



**ARPT Committee**

---

---

**2015–2016 ANNUAL REPORT**

**Submitted by Christopher Hobson, Chair (2015-2016), Jan. 30, 2017**

**INTRODUCTION**

As in several recent years, ARPT experienced some difficulty in filling all seats. The Spring 2015 elections left three seats unfilled; a fourth became vacant when a continuing member resigned after being elected Department chair. In response, ARPT recommended, and the Senate approved, moving two elected At-Large members to School seats; two School seats and an At-Large seat were filled by appointment; and an At-Large runner-up succeeded to the remaining At-Large seat. This committee functioned smoothly throughout the year.

**CASES**

ARPT heard and voted on 31 cases, 30 of which are listed in the attached report from Academic Affairs. This was a relatively light workload, as compared to 38 cases the prior year. Of the 30 listed cases:

- 26 resulted in full agreement between the Department majority (in dual appointments, the majority of the two Department votes), ARPT, and the final administrative decision;
- 4 resulted in disagreement on the term of reappointment among one or more recommendations and the final decision (cases 11, 17, 18, and 22);
- 0 resulted in disagreement over retention or non-retention.

The following cases call for special comment:

- Case 30: All ARPT voting members felt the candidate's file showed major weakness in one area, detailed in ARPT's recommendation. Three voting members abstained on the issue of reappointment; one voted for a two-year reappointment, which was also the

Department's recommendation and the final administrative decision. As a result, despite ARPT's criticism, there was no disagreement on disposition of this case.

- Case 29 plus additional 31st case not listed: Both were second reappointments and were heard and voted as 1-Year-to-Tenure-Review cases due to prior service credit granted by Academic Affairs. Subsequently, it became clear that the grant of prior service credit was not valid under Board of Trustees rules. Agreements were made with the approval of all parties on how to extend the time-line toward tenure. There was no disagreement in either case about the substantive merits of the candidates' files.

**COMMENT:** While these two cases involved no disagreement over merits and while favorable ultimate outcomes are to be expected, both created disruption and readjustment in the candidates' professional lives. ARPT urges care by Academic Affairs in negotiating and renegotiating terms of appointment/reappointment.



**Attachment**