

## **TENURE REVIEW BOARD Annual Report 2014-2015**

In the fall we reviewed and revised our operating code, and forwarded it to FEC to be posted on the faculty governance website. The updated version is attached as Appendix A.

We reviewed changes proposed by CAFR to their Operating Code concerning the relationship between CAFR and the TRB. The following language was added to the CAFR Operating Code:

In the event that a faculty member brings a complaint to CAFR and the Tenure Review Board (TRB) simultaneously, the complainant may waive his/her right to confidentiality to allow CAFR to communicate directly with the TRB to best serve the complainant's interests. If it is the wish of the complainant to waive confidentiality, s/he will directly notify the chairs of both CAFR and TRB of his/her intention to waive confidentiality.

In consultation with CAPT and CAFR, the TRB made revisions to the Faculty Handbook. These were presented at the March 27 Faculty Meeting and voted in at the April 24 Faculty Meeting, and are attached as Appendix B.

The committee received no petitions for appeal of negative tenure decisions.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mary Crone Odekon, Chair

### **Members 2014-2015**

Mary Crone Odekon (2012-2015), Chair  
Paul Sattler (2013-2016)  
Christine Page (2014-2017)

### **Members 2015-2016**

Grace Burton, 2015-2018  
Sonia Silva (Sabbatical replacement for Paul Sattler, 2015-2016)  
Aldo Vacs (Sabbatical replacement for Christine Page, 2015-2016)

## **Appendix A: TENURE REVIEW BOARD OPERATING CODE, 2014-2015**

### **FUNCTION:**

To review a negative tenure recommendation at the request of the candidate. In the event that the Tenure Review Board determines that a tenure case requires reconsideration, the three members of the TRB will sit together with the six members of the CAPT, as the Tenure Appeal Committee, to reconsider the case.

### **MEMBERSHIP:**

Three tenured faculty members, each elected to serve a three-year term, at least one of whom has previously served on the CAPT. All members of the Board must have been tenured for at least two years. No two members may be from the same department. Faculty currently serving on the CAPT, CAFR or FAB are not eligible. No member of the Tenure Review Board may sit for the review of a candidate in his/her department. The FEC will provide replacements for such reviews as needed.

### **PROCEDURES:**

(Note that procedures must be consistent with Faculty Handbook language on "Review of Negative Tenure Decisions.")

#### **FALL SEMESTER**

The Tenure Review Board will determine the committee Chair, review the Operating Code, and forward the updated Operating Code to the FEC.

#### **SPRING SEMESTER**

1. A faculty member who is denied tenure but believes that his or her case received inadequate consideration may petition the Tenure Review Board for a review. Such a review must be requested by January 15th of the year following the semester in which CAPT considered the case, or within 15 days of notification of denial of tenure, whichever is later. The candidate must submit to the TRB a letter stating in a clear and precise manner exactly how the consideration of the case is perceived as having been inadequate.

2. The Tenure Review Board will have at its disposal all of the materials contained in the original tenure file that was available to the CAPT, together with the letter referred to in number 1 above. No other materials may be added, and the TRB will restrict its inquiry to the area or areas of consideration claimed in the candidate's letter to have been inadequate. The TRB may consult with the CAPT, members of the candidate's department, and/or the DOF/VPAA, if necessary. The Board is bound by confidentiality.

3. The Tenure Review Board will convey its recommendation to the President, the DOF/VPAA, CAPT, the department Chair or program Director, and the candidate within four weeks after the petition deadline.

4. In cases where an appeal will go forward, and the Tenure Appeal Committee (TAC) is convened by the chair of the CAPT, called into existence, the Chair of the TRB will summarize for the Tenure Appeal Committee what complaints the TRB determines warrant the review. Similarly, but separately, the Chair of the TRB will summarize those issues for the candidate and his or her advocate, in the presence of the Chair of the TAC.

5. The Tenure Review Board is free to discuss with the administration or with the Chair of CAPT issues raised by a candidate that—although not warranting an appeal—nonetheless might improve future tenure deliberations.

## Appendix B: Motion from Tenure Review Board to Revise Faculty Handbook

**Motion:** The Tenure Review Board proposes the following modifications to Faculty Handbook section VIII.E.6, "Review of Negative Tenure Decisions."

### 6. Review of Negative Tenure Decisions

a. A faculty member who is denied tenure but believes that his or her case received inadequate consideration may petition the Tenure Review Board ("TRB") for a review. Such a review must be requested by January 15th of the year following the semester in which CAPT considered the case, or within 15 days of notification of denial of tenure, whichever is later. The candidate must submit to the TRB a letter stating in a clear and ~~precise~~ concise manner exactly how the consideration of the case is perceived as having been inadequate.

c. The Tenure Review Board will have at its disposal all of the materials contained in the original tenure file which was available to CAPT, together with the letter referred to in section a above. No other materials may be added, and the TRB will restrict its inquiry to the area or areas of consideration claimed in the candidate's letter to have been inadequate. The TRB may consult with CAPT; members of the candidate's department; ~~and/or~~ the Dean of the Faculty/Vice President for Academic Affairs; the Associate Dean of the Faculty for Personnel, Development, and Diversity; and others deemed necessary by the TRB to assess the petition. if necessary. The Board shall be bound by confidentiality.

#### **Rational:**

The change from "precise" to "concise" does a better job of conveying the most effective way for a candidate to explain their petition; "precise" is very similar to the accompanying word "clear," while "concise" suggest a focused letter that better guides the TRB in evaluating the petition.

The inclusion of the ADOFPDD in part c reflects the current structure of the Dean's Office, where the ADOFPDD presents cases to CAPT. The inclusion of "others deemed necessary by TRB to assess the petition" allows for cases where the TRB finds that parties other than those listed are important to consult.