

## COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE

### Motions on Handbook Language Concerning the Tenure Review Board March 5, 2004

**Motion 1:** CFG moves that the underlined language be removed from and the **bold** language be added to Section VIII, Parts F and G on pages 121-122 of the Faculty Handbook.

#### F. Review of Negative Tenure Decisions

1. A faculty member who is denied tenure **but believes that his or her case received inadequate consideration**

areas can be added to the candidate's file if TRB calls for a reconsideration of the case by the Tenure Appeal Committee.

AAUP guidelines on this topic use this exact language: "The basic function of a review committee should be to determine whether the appropriate faculty body gave *adequate consideration* [emphasis added] to the faculty member's candidacy in reaching its decision.... It is easier to state what the standard 'adequate consideration' does not mean than to specify in detail what it does. It does not mean that the review committee should substitute its own judgment for that of members of the [tenure committee]...." TRB and CAPT have tried to capture this spirit in the proposed language.

If this motion passes the faculty, TRB will then bring its operating code into line with this language.

**Motion 2:** CFG moves that the underlined language be removed from Section VIII, Part E, Paragraph 2 on page 119 of the Faculty Handbook.

2. The CAPT shall annually disseminate its calendar, its operating code, and the operating code of the Tenure Review Board and the Tenure Appeal Committee to all faculty.

**Rationale:** This is housekeeping. TRB and CAPT are (int