

November 16, 2009

Professor Emerlinda Roman, PhD
President
University of the Philippines System
Quezon Hall, Diliman, Quezon City

Dear President Roman:

The purpose of this letter is two-fold. First, I seek redress and appeal for a reversal of the denial of my tenure by the Office of the Chancellor of the University of the Philippines – Diliman. Second, I wish to apprise you of the grave injustice that I have endured in my overdrawn and highly irregular tenure application process.

On November 3, 2009, I received Chancellor Sergio S. Cao's memorandum (No. SSC-09-541, (attached as ANNEX A) which ruled against my appeal for tenure.

I would like to begin by emphasizing that I have fulfilled all the academic requirements for tenure. The Sociology Department never at any instance questioned my academic credentials and, except for Chancellor Cao's memo, my eligibility for tenure has been upheld by the other offices and bodies which deliberated on the matter. I cite the following documents and instances to support my position that is shared by various bodies that I am qualified to be granted tenure.

1) Department of Sociology Tenure Justification, April 18, 2008 (ANNEX B).

In a vote of seven to three and after two meetings dated March 5 and 25, 2008, the majority of the tenured faculty members of the Department of Sociology recommended me for tenure. My own Department in its written justification for tenure on April 18, 2008, cited the significant academic work I have conducted as a faculty member for the past nine years. I quote:

"Prof. Raymundo has served the University for at least eight years. She joined the Department of Sociology in June 1999 as Lecturer. In November 1999, she was appointed to the position of Fulltime Instructor and earned a promotion to Assistant Professor 1 in June 2006. Through the years, Prof. Raymundo has consistently been ranked as among the top three of an average of eight to twelve candidates for hiring and renewal."

"Prof. Raymundo's excellent quality of mind, expansive intellectual interest and competence in current and emerging academic discourses are reflected in her teaching. Her teaching portfolio includes course syllabi with updated readings lists, the use of

classic and contemporary audio-visual resources as instructional materials, and the formulation of integrative exam questions. Her commitment to continuously enrich academic discourse especially in social theorizing and her passion to infuse dynamism into the discipline of Sociology have led her to an in-depth examination of current developments in Modern and Postmodern Social Theory, Feminist Theory, and Cultural Studies."

2) Basic Paper for Tenure, April 18, 2008 (ANNEX C).

The Basic Papers for my tenure dated April 18, 2008 holds the signature not just of the majority of the faculty members of the Department but also the approval of the College Personnel Committee, and the the Dean of CSSP. The Academic Personnel and Fellowship Committee (APFC) of the University also endorsed my tenure in its 381st meeting on May 27, 2008 as indicated in the same document.

3) "Pananaw bilang Tagapangulo ng Departamento ng Sosyolohiya," Prof. Aquino's letter dated April 18, 2008. (ANNEX D)

Even in Prof. Aquino's attachment to my Basic Papers on April 18, 2008, wherein she manifested a dissenting opinion to the majority vote, she acknowledged my academic credentials.

"Kinikilala ko po ang ang mga akademikong nagawa ni Prop. Raymundo sa larangan ng pagtuturo at publikasyon. Kahanga-hanga ang kanyang sigasig na makapag-ambag sa pagpapayaman ng disiplina ng sosyolohiya at magamit ito tungo sa ikauunlad ng ating lipunan."

4) Dean Zosimo Lee's Memo relaying the College Executive Board (CEB) Vote on the matter of my tenure, dated March 18, 2009. (ANNEX E)

After the irregular delays, the Chancellor instructed the College Executive Board (CEB) of CSSP to "discuss the matter and make a decision on the matter of tenure." In a meeting on March 17, 2008, the CEB voted to recommend my tenure in a vote of seven against one, with three neither recommending or not recommending.

5) May 15, 2009 Reference Slip of Vice Chancellor Paredes to Chancellor Cao citing my eligibility for tenure (ANNEX F) and the subsequent Reference Slip from Chancellor Cao to the Department for tenure processing to commence as cited in June 3, 2009 Letter from the Department of Sociology (ANNEX G)

Acting upon the instructions of the Chancellor to consider once again my eligibility for tenure, Vice Chancellor Paredes relayed that the APFC considers me eligible for tenure in a May 15, 2009 Reference Slip addressed to Chancellor Cao. The Chancellor subsequently instructed the Sociology Department to

"please prepare basic papers for tenure processing to commence."

Despite the concurrence of my own Department, the CEB, and the University APFC regarding my eligibility for tenure on academic grounds in various instances, the Chancellor in a memo dated October 28, 2009 handed down a decision denying my appeal citing a supposed Departmental rule of two-thirds majority vote and my insufficient academic requirements as a major basis among others.

In my almost fifteen years of study and teaching in the University, I have adhered to the standards of academic excellence and service to the nation to my utmost capacity. I have published my own research in refereed journals, attended and presented in local and international conferences, and have also undertaken social research. The justification for my tenure attached to my Basic Papers also cite that I have not been remiss in my teaching. I have spent the last decade of my life working towards an academic career in the University. I believe that I am now being denied of my right to tenure on the basis of my political convictions and activism which I consider to be consistent with the the University's cherished tradition of critical thinking and service to the nation.

I am the Secretary-General of the Congress of Teachers/Educators for Nationalist and Democracy or CONTEND and a National Council member of the Alliance of Concerned Teachers (ACT), organizations known for their nationalist and progressive advocacies which I have imbibed both as a student of Sociology and a "Scholar of the People". I believe that the procedural and institutional barricades that have been placed in my way of getting tenure are politically motivated and violate my rights to a fair and judicious resolution of my request for tenure.

I will also, for the first time, take this chance to formally reply point-by-point to the allegations contained in the the minority report (MR) (ANNEX H) filed against me by some members of the faculty last October 17, 2008 which I feel has been unjustly used to deny me tenure. Note that it is only upon receiving the Chancellor Cao's memo last November 3, 2008 that I got the chance to read the MR. If only to highlight that the allegations against me contained in the MR consists of allegations which remain unproven, I am attaching my response to specific allegations and questions raised in the said document in this letter (see ATTACHMENT). I would like to emphasize, however, that the allegations cloaked as instances of "breach of professional ethics" and "lack of transparency," and hence are academic grounds for denying tenure, are actually " a few concerns pertaining to [my] political commitment" by some faculty members as stated in the April 18, 2008 justification for my tenure made by the Department (see ANNEX B).

I shall now address the Chancellor's essential points as well as reiterate the grounds upon which my appeal stands.

The Grounds of my Appeal

A chronology of events is provided in the Chancellor's memo. While the Chancellor correctly presented the chronology of events, some very glaring and highly crucial points necessary to the fair and judicious resolution of my case have surprisingly escaped his attention. I will present these to refute Chancellor Cao's bases for deciding against my tenure.

I. What is the Department's position on the matter?

Chancellor Cao predicated his decision to deny my appeal based on a supposed two-thirds vote rule of the Department as constructed in a meeting attended by the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor Paredes, Dean Zosimo Lee, Chairperson Randolph David, and former chairperson Prof. Clemen Aquino on June 16, 2009. Thus, according to the Chancellor, the March 9, 2009 meeting will be interpreted as a decision not to grant tenure.

Here are some points:

- a) With a vote of seven (7) against three (3), I was already recommended for tenure by the faculty of the Department of Sociology as indicated in the Basic Paper forwarded and the accompanying Justification for my tenure dated April 18, 2008. If such a rule does exist, then I should have been granted tenure as of April 18, 2008.
- b) The Department is deeply divided and remains ambiguous on many issues related to my tenure including the two-thirds rule that the Chancellor based his judgement on.

In the course of my tenure process, the Department deliberated and divided the house a total of three times. The first was on March 25, 2008, with a vote of seven against three. The second voting was reported in the November 14, 2008 letter where a number of faculty members did not reiterate their recommendations for tenure. Even on the particular voting that the Chancellor cited, the one on March 9, 2009 where five voted for my tenure, four did not, one abstained while another recommended a waiver of the tenure rule, nobody raised the so-called two-thirds rule for tenure. A review of the documents show that it is, in fact, the Chancellor who insisted on using the two-thirds rule as the minutes of the said meeting bear on July 16, 2009 (ANNEX I).

I quote:

"1. Prof. David reiterated the Department's long-standing practice of arriving at a consensus in the matter of tenure. The only time that there was a vote was in the case of Prof. Dionisio (who got at least *two-thirds* of the votes and was therefore given tenure).

2. The **Chancellor said** that in the absence of a "codified" policy, what is long-standing practice/tradition can be considered "policy."

3. In view of this tradition in the Department, the **Chancellor said** that the result of the Department's vote reported in the March 9, 2009 letter will be interpreted as a decision not to grant tenure." [emphasis supplied]

The application of the Chancellor of the two-thirds rule as a policy that guided him in ruling against my tenure is problematic for a number of reasons.

- i. The rules for interpreting the result of a vote cannot be promulgated after the fact. In this case, the Chancellor is interpreting the results of a vote that took place three months after the March 9, 2009 meeting when the tenured faculty members of the Department voted.
- ii. The Chancellor is also external to the process. He was not around when the votes took place. It is surprising how the Chancellor takes for himself this interpretation when the tenured faculty of the Department did not.
- iii. It is my understanding that the faculty of the Department simply transmitted the votes on March 9, 2009 with a reason. The Department letter did not contain a specific recommendation for or against my tenure because they could not arrive at a consensus even in the matter of how to interpret the votes.
- iv. The so-called Departmental practice that the Chancellor cites as basis has a glaring difference with my case. On Prof. Dionisio's tenure application, the Department reached a consensus that a two-thirds rule will be applied before they voted.
- v. I believe there was no agreement among the members of the faculty to apply this rule in my case at any point, even during the most recent June 29, 2009 meeting of the Chancellor with the members of the tenured faculty of the Department.

The Chancellor himself declared in the first line of his memo that: "This is not a typical case of a tenure application which was simply denied by a department." Yet, he employs as a justification for his decision the two-thirds rule which the Department did not even resort to in order to traverse a deadlock.

I am scandalized by the Chancellor's recourse to the two-thirds rule because it trivializes the whole tenure process. Instead of opening the irregularities of my tenure process to scrutiny, sharing with me the minority report which played such an important role in his decision and allowing me to answer in writing the allegations, the Chancellor resorted to the use of a so-called two-thirds rule which was not applied with consistency in the long process of the resolution of my tenure application.

II. What is the College's position on the grant of tenure?

First, let me point out that that the CEB had endorsed my tenure in a number of instances. The first time was on April 18, 2008 as my Basic Papers indicate. When asked for an opinion by Vice Chancellor Paredes given the letter of the Chair and the first minority report, the CEB once again reiterated their position recommending me for tenure as indicated in Vice Chancellor Paredes' letter to Prof. Aquino on June 20, 2008 (ANNEX J). When asked to vote by the Chancellor once again, the CEB responded overwhelmingly in my favor last March 17, 2008 (ANNEX K). The Chancellor cites this fact in his own memo: "The CEB of the college, however, recommended the grant of tenure, by a unanimous vote of those qualified to vote on the matter" (ANNEX A pp.11-12).

Complications once again arose, when the Chancellor allowed certain opinions to take precedence instead of valuing the decisions of the CEB as a critical and collegial body.

- 1) The Chancellor allowed the composition of the CEB which voted for my tenure on March 17, 2008 to be questioned. Citing the letter of Prof. Serena Diokno (ANNEX L) and a Chair of a Department (ANNEX M), the Chancellor agreed to the position that Department Chairs and the Dean have the sole prerogative on matters regarding tenure thus effectively excluding the other members of the CEB who voted in my favor.
- 2) On July 8, 2009, the Chancellor also presided over a meeting that supposedly establishes the CEB's position to "respect or defer to the decision of the Department." He continues in his memo dated October 28, 2009: "since there was no consensus to grant tenure to Professor Raymundo at the Department level, **it should be taken to mean** that there is also no consensus to grant tenure to Professor Raymundo at the College level."(p.9) [emphasis mine] It is not clear, once again, in this instance, if the CEB categorically expressed in that meeting that "since there was no consensus to grant tenure [to me]... at the Department level, there is no consensus to grant tenure [to me] at the College level as well."

What is clear in both these instances, in what is also becoming a constant feature of this tenure process, is that when various bodies decide in my favor, an intervening entity, endeavors to nullify the favorable decision. Let me reiterate that the CEB, on their own and as a critical body, had endorsed my tenure even with the presence of Prof. Aquino among them the first time around on April 18, 2008 and on June 20, 2008. They did so again on March 17, 2009.

By constructing the relationship of the Department Chairs and the CEB as one characterized by deference, wherein the CEB as a collegial body defers to the Department's wishes in matters of tenure, the Chancellor is removing an important function of the CEB as a necessary venue where fairness and transparency in the tenure process can be assured. Where else can aggrieved members of the young faculty express their appeal for justice and fairness especially if they cannot find it in their own Departments? In this formulation favored by the Chancellor, the CEB ceases to be a critical collegial body capable

of making its own decisions autonomous from the departments and their interests.

I am proud to cite some members of the CEB from my college who have insisted on playing this critical role with regards my tenure case. None of them were appreciated by the Chancellor in his memo.

The OIC of one department who voted for my tenure wrote:

"The Department Faculty wishes to prod the College to be transparent on granting tenure especially in cases like this. Substantiation of proof, may it be against or for the tenure should be opened for scrutiny to arrive to a fair and just decision." (ANNEX L)

While insisting that departmental autonomy should be respected, another Chairperson also wrote:

"We also recommend that departmental responsibility be observed, such as by the Department of Sociology's presentation at the college assembly of the process and the decision criteria used in the case of Prof. Sarah Raymundo." (ANNEX M)

III. Was I given the opportunity to explain my side on the issues and concerns raised against me?

The Chancellor cites the two instances when I was made to explain my side before the authorized representative of the Department on March 2007 and on June 2008 before some faculty members who voted for my tenure on March 25, 2008 (p.9). He considers these occasions as sufficient instances for me to clarify matters and explain my side on the issues raised against me.

I strongly challenge Chancellor Gao's appreciation of my ordeal. If anything, my whole tenure process has been flawed and violative of my rights. Mine is not the only voice that think so. Even my colleagues from my Department have expressed the same observation.

In a letter addressed to Vice Chancellor Paredes dated January 12, 2009 (ANNEX N), Prof. Walden Bello asserted that there was no consensus on the November 2008 decision of the Department not to recommend my tenure since he was unable to sign it and he was registering his opposition to the said decision. He wrote:

Because it has been such a flawed process, I feel strongly that the decision-making on the Raymundo case should not be rushed and that it should be conducted with fairness, with transparency, and with the primacy of academic criteria. **I feel that it is the responsibility of the higher academic authorities to ensure that**

Ms. Raymundo, whose academic record is considered excellent by all sides, is provided with a just tenure process that is based on academic considerations. I also feel that non-academic issues must not taint this process, as they have in the current process, 98 per cent of which was focused on a particular nonacademic incident involving Ms. Raymundo. Surely, this is highly questionable as a focus of tenure discussions, which must be devoted to the teaching and publishing record of the faculty member being considered.

Prof. Gerardo Lanuza also wrote on a letter addressed to the Vice Chancellor on the same date (ANNEX O):

Also, I believe that Prof. Sarah Jane Raymundo **deserves a fair hearing** before the tenured faculty so that she can answer all serious allegations raised against by some of our colleagues in the series of our deliberations.

Prof. Filomin Gutierrez, apart from withdrawing her signature in the Department decision not to grant tenure on November 5, 2008, also wrote that "there should be an opportunity to, once and for all, resolve questions about Prof. Raymundo." (ANNEX P)

She adds:

"My hope is that we could thoroughly address not only questions about her 'lack of transparency' relating to the disappearance of Ms. Karen Empeno, and whether that constitutes a serious breach of professional ethics was committed, a decision that **I do not believe was formally arrived at.** It would also be for the best to ascertain whether such perception and/or judgment on Prof. Raymundo's behavior should take precedence over her excellent academic qualifications in consideration of her tenure."

The accusations and allegations that my colleagues were referring to is contained in a document I refer to as the minority report (MR).

The Minority Report and Violations of my Rights to Fairness, Transparency, and Due Process

On October 17, 2008, Professors Arguillas, Rubio, and Fernandez sent a letter addressed to Vice Chancellor Paredes substantiating the so-called Minority Position (ANNEX H). It (MR) is the document containing specific allegations and instances when I supposedly "failed to uphold the truth" and "lacked transparency" in relation to the case of the two missing students two years before I submitted by application for tenure.

In November 14, 2008 (ANNEX Q), the Department wrote a letter to Vice Chancellor Paredes transmitting the decision that the Department cannot

recommend tenure anymore. Votes were again casted with two out of the eleven faculty members still reiterating their position to grant tenure and three faculty members from the original majority abstaining from reiterating their earlier tenure recommendation because "certain concerns that have bearing on the granting of tenure...remain unclarified." I have every reason that this turn around by some faculty members of the Department is on account of the MR.

Let me also note that I was instructed by then Chairperson Prof. Aquino on November 6, 2009 to desist from attending my classes until further notice.

Here are my issues against the Department's and the Chancellor's handling of the minority report which, taken together, seriously violated my rights to fairness and transparency in my tenure process:

- a. I was never given the opportunity to peruse the said report until I received the Chancellor's memorandum where it was attached on November 3, 2009. Hence, the claim that I have been given sufficient opportunity to defend myself against the allegations therein is duplicitous and has misguided the Chancellor's decision. I cannot have been expected to properly defend myself when the said allegations were never explicitly and directly presented. Given the monumental consequence of the MR, I strongly feel that I should have been given a copy of the said document in the first instance so I can respond and clarify matters accordingly. To this day, I have not been given the opportunity to answer all the allegations as they were written in the full context of the minority report.
- b. Moreover, the contents of the MR remain allegations and insinuations which have not been substantiated and presented before any independent body. I am appalled at the fact that this document, which I have not had the chance to read and refute, had been informing the decisions of my colleagues at the Department as well as shaping the dispositions of higher offices.
- c. While there were "discussions" between myself, former Department Chairperson Prof. Aquino, and members of the tenured faculty, the questions raised in these occasions were never put in their proper context. What actually took place were a series of interviews that demanded a factual recounting of occurrences that took place two or three years before. At that time of these interviews, I have not perused and fully appreciated the minority report in its full sequence and over-all context. It is only now that I am beginning to understand the logic of their queries and the weight of their accusations.

Despite the good faith and trust that I placed on the faculty members who interviewed me, I feel violated that they were in fact crafting serious allegations of "lack of transparency," and "failure to uphold the truth" - issues that in effect cast aspersions on my academic integrity and professional ethics. It is very clear that I have been actually denied of

both substantive and procedural due process. This underhandedness makes a mockery of due process and puts to question the ethics and motives of my accusers.

- d. It must be noted that I was only ever granted an official opportunity to discuss these allegations when Chancellor Cao invited me to an interview in his office on August 25, 2009, almost a full year since the filing of the minority report. I was asked questions about the Karen Empeño case presented as the issues raised by the Department against me. I was also made to comment on the issue of trustworthiness that was supposed to be the major thread that weaves particular questions on the said case. I feel that I have responded to his queries in the most honest and collegial manner. Yet, none of my responses were ever cited in the Chancellor's memorandum deciding against my tenure.

Upon receiving the said memo with its accompanying attachments, it is only now that I realized that those particular questions raised by Chancellor Cao were in fact culled from the minority report. Even the said discussion with the Chancellor, I was never given the chance to read the MR.

Violations of my other Rights

1. **The right to a speedy resolution.** Many of the complications that beset my tenure process can be attributed not just to the actions and intentions of those opposed to my tenure but also by the inaction especially of higher offices in finding a resolution to my case without undue delay. The Department, College, and the Vice Chancellor Office's must be faulted for the inaction that took place between June 20, 2008 wherein Vice Chancellor Paredes requested the Department's comments, and the response of the minority four months later, on October 17, 2009. After the August 25, 2009 meeting with the Chancellor, it took another two months for the Chancellor to come up with his decision.
2. **My right to a speedy and official response from higher authorities.** I wrote to the Chancellor for the first time on November 20, 2008 (ANNEX R) relaying my predicament having been informed by the Chair Prof. Aquino not to attend my classes. Earlier, I have also written a letter to the Dean of the College requesting for an explanation for such a decision. In the same letter, I relayed my intention of attending my classes despite the information from the Chair. None of these formal letters were ever recognized with a reply by either the Dean's Office or the Chancellor's Office.

I wrote to the Chancellor in three more occasions. On June 24, 2009 (ANNEX S), I wrote Chancellor Cao requesting him to look again into my tenure application and to clarify my status in the university. The same letter contains a chronology of events beginning from the time I submitted

my application. I received a cryptic reply that my tenure process was still in review. That is the only reply I ever received from his office. My letter on August 2009 (ANNEX T) asking about developments on my case as well as my September 11, 2009 (ANNEX U) correspondence informing him that my salary has been abruptly cut-off never received a written response from the Chancellor.

- 3. Inaction about complaints.** I did not just expect responses from the letters that I sent to the Dean's and Chancellor's offices. I also sought reprieve from the unfortunate situations this tenure process has brought me. When I was barred from teaching by the Department without basis on November 6, 2008, I sought the help of the Dean in getting a written explanation and a clear clarification of why I was barred from from teaching when I have a contract with the University until May 31, 2009. When my salary was cut off, I expected the Chancellor to uphold my right to compensation. In both instances, no action was undertaken by the concerned offices.

IV. What would support the Chancellor's Decision if he were to grant tenure to me?

The Chancellor cites the correspondences between him and Vice Chancellor Paredes indicating that I have met the minimum requirements for tenure. However, the Chancellor also cites the policy that units in the University can impose more stringent standards as they see fit (p.10) .

It is at this point that Chancellor Cao, I believe, shows that he has accepted as a fact the allegations of the minority that I have not conducted myself ethically. He quotes from the MR regarding ethical conduct.

"A faculty member who applies for tenure should not only meet the minimum requirements for tenure in terms of teaching, publications and service, it is also indispensable that the application must 'conduct himself/herself ethically in all dealings with students, colleagues, staff, and persons outside the University' (UPOVPAA, 2004, Shaping Our Institutional Future: A Statement on Faculty Tenure, Rank, and Promotion. Furthermore, 'academic grounds include professional ethics, intellectual honesty, and other values central to academic life" (Ibid., p. 12)

He continues in his memo, "they [those opposed to the grant of tenure in the Department] have, in my assessment, sufficiently explained why she failed to meet the standards stipulated above." (p. 11) This statement exposes the Chancellor's acceptance of the allegations and insinuations against me in the MR.

The Chancellor, to whom I addressed my appeal to, and prayed would deliver me

from the irregularities and injustice that I experienced in my tenure process has one-sidedly and unfairly ruled against my appeal. Relying mainly on the MR document as basis, he has found me guilty of the allegations therein which, throughout this whole time, I have not read and responded to, a document which has not gone through the scrutiny of an independent body, a document that remains a compendium of mere accusations by three members of the faculty and not all. In effect, Chancellor Cao accepted as facts the personal opinion of a small group of individuals and believed that their allegations are founded, and that these are sufficient academic grounds to deny my tenure.

It behooves me to note how someone accorded with such a high position in our esteemed University is so arbitrary and unfair in his practice of power. To Chancellor Cao reckless actions, I present Prof. Bello's opinion in his letter to Vice Chancellor Paredes on January 12, 2008 (ANNEX N) :

If there are such extraneous non-academic issues, they should be subjected to a separate legal process where all parties are given a chance to present their side. The conflation of the tenure process with a disciplinary *process--especially one that has not reached any conclusion on the guilt or innocence of the defendant--is* wrong and constitutes a dangerous precedent that would destroy the academic objectivity that is central to the tenure process.

Furthermore, the very document that the minority report cites also has provisions that has been conveniently ignored by the Chancellor. Shaping our Institutional Future" (2004) under the "responsibilities" on the part of the tenured faculty tasked with recommending tenure, that they:

"Uphold academic freedom, which requires that faculty appointments are made solely on academic grounds – performance in teaching, research and extension, potential to contribute to the discipline, and ethical conduct of the profession" (I.B.2.2.a).

And that it is their responsibility to:

"create an intellectual environment that supports open and free inquiry, including the freedom to differ, in the spirit of learning and scholarship" (I.B.2.2.c).(From Shaping Our Institutional Future: A Statement on Faculty Tenure, Rank and Promotion," OVPAA, 2004)

V. Action

In finally denying my appeal, the Chancellor compared my academic qualifications with those of an associate professor from another institute with different tenure requirements. The Chancellor has conveniently forgotten that the

University Council adopted on December 15, 2008 the following additional guideline related to the process of the grant of tenure:

“Each faculty with temporary but tenure track appointment shall be provided by the Department/Division chair as Chair of the Departmental/Division Academic and Personnel Fellowship Committee not later than 30 days after the start of his/her original appointment, a written notification of the evaluation criteria and procedures in effect at the time of the appointment and shall be evaluated on the basis of these criteria”.

I have fully satisfied the existing academic requirements for tenure of the Dept of Sociology and the CSSP, a fact that was affirmed by the Department, the CEB and UP-Diliman's Academic Personnel and Fellowship Committee as I have already mentioned in the beginning of this letter.

VI. Prayer

The issues against me mainly pertain to my alleged "lack of transparency" or "failure to uphold the truth" in connection with the real academic status of Ms. Karen Empeno, a former student of the Department of Sociology, who was abducted on June 26, 2006 along with Sherlyn Cadapan, a former student of the College of Human Kinetics. No matter how hard they try to hide behind notions of professional ethics, I recognize that I am being penalized for the politics I espouse which informs their reading of my alleged involvement in the press conference for the two missing students on June 30, 2009. I am responding to these accusations in the attached document refuting the minority report.

My tenure saga has really been a saga by all accounts. But ultimately, what is alarming are the red-baiting accusations contained in the Minority Report upheld by our esteemed University officials particularly Chancellor Sergio Cao.

I contend that the Chancellor Cao erred in the following instances:

- 1) When the Department and the College relayed their inability to reach a consensus on my tenure case, it was expected of the Chancellor to prove he is worthy of the office he occupies. It was hoped that he would preside over a judicious process where all the parties concerned can expect a fair and transparent ascertaining of the truth, a process that I was more than willing to submit to given the chance. Instead, he devised an ineffective resolution that insults all the stakeholders in this tenure case by citing the two-thirds rule.
- 2) Acting upon his request, the College Executive Board (CEB) of the College, as a critical and collegial body, voted in favor of my tenure on March 18, 2009. Allowing the composition to be questioned and nullifying the validity of their votes after the fact is unfair.

- 3) The Chancellor believes that there have been sufficient instances for me to explain my side. I reiterate that my rights to due process, fairness, and transparency as explained above among others have been violated by the actions of those behind the minority report and the Chancellor's arbitrary adoption of their opinion and I reserve the right to file administrative cases and moral damages.
- 4) The Chancellor believes that I lack the necessary academic requirements for tenure. I reiterate once more that I have fully satisfied the existing academic requirements for tenure of the Dept of Sociology and the CSSP, a fact that was affirmed by the Department, the CEB and UP-Diliman's Academic Personnel and Fellowship Committee.

From the moment Vice Chancellor Paredes remanded my tenure application back to the Department on June 20, 2008, the whole process for my tenure has been characterized by serious irregularities. Let me register the fact that as of April 18, 2008, with a vote of seven (7) against three (3), I was already recommended for tenure by the faculty of the Department of Sociology as indicated in the Basic Paper forwarded and the accompanying Justification. I have established above how **various bodies and offices have ascertained that I am eligible for tenure** in the course of this long process.

Furthermore, all **issues** that were thrown at me after the "7-3" March 25, 2008 decision in my favor have already been **brought up, discussed and decided** upon after thorough deliberations.

- a. The written Justification (ANNEX B) for the granting of my tenure states the following:

*"The decision to recommend the granting of tenure to Prof. Raymundo was arrived at after **thorough deliberations** in the two meetings of the Department's tenured faculty held on 5 March 2008 and 25 March 2008"*

xxx xxx xxx

"Some members of the faculty raised a few questions pertaining to Prof. Raymundo's political commitment (vis-à-vis her academic responsibilities) and her participation in department committee assignments, particularly the handling of work in the undergraduate Committee. After long and passionate discussions which touched on, among others, the theory and practice of democracy, academic freedom, and professional ethics, seven out of ten tenured faculty members (excluding the Chair and Dr. Walden Bello,

who is on leave without pay), decided that her academic qualifications and achievements far outweigh the perceived shortcomings.” (Emphasis supplied)

- b. The written Views of the Chair (“Pananaw bilang Tagapangulo ng Departamento ng Sosyolohiya Kaugnay sa Pagrekomenda ng Tenyur kay Prop. Sarah Jane S. Raymundo” attached as ANNEX D), written by former Department Chairperson Prof. Clemen C. Aquino clearly stated that she had expressed her views during the March 25, 2008 meeting of tenured faculty members. Just the same, after the expression of her views and all possible objections to a decision in my favor, seven (7) against (3) faculty members voted to grant me tenure.
- c. The events upon which the alleged questions on my ethics took place almost two years prior to my filing of application for tenure. None was formally cited to have transpired after I applied for tenure, much less after the tenured faculty originally voted in favor of granting me tenure last April 18, 2008. I was also renewed as a full-time faculty member for the next two years in the same Department.

In view of the foregoing, I ask that the rescission of the original favorable decision dated April 18, 2008 be declared null and void and that the said decision granting me tenure be upheld.

Respectfully yours,

Sarah Jane S. Raymundo

cc: **Board of Regents**

All U.P. Academic Employees Union, Diliman Chapter