

DIGEST OF THE SPECIAL MEETING

February 22, 1971

CONVENED: 4:13 p.m.

REPORTS: Report on Student Court membership increase, Mr. Hale, SGA.

BILLS REPORTED:

S. 42 (introduced February 15, 1971), to approve establishment of a Ph.D. in the College of Education. Passed 35 ayes, 10 nays, 5 abstentions.

S. 37, Faculty Personnel Policy Committee Report, continued. Remainder of the report was considered and approved as amended.

ADJOURNED: 5:30 p.m.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

February 22, 1971

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by President Olson at 4:13 p.m. The following senators were not in attendance:

Irma Ayers	Jay L. Halio	Francis J. Merceret
May K. Carl	Robert Hogenson	John W. Shirley
Edward W. Comings	Wayland M. Hubbart	Mary J. Strattner
William S. Gaither	Franklin P. Kilpatrick	Edward A. Trabant
Edmund S. Glenn	Paul Knudson	Laszlo Zsoldos

I. REPORTS

President Olson introduced Mr. George Hale, who reported that the Senate of the Student Government Association, acting upon a ruling by the Judicial Policy Board, had passed a motion to appoint two black students to the Student Court. This will increase the membership from seven to nine members.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

On motion by Mr. Crawford, seconded by Mr. Tingey, the agenda was approved as follows:

1. Proposal for a Program in Education Leading to the Doctor of Philosophy Degree, continued.
2. Faculty Personnel Policy Committee Report, continued.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Proposal for a Program in Education Leading to the Doctor of Philosophy Degree, continued.

The chair asked for a recap of the discussion at the previous meeting of the Senate. Mr. Harlan and Mr. Tingey declined. Mr. Schweizer reiterated his position against the proposal: (1) The College of Education now has around 600 people working towards a Masters degree for largely political reasons; he feels candidates for the Ph.D. program would be similarly motivated. (2) One cannot build a strong edifice on a foundation of sand; good people are being turned away from teaching because of the poor quality of instruction. Mr. Dilley reiterated that the Committee on University Courses and Curricula had passed the program unanimously. This committee consisted of the Vice Provost, the Director of Admissions, one representative from University Extension, and one member from each College with undergraduate programs. Mr. Moszynski questioned the appropriateness of the title, suggesting a non-research Education degree, Doctorate of Education. Mr. Bonner felt the Senate is not the place to examine in detail the pros and cons of this program. Mr. Wriston asked if there is anything in the unpublished Design Commission Part II that would be at odds with the degree program in Education. Mr. Dilley replied that the Subcommittee of the College of Education had not given its draft to the Design Commission but he knows of nothing which would interfere with this proposal. Mr. Worthen explained that most of the comments of the College of Education would focus on the undergraduate and M.A. program, not the Ph.D.

Mr. Stegner stated that the faculty of the College of Education want to do the very best possible job in preparing students for teaching. He believes this program will improve the quality of its teachers through research. The program is fully justified in terms of need, ability of the faculty, and quality of the students. The existing Behavioral Sciences program is too limited for students interested in such fields as biology. A Ph.D. in Education would give able students opportunity for research in his chosen field.

Mr. Crawford asked if the program would necessitate an increase in budgetary appropriations. Mr. Heck replied that the expenditure would be approximately the same as for the current program in Behavioral Sciences. Mr. Crawford stated that if the Senate rejects this proposal, it should offer concrete, constructive suggestions.

Mr. Schweizer said he would like to see open hearings to examine the background of the type of education that is now being given to students in the College of Education and to hear comments from students on the present program -- persons who have gone through the program and have found inadequacies. He would like review further down the line.

Mr. Williams suggested that (1) the discussions to be held Wednesday on Part I of the Design Commission's report might clarify this, and (2) a strong M.A. program is necessary before initiating a Ph.D. program. He proposed waiting for the availability of Part II concerned with the new doctoral programs of any type. Mr. Williams moved that the matter be tabled, seconded by Mr. Schweizer. Mr. Anapol on a point of information asked Mr. Heck what would be the practical consequences of this motion to table, if the motion passed. Mr. Heck said it would be relatively drastic. At Mr. Tingey's request, Mr. Williams clarified the intent of his motion to table. Mr. Williams stated that the motion should be tabled until after the discussion of Part I of the Community Design report and the availability of Part II's evaluation of the specific colleges and departments. Motion to table was defeated: 17 ayes, 32 nays.

Mr. Crawford asked what hardship would a delay bring to the College of Education. Mr. Heck replied that each time such a proposal has been given in the past, it has been shot down. In 1968 the College began a long, laborious process of formulating a new plan through proper channels. College of Education faculty members have great expectations about this program. He fears the loss of good faculty members who have come here expecting to work under the new plan. Morale would drop. As to the quality of instruction, ratings of both teachers and courses are high. Twenty percent of the faculty gave major research papers at a recent Educational Research conference. If there is indeed a basis for asserting that the quality is poor, the problem is not only within the College of Education but the entire University, since 83.4 percent of the instruction is carried on by non-Education faculty. The College has no problem placing graduates of its program; demand is high because of proven quality of graduates. There is little data to support the allegation that the quality is poor. It is an important matter that the Senate approve this proposal so that it can be sent to the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Brown called the question, seconded by Mr. Sasser. Question passed 33 ayes, 7 nays.

Vote on the Proposal for a Program in Education Leading to the Doctor of Philosophy Degree: 35 ayes, 10 nays, 5 abstentions.

B. Faculty Personnel Policy Committee Report, continued

Mr. Wriston continued the discussion of this report, beginning on page 9, section (6). Mr. Crawford moved that this entire section be adopted, seconded by Mr. Salsbury; motion passed voice vote. Section (7), line 9: Mr. Anapol suggested adding the phrase "to become effective" after the word "faculty." Mr. Wriston indicated that the committee would accept this. Section (7), line 6: discussion on adding the words "verbal," or "unofficial written" after "receiving." Motion by Mr. Bonner, seconded by Mr. Krum to add "unofficial written" here. Question was called by Mr. Schweizer, seconded by Mr. Crawford. The Bonner motion failed unanimously by voice vote. The original wording stands on line 6. Section (7), lines 5 and 6: Miss DeArmond commented that the wording "60 days before the end of an academic year" is ambiguous. Mr. Lippert moved that "April 1" be substituted for "60 days before the end of an academic year." Question was called and passed voice vote. The Lippert motion passed voice vote. Mr. Crawford moved the question on Section (7), seconded by Mr. Anapol; passed voice vote. Vote on Section (7): passed voice vote. Section (8): Mr. Anapol called the question seconded by Mr. Williams and passed voice vote. Section (8) was approved by voice vote. Section (9): Mr. Crawford moved that this section be adopted, second unknown. Mr. Crawford called the question, seconded by Mr. Schweizer, passed voice vote. Vote on Section (9): passed by voice vote. Approval of the report from the Faculty Personnel Policy Committee, as amended, is now complete. Note: Subsection (10), page 6 of Section II was deleted by the FPPC as a consequence of the approval of the Standing Committees of the Senate.

The meeting was adjourned on motion of Mr. Lippert, seconded by Mr. Tingey, at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry B. Tingey, Secretary

HBT:psb

Attachment: Report from the Faculty Personnel Policy Committee,
as approved by the University Faculty Senate

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 was eventually received.* There is a wide variation within those 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 a new faculty member to know what criteria were being used to evaluate him.

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

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

*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.

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

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

This Committee accepts the principle of joint determination with respect to the educational objectives of departments, colleges and the University as a whole. In what follows, as we develop the concept of faculty involvement in the determination of faculty status, it should be understood that this is in the context of a previously agreed upon and jointly determined set of objectives and criteria.

II. General Recommendations

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

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

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

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

(4) The evaluations must involve more people than the chairman alone, but whether the group entrusted with such matters is an elected committee of the department or is composed of all persons of a certain rank, is a matter that can be left to the departments. Except under unusual circumstances, we do not regard it as sufficient for the chairman to obtain a consensus by informal consultation with various faculty members on such matters.

(5) We strongly urge departments to consider the use of outside referees in evaluation for promotion. We are not yet prepared to recommend that departments be required to do this for several reasons:

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

(b) cost

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

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

(7) Departmental autonomy with respect to criteria used in faculty evaluation carries with it certain implications. If, for example, a department chooses to stress undergraduate teaching, or to adopt a "track system" (defined as any system that allows faculty persons to be identified as being primarily research-oriented or teaching-oriented), then demonstrated excellence in teaching should be given consideration equivalent to demonstrated excellence in research. There are difficulties in this view, two of which we have identified.

(a) It is often said that teaching ability cannot be evaluated with an accuracy that even approaches that which can be made of research ability. This is hardly the place to discuss teaching evaluation in detail, but several points should be made. The first is that much more could be done to evaluate teaching than is now being done (see, for example, the Dilley Report); the second is that evaluation of scholarly productivity in actual practice is

often little more than the counting of publications; and the third point is that if teaching effectiveness is thought by a department to be of equal or greater importance than research, then the effort must be made to evaluate it, even though it is agreed that the results will not be perfect.

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

(8) We understand that a departmental chairman is expected to review each year the Faculty Evaluation form with the individual members of the department. This is not now done by all chairmen, and failure to discuss these evaluations candidly is potentially a source of considerable misunderstanding. This review policy should be made widely known.

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

III. Specific Recommendations

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

The chairman serves both as the chief representative of his department within the institution and as departmental administrator, responsible for communicating and administering policies and procedures of the University and for developing and organizing courses of study. Together with his dean and provost, he is charged with the recruiting and professional development of staff. Chairmen make recommendation to the dean for faculty appointments, promotions, leaves of absence, tenure, salary increase and termination of service. The chairman will be expected to consult in a formalized way with the appropriate departmental body on matters of faculty status, excluding at his discretion matters of individual raises and faculty course assignments. The chairman should also establish appropriate vehicles for obtaining student opinion on curricular matters.

Departmental chairmen are appointed by the President for five-year terms upon the recommendation of the college dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

These appointments are renewable for like periods. Except in most unusual circumstances, he should be selected only after consultation with members of the department and in conformity with their judgment. The President has the authority to replace a department chairman at any time, after consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the appropriate dean, if he deems such action to be in the best interests of the department or the University. His tenure as a faculty member is a separate right.

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

General University criteria for appointment or promotion to given ranks are set forth below. Within these criteria, and those set by the college, individual departments may establish more explicit criteria consistent with the educational goals of the department. Faculty members are advised to consult with their department chairman or the appropriate departmental committees.

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

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

Notice of nonreappointment, or of intention not to recommend reappointment to the governing board, should be given in writing in accordance with the following standards:

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

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

(c) At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution* with the exception of instructors and lecturers with one-year appointments, who shall be notified not later than December 15.

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

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

(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).

(a) Any recommendation regarding renewal, promotion or tenure should be reached by an appropriate faculty group in accordance with established procedures agreed to by the faculty.

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

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

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

(7) Change, in the Faculty Handbook (page 4-26, Section IV-U, Resignations) 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, 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:

(a) 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

(b) they should be presented verbatim in the appropriate sections.

Approved by the
University Faculty Senate
February 22, 1971