



Arts & Sciences Senate

Special Meeting with Provost Lejuez

August 17, 2026

9:00 AM - 10:00 AM (Virtual)

Meeting Minutes

1. Meeting called to order at 9:04 AM
2. Welcome & Opening Remarks from A&S Senate President, F. Jason Torre
 - a. The purpose of the meeting is to solicit additional feedback on the current version of the proposed promotion and tenure revisions. No votes were to be taken at this meeting.
 - b. Major governance bodies will coordinate their review and any subsequent voting will be conducted through a coordinated ballot to ensure that the Provost's Office receives consistent feedback from the major governance groups.
 - c. The floor was then turned over to the Provost and Vice Provost for the presentation.
3. Provost Carl Lejuez' Presentation
 - a. Promotion and Tenure Procedures – University-Wide Proposals
 - i. The Provost's Office presented the current version of the proposed University promotion and tenure procedures. The presentation addressed revisions to the overall promotion and tenure process, the proposed University-wide Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, and the proposed expedited tenure review process.
 - ii. It was noted that the current draft reflects feedback received through multiple rounds of consultation and discussion with shared governance bodies.
 - iii. Key revisions included:
 1. Clock stoppages: Clarified processes for family/personal and infrastructural/professional disruptions, including guaranteed

stoppage for birth, fostering, and adoption.

2. Candidate response: Added a written response process and advisor support following an adverse departmental decision.
3. Negative votes: Added requirements for written reasons and a clear option for candidates to proceed with the review process.
4. Calendar alignment: Revised dates to better align with the review sequence, with compression of timelines handled by the central office.
5. Mid-point feedback: Added formative guidance while avoiding the creation of an additional formal review stage.
6. External evaluators: Clarified peer/aspirational expectations and permitted non-academic referees when justified.

- iv. Provost Lejuez emphasized that the proposals are intended to improve clarity, consistency, equity, and efficiency in the promotion and tenure process.

b. University-wide Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee

- i. The committee is intended to provide an additional faculty perspective at the University level following departmental and college review.
 1. The proposed committee would include 11 members, with representation designed to reflect the different schools and colleges.
 2. Three committee members would serve as initial readers for cases, with the committee otherwise reviewing cases collectively.
 3. Most cases would be placed on a consent agenda, with cases removed for discussion when requested and seconded.
 4. The committee is expected to meet approximately three to four times annually, with additional preparation and reading required.
 5. Concerns were raised regarding the workload associated with recruiting and retaining faculty members to serve, particularly at the full-professor level.
 6. Clarification was provided that the proposed committee members are not external reviewers; the committee itself would consist of SBU faculty.

7. Discussion also addressed the advisory nature of the committee and the Provost's ultimate decision-making authority.

4. Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Process Alignment Discussion

- a. Discussion emphasized the importance of clearly articulated departmental promotion and tenure criteria and ensuring that those criteria are communicated to external reviewers.
- b. The following concerns and recommendations were raised:
 - i. Departments should maintain current, written promotion and tenure criteria.
 - ii. Departmental criteria should be provided to external evaluators as part of the review process.
 - iii. Promotion and tenure guidelines across the University, including Arts & Sciences guidelines and Provost-level procedures, should be aligned to avoid confusion for candidates, department chairs, and review committees.
 - iv. A single, clearly maintained source of information was recommended for promotion and tenure procedures.
 - v. Continued coordination between shared governance bodies and the Provost's Office was encouraged when revisions are made.
 - vi. Transparency in the revision process, including documentation of changes and feedback received, was identified as important to maintaining faculty confidence in the process.

5. Transition and Implementation

- a. It was noted that the revised procedures represent the latest stage of a multi-year process and that additional feedback will be solicited before final implementation.
- b. The Provost & Vice Provost indicated that candidates should not be negatively impacted during the transition to revised procedures. Additional feedback will be reviewed and incorporated where appropriate before the documents are finalized.

6. Next Steps

- a. The major governance bodies are coordinating their review of the

proposals.

- b. Any future votes are expected to occur through a coordinated process to provide consistent feedback to the Provost's Office.
- c. Arts & Sciences Senate will continue its review in accordance with its established governance procedures and Robert's Rules.
- d. Additional opportunities for faculty feedback and discussion will be provided before voting.
- e. Continued coordination among the University Senate, Arts & Sciences Senate, and other major governance bodies.

7. Meeting was adjourned at 10:10 AM