The Faculty Welfare Committee is not in favor of motion for the following reasons:

- Motion necessitates a change in procedure that will create more problems than it solves. In many schools, the Dean would be unable to review a large percentage of the cases coming up from the departments because he or she is affiliated with one of 2-3 departments. While the language is well written and meaningful, it would upset the flow of how things are done now. The School of Ed, for example, has only 2 departments. The Dean holds an appointment in one and therefore she would be required to recuse herself from over half of the cases in her school. This potentially creates arguments of inconsistency in evaluation for one department over the other and for some schools over others. This motion creates an inconsistency in process across departments and schools.
- We need to trust people at the Dean/Provost levels to remain objective in these cases.
- The motion suggests that all Deans who hold appointments in academic departments should recuse themselves regardless of their level of interaction or involvement in those departments. Many Academic Deans have been hired from outside the institution. Some Deans have spent little to no time in that department.
- Why should we presume that knowledge of the discipline of the candidate will create an biased review?
- Members of the T&P committee are not allowed to sit in on cases active in their own department because they have already weighed in on that case as a member of the DEP. Deans are not allowed to sit in on the DEP event as “members of the department.” Deans and Provosts are not active members of their respective departments or department evaluation panels. T&P Committee members are active members of their department panels.

Noted Concern:
- In the case of a Dean or administrator that comes from a specific department and then ascends to the position of Dean or Provost, the decision could be handled on an individual basis where the Dean or Provost would recuse themselves rather than presuming some conflict of interest as a whole. However, there is no clear language in the FAM about when recusal should occur (e.g. co-authorships, romantic partners, etc.)
Other issues discussed:

- Because Provosts have usually been hired from the outside, new situation to have a Provost coming from an internal department rendering decisions about faculty from that department.

Possible recommendation:

- Change in the FAM to include language that the candidate can request to the Provost or President an independent review at whatever level he or she anticipates conflict of interest. However, we discussed that this puts candidates in vulnerable position.

Deans' Email:

From: Folds-Bennett, Trisha H
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2015 3:05 PM
To: McGee, Brian; McNerney, Todd James
Subject: Deans’ response to Krasnoff motion

Brian and Todd,
In advance of tomorrow's Senate meeting, on behalf of the Deans, I submit the following:

"Having reviewed the motion put forth by Professor Larry Krasnoff regarding the role of the dean in tenure, promotion, and third-year review cases, be it known that the Deans of the College of Charleston unanimously oppose the motion."

Most (if not all) of the deans will attend the meeting and will be able to elaborate if necessary.

Thanks,
Trisha

Trisha Folds-Bennett, PhD
Dean of the Honors College
Associate Professor of Psychology
College of Charleston