

RULES COMMITTEE

February 19, 2020

Present: Robert Gregory (Heath and Movement Studies), Matthew Miller (Environment, Geography and Marine Science), Jeffrey Webb (Chemistry), Paul Levatino (Social Work-Marriage and Family Therapy) (minutes)

Absent: none

Robert Gregory Called the meeting to Order at 12:15PM

Topic	Discussion	Action Item
Chair charge for the meeting	<p>The chair called the group order and presented a vision of past tasks of the rules committee:</p> <p>The constitution and by-laws are with the executive committee for additional review. The chair reports that there are small changes and suggestions coming forward, however there are no substantial changes at this point in time.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>The by-laws can be approved by the senate by vote. After by-laws approval, the Constitution will move forward with a faculty referendum vote. The RC chair will investigate and liaison with the committee responsible for that forthcoming task.</p>
	<p>The committee is evaluating charges involving Promotion and Tenure, and perhaps renewal. The group discussed realistic work expectations based on its composition size (4 members) and potential charges.</p> <p>The chair introduced a new subject: The RC was asked to make recommendation around whether it is advantageous for a faculty candidate for P or T to be able to continue to add materials to a file after the “sealing deadline.” The sealing deadline is currently a fluid deadline with candidates eligible to add to materials after formal “sealing.”</p>	<p>The RC agreed that it is cleaner if a file is consistently reviewed with identical content along the P&T process. Therefore, the RC recommends that applicants get a hard deadline.</p>
	<p>Candidates’ withdrawal of P & T file. A candidate can withdraw a file for promotion in the current language. The RC was tasked with a recommendation whether language should include language to withdraw an application. The RC recommended that a candidate could withdraw a file for tenure under a caveat outlined in the action criteria to left.</p>	<p>RC chair will check with Union representative to ensure this recommendation does not impact any other contract language.</p>

	The committee was asked to review whether a faculty member of one rank going for P & T should be allowed to submit a letter for another faculty member of a different rank going up for P & T.	The committee was tied 2 in favor, two against this rule.
	The committee reviewed a request that the language in the P & T process II, P. item 4 page 9, re: <i>Each candidate may also include supporting letters from colleagues inside or outside of his/her department.</i> A proposal was put forward to change to: "Each candidate shall include"	The committee unanimously voted to keep the language as is.
	The committee reviewed a request for clarification re: Faculty Senate reconsider the statement that a faculty member may have supporting letters from any colleague provided they do not play a formal role in <i>"their"</i> P & T process."	The RC agreed to support the faculty senate review this language and make the language clearer.
	Would it be possible for Faculty Senate to review the process of the opportunity to appear personally before representatives of the P & T Committee? Are there procedures that ensure all interviews are conducted with consistency from candidate to candidate? What actions might be taken should a candidate feel that questions posed were not relevant to the evaluation of the file? What consideration is given to candidates who opt out of the interview process?	While the RC is unaware of specific inconsistencies in the interview process, we recommend the P&T committee members look at ways to ensure consistency throughout the process including, and not limited to, standardized questions to candidates.
Motion to Adjourn	Motion to adjourn was made and passed at 1:37PM	Motioned seconded Meeting adjourned

Respectfully Submitted, Paul Levatino