


X-Sender: jlehman@j.imap.itd.umich.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Tue, 22 Oct 2002 17:30:15 -0400
To: caminker@umich.edu
From: "Jeffrey S. Lehman" <jlehman@umich.edu>
Subject: Fwd: Provost Review of Tenure Decision



X-Sender: hammerp@h.imap.itd.umich.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2
Date: Tue, 22 Oct 2002 17:20:25 -0400
To: jlehman@umich.edu
From: "Peter J. Hammer" <hammerp@umich.edu>
Subject: Provost Review of Tenure Decision
Cc: hammerp@umich.edu

Dear Jeff,

I am writing to report the substance of my communications with the Provost Office regarding their review of my candidacy for tenure. I made direct e-mail inquiries of the Provost Office to gain information about the procedural and substantive nature of the review process in general, and of the status of my case in particular. I was informed by Associate Provost Valerie Castle that it was her belief that the Provost review had already been completed, and that it would likely have been conducted the previous spring. This took me completely by surprise. As I stated in my correspondence to Dr. Castle of October 2, 2002: "I have never received, directly or indirectly, from either the Provost Office or the Law School, any notice that the Provost Office has completed its review of my tenure decision. I was under the impression that the review was still pending." I spoke again with Dr. Castle on October 16, 2002. She restated her belief that the Provost decision had been communicated to the Law School last May, and that it would have been the responsibility of the academic unit or department to communicate the substance of such a decision directly to the candidate.

The last communication you and I had regarding the substance of the Provost's tenure review was in the immediate wake of the faculty's vote, where you described the general nature of the process. Subsequently, I made specific inquiries of yourself and Evan to learn greater details about the timing and substance of such review. At no time during these inquiries was I informed that a decision had already been made. I shared early drafts of my April 4, 2002 letter to the Provost with yourself, Evan and Rob Howse. In discussing the contents of the letter, I was never informed that a decision had already been made. On May 30, 2002, I requested "to be provided with the entire contents of my 'personnel file,' as that term is defined in the Michigan Employee Right to Know Act, MCL § 423.501." In response to this request, no document was produced purporting to represent or constitute a final determination by the University of my candidacy for tenure. On August 19, 2002, I supplemented the informational request for my personnel file specifically to obtain "all information relating to the Law School's transmittal of information regarding the negative 2002 tenure recommendation to the Provost Office and others in the central university administration, as well as all subsequent correspondence with such parties relating to said matter." In response to this request the only document that was produced was your February 28, 2002, letter transmitting the file to the Provost Office. That letter was properly captioned "Confidential, Preliminary, and Advisory." No document was produced purporting to

represent or constitute a final determination by the University of my candidacy for tenure.

On August 13, 2002, I received in my box by inter-campus mail the annual letter specifying the terms and conditions of employment. On the letter was a posted note from Rozona saying that I should contact her if I had any questions. I send her an e-mail stating the following:

I got a copy of my new terms and conditions of appointment in my mail box. As with any accounting-type document, it is not always clear what they mean. I have a few questions. The first is whether the document has any larger significance, other than a simple administrative function? I have received no official correspondence from either the Law School or the Provost Office concerning Provost-level review of the tenure decision. Is there a connection between this document and that process?

Rozona replied that the letter had no larger significance and that its only function was to document that I had received summer research funds. I received a similar letter on September 1, 2002. The only difference in the letter was a notation of my salary increase for the coming year.

On September 17, 2002, I met with you and Evan in Evan's office. During the meeting I directly raised the question whether the Law School had received any response from the Provost Office regarding its review of my tenure decision. You stated that the Law School had received no communication or response from the Provost Office on the matter. You also stated that gaps in communication between the Provost Office and academic units were not uncommon. You further stated that it was not unusual that I had received no direct response to my April letter to the Provost. Finally, you stated that it would not be inappropriate for me to directly contact the Provost Office and inquire about the status of its review. Based on this advice, I sent the missives described at the beginning of this letter.

Nearly eight months have passed since the faculty's vote. The status of my candidacy for tenure at the University continues to be a daily source of concern and anxiety. My future personal and professional plans are fundamentally contingent on the University's final determination. It is distressing that others at the University have been so casual about the matter. I do not question the sincerity of Dr. Castle's report, but I also understand that she assumed her post in July and was not directly involved in the matter. Based upon my experience with you, the Provost Office narrative is difficult to fully credit. I find it hard to believe that you would have received this information and not communicate it to me in a timely and appropriate manner.

I would appreciate your assistance in obtaining a clearer understanding of the nature, substance and timing of the University's decision making. I would also appreciate your attention to the question of whether there are documents or materials at the Law School, the Provost Office, or elsewhere in the University that should have been, or should be produced as part of my request for the contents of my personnel record.

Peter

Jeffrey S. Lehman

UM 1020

The University of Michigan
Law School
324 Hutchins Hall
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1215

Voice: 734-764-0514
Fax: 734-763-1055
Video: 734-647-9948/9949
Video/IP: 141.211.46.201

UM 1021