

To: Faculty Senate
From: Senator Pam Schlomann
Date: February 8, 2006

I would like to bring forward at the March meeting a motion to add the following amendment to the Ad Hoc P & T Committee report:

Under Part I, Section A, add number five, to read as follows:

- a. If all recommendations are positive, the sequence of reviews of all applications for promotion and tenure are as follows: Department committee, Department chair, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, Dean, Provost, President, and Board of Regents.
- b. If a candidate is not recommended for tenure by the Department committee, Department chair, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, or Dean, the application will automatically be reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee prior to being forwarded to the Provost.
- c. If a candidate is not recommended for promotion by the Department committee, Department chair, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, or Dean, the application shall not be considered further, unless the candidate appeals to the next level. If the candidate does appeal, the sequence of the process shall follow that stated in b.

Justification:

The last Senate meeting there was a tied vote, broken by the Senate chair to delete section 5.

During the debate important issues were noted on both sides of the debate:

1. The importance of protecting the integrity of the academy by ensuring that a) individuals are not inappropriately promoted or tenured and b) peer review is not undermined.
2. The importance of protecting the rights of individuals by ensuring a) they are not capriciously blocked from promotion and tenure and b) the doctrine of no surprises is not violated.

Additional points were noted:

1. Without opportunity to consider positively evaluated applications, evaluating the appropriateness of a negatively evaluated application is difficult.
2. Due to proximity, the department on one hand is most knowledgeable about the candidate, but also may be least objective.

This proposed amendment seeks to balance all of the issues and not to weigh solely on one side or the other. Having both positive and negative recommendations go to a college committee provides an opportunity for additional peer recommendations from those not as closely connected with the applicant and yet who still share some common understandings of the discipline. This provides protection to both the academy and to the individual. It also provides the college committee an opportunity to compare positive and negative recommendations.

Additionally, the proposed amendment addresses one of the concerns which initiated the creation of the Ad Hoc P & T Committee. The work of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee is enormous. Each year they must review applications for tenure and promotion from approximately 75 individuals. Approximately 25% of these have received a negative recommendation from a lower level. In order for this committee to thoroughly review these appeals, reducing their total workload is appropriate. It is not unusual to have an appeal committee only review cases which have had negative outcomes