



Committee on Oversight of Administrative Action (COAA)

Minutes of Meeting: 12/8/25

Circulated: 1/7/26

Approved: 1/12/26

Present: Wayne C. Petty (Chair), Hari Nathan, Devi Chiravuri, Vilma Mesa (SACUA), Adam Matzger, Oleg Zamulin, Mimi Dalaly, Mary Franklin

Absent: Cynthia Gabriel, Parag Patil, Lauren Smith, Kristen Verhey

Faculty Senate Office: Eric Vandenberghe

10:01am-10:02am: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Announcements

The agenda was approved. The minutes for the October COAA meeting were approved.

10:02am-10:17am: Chair's update on state of the grievance policies

Summary: Chair Petty updates the committee on recent developments regarding the University's grievance procedures. A preliminary report has been prepared by the Provost's Office and is currently under review by relevant stakeholders, including SACUA. When appropriate, SACUA will be encouraging COAA to be included in the review process. The Chair provides background on the work COAA has done on this subject over the past few years. Members briefly discuss this subject.

Action: Update

10:17am-10:59am: Develop questions and concerns relating to the revision to the university's tenure policies announced earlier this year

Summary: Over the summer, the Provost's Office produced a document titled "Tenure and Promotion Review in the Office of the Provost." The committee proceeds to review this document.

Committee members identify points that may require further clarification. The Provost's additional review of "academic credentials" is identified as vague. A member suggests that it is problematic to have a substance-based review at this stage, and that any review should be about process. Members discuss this point with varying opinions shared. A member discusses an example of a tenure denial at the Provost level, and the lack of transparency they perceive.

A member indicates that there is a need for the faculty under review to have a chance to respond to any new materials that would be procured during a review at the Provost's level. They need a chance to defend themselves as needed.

A member provides a hypothetical example of a tenure case that is a split decision at the Department or college level. The member indicates in this scenario it would be appropriate



for the Provost to step in to make the difficult decision to deny tenure if appropriate. Members offer their input on this scenario. A member discusses that this is appropriate but may not be if the review at the unit level yielded a unanimous decision to promote the faculty member.

A member indicates that getting data from the Provost's Office may help reveal if there is need for committee oversight on this matter. The tenure review policies across units are discussed. There is wide disparity among the units. The members further discuss where certain units can and should improve their process.

The reviewers at the Provost's level are listed as experts in the tenure and promotion process. A member indicates that this reinforces the need for the Provost review to primarily serve as a high-level review to ensure that the process was followed appropriately. A member discusses their experience on this subject at other institutions.

The committee agrees to continue discussion on this subject at the next meeting in January.

Action: Discussion

11:00am: Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe
Faculty Governance Coordinator
Faculty Senate Office