Dean,

Thanks for your very detailed reading of the APT documents and your very helpful and
details comments. Our committee considered every comment you made and I wanted to
respond briefly.

Section 1.1.A – We don’t believe it makes sense to add “without institutional discipline or
restraint” because there must be such things. Faculty should be allowed to libel or plagiarize
without constraint, for example. We think you are asking for too much here. The university must
be able to restraint faculty from outrageous behavior – and the APT document allows that under
the section on termination for cause.

Section 1.1.B – agreed.

Section 1.2 – agreed.

Section 2.2 – there are statements like this elsewhere in the document. And why should we
name some examples rather than others?

Section 4 and elsewhere – fixed

Section 4.1 – departments are allowed to fire someone if institutional needs change. As a result,
we thought it best to leave the wording as it is. Plus, no one is going to be denied promotion if
the standards decrease.

Section 4.2 – we thought this was asking for too much specificity in a document like the APT.
We will leave such things up to departments.

Section 4.3.2.E – the problem is that if we include the word “representative,” letters from
students could seldom be used because such letters are seldom strictly representative.

Section 4.3.3.C – We didn’t think we needed to specify examples of “other external
commentaries.” The reference seems clear to use.

Section 4.3.3.C – yes, three letters is too few. And we tightened up the wording here somewhat.
But we also have to be careful to avoid the complication of not getting more than 3 letter writers
to respond. Suppose we get only three letters and absolutely everyone (inside and outside the
department agrees the faculty member should not be promoted). If we require more than three
letters we would have to postpone the propose until three are obtained. Also remember this
section is for promotion and not just tenure and not every non-tenure-line faculty member has
research as a major component of their job.

Section 4.4.1 – we talked about this a long time. But some departments definitely don’t want to
do this. And note your preceding comment about Section 4.2 where you worry that people might
not have enough expertise to adequately judge a candidate’s work. In the end, we left the APT
the way it was.

Sections 4.4.5 and 4.4.6 – Yes, we are aware that you have been a strong proponent of the
“simultaneous” approach. We however, favor the “sequential” approach. We believe the
sequential approach is specified in the current document and we are not willing to change
without compelling reasons. We believe alternative arguments could be given to yours.
Section 4.4.7 – agreed

Section 7.3.4 – agreed

Section 7.3.5 – agreed

Section 7.4.2 – agreed (thanks for the specific wording)

General Comments

1. We made your suggestions the default option unless department guidelines explicitly state otherwise.

2. We strongly disagree with this suggestion. We believe it would be a literal disaster to present this idea to the Board of Trustees.