

Report of the Senate Academic Affairs Committee , 4 December 2013

What follows is a brief summary of the Senate Academic Affairs Committee's discussion of the Report on Promotions at its November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

There was unanimous belief that the proposed timetable for discussing the Report and acting on its recommendations is unrealistic and contrary to the interests of a reasoned, deliberative, and inclusive debate. All members felt that only by extending the discussion and including more faculty voices could the Senate act in an informed manner to possibly reach consensus on the nature of the problems and the most prudent solutions relevant to promotions. (Indeed, because of insufficient time we ourselves were unable to address the Report's recommendations during our hour-long discussion.) Moreover, the committee concurred that the fullest discussion of the Report should allow for the participation of the incoming Chancellor and his administration, which would add vital new perspectives to important and complex matters.

Other concerns shared by all present included, among others, the following:

- Because input by faculty is ongoing and incomplete the Report's authority and credibility are diminished. Questions were raised about why the polling of faculty was not begun immediately in spring 2013, and instead delayed until fall 2013. Moreover, members noted the Report makes no mention of any faculty opposed to the Report's recommendations, another indication that faculty polling is not as comprehensive as it needs to be.
- Members present noted that the two Senate committees that currently deal with promotions were mentioned but not adequately discussed in the Report. It is our understanding that both The Senate Committee on Appointments and Promotions and The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Professional Ethics have long been part of tenure and promotion processes, and their roles need to be integrated into the Report.
- The Report alludes to inconsistencies and differences in promotion policy among academic units, but offers few specific descriptions that might illuminate the problems the Report alleges.
- The Report alludes to the need for deans and the provost to act with alacrity to promote colleagues being courted by other institutions, but provides no data on the frequency of this occurrence.
- Though gender is mentioned in the Report as a factor when it comes to promotion and retention, race/ethnicity is not. This struck the members as an important omission.

Respectfully submitted,  
Harvey Teres (Acting Chair)