

## Comments

### Do you support the Resolution on No Contact Lists in Tenure Cases?

It would be helpful if, in the future, the wording of such resolutions are clearer on who it goes to (i.e. Provosts office, Colleges, Departments, other)

I am voting no because of the following qualification: "Be it further resolved that a department can choose an external reviewer from a no-contact list, but must provide a written justification for inclusion in the dossier." This counteracts the purpose of the "no contact" list entirely, as it gives essentially gives the dept veto power over the list. It is not hard to come up with some justification to request a letter, and if a department member is working against someone's tenure case this veto power over the no-contact list gives them the opportunity to do real damage.

I support candidates' ability to provide a list of no-contact faculty, but it should be advisory. More importantly, I do not think the faculty senate is the appropriate place to determine this policy. This is a bizarre use of senate time, and it is frustrating that the senate is focused on inappropriate questions to the exclusion of more important matters.

Although we support this resolution's general principle, we strongly oppose its current wording. The resolution wrongly places the burden of proof on tenure candidates and further insinuates that they would falsify no-contact lists for illegitimate reasons. To be clear, every tenure candidate *must* have the right to submit no-contact lists, as is already the case in several colleges. However, the proposal to *annotate* the no-contact list is unfair and misguided, especially for cases involving consensual relationships, sexual harassment, and many other configurations. We hired our junior faculty with a strong belief in their truthfulness and sincerity. Let us believe them when they suspect bias, especially in cases when it cannot be documented by hard evidence but by real-life experience. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that these annotated lists will not be made public, which would have disastrous results for everyone involved in the tenure process. Any annotation of no-contact lists on the candidate's part should thus remain *optional* rather than becoming mandatory.

We CCB already do this.

My unit has permitted this for many years and not seen any abuse of the concept. I think it has actually been used at most a half-dozen times out of perhaps 60 or 80 tenure cases that I can remember.

Departmental voices: "Candidates should not be required to list a reason for no-contact as that information is potentially volatile in the collegial environment and confidentiality cannot be absolutely assured.", "I dislike the idea of making a faculty member justify their own preferences. I think the current system in which one or two scholars can be excluded without debate is more protective than the proposed system."