

August 31, 1992

University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure
Annual Report, 1991-92

The Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure held five formal meetings during the academic year. The members of the committee included Dennis Clouthier, Marilyn Hamann, William Lyons and Clayton Paul. In addition, as chair of the committee, I consulted with five faculty members and a departmental faculty group whose problems did not result in a formal appeal to the committee. Of those cases heard and investigated by the committee as a whole, two involved denial of promotion to rank of full professor and one involved denial of tenure and promotion to rank of associate professor.

Summary of Cases Investigated:

1. Case of denial of promotion to full professor, Extension Title Series.

Committee found that the faculty member's promotion materials had been inadequately, and in some respects, inaccurately reviewed. The most glaring problem was the failure of the area committee to review the record in the context of the D.O.E.'s and unique position description. The committee recommended to the President a de novo review by the Extension Area Advisory Committee. The President acted on the recommendation, and the faculty member was promoted on the basis of the new review.

2. Case of denial of promotion to full professor, Regular Title Series.

Committee found that faculty member's promotion had been denied at the Dean's level, and that the dossier was not forwarded to the Chancellor and Area Committee as dictated by AR procedures. (Section III.F.2). The case was further complicated by the fact that the faculty member's promotional materials, including review letters, had been shredded by the Dean's office. The committee recommended to the Chancellor that the dossier be reconstituted as completely as possible and

submitted with explanation to the Area Advisory Committee for review.

The Chancellor acted on the recommendation, but further procedural problems ensued and the case is still pending.

3. Case of denial of promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, Regular Title Series.

Faculty member's promotion had been denied at the Dean's level after favorable review by departmental chair and faculty. Due to several questionable procedural issues, the committee recommended to the President that the faculty member's promotion materials be forwarded to the Chancellor and Area Committee for review. The President acted on the recommendation and forwarded the case to the Chancellor for action. Case is still pending.

Summary of Other Matters:

A number of other concerns or problems were brought to the Committee Chair. Most involved some abridgement of faculty rights, but the faculty members involved did not wish to file a formal complaint with the committee. These cases instead were handled by informal counseling and/or advice. In some cases, they also involved informal contacts or mediation on behalf of the faculty member.

Recommendations

1. On the basis of complaints heard by the Privilege and Tenure Committee during the 1991-92 academic year, it is apparent that discrepancies exist between units in the University regarding availability and specificity of written unit guidelines and procedures for promotion and tenure, merit reviews and appeals. It is critical that continued efforts be made to bring all units into compliance.

2. The relationship of the D.O.E., annual reviews, two and four year reviews and promotion/tenure criteria is often poorly articulated within academic units. Clarification and consistency of expectations would prevent many complaints of unfair treatment.

3. The committee strongly believes that the right of review at the Chancellor and Area Committee level should be extended to assistant professors being considered for promotion and tenure. A change in the Administrative Regulations would insure that faculty at this critical juncture would have access

to a review by the broadest possible body, the same right that is now afforded tenured faculty members seeking promotion. While faculty denied promotion and tenure at the college level can avail themselves of an appeal process, the procedures are time consuming and often inadequately understood by faculty. Further, appeals can frequently result in adversarial and acrimonious working relationships. The committee recommends the same change in Administrative Regulations as suggested by the Senate Council in January 1990.

Gretchen E. LaGodna *ML*
Chair
University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure