

## Procedures About the Level of the College

### M37F

Where University regulations (AR II-1.0-1.III.I) require that “Whenever a recommendation to promote and/or grant tenure is disapproved at any level, this fact shall be reported back to the preceding level(s) with supporting reasons and an opportunity provided for a thorough discussion of the recommendation among the concerned parties,” the SACPT committee confirmed that the Vice President “after receiving the recommendation from the Area Committee, did indeed interact with and report back to” the Dean, “before arriving at his final decision,” and that the Dean “was asked for any additional supporting input to offset the negative recommendations...”

### B53B

When a faculty member denied tenured at the level of the Dean appealed, the SACPT recommended a seventh year new review. The President concurred, adding “Two aspects of the case trouble me from the standpoint of basic fairness: 1) misrepresentation as to why \_\_\_ did not comment went all the way to the College Advisory Committee; and 2) lack of negative feedback prior to the no tenure decision. Therefore, in an effort to assure that you receive every consideration, I am agreeable to a 7<sup>th</sup> year review provided you waive notice requirements in writing and agree not to raise inadequate notice in this, or any other proceeding.” Faculty member agreed, was considered in a 7<sup>th</sup> year review, and was awarded tenure.

### B56D

Faculty member, denied promotion and tenure at the level of the Chancellor, appealed that an Open Records Request had shown that neither the Dean of the Graduate School nor the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs had been solicited to provide a recommendation on the merits of the case prior to the Chancellor rendering final decision. The SACPT wrote “it is the opinion of the Privilege and Tenure Committee that [his] dossier should have been sent to the Graduate Dean for review. The committee views this oversight as a significant procedural error and recommends that [his] dossier be reactivated at the Chancellor’s office level, and that the procedures from that point be reinitiated. In some sectors, the area committee reviews a promotional dossier after the Graduate Dean which allows the committee to consider the Dean’s opinion in their deliberations. The Vice Chancellor should also provide an opinion in writing to accompany the dossier.” The President concurred, and directed that the SACPT’s recommendations be followed. The dossier was then sent to the Dean of the Graduate School, who submitted a letter, and a letter obtained from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (it was not sent to the Area Committee again subsequent to obtaining the Graduate School Dean’s recommendation).