

2 July 2008

From: Carsten Holz
To: Roland Chin, Vice-President for Academic Affairs
Cc: Erik Baark, Dean, HSS
James Kung, Division Head, SOSC

Re: Appeal against decision to turn down my application for full professorship

Dear Professor Chin,

I would like to appeal, on procedural grounds, against your decision to deny my promotion to full professor (your letter dated 13 June 2008).

In March 08 I provided an update on my publications via the HRO. The “Checklist for Promotion to Full Professor” has a note re this update: “ ... It is NOT enclosed in the dossier for review by UASC UNLESS it is requested by the UASC according to the Academic Review Guidelines AP20.1 Section 5.2. (The UASC did not request for this additional information.)” AP20.1 Section 5.2 reads “ ... The Committee may request additional information from Schools during the review process.”

The Academic Personnel Policy and Procedure Manual does not prohibit a candidate from supplying additional information during the review process as it becomes available. I was prevented from supplying additional information when it became available. (And I am aware of previous instances when additional, update information was provided by the applicant during the review process via a member of a review committee.)

Second, AP20.1 Section 5.2 is irrelevant to this case. (a) I am not a “School.” (b) It would appear to me that the sentence refers to initiatives that *originate* at the UASC.

I request that the Senate Standing Committee for Academic Review Procedure “look at the review procedure” (your phrasing) as exercised in the omission of relevant update information in my application for full professorship.

On 16 May 08 I emailed a second update to the HRO which was passed on to the VPAAO on 23 May. The UASC met on 26 May. I have no evidence that the UASC has seen this second update, either.

These updates would have directly addressed the UASC comment “if he had chosen to publish some manuscripts in better-ranked economics journals.”

Regarding “services to the Division and School,” the two concrete shortcomings noted in the dean’s report are based on factual errors (and these are the two only shortcomings noted anywhere). If “review procedure” were a term that covers factual errors committed by individuals or committees within HKUST, I ask the Senate Committee to examine item 10 in the dean’s report. Witnesses exist who can give testimony re both shortcomings listed in the dean’s item 10.

Sincerely,