

**MINUTES:  
OCTOBER 4, 2017 MEETING OF THE TENURE POLICY COMMITTEE  
(Oct. 23, 2017 final draft)**

The meeting began with 13 of 19 members present, and two more arrived a bit later. Mention was first made that we have four issues before us:

1. Should the area subcommittees be retained or be replaced by College committees?
2. Should a candidate's opportunities to appeal a negative recommendation be reduced from six to three? The reduction would create more time for deliberation by the committees and administrators involved in the p/t process.
3. Should the size of the campus p/t committee be reduced from 19 to, say, seven or eight members?
4. Should an individual faculty member be limited to serving on a single p/t committee in a single year?

At the October 4 meeting the committee discussed first two issues and agreed to treat the remaining two issues at our next meeting (in two weeks, Wed., Oct. 18, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m., 312 Butler Carlton Hall).

Also, clarification was made that whatever the TPC approves goes only as a recommendation to the Faculty Senate (our committee operates under its aegis), which will in turn consider and vote on the recommendations. Those recommendations will go to the Chancellor for either final approval or a request to consider the matter further.

**AREA SUBCOMMITTEES VS. COLLEGE COMMITTEES**

A motion was made recommending that College promotion/tenure committees replace the promotion/tenure area subcommittees. Particular concern was voiced that the individual area subcommittees have very few members (three or four), resulting in the possibility of just one or two votes determining whether a given candidate receives a positive or negative subcommittee vote. A larger vote would be more indicative of the strength or weakness of a given candidate's dossier.

Before voting specifically on this motion the committee wished to clarify that each department should have one member on the College Committee. A motion

was made to that effect and was strongly approved (11-2-1—for, against, abstain). A vote was then taken on the motion to replace the area subcommittees with College committees (in the meantime, two more TPC members had arrived), and the vote passed 14-0-1 (for, against, abstain).

### SHOULD THE NUMBER OF POSSIBLE APPEALS BE REDUCED?

A motion was made to accept the following package of items pertaining to appeals:

- 1) The number of possible appeals should be reduced from six to three. Candidates can now file an appeal only upon receiving a letter from an administrator (chair, dean, provost).
- 2) If a p/t committee has a majority “no” vote or the administrator directly above that committee recommends negatively against a candidate, the administrator shall inform the candidate by letter of the negative recommendation, providing the candidate sufficient information (while maintaining confidentiality) to permit the candidate to prepare an appropriate rebuttal.
- 3) Barring extenuating circumstances, candidates wishing to file an appeal will have seven calendar days to do so.
- 4) Rebuttals will no longer be permitted to criticism within an overall positive recommendation, i.e., a majority “yes” vote of the p/t committee and a positive recommendation of the administrator directly above that committee.

As mentioned earlier, the motivation to address this whole issue is the desirability of providing the administrators and p/t committees more time for deliberation. At present the schedule is quite tight, and even with the changes the candidates would still have ample opportunity to rebut negative recommendations.

The motion passed 15-0-0 (for, against, abstain).

Respectfully submitted,

Jerry Cohen