

REPORT OF THE FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

ATTACHMENT 4.

TO THE FACULTY SENATE

CONCERNING DISCLOSURE OF PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISIONS

November 19, 1979

Over the past several months the Faculty Welfare Committee has given attention to the desirability of providing to University Faculty, on an annual basis, fairly detailed reports concerning promotion and tenure decisions. In the course of reviewing this matter, the Committee obtained and studied reports prepared by the last two Chairmen of the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion and submitted to the Faculty Senate. Copies of those reports are attached hereto as Exhibits A and B. It is the Committee's judgment that those reports are not designed to, and do not, provide reasonable disclosure of actions taken on unit tenure and promotion recommendations at the Columbia campus. The lack of information evident in Exhibits A and B may be contrasted with the considerably more complete report prepared by Elmer Schwartz when he was the Chairman of the Tenure and Promotion Committee several years ago. The "Schwartz Report" is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

The Committee has concluded that the paucity of disclosure in recent years concerning promotion and tenure is particularly startling when one considers that followers of the University's athletic teams enjoy very complete reporting of myriad statistics concerning athletic performance, e.g., rushing yardage per player, rushing yardage per game, percentage of free throws made, home runs, yards per punt and "sacks." The Committee believes that records concerning important faculty professional advancement decisions should be kept with essentially the same thoroughness and diligence as records concerning the University's athletic teams.

The Committee has concluded that it is desirable for University Faculty to receive full disclosure of promotion and tenure decisions on both aggregate and unit-by-unit bases. The Committee does not believe that it is appropriate to require disclosure of names of affected faculty or scrutiny of individual cases. The Committee does not favor action that would lead to invasions of privacy.

What the Committee seeks is the accumulation and presentation of data going back two years, plus a commitment that detailed records concerning promotion and tenure decisions will be kept in the future and made public. The Committee is interested in going back two years in order to generate data that will fill the void that presently exists. Such information will facilitate appropriate comparisons and evaluations of trends.

The Committee has discussed the desirability of detailed record keeping with Provost Borkowski and Dr. Donald Jones, Chairman of the University's Committee on Tenure and Promotion. In the course of a Welfare Committee meeting in October,

Report
Page 2
November 19, 1979

Provost Borkowski was shown a copy of a resolution very similar in form and content to Resolution A set forth below. That resolution, like Resolution A, called for the accumulation and presentation of promotion and tenure data covering the last two academic years. The Committee asked for his views concerning the resolution. Provost Borkowski replied that if the resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate, he would support it. The only significant difference between the resolution reviewed by Provost Borkowski and Resolution A below is that Paragraphs (2)-(6) of Resolution A have the words "and for each local unit" added to them. Chairman Jones indicated that he would be guided by the will of the Faculty Senate in formulating disclosure policy, although he also stated that, in his judgment, President Holderman and Provost Borkowski have the last word on the subject.

Resolution B, set forth under Resolution A, respectfully petitions the appropriate University administrative officials to supply the Faculty Senate with disclosure of the data covered by Resolution A on an on-going basis.

The Committee respectfully moves the adoption of Resolutions A and B set forth below.

RESOLUTION A

*- Approved on
December 12, 1980*

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina hereby respectfully requests appropriate officials in the University Administration to prepare a report concerning promotion and tenure decisions made during the last two academic years concerning faculty at the Columbia campus. It is the intent of this resolution that the report should include disclosure of the following data for AY 1977-78 and AY 1978-79.

- (1) For each year: number of favorable local unit tenure recommendations per college and school; number of favorable local unit promotion recommendations per college and per school.
- (2) For each year and for each local unit: number of cases in which Provost agreed with favorable local unit tenure recommendations; number of cases in which Provost agreed with favorable local unit promotion recommendations.
- (3) For each year and for each local unit, as to favorable local unit tenure recommendations: number of cases in which the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion agreed with (a) local unit, and (b) Provost.
- (4) For each year and for each local unit, as to favorable local unit promotion recommendations: number of cases in which

Report
Page 3
November 19, 1979

Committee on Tenure and Promotion agreed with (a) local unit, and (b) Provost.

(5) For each year and for each local unit, as to favorable local unit tenure recommendations: number of cases in which the President agreed with: (a) local unit, (b) Provost, and (c) University Committee on Tenure and Promotion.

(6) For each year and for each local unit, as to favorable local unit promotion recommendations: number of cases in which the President agreed with: (a) local unit, (b) Provost, and (c) University Committee on Tenure and Promotion.

RESOLUTION B

*- Approved on
Dec. 12, 1980*

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina hereby respectfully requests appropriate University administrative officials to prepare and present to the Faculty Senate an annual report supplying the information described in paragraphs (1) - (6) of Resolution A.



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Secretary

June 29, 1979

Professor Robert L. Felix
Chairman, Faculty Senate
Faculty House
Campus

Dear Bob:

In accordance with recent practice I would like to report to the faculty concerning the major operations of the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion during 1978-79, the Committee's fifth year of operation. Our major business was the consideration of 137 files involving 183 recommendations concerning tenure and promotion. The President accepted 93% of the Committee's recommendations; he supported 95% of our recommendations for promotion and 91% of our recommendations for tenure.

Another major function of the committee is to work with individual academic units in formulating and revising their tenure and promotion criteria and procedures. To date the committee has cooperated with approximately 15 units in such efforts.

Cordially,

Robert B. Patterson, Chairman
University Committee on Tenure
and Promotion

RBP/pap

cc: President Holderman
Provost Borkowski
Sub-committee Chairmen

Exhibit A



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Secretary

January 10, 1978

Professor Robert L. Felix
Chairman, Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Bob,

The University Committee on Tenure and Promotions is currently in its fourth year of operation. When the University faculty adopted the new tenure and promotion system, the Faculty Advisory Committee and the Faculty Welfare Committee were charged with reviewing the plan following the third year of operation and with soliciting comments and suggestions from the Faculty. The review took place in Spring 1977. Recommendations made by the two faculty committees were discussed by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions in April 1977. In May 1977, the University Faculty voted on changes in the tenure and promotion system which resulted in alterations now stated in the Faculty Manual regarding relevance of length of service, the maximum probationary period, external evaluation of a faculty member's scholarly activities, and written justification of votes at the unit level.

The University Committee on Tenure and Promotions is pleased to note that nearly 95% of its recommendations for 1976-77 were supported by the President and Board of Trustees. Of 107 promotion decisions, 100 were accepted by the President and Board. Of the 88 tenure decisions made by the University Committee, 83 were accepted by the President and Board.


In addition to making recommendations on tenure and promotion cases, the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions is charged with overseeing statements of criteria and procedures for the various departments and colleges. These statements originate at the department or college level in accordance with the general guidelines established in the Faculty Manual. Following approval by the appropriate tenured faculty at the unit level, the statements of criteria and procedures are forwarded to the University Committee. Formal

Exhibit B

Robert L. Felix, Chairman
January 10, 1978
Page Two

approval is withheld until recommendations for changes are made by the department or college. Approved statements of criteria and procedures are then used by each member of the University Committee when evaluating tenure and promotion files.

Cordially


Don Greiner, Chairman
University Committee on
Tenure and Promotions

DG/pap

cc: President James B. Holderman
Provost Keith E. Davis
Associate Provost William H. Wesson
Members of the University Committee on
Tenure and Promotion

[FS 4/7/76]

Report of University Committee on Tenure and Promotion (continued)

ALL DECISION

(L.U. = Local Unit, UCIP = University Committee, P-B = President Board)

	#	%
I. Recommended by Local Unit:	204	(100)
UCIP agreed with L.U.:	139	(68)
UCIP disagreed with L.U.:	65	(32)
P-B. agreed with L.U.:	132	(65)
P-B. disagreed with L.U.:	72	(35)
P-B. disagreed with UCIP: ^a	18	(9)
II. Appeal Track:	35	(100)
UCIP agreed with L.U.:	28	(80)
UCIP disagreed with L.U.:	7	(20)
P-B. agreed with L.U.:	31	(89)
P-B. disagreed with L.U.:	4	(11)
P-B. disagreed with UCIP: ^a	3	(9)
III. All Decisions (Recommended & Appealed):	239	(100)
UCIP agreed with L.U.:	167	(70)
P-B. agreed with L.U.:	163	(68)
P-B. disagreed with UCIP:	21	(9)

^a In general, the President-Board granting action required a strong (i.e. 2/3 majority) support vote from the UCIP. There were 9 decisions of this kind where the candidate received a simple majority from the UCIP but not a 2/3 majority and the President-Board did not grant the promotion and/or tenure. There were 4 cases where the candidate received a 2/3 majority in support and the President-Board did not grant and 3 cases where the candidate received a simple majority and the President-Board did grant tenure.

Report of University Committee on Tenure and Promotion (continued) [FS 4/7/76]

GENERAL DATA CONCERNING TENURE AND PROMOTION DECISIONS 1975

	#	%
1. Total Decisions:	239	(100)
Recommended by Local Unit:	204	(85)
Appeal Track:	35	(15)
2. Total Decisions:	239	(100)
Promotion:	129	(54)
Tenure:	110	(46)
3. Local Unit Recommended:	204	(100)
Promotion:	104	(51)
Tenure:	98	(48)
4. Appeal Decisions:	35	(100)
Promotion:	25	(68)
Tenure:	12	(34)
5. Decisions Granted:	138	(100)
Promotion:	62	(45)
Tenure:	76	(55)
6. Promotion Decisions:	129	(100)
To Professor:	32	(25)
Associate Professor:	86	(67)
Assistant Professor:	11	(9)
7. Promotion Decisions:		
Granted by Board:	129/62	(48)
To Professor:	32/10	(31)
Associate Professor:	86/44	(51)
Assistant Professor:	11/8	(73)
8. Tenure Decisions:	110	(100)
At Professor:	14	(13)
Associate Professor:	83	(75)
Assistant Professor:	10	(9)
Librarians:	3	(3)
9. Tenure Decisions:		
Granted by Board:	110/76	(69)
At Professor:	14/13	(93)
Associate Professor:	83/56	(67)
Assistant Professor:	10/6	(60)
Librarians:	3/1	(33)