Director may choose to include additional letters from outside evaluators that have been suggested by the candidate or who are co-authors or the thesis advisor of the candidate, provided that this information is clearly noted in the docket. Evaluators selected normally will hold a tenured position as a full professor in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, a position of equivalent rank in an academic unit that does not grant tenure, or a position of equivalent rank in a non-academic institution (e.g., museum, conservation center, or research institute). Letters solicited from individuals selected by the candidate can be included as supplementary information as long as their provenance is clearly identified.

6.2.3. It is helpful for the IFA Director’s report to include the justification for establishing or filling a tenured position within the IFA in the candidate's field of expertise. The report also must include a summary of the recommendations of the Search Committee and must identify the external referees consulted by the IFA in the search process, indicating which were suggested by the candidate and which were selected by the IFA. The report also may include letters from other Search Committee referees as supplemental materials to the docket. In all cases a full docket must be submitted.

6.2.4. The docket must include a description of the candidate’s teaching and an indication of how the candidate will meet the teaching needs of the IFA. If evaluations are not available, alternative assessment of teaching ability must be provided by the Chair of the Search Committee.

6.2.5. The IFA Director will make his/her recommendation to the Provost. This constitutes the definitive recommendation and must be accompanied by the docket and the recommendation of the eligible voting faculty.

7. Sample Solicitation Letters

7.1 Tenure and Promotion Review

Dear xxxx:

Josephine Smith, currently an Assistant Professor at the Institute of Fine Arts, is being considered for tenure and promotion. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of her published and unpublished research and scholarship.
I am enclosing Professor Smith's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies and/or descriptions of her work. Of particular value to us would be your candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor Smith’s scholarly research with respect to originality, scope, and significance. We would equally welcome your consideration of Professor Smith’s potential for sustained contributions to the field and further intellectual growth. We also request explicit and specific comparisons of her work with that of the most prominent scholars working in the field of xxxx who are at comparable as well as more advanced points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor Smith’s service to and standing in the professional community, we would appreciate your thoughts on these matters as well. Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor Smith would be considered a compelling candidate for promotion and tenure in your and other leading departments in the field.

We will need your letter within six weeks. Please forward to me a current curriculum vitae as well.

Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the tenured professors of the IFA, and appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University.

Thank you for generously assisting us. I realize scholarly evaluation is a time-consuming task, but as you know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review.

Sincerely,

7.2 Sample Solicitation Letter, External Senior Appointment

Dear xxxx:

Professor John Smith of the University West at East is being considered for a tenured appointment at the rank of full professor in the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of his research and scholarship.

I am enclosing Professor X's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies or descriptions of his work. Of particular value to us would be your candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor X's research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, scope, and significance. We would equally welcome your consideration of Professor X’s potential for sustained contributions to the field and for further intellectual growth. We also request an explicit comparison of his work with that
of the most prominent scholars working in the same field who are at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor X's teaching ability or service to the professional community, we would appreciate your thoughts on these matters as well. Please indicate in your letter how long and in what specific capacities you have known Professor X.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor X would be considered a compelling candidate for appointment as a full professor in your or other leading departments in the field.

We will need your letter within six weeks, sooner if possible. Please forward to me a current curriculum vitae as well.

Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the tenured professors of the IFA, and appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University.

Thank you for generously assisting us. I realize scholarly evaluation is a time-consuming task, but as you know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review.

Sincerely
Incorporates Review by Provost Office and Office of General Counsel, January 10, 2011 and ISAW Faculty Input of January 11, 2011

Institute for the Study of the Ancient World
New York University
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The guidelines given in this document are to be read in the context of the statement “New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines” (available at http://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-and-guidelines/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines.html) and of the policy statements on academic tenure in the Faculty Handbook (2008 ed.).

These guidelines recognize the special circumstances of the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World (“ISAW”), including its small faculty size and the absence of a departmental structure. Should ISAW substantially grow or change its structure, these guidelines will be modified accordingly through the same process by which they were adopted.

1. Standards.

1.1. A high standard of excellence and effectiveness in tutorial instruction, research seminars, and the direction of research in the context of a research university, together with the promise of effective contributions toward the work and intellectual life of ISAW and NYU, are prerequisite for tenure and promotion at ISAW. Once these prerequisites are met, a candidate must have a record of outstanding scholarly research and publication. In the absence of such a record, tenure or promotion will not be granted.

1.2. The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure and promotion is an inquiry. Is the candidate for tenure or promotion among the strongest in his/her field, in comparison with other scholars in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of ISAW? It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement. Each case must be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses that may be improved.

2. Promotion and Tenure Committees.

2.1. Because of its relatively small size and lack of a departmental structure, the Director of the ISAW will appoint an ad hoc Faculty Review Committee for each case of tenure or promotion, with members typically chosen from ISAW as well as other NYU faculties. A recommendation is made that one member of the ad hoc committee be appointed by someone other than the director, such as the Dean of FAS. This will prevent the appearance that the process is under the total control of the Director.

2.2. In the case of initial appointment to tenure rank, the Faculty Review Committee will be composed of the tenured members at or above the proposed rank of the candidate who served on the search committee. If there are fewer than three such members on the search committee, the Director of ISAW will appoint additional members from among the eligible faculty of ISAW or
from other closely related faculties in the University to create a quorum of three. The Director will appoint a Chair of the Faculty Review Committee from among the members of the Committee, who will administer the business of the Committee.

2.3 In the case of reviews of faculty members already serving at ISAW, the Faculty Review Committee will be composed of three members at appropriate rank who will be appointed by the Director. It is suggested that one member of this committee be appointed by someone other than the Director, such as the Dean of FAS. If there are too few ISAW faculty members suitable for service on a particular Committee, the Director of ISAW will appoint appropriate members from other closely related faculties in the University to create a quorum of three. The Director will appoint a Chair of the Faculty Review Committee, who will administer the business of the Committee. The Director will not attend the meetings of the Faculty Review Committee. The vote of the Committee members will be by closed ballot and reported by numbers.

2.4 It is the responsibility of the Faculty Review Committee to gather the relevant materials for the case, both from the candidate and from a minimum of five external referees. All letters to outside referees are sent by the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee on behalf of the committee. The materials gathered by the Faculty Review Committee, together with its assessment of the candidate, form the docket that goes to the full tenured faculty of the Institute for its consideration.

3. Materials included in the docket.


3.2. Assessment of teaching performance and potential. This assessment is to be specific to the character of ISAW’s doctoral program, focusing on the leading of research seminars, the supervision of research, and the conducting of tutorial instruction. The docket may include the following information:

   - Candidate’s statement of teaching philosophy and practices
   - Syllabi or descriptions of seminars
   - List of doctoral students directed and committees served on
   - Record of observation of teaching
   - Student evaluations, including letters solicited from students or former students

3.3. Assessment of the candidate’s record of contributions to the work of the Institute, of the University, and of the larger academic community, or of potential for such contributions.

3.4. Assessment of the candidate’s scholarly work. This assessment should consider not only the quality of the candidate’s published and forthcoming work but its specific suitability to ISAW’s distinctive mission. The docket should include, as appropriate, the following information and documents:

   - Candidate’s statement of research aims and plans
   - Copies of major and representative scholarly publications
External assessments of the candidate’s publications, including reviews
Copies of any earlier reviews (in the case of internal candidates for tenure)
List of the external referees, with brief indication of their scholarly interests and
reason for their selection
The external referees’ letters

3.5 The five referees should not be scholars with whom the candidate has had a close
association, such as a dissertation adviser. (Co-authors should not be included unless the
association is relatively minor or unless the candidate’s work is in a narrow field where it would
be difficult to find enough equally qualified referees.) The referees should be suggested by
members of the Faculty Review Committee or in consultation with external experts, not by or in
consultation with the candidate. In the event that five independent scholars cannot be identified,
additional letters may come from scholars who have an association with the candidate, but any
such connection shall be disclosed.

4. Review by the ISAW Faculty.

4.1 The docket prepared by the Faculty Review Committee will be made available to the entire
tenured faculty of ISAW, except that in the case of promotion to the rank of Professor only those
members at that rank may participate in the process. The faculty will vote whether to accept
the recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee and will submit its recommendation to the
Director. The vote must be by closed ballot and tallied following departmental custom or
departmental decision.

5. Review by the Director.

5.1 The Director of ISAW is responsible for evaluating the docket and making a
recommendation to the Provost. The Director will consider the recommendation of the Faculty
Review Committee and the vote of the full ISAW faculty in preparing this recommendation. The
director must forward the report of the committee as well as the results of the closed vote
(including the number of positives, negatives and abstentions) to the Provost. The Director will
inform the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee and the candidate of the recommendation. In
the case of a recommendation contrary to the vote of the faculty, the Director will provide the
Chair of the Faculty Review Committee with reasons for the recommendation, and the Chair of
the Faculty Review Committee will have an opportunity for further information or counter-
argument before the Director makes a final recommendation to the Provost.

5.2 In the case of internal candidacies, the Director of ISAW ordinarily will submit the docket to
the Provost with a recommendation no later than March 1.


6.1 In the case of a Joint Appointment between ISAW and another school of the University, the
Faculty Review Committee must include members selected from ISAW and the relevant
academic department in the other school. The eligible faculty of ISAW and the eligible faculty
of the other school shall vote whether to accept the recommendation of the Faculty Review
Committee, and the votes shall be forwarded to the Director of ISAW and the Dean of the other school, respectively. The ISAW Director and the Dean will forward a joint decision to the Provost. If the ISAW Director and the Dean find themselves in disagreement, they will discuss the case jointly and individually with the Provost.

7. **Review by the Provost.**

7.1 The Provost will evaluate each docket, including the ISAW Director’s recommendation. The Provost may convene an ad hoc committee to advise him or her on ISAW promotion and tenure cases.

7.2 The Provost will support or oppose the ISAW Director’s recommendation in his/her final decision and will inform the Director of his/her pending decision. In those cases in which the Provost’s decision is contrary to the recommendation of the Director, the Provost will provide the Director with the reasons and give the Director an opportunity to provide further information or counter-argument before the Provost issues a final decision. The Provost will notify the Director of the final decision, along with reasons for the decision if the Director’s recommendation is disapproved.

8. **Guidelines for Appeal.**

8.1 In the event of a negative decision on tenure or promotion, the candidate shall have the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of NYU’s Faculty Grievance Procedures appearing at pp. 56-58 of the Faculty Handbook (2008 ed.), available at http://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/FacHbk2008.pdf.
May 11, 2011

MEMORANDUM

TO: Provost David McLaughlin

FROM: Robert Schacht
Chairperson, Faculty Senators Council
A/Y 2010-2011

RE: Faculty Senators Council Recommendation: Institute for the Study of the Ancient World (ISAW) and Institute of Fine Arts (IFA) Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

At the May 5, 2011 meeting of the Faculty Senators Council, the attached recommendation was approved.

CC: Carol Morrow, Associate Provost
Bonnie Brier, Senior Vice President & Secretary of the University
Leona Chamberlin, Associate General Counsel
Peter Gonzalez, Assistant Provost for Academic Appointments
Daniel Zwanziger, FSC Vice Chairperson
Carol Hutchins, FSC Secretary
Floyd Hammack, FSC Immediate Past Chair
Marie Monaco, FSC Tenure Modifications Committee Chair
May 5, 2011

Dear Provost McLaughlin:

The Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the Institute of Fine Arts (IFA) and the Institute for the Study of Ancient Worlds (ISAW) were considered by the Tenure Modifications Committee (TMC) and discussed by the Faculty Senators’ Council (FSC) at the meeting held on May 5, 2011. It was concluded that more time was needed to investigate a variety of issues raised by the members, but there was unanimous agreement on a set of recommendations that appear below. The Council members expressed the desire to open a dialog with the administration on this issue.

Recommendations from the Tenure Modifications Committee, approved unanimously by the Faculty Senators’ Council, regarding Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the Institute of Fine Arts and the Institute for the Study of Ancient Worlds.

1. In both cases, although associated with FAS in that degree programs are granted through FAS, IFA and ISAW function independently in the sense that the Directors in both cases report directly to the Provost. As such, the Directors have the sole responsibility for making tenure recommendations, with no input from any other Dean. In this respect, the Directors function as Deans. It was suggested by the TMC and unanimously approved by the FSC that these institutes follow the guidelines for Courant, which state that the recommendation of the Director is in addition to that of the Dean of FAS.

2. In both instances (IFA and ISAW) the Director is solely responsible for appointing the tenure review committees. We recommend that one of the three members be appointed by someone else, such as the Dean of FAS, to avoid the perception that the process is under the total control of a single individual.

3. The committee recommended that the directors not attend the meetings of the review committees to avoid any perception that pressure is being exerted on the members. Likewise the committee felt it was inappropriate that the deputy director of IFA should be a member and chair of each review committee. The committee also questioned the rationale for having the Chair of the IFA Conservation Center serve on the Review Committee, even in an ex officio capacity.

4. Lastly, the TMC and FSC felt that in both cases the University-wide guidelines must be followed with respect to all balloting being closed, regardless of the tradition at IFA, and that all results should be reported by the numbers.

Sincerely,

Marie Monaco (Chair of the Tenure Modifications Committee)

Members of the Tenure Modifications Committee: Susan Anton, Bruce Bogart, Carl Lebowitz, Marie Monaco (Chair), Eric Simon and Raghu Sundaram
May 10, 2011

MEMORANDUM

TO: President John Sexton
    Provost David McLaughlin
    Executive Vice President Michael Alfano

FROM: Robert Schacht
      Chairperson, Faculty Senators Council
      A/Y 2010-2011

RE: Faculty Senators Council Resolutions regarding Shared Governance

At the May 5, 2011 meeting of the Faculty Senators Council, the attached resolutions were approved.

CC: Ron Robin, Senior Vice Provost
    Carol Morrow, Associate Provost
    Diane Yu, Chief of Staff and Deputy to the President
    Daniel Zwanziger, FSC Vice Chairperson
    Carol Hutchins, FSC Secretary
    Floyd Hammack, FSC Immediate Past Chair
    Ted Magder, FSC Chair-Elect
    Christine Harrington, FSC Governance Committee Chair
Resolutions of the Faculty Senators Council
Regarding Shared Governance
Approved 5/5/11

At the May 5, 2011 meeting of the Faculty Senators Council, the Council approved by a unanimous vote the following resolutions:

A. There are 5 basic features of shared governance:

1. Representation

WHEREAS: Shared governance means that input from the faculties’ duly elected representatives (FSC) is central to the process of “consulting with faculty”,

IT IS RESOLVED: That the Faculty’s Senate Council will have representatives, selected by the FSC, on University Committees, Taskforces, or other like bodies dealing with all matters that affect faculty and university policy.

2. Information

BACKGROUND: The Faculty Senators’ Council functions as the personnel committee for the faculty. As such, it is obligated to represent the faculty’s interest in dealing with the administration, and to insure that the faculty is informed on issues that pertain to them and impact their well-being. It has been common practice by the administration to impose a rule requiring confidentiality with respect to deliberations on certain topics, such as, but not limited to, benefits. This practice is referred to as “deliberative privilege”.

WHEREAS: This practice prevents the faculty from obtaining timely knowledge concerning issues that affect them, and

WHEREAS: This practice prevents the administration from obtaining valuable feedback from the FSC, and when appropriate, from the entire faculty,

IT IS RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senators’ Council does not support the practice of a code of confidentiality, also known as “deliberative privilege”, except in cases concerning information specific to individuals, whose privacy rights transcend the need for transparency, and cases involving university negotiating positions with external financial entities.
3. Consultation

WHEREAS: Shared governance means seeking and evaluating faculty input before decisions that affect faculty are made and adequately responding to faculty input,

IT IS RESOLVED: That when a decision is not pressing, a reasonable length of time for consultation must be provided (i.e., during semesters this means a few weeks in order to have at least one FSC meeting). During the summer when FSC is not in session, decisions should be postponed. If a decision is absolutely necessary during the period when the FSC is not in session, then all efforts must be made to communicate with the FSC Executive Committee, who will take appropriate actions to inform all Senators.

4. Reasoned Justifications

WHEREAS: Accountability is an important element of the consultation process,

IT IS RESOLVED: That when FSC advice is not taken, the Administration will provide, in writing, its reasons for not accepting the FSC’s advice developed through the process of consultation.

5. Communications

WHEREAS: Access to information is fundamental to policymaking,

IT IS RESOLVED: That FSC Senators will circulate, through their Schools and departments, the agreement FSC worked out with the Administration (see Memo from Provost McLaughlin, 3/3/2011), which allows Senators access to email addresses of all faculty for the purpose of communicating with the faculty (their constituents).

IT IS RESOLVED: That FSC Senators are obligated to keep their respective faculty informed on an ongoing basis.

B. Implementation Process:

In May 2011, the FSC-GC will assemble instructions for revising the Faculty Handbook so as to incorporate the text of the above Resolutions on Shared Governance. The FSC-GC will circulate copy-edited pages of the Faculty Handbook to all current Faculty Senators in June, request comments and edits from all Senators, incorporate these edits, and formally propose such revisions to the Faculty Handbook at the first FSC meeting in fall 2011.
Resolution of the Faculty Senators Council
Regarding Motions and Voting Procedure
Approved 5/5/11

At the May 5, 2011 meeting of the Faculty Senators Council, the Council approved the following resolution:

Amendment to The Rules of Procedure
Faculty Senators Council

Background & Rationale

In order to have items of business which require votes receive the fullest consideration by all members of FSC we should build in enough time to have such items distributed in writing to the Council in advance of debate. Most motions will have originated from and been deliberated and edited by FSC committees.

Rule of Procedure (add to section "IV Regular and Special Meetings")

The text of all substantive motions to be considered at a regular meeting of the Faculty Senators Council must be submitted to the FSC Coordinator by Monday 10:00 am of the week of the regular FSC meeting. The agenda, text of motions, and supporting materials shall be distributed to the members by Tuesday, mid-day before regular FSC meetings. A motion from the floor is possible but, without this prior notice and documentation, the vote will normally take place at the next FSC meeting following the debate and in exceptional cases by e-mail no less than one week after the debate.

This will be effective beginning academic year 2011-2012.