

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

December 7, 1970

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 4:12 p.m. by President Olson. The following senators were absent:

Irma Ayers	Elizabeth D. Cloud	Dorothy A. Kennedy
William J. Benton	William S. Gaither	Peter W. Rees
Mary K. Carl	James B. Heck	John W. Shirley

Mr. Olson recognized the presence of President Trabant and indicated the desire of the Senate to hear remarks similar to those the President usually makes at the beginning of regular Faculty meetings. President Trabant was given the floor and offered an apology to the Senate for missing so many meetings and indicated this was due to his rather tight schedule. He then reviewed the meeting held by the Board of Trustees with respect to the University budget.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

It was announced that the Senate would meet on December 14 and 21, both in the afternoon and in the evening, to complete the business regarding approval of the Committee on Committees Report.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted on a motion by Mr. Wriston, seconded by Mr. Anapol and passed voice vote.

III. REPORTS

A report was given by Mr. Tingey regarding the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee on Retirement.

A report from Mr. Anapol, Rules Committee, on the Salsbury resolution was given. Mr. Anapol suggested that the intent of the Salsbury resolution might more easily be fulfilled at this time by directing the Secretary of the Senate to write a letter to the Director of Libraries inviting him to attend Senate meetings and participate in the debate. The Senate approved this suggestion, and the President of the Senate directed the Secretary to write the letter.

IV. BUSINESS

A. Proposed Revision in the Freshman English Course

Mr. Rosenberry of the English Department was recognized and gave some explanatory remarks regarding the proposed revision. Mr. Bohner explained the rationale for this change. Mr. Duggan of the History Department read a letter to the Senate signed by several members of the faculty of the History Department. The letter is included as an attachment to these minutes. Motion by Mr. Schweizer, seconded by Mr. Williams, to table the proposed revision in the Freshman English Course. Question was moved by Mr. Anapol, seconded by Mr. Tingey, passed 30 ayes, 11 nays. Schweizer

motion was defeated 13 ayes, 33 nays. The English Department motion to revise Freshman English Course passed 30 ayes, 11 nays.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry B. Tingey, Secretary

HBT:psb

Attachment

REPORT FROM THE FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE ON CRITERIA
AND PROCEDURES FOR CONTRACT RENEWAL, PROMOTION AND GRANTING OF TENURE

I. Introduction

Several of the complaints reaching the Faculty Personnel Policy Committee in the last three years have been such as to suggest that there is a need for more clearly defined criteria for evaluating the performance of faculty, and considerable room for improvement in the procedures used to make personnel decisions as well. The appointment in the winter of 1968-1969 of an Ad Hoc Promotions Committee (the Birchenall Committee) was one expression of the University's awareness that there was room for improvement in this area. One of the major activities of the present Faculty Personnel Policy Committee has been a study of the criteria applied and the procedures used in evaluating faculty personnel.

One of the things done was to carry out a survey by questionnaire of the present criteria and procedures in the various departments and divisions. A total of 37 such questionnaires were sent out, with a follow-up letter a few weeks later. A total of 28 replies were eventually received.* There is a wide variation within these departments that replied with respect to their procedures for making personnel decisions. Some departments have written by-laws; promotion committees; criteria that are more explicit than those in the Faculty Handbook; and carefully spelled out procedures. In other departments, it is clear that the chairman is making personnel recommendations without formally consulting with any group of faculty in the department, and that it would be quite difficult for

*The 9 departments or administrative units about which we have no information are: Department of Agricultural and Food Economics, Agricultural Engineering, Statistics and Computer Science, Chemical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Division of Secretarial Studies, College of Education, College of Home Economics.

1 a new faculty member to know what criteria were being used to evaluate him.

2 In addition to information provided by the questionnaire, the
3 committee has had the benefit of the report of the Birchenall Committee; it
4 has drawn heavily from its own experience in handling complaints in the last
5 three years; and it has drawn ideas from the 1966 Statement on Government of
6 Colleges and Universities of the AAUP.

7 The 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities of
8 the AAUP defines "joint determination" as follows:

9 "The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions
10 of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing
11 board, administration, faculty, students and others. The relationship calls
12 for adequate communications among these components, and full opportunity for
13 appropriate joint planning and effort."

14 The statement goes on to point out that "important areas of action
15 involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making
16 participation of all the institutional components, and differences in the
17 weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by
18 reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter
19 at hand. . ."

20 This Committee accepts the principle of joint determination with
21 respect to the educational objectives of departments, colleges and the University
22 as a whole. In what follows, as we develop the concept of faculty involvement in

1 the determination of faculty status, it should be understood that this is in
2 the context of a previously agreed upon and jointly determined set of ob-
3 jectives and criteria.

II. General Recommendations

4 (1) We accept the assertion that "Faculty status and related
5 matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments,
6 reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure,
7 and dismissal."* These matters should first be determined through established
8 departmental procedures, and the recommendations then reviewed by the appro-
9 priate academic officers, with the concurrence of the Board of Trustees.

10 (2) We support the principle that the criteria employed for
11 evaluating faculty should be stated as explicitly as possible and made known
12 to all faculty members in the department.

13 (3) Within the constraints of jointly determined educational policy,
14 both at college and University levels, and subject to the legitimate pressure
15 of other members of the University community, we believe that each department
16 should be free to design its own program, emphasize one or another of the roles
17 it might play, and thus develop working descriptions of the qualities it wishes
18 to reward. These will not necessarily be constant from one department to
19 another.

20 (4) The evaluations must involve more people than the chairman
21 alone, but whether the group entrusted with such matters is an elected committee

*from the 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities of the AAUP.

1 of the department or is composed of all persons of a certain rank, is a matter
2 that can be left to the departments. Except under unusual circumstances, we do
3 not regard it as sufficient for the chairman to obtain a consensus by informal
4 consultation with various faculty members on such matters.

5 (5) We strongly urge departments to ^{consider the} use of outside referees in evalua-
6 tion for promotion. We are not yet prepared to recommend that departments be
7 required to do this for several reasons:

8 (a) insufficient experience with the procedure to be sure of its
9 value and practicality

10 (b) cost

11 (c) uncertainty as to whether such an evaluation should be
12 invoked at the time when a person is being considered for promotion
13 to associate professor (usually carrying tenure) or when he is being
14 considered for promotion to full professor.

15 (6) The fact that a given department has certain obligations with
16 respect to research, teaching and service does not necessarily mean that an
17 attempt must be made to have each person in the department apportion his efforts
18 in the same way at all times. Greater flexibility might be achieved by having
19 certain members carry a greater share of the research obligation and others the
20 heavy teaching responsibilities, bearing in mind that individual faculty assign-
21 ments are subject to the formal approval of the college Dean.

22 (7) Departmental autonomy with respect to criteria used in faculty
23 evaluation carries with it certain implications. If, for example, a department

1 chooses to stress undergraduate teaching, or to adopt a "track system" (defined
2 as any system that allows faculty persons to be identified as being primarily
3 research-oriented or teaching-oriented), then demonstrated excellence in teaching
4 should be given consideration equivalent to demonstrated excellence in re-
5 search. There are difficulties in this view, two of which we have identified.

6 (a) It is often said that teaching ability cannot be evaluated
7 with an accuracy that even approaches that which can be made of research
8 ability. This is hardly the place to discuss teaching evaluation in detail,
9 but several points should be made. The first is that much more could be done
10 to evaluate teaching than is now being done (see, for example, the Dilley
11 Report); the second is that evaluation of scholarly productivity in actual
12 practice is often little more than the counting of publications; and the third
13 point is that if teaching effectiveness is thought by a department to be of
14 equal or greater importance than research, then the effort must be made to
15 evaluate it, even though it is agreed that the results will not be perfect.

16 (b) The implications of departmental autonomy with respect to
17 criteria for promotion carries with it a second difficulty. Several deans
18 apparently believe that promotion to associate professor for teaching excellence
19 might be warranted, but that promotion to full professor should require the
20 usual evidence of research productivity. If this position persists, the concept
21 of departmental autonomy is weakened.

22 (8) We understand that a departmental chairman is expected to
23 review each year the Faculty Evaluation form with the individual members of

1 the department. This is not now done by all chairmen, and failure to discuss
2 these evaluations candidly is potentially a source of considerable misunder-
3 standing. This review policy should be made widely known.

4 (9) The process of evaluation should be continuous, and should not
5 be restricted to the evaluation of junior faculty. We also recommend that
6 departments consider ways in which they can provide constructive evaluations of
7 the performance of their chairman.

8 *delete* (10) The Committee is in complete agreement that the determination
9 of faculty status should be primarily a faculty responsibility. We are divided
10 on the question of whether there should be college- or University-wide promotion
11 committees to review the recommendations of the departments. We are agreed
12 that there must be a University-wide committee to deal with complaints by
13 faculty members. Some members of this Committee believe that with more explicit
14 criteria, more carefully prepared recommendations, and an appeals procedure, the
15 need for a regular faculty review group is not as severe as in the past. Others
16 believe that better decisions will result from the insertion of a committee
17 review process.

III. Specific Recommendations

18 *Passed* (1) Replace, in the Faculty Handbook (on page 3-4, Section III-K,
19 Department Chairman):

20 The chairman serves both as the chief representative of his department
21 within the institution and as departmental administrator, responsible for
22 communicating and administering policies and procedures of the University and

1 for developing and organizing courses of study. Together with his dean and
2 provost, he is charged with the recruiting and professional development of
3 staff. Chairmen make recommendation to the dean for faculty appointments,
4 promotions, leaves of absence, tenure, salary increase and termination of
5 service. (~~Except under the most unusual circumstances~~^{write}) the chairman will be
6 expected to consult in a formalized way with the appropriate departmental body
7 on matters of faculty status, excluding at his discretion matters of individual
8 raises and faculty course assignments. The chairman should also establish
9 appropriate vehicles for obtaining student opinion on curricular matters.

10 Departmental chairmen are appointed by the president for five-year
11 terms upon the recommendation of the college dean and the Vice President for
12 Academic Affairs. ^{or reappoint} Except in most unusual circumstances, he should be selected,
13 only after consultation with members of the department and in conformity with
14 their judgment. These appointments are renewable for like periods. The
15 president has the authority to replace a department chairman at any time,
16 after consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the
17 appropriate dean, if he deems such action to be in the best interests of the
18 department or the University. His tenure as a faculty member is a separate
19 right.

20 ^{Passed} (2) Add, in the Faculty Handbook (page 4-5, Section IV-C,
21 Promotion Policy, just before the heading Rank and Tenure):

22 General University criteria for appointment or promotion to given

1 ranks are set forth below. Within these criteria, and those set by the
2 college, individual departments may establish more explicit criteria consistent
3 with the educational goals of the department. Faculty members are advised to
4 consult with their department chairman or the appropriate departmental committees.

5 (3) Delete, in the Faculty Handbook (page 4-5, 4-6, 4-7, Section
6 IV-C) all references to and descriptions of tenure. (*pending com. action on Section (5)*)

X 7 (4) Add, in the Faculty Handbook (page 4-10, Section IV-F, Tenure
8 and Academic Freedom, at the end of the next to last paragraph):

9 Notice of nonreappointment, or of intention not to recommend re-
10 appointment to the governing board, should be given in writing in accordance
11 with the following standards:

12 (a) Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service,
13 if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appoint-
14 ment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of
15 its termination.

16 (b) Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of
17 service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial
18 two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months
19 in advance of its termination.

20 ~~At least~~ (c) At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment
21 after two or more years in the institution. * ~~amendment states~~ *with the exception*
to instructors & lecturers with longer appointments
who shall be notified no later than Dec. 15.

*Taken from the 1964 Standards for Notice of Nonreappointment of the AAUP.

Note: Section (5) has been
referred to the Committee
on Promotion and Tenure

- 9 -

Section (5)
Referred to
New Senate
Committee
on Promotion
& Tenure
Minutes 2/8/82

(5) The Committee is divided on what recommendation to make concerning the matter of tenure. Two alternate ways of changing Section IV-F, Tenure and Academic Freedom, second paragraph on page 4-11, are presented below. The first proposal would put us in line with the 1940 Statement of Principles of the AAUP; the second proposal would make it possible for persons below the rank of associate professor to be granted tenure.

(a) Alternate No. 1

Assistant professors are appointed for an initial term of from one to three years; reappointments at this rank are normally for three-year terms. Appointments and reappointments for instructors are on an annual basis. Reappointments of assistant professors for instructors beyond a seven year probationary period will also automatically carry tenure.

(b) Alternate No. 2

Assistant professors are appointed for an initial term of from one to three years; reappointments at this rank are normally for three-year terms. Appointments and reappointments for instructors are on an annual basis. Reappointments of assistant professors for instructors beyond a seven year probationary period will also automatically carry tenure, unless a specific stipulation to the contrary is contained in the contract signed by the faculty member involved.

(6) Add, in the Faculty Handbook, a new section IV-G entitled University Policy Regarding Recommendations for Renewal, Promotion or the Award of Tenure (this will necessitate changing the letter headings of the subsequent sections in IV).

1 (a) Any recommendation regarding renewal, promotion or tenure
2 should be reached by an appropriate faculty group in accordance with es-
3 tablished procedures agreed to by the faculty.

4 (b) The faculty member should be advised, early in his appoint-
5 ment, of the substantive and procedural standards generally employed in
6 decisions affecting renewal, promotions and tenure. Any special standards
7 adopted by his department or school should also be brought to his attention.

8 (c) The faculty member should be advised of the time when decisions
9 affecting renewal and tenure are ordinarily made, and he should be given the
10 opportunity to submit material which he believes will be helpful to an ade-
11 quate consideration of his circumstance.

12 (d) In the event of a decision not to renew his appointment, the
13 faculty member should be informed of the decision in writing, and, if he so
14 requests, he should be advised of the reasons which contributed to that
15 decision. He should also have the opportunity to request a reconsideration
16 by the decision-making body. If the faculty member alleges that his academic
17 freedom has been violated by the decision-making body, or that the decision-
18 making body did not give adequate consideration to his circumstances, he should
19 have the right to petition a grievance committee or other appropriate committee.
20 Under ordinary circumstances, the grievance committee should issue a report to
21 the appropriate administrative offices within one month of the filing of the
22 grievance. The grievance committee will consist of tenured faculty members
23 elected at large but no department chairman or administrative officer shall
24 serve on the committee.

~~(7) Replace, in the Faculty Handbook (page 4-26, Section IV-U, Resignations), the wording at the end of the first sentence, "60 days before the end of an academic year" with "April 1", and~~
~~(8) add a phrase, so that the whole section shall read:~~

Change,

(7) Add, in the Faculty Handbook (page 4-26, Section IV-U, Resignations) ~~a phrase at the end of the first sentence;~~ so that the whole section shall read:

Accepted professional practice requires that resignations be submitted by letter to the department chairman no later than ^{April 1} ~~60 days before the~~ ~~end of an academic year,~~ or 30 days after receiving notification of the terms of his continued employment the following year, whichever date occurs later.

Except by mutual agreement with the appropriate University administrator, resignations by the teaching faculty ^{to become effective} during the academic year cannot be accepted.

Also, for consistency, delete, in the Faculty Handbook (page 4-4, Section IV-B-1), the second paragraph.

(8) Delete, on the inside cover of the Faculty Handbook the term "Confidential".

(9) Change, in the preface to the Faculty Handbook, the second sentence in the first paragraph, in one of two ways:

(1) if the verbatim rule and resolution from which the various policies and regulations were derived are so complex and lengthy as to interfere with a general understanding, they should be attached as an appendix, to which reference should be made at appropriate points throughout the Handbook; or (2) they should be presented verbatim in the appropriate sections.

(omit underlining)
accepted by com.

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
NEWARK, DELAWARE
19711

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
127 MEMORIAL HALL
PHONE: 302-738-2371

TO: The University Senate
FROM: The Undersigned Members of the Faculty of History
CONCERNING: Proposals of the English Department with Respect
to Freshman English

To the Members of the University Senate:

We all agree, we feel sure, that it avails a student little if he can read with discrimination and think with precision but cannot express himself in clear, correct, and forceful English. In virtually all colleges and universities in this country primary responsibility for the development of a minimally acceptable level of writing ability has traditionally rested with the freshman course in English composition.

Now we are told about "a nationally significant trend recognizing a pattern of diminishing returns in the improvement of student writing through formal instruction at the immediate post-high school level" (Professor Bohner's memorandum). In accordance with that "trend" the Department of English proposes a reduction in the freshman English requirement from six hours to three hours and urges that the Writing Center and the rest of the faculty assume greater responsibility for the improvement of the written expression of the students of the University.

The first point we wish to raise is to ask where, since this is "a nationally significant trend," similar reductions are taking place. A quick perusal of college and university catalogues indicates that virtually all schools continue to require a full year of composition of their entering students. Princeton imposes this obligation on most of its freshmen, and Harvard on all of its freshmen, no matter what their level of competence. If Harvard and Princeton persist in thinking their students need such training, how much more true this must be of the students at the University of Delaware, most of whom, it can in fairness be said, cannot be compared in ability with the students at those schools?

- 2 -

Secondly, the proposals of the English Department affect at best the students at either extreme of the scale of ability and competence. We wonder about the soundness of those proposals, particularly with respect to the poorer students. The Writing Center cannot be reasonably expected to achieve more than the barest minimal competence in terms of grammar, spelling, and syntax. It certainly cannot be held responsible for the development of style, organization, and clarity of expression, hallmarks of the prose of the educated men and women we should be producing. And what of the great mass of students who fall between the two extremes and whose writing ability could be significantly bettered through practice? Surely they would benefit much more from two semesters of intensive composition than from one. If the freshman course as presently taught consists of no more than "further technical drill or rhetorical theory" and "the repetition of pedagogical procedures which lack the necessary reinforcement in the student's other work to make for genuine learning," one might suggest that the difficulty lies not so much in the course itself as in the unimaginative way it is taught. English composition can be taught well.

As for shifting some of the responsibility for writing to the faculty at large, this is naive. The unrealistic optimism inherent in this proposal is evident in the required 200-level course given by the English Department itself in which, we have the impression, little if any writing outside of examinations is demanded. Although members of other departments should have students write more, it is for two reasons unfair to ask them to assume formal responsibility for the students' English as such. First, many introductory courses at the freshman and sophomore level are too large to permit this; and this situation will be exacerbated next year when the anticipated increase in enrollment will be 700 as opposed to a total of 7 additions to the faculty. Second, even when a faculty member does require papers, he can perforce be only secondarily concerned with the student's English and must restrict his commentary and corrections to the most elementary points of grammar and spelling and to only the broadest aspects of style. It is enough to expect us to teach our own disciplines well without compelling us to undertake these exacting responsibilities.

It is, furthermore, equally unrealistic to hope for smaller classes until this University is prepared to spend more money on education; to believe that the senior faculty will participate more in freshman instruction; or to assert that elementary and high schools should carry more of the burden. Obviously they ought to; but they do not, and they probably will not. They are passing the buck; but the buck must stop here, for there is no one beyond the university to pass it on to. The English Department must deal with things as they are, not as they might be.

- 3 -

What nearly every student here needs is more exercise in writing, however boring or irrelevant he or his teacher may find it. It is the fundamental duty of the English Department to insure that students graduated from this University can write correct, clear, and concise English. Functioning as a "service department" may not please members of the English Department, but that is precisely what it must do at the freshman level if it is to fulfill its basic responsibilities to our students and to the community as a whole.

We, the undersigned of the faculty of History, therefore wish to state clearly our opposition to the proposals of the English Department and request that, since these recommendations affect the rest of the faculty and the undergraduate curricula of the University, the faculty be thoroughly canvassed as to the advisability of these changes and that the question be given a complete public airing.

Sincerely,

Lawrence G. Duggan

Stephen Palmer

John A. Bernstein

Donald Meyer

Evelyn Holst Clift

Fai Lin

Stephen Lukashewich

James R. Allen

David Pong