

SENATE
Minutes of Meeting

Date: Friday, May 13, 2013

Time: 2:30pm – 5:25pm

Room: 203 Anthony P. Toldo

PRESENT: Mr. Hussein Ahmed, Mr. Mohammad Alam, Dr. Abdul-Fattah Asfour, Mr. Iftexhar Ibne Basith, Dr. Pierre Boulos, Mr. Tim Brunet, Dr. Kimberly Calderwood, Dr. Camille Cameron, Dr. Rick Caron, Dr. Allan Conway, Mr. Rob Crawford, Dr. Beth Daly, Ms. Nicole DaSilva, Dr. Carol Davison, Ms. Marilyn Farrough, Dr. Anne Forrest, Dr. Richard Frost, Dr. Phil Graniero, Dr. Jill Grant, Dr. Christopher Greig, Dr. Leo Groarke, Mr. Werner Keller, Dr. Michael Khan, Dr. Ed King, Dr. Kathryn Lafreniere, Dr. Dietmar Lage, Dr. Charles Macdonald, Ms. Maya Madolyn, Dr. Elena Maev, Dr. Kevin Milne, Dr. Mitra Mirhassani, Dr. Maureen Muldoon, Ms. Sharon Munro, Dr. Leo Oriet, Dr. Robert Orr, Mr. Julien Paquette, Dr. Linda Patrick, Dr. Stephen Pender, Dr. Chitra Rangan, Mr. Kaushik Ray, Dr. Karen Roland, Dr. Antonio Rossini, Dr. Alan Scoboria, Dr. Jang Singh, Dr. Clayton Smith, Ms. Jennifer Soutter, Dr. Shelagh Towson, Dr. Christian Trudeau, Dr. Patricia Weir, Dr. Alan Wildeman, Prof. Larry Wilson, Dr. Jeremy Worth, Ms. Charlene Yates, Mr. Hussein Zarif, Dr. Shuzhen Zhao,

REGRETS: Dr. Gordon Drake, Ms. Gwen Ebbett, Dr. Marlys Koschinsky, Dr. Martha Lee, Prof. Cyndra MacDowall, Mr. Anthony Meloche, Dr. Lydia Miljan, Dr. Derek Northwood, Ms. Erin Plumb, Rev. Thomas Rosica, Dr. Mehrdad Saif, Dr. K. W. Michael Siu, Dr. Bruce Tucker, Prof. Lionel Walsh

ABSENT: Dr. Chris Fredette, Mr. Hussein Hammoud, Dr. Maureen Irish, Mr. Tory James, Mr. Raed Kadri, Dr. Norman King, Dr. Anna Lanoszka, Dr. Chike Okecheku, Dr. Jagdish Pathak, Dr. Trevor Pitcher, Dr. Dale Rajacich, Dr. Marijke Taks, Dr. Robert Weaver, Dr. Nader Zamani

IN ATTENDANCE: Dr. Dave Andrews, Prof. Brian Brown, Dr. Simon du Toit, Prof. Brian Mazer, Ms. Renée Wintermute and Ms. Alison Zilli (University Secretariat).

1 Approval of Agenda (Unstarring agenda items)

MOTION: That the agenda be approved.

Dr. P. Boulos/Mr. W. Keller
CARRIED

2 Bylaw Business

2.1 Revising Bylaw 22 and 23 (Discussion)

(See document Sa130513-2.1 for more details.)

Senators were reminded that the purpose of this meeting is to provide feedback to the Bylaw Review Committee on Bylaws 22 and 23 (Promotion, Tenure and Renewal Criteria and Procedures). Once proposed bylaws revisions are drafted they will be circulated to the academic community for additional comments and feedback prior to being forwarded to Senate for approval. A discussion ensued.

Members were reminded that the 17 proposals/themes, presented for consideration, were received by the Bylaw Review Committee following a general call for recommendations for revisions to the promotion and tenure bylaws.

The following directional feedback was provided on the 17 key questions:

Tenure and Promotion Procedures

1. There was support for Tenure and Promotion to be a single application occurring simultaneously. Currently, some AAUs have promotion criteria that are different from tenure criteria and tenure and promotion become separate applications. It was noted that where tenure criteria exceeds the criteria for promotion, the current bylaw wording permits a single application.

2. There was support that a tenure application be required after six years of probationary appointment, provided that those wishing to apply earlier would be permitted to do so. This will provide faculty members with additional time to work on their teaching and research (*i.e.*, publish articles.) thereby helping to ensure a successful application.
3. There was a general consensus to reduce the number of reviews, but to ensure that the reviews be robust and the feedback constructive. Since there was support for the tenure application to be required after six years, it was agreed that a performance review by the Head should take place in year 1 (to provide immediate feedback), a more complete, “dry-run” review through the full process should take place in year 3 (mid-period); and the final review would then consist of the faculty member’s tenure application. However, the faculty member and possibly the Head should be able to request additional reviews, if deemed necessary.
4. There was no support for the promotion to full professor status to be decided by a Committee of Senior Academics.
5. Senate agreed that it is important to have student input in promotion and tenure reviews, however this might be best obtained. There was general agreement that student membership in promotion and tenure committees should be maintained, though the faculty:student ratio on the AAU PTR Committee and UCAPT should be reconsidered, perhaps set at a 4:1 ratio. However, students must be given a clear understanding of their role on the committee.

Tenure and Promotion Criteria

6. There was support for all AAUs to devise clear documented PTR criteria for each of teaching, research and service and that it be shared amongst colleagues and even as early as the initial interview stage. There was also support to recognize that the criteria and weighting for each of these areas will vary across AAUs. It was further noted that there should be consequences for not establishing clear criteria.
7. There was support for the AAU PTR criteria to be submitted and approved by FCC and the UCAPT to assure faculty-wide and University-wide consistency of standards.
8. There was support for all three levels of review (AAU PTR Committee, Dean and the UCAPT) to use the same AAU devised PTR criteria approved by the AAU Council, Faculty Coordinating Council and the UCAPT in arriving at their recommendations.
9. While some argued that UCAPT should review all positive and negative recommendations so that it has a frame of reference for both, many noted that members on UCAPT would bring their experiences of both positive and negative reviews from their home departments and would be equipped to assess only those recommendations that were not unanimous. UCAPT should be viewed as an oversight committee for process and to review applications that are not unanimous. The Deans are in the process to ensure corrective action if there is a concern with the AAU PTR Committee’s decision. This proposal would remove an unnecessary level of bureaucracy.
10. It was agreed that the standards for obtaining tenure and promotion should remain the same regardless of the additional year of probationary appointment. The goal is to clarify criteria rather than make them more difficult to attain. The criteria should just be made more accessible with clear benchmarks.

External Assessors for Research

11. There was support to require *at least* three letters from external assessors for tenure/promotion and promotion to full Professor. This allows flexibility for professors to submit more than three external letters. Faculty members should be made aware that the fewer the letters, the weaker the application might be. While the bylaw could set the minimum at three, a recommended number of letters from external assessors should be provided to the faculty member.
12. There was no support to require that one of the external assessors, for tenure/promotion and promotion to full Professor, be international.
13. There was support that the AAU PTR Committee must specifically address any negative written comments by an external referee.

MOTION: That the meeting go beyond 5:00pm.

Dr. J. Singh/Dr. A. Rossini
CARRIED

Teaching Assessment

14. There was no support for teaching evaluations to include peer review in addition to SET scores. However, it was suggested that faculty members could include a peer review teaching assessment as an optional component of their promotion/tenure application. It was noted that the Centre for Teaching and Learning has a peer review program for instructors who are interested in feedback. The program is optional and provides a safe forum for dialogue and discussion.

Service Assessment

15. There was strong support to increase the role of service in the PTR criteria as long as it does not overshadow the percentage/weight allocated for teaching, research, *etc.*
16. There was support for “service” to include service outside the University.

Flexible Criteria

17. There was general support (provided there are limitations) to allow the faculty member to choose which percentage/weight to attribute to each of the three areas of: 1) teaching; 2) research and scholarly activity/artistic and creative activity; and, 3) service to the university/community. Limitations would need to be set. For example, in no case shall service exceed xx%. See also #15 above.

It was agreed that, in preparing the initial draft, the Bylaw Review Committee conduct further research on the practices at universities across Ontario related to promotion, tenure and renewal.

3 Adjournment

MOTION: That the meeting be adjourned.

Dr. K. Milne/Ms. J. Soutter
CARRIED