

**Report on Activities of the
Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure
for the 1997-1998 Academic Year**

(Note: this is not an annual report prepared by the committee [which cannot be located at this time] but is instead a summary of committee activities prepared by “genericizing” the minutes of its meetings for the year).

Only a single promotion/tenure case was heard by the committee.

Initially, the committee chair met with the appellate to review the particular. The chair then outlined to the committee the basis of the appeal, summarizing the appeal and the supporting appendices. The appellate had been denied promotion with tenure by the Chancellor. The appellate requested a meeting with the committee, but the committee wished to examine the appeal and supporting appendices beforehand. The committee agreed to a confidentiality-protecting procedure in which the committee Chair would arrange that photocopies of the documents be delivered to the committee members. After review, the committee members would convene to determine which issues should be pursued in meeting with the appellate, and whether additional information from the appellate’s department would be needed.

Two months later, the committee met and identified two major issues to be addressed with additional information (1) the original job application for the appellate’s special title series appointment provided to the appellate at the time of the appellate’s application for the position and (2) the job description and criteria for promotion and tenure for the Special Title Series in Anthropology that received the approval of the Academic Area Advisory Committee. The committee Chair agreed to request that the department chairperson would provide copies of these documents within two weeks. The committee chair would see to it that copies of these documents would be distributed to the committee members. The committee agreed that the Chair would invite the appellate to speak to the committee at the next meeting.

One month later, the committee heard the appellate present the case (a third party invited by the appellate attended as an observer). A question and answer period followed, after which the appellate and third party left and a committee discussion ensued to decide whether there was sufficient information to write a recommendation to the President and Faculty Senate. The committee determined that the case represented a clear cut violation of the Administrative Regulations since the appellate did not receive an approved job description at the time of appointment and their were not criteria specific for promotion and tenure in the appellate’s Special Title Series position. The committee expressed some concern that this case has implications for several other faculty in similar positions in the College of Arts and Sciences. The committee Chair agreed to draft a memo to the President and Faculty Senate to notify them of the findings of the committee’s investigation of the case. He also agreed to notify the appellate that the committee’s deliberations were complete and that the appellate should expect to hear shortly from the administration about the disposition of the case