


SEP 6 1996

College of Arts and Sciences

Department of Geography
1457 Patterson Office Tower
Lexington, Kentucky 40506-0027
606-257-2931/2
FAX: 606-323-1969

5 September 1996

To: Dr. Charles T. Wethington, Jr. President

From: Karl Raitz, 1995-96 Chair 
Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure

RE: Annual Report

Enclosed please find the 1995-96 *Annual Report* of the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure. I have filed official correspondence and minutes in the office of the Special Assistant for Academic Affairs.

Because this committee reports to your office, I have not delivered the *Annual Report* to the Chancellors or other university administrators.

On behalf of the committee members, I would like to express our appreciation for your support of committee recommendations and say that we hope that we have performed a useful service to the University and its faculty. If you would like additional information about the committee's activities this year you may reach me at 257-6948 or GEGRAITZ@UKCC.

cc: Dr. Juanita Fleming, Special Assistant for Academic Affairs
Dr. Janice Schach, Chair, Senate Council

Enclosure

5 September 1996

University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure
Annual Report, 1995-1996

The Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure held two formal meetings between September 1, 1995 and August 31, 1996. Committee members were Jeremy Popkin, Phyllis Wise, Jim Wells, Steve Yates, and Karl Raitz (chair). Of the two formal cases considered by the committee, one was a promotional appeal and the other was request for information or guidance in a question of academic procedure. After May 1st, the committee received two additional inquiries from faculty members concerning promotional appeals and one inquiry from a graduate student concerning academic freedom. Both of these latter two promotional appeals were filed with the committee within the sixty-day deadline for filing such documents after notification from the Chancellor's office that a negative decision concerning a promotional dossier had been rendered. These two cases will be processed by the committee early Fall Semester, as will the graduate student's appeal. Minutes of meetings and official correspondence have been filed in the office of the Special Assistant for Academic Affairs.

The committee followed University Senate Rules (1.4.5.2) and the Administrative Regulations (II-1.0-1, Page III-7) to guide its deliberations. When considering the promotion and tenure case the committee referred to the specific language in the Administrative Regulations which we interpreted as assigning the committee's responsibility to the consideration of "procedural matters," "privilege," and "allegations of academic freedom."

Each formal meeting was an open meeting. In both cases that the committee processed, the committee chair conducted informal visits with departmental chairs to obtain information in addition to that provided by the appellate. Additional information from email messages and phone calls to and from the appellants was obtained. The chair then compiled that information and presented it to the committee. Because both cases were thoroughly documented by the appellants the committee chose not to invite them to appear and reiterate their files but made recommendations based upon the informal interviews conducted by the chair and the submitted documents.

The promotional appeal case centered on a procedural matter. The faculty member who had been denied tenure stated that the Graduate Dean had not been consulted in the dossier review process and hence this constituted a procedural error. After consultation with university attorney Paul Van Booven about procedural matters, the committee recommended that the Chancellor's office reprocess the dossier from the point where the procedural error occurred. The second case involved an issue of communication between a faculty member and her chair, and the committee, though unclear as to whether the topic was appropriate to consider, made a recommendation to the departmental chair that a third party should be present in future discussions between the chair and the faculty member.

A final note about committee meetings: although faculty members were on campus off and on during the summer months, the two promotion appeal cases submitted in late spring could not be considered in July or August because all committee members could not be assembled for a

meeting. Any delay in processing these cases should not be construed as the fault of the appellants who were remiss in punctually submitting their appeal dossiers. It was simply not possible to schedule a meeting. I am certain that Phyllis Wise, the new committee chair, will make every effort to punctually process these cases early this semester.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Raitz', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Karl Raitz, Chair