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WHEREAS, Marshall University policy (Greenbook, pp. 16-17) states that the grant of tenure shall be based on a two-fold determination:

a. That the candidate is professionally qualified;
b. That the university has a continuing need for a faculty member with the particular qualifications and competencies of the candidate

and WHEREAS, Policy Bulletin 36, Section 8.1 states that "Tenure applies to those faculty members who qualify for it and is a means of making the teaching and research profession attractive to persons of ability. There shall be demonstrated evidence that tenure is based upon a wide range of criteria: such as excellence in teaching; accessibility to students; professional and scholarly activity and recognition; significant service to the college community; experience in higher education and at the institution; possession of the doctorate, special competence, or the highest earned degree appropriate to the teaching field; publications and research; potential for continued professional growth; and service to the people of the State of West Virginia."

and WHEREAS no university policy requires a minimum number of years or service before a faculty member can be considered for tenure;

and WHEREAS a moratorium on "early tenure decisions" for this year fails to take into account the professional qualifications of the faculty member or the continuing needs of the university and competencies of the candidate

Therefore, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate finds the announced moratorium on early tenure to be contrary to written university procedures and therefore urges that the moratorium on early tenure be rescinded for the current year and that all requests for tenure that were rejected on those grounds be reconsidered for their merits.

Be it further resolved, that the Faculty Senate stands ready to work with the Vice President for Academic Affairs to consider the need for revisions in the Marshall University tenure policy.

FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT:

APPROVED
BY SENATE: Robert Sawyer DATE: 4-1-93

DISAPPROVED
BY SENATE: DATE:
COMMENTS: 

Please see note.

SR-92-93-(102)248(FS)
TO:                   Dr. Robert Sawrey
FROM:                 J. Wade Gilley
DATE:                 April 29, 1993
SUBJECT:  Faculty Senate Resolution SR-92-93-(102) 248 (FS)

I have read the resolution and wish we had more time to discuss this situation; however, with the limited time before us and based on the advice of legal counsel, I am reluctant to reopen this issue and consider individual cases.

As you are aware, a number of faculty have asked that their cases be reviewed on technical grounds. In at least one case, we found that the information in the file was wrong and the person should have been considered for tenure.

I would point out that this policy of not granting faculty early tenure was a university decision made on the recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs because of our shared concern about shifting enrollments, underutilization of minorities and women in some departments, and the need for maximum flexibility in changing times.

I look forward to working with the faculty in providing clear guidelines and procedures for next year.
WHEREAS, Marshall University policy (Greenbook, pp. 16-17) states that the grant of tenure shall be based on a two-fold determination:

a. That the candidate is professionally qualified;
b. That the university has a continuing need for a faculty member with the particular qualifications and competencies of the candidate

and WHEREAS, Policy Bulletin 36, Section 8.1 states that "Tenure applies to those faculty members who qualify for it and is a means of making the teaching and research profession attractive to persons of ability. There shall be demonstrated evidence that tenure is based upon a wide range of criteria: such as excellence in teaching; accessibility to students; professional and scholarly activity and recognition; significant service to the college community; experience in higher education and at the institution; possession of the doctorate, special competence, or the highest earned degree appropriate to the teaching field; publications and research; potential for continued professional growth; and service to the people of the State of West Virginia."

and WHEREAS no university policy requires a minimum number of years or service before a faculty member can be considered for tenure;

and WHEREAS a moratorium on "early tenure decisions" for this year fails to take into account the professional qualifications of the faculty member or the continuing needs of the university and competencies of the candidate

Therefore, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate finds the announced moratorium on early tenure to be contrary to written university procedures and therefore urges that the moratorium on early tenure be rescinded for the current year and that all requests for tenure that were rejected on those grounds be reconsidered for their merits.

Be it further resolved, that the Faculty Senate stands ready to work with the Vice President for Academic Affairs to consider the need for revisions in the Marshall University tenure policy.
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DISAPPROVED
BY SENATE:________________________DATE:__________
UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT:
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Please see xlate.

SR-92-93-(102)248(FS)
TO:       Dr. Robert Sawrey
FROM:  J. Wade Gilley
DATE:  April 29, 1993
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Resolution SR-92-93-(102) 248 (FS)

I have read the resolution and wish we had more time to discuss this situation; however, with the limited time before us and based on the advice of legal counsel, I am reluctant to reopen this issue and consider individual cases.

As you are aware, a number of faculty have asked that their cases be reviewed on technical grounds. In at least one case, we found that the information in the file was wrong and the person should have been considered for tenure.

I would point out that this policy of not granting faculty early tenure was a university decision made on the recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs because of our shared concern about shifting enrollments, underutilization of minorities and women in some departments, and the need for maximum flexibility in changing times.

I look forward to working with the faculty in providing clear guidelines and procedures for next year.