

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

DIGEST OF SPECIAL MEETING

FEBRUARY 28, 1972

CONVENED: 4:05 PM.

BILL REFERRED: S.B. 73 - Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges -
Evaluation of non-teaching activities

Motion made to return report to Committee
for revisions.

ADJOURNED: 5:40 PM.

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

NEWARK, DELAWARE

1971

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
303 HULLIHEN HALL
PHONE: 302-738-2829

February 9, 1972

MEMORANDUM

TO: ALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY

FROM: Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges

JCH

Because the attached report, if adopted by the Senate, will have consequences of some importance to all members of the faculty, we have requested that the report be circulated fully before the special meeting of the Senate on February 28, 1972. It was also judged advisable that some additional statement concerning the context of ideas and events should be made, along with a clear indication of the principles governing the development of this report.

1. Not only did President Trabant, at the recommendation of his Advisory Group last August, ask us to formulate "equitable guidelines for the evaluation of non-teaching activities," he also requested us to form a sub-committee jointly with members of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure to study the whole matter of academic tenure. That part of his charge, in a memorandum dated August 18, 1971, reads:

"Conscious of pressures developing nationwide and aimed at severe modifications and possible elimination of the traditional tenure system, we recommend that a joint sub-committee of the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges and the Committee on Promotions and Tenure undertake a study of possible alternatives which might result in an improved system with great flexibility."

The report on the evaluation of non-teaching activities was given the deadline of the November meeting of the Senate; the sub-committee on the matter of tenure was given no deadline.

2. The Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges developed its report keeping in mind the full implications of both charges; hence, the implications for promotions and tenure under any system of evaluation were frankly faced rather than avoided. Both the joint sub-committee and our committee appeared to be unanimous in the conviction that for any system of tenure to be strong and defensible, adequate review procedures for all members of the faculty would have to be instituted where they did not presently exist and possibly reinforced where they did. Our report, therefore, should be seen as an integral part of a larger report that will recommend strengthening the present tenure system at the University of Delaware.

3. Foremost among our guiding principles was the principle of fair and full accountability under suitable contractual agreements. Every faculty member should be held accountable for work in those areas agreed upon in advance in precisely those proportions stipulated under those agreements, although the emphases very conceivably could and perhaps should shift in one contractual period or another. (See p. 6, paragraph #3.)

4. In the evaluation process, greater emphasis should be placed on fuller faculty participation instead of more restricted administrative channels. Minimum requirements for faculty participation are thus recommended, but these leave sufficient room for still broader participation as departments or colleges may desire.

5. Primary responsibility in evaluation procedures and in the formulation and application of specific criteria rests with the individual departments or colleges, with adequate provision for communication back to the individual faculty member under review. Moreover, the responsibility for assembling materials for review rests primarily with the individual faculty member. To insure university-wide comparability, however, general criteria and procedures are recommended.

6. In only one instance, the review of full professors, is a confidential review committee recommended, mainly for the protection of those of lesser rank who would be asked to serve on it, and who (it was felt) would be in a position to contribute significantly to the review. In some departments with few or no full professors, faculty of lesser rank would almost have to be appointed.

7. Under present by-laws, adequate provisions exist for appeal against unfavorable reviews judged to be unfair. (See the charge to the Committee on Promotions and Tenure and the one to the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges.) In any case, results of every review must be communicated to the faculty member in written form, and a personal interview is required.

JLH/dpe
Attachment

Committee on Faculty Welfare & Privileges:

Jay L. Halio, Chairman
Edward E. Schweizer
Barbara H. Settles
Conrad Trumbore
Peter M. Weil

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE AND PRIVILEGE

Draft of "Evaluation of Non-Teaching Activities" Document

Whereas:

- The Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privilege has been charged by the President of the University and his advisory committee from the Senate with the creation of "equitable guidelines for the evaluation of non-teaching activities;"
- teaching and non-teaching activities must be considered as a whole unit, and their evaluation must be based upon some reasonable distribution of the faculty member's time among these several activities;
- the 1969 Faculty Handbook states that the University adheres to a policy of "administered teaching loads. Under this arrangement department chairmen are encouraged to vary the teaching loads of individual faculty members so long as the total teaching obligations are met with the available teaching personnel:" therefore, non-teaching loads are indirectly also administered;
- it is recognized that the "non-teaching" activities in many instances cannot be clearly distinguished from "teaching" activities, e.g. guest lectures given at other universities, advisement, etc.;
- it is recognized that the proportions of faculty members' time spent in teaching and non-teaching activities will vary from college to college, department to department, and from faculty member to faculty member, even within the same department;
- it is recognized that for some individual faculty members, as well as administrators, there are times when the pressures of departmental, college, or university committee or senate work justifiably interfere with research or teaching activities for extended periods;
- the most harmonious conditions are those in which both faculty and administration have the clearest possible picture of the expectations of the department chairman and the administration regarding the balance between teaching and non-teaching activities of the faculty member;
- we live in a world which it is increasingly difficult to decide which non-teaching activities are university-related and which are not;
- there is a false sense of security in deriving quantitative evaluations from essentially non-quantifiable activities;

Therefore, be it resolved that the following general guidelines be established for the evaluation of teaching and non-teaching activities;

I. Categories of Faculty Activity

In the evaluation of the contributions of the faculty member for purposes of salary increases, yearly or biennial review (with feedback to the faculty member, or for the purpose of promotion to a higher rank), the activities of the faculty member shall be classified according to the following three categories:

Teaching

Scholarly, Creative, and/or Professional Development

Service

A. Teaching

Under this category shall be included all scheduled classes (and advising involved therein), seminars, laboratories, thesis and research supervision, field activities and any other credit-bearing activity involving contact between faculty and students for which formal credit is given to the student.

B. Scholarly, Creative, and/or Professional Development

Under this category shall be the following:

1. Research leading to publication of books, articles, published reports, or to appropriate colloquia, seminars, conferences, or lectures in which research results are revealed.
2. Creative development in those fields in which the faculty member receives public recognition for his professional contributions to society or to the university. Included are such activities as plays (composition or production), music (composition or performances), art exhibitions, etc.
3. Professional development involving the presentation of papers or chairing sessions at professional meetings, serving as an officer or committee member of a professional organization, editorial duties, consulting in a professional capacity (paid or unpaid), and similar activities.

C. Service

Included in this category shall be:

1. Advisement (Career, professional, or personal):
 - a. Undergraduate
 - b. Graduate
 - c. Post-doctoral
2. University service:
 - a. Departmental committees and special assignments
 - b. College Senates, committees, and special assignments
 - c. University Senate, committees, and special assignments
 - d. Administrative and quasi-administrative appointments
3. Community service (local, state, regional, national, international), such as election or appointment to boards, commissions, committees, legislative bodies, or the like outside the normal professional calling of the faculty member in his teaching function.
4. Creative activities outside the normal professional calling of the faculty member; for example, participation in orchestras or ensembles, one-man shows of paintings, musical or literary productions, and the like.

II. Evaluation of Faculty Members

A. Frequency of Evaluation and General Procedures

1. At least every two years every Instructor, Assistant Professor, and Associate Professor shall be evaluated by the following individuals and groups, but in the fall semester of their sixth year of service--or sooner, if their specific situations warrant--Instructors and Assistant Professors shall be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure:
 - a. A committee of faculty containing at least one member only one step in rank above that of the faculty member being evaluated (e.g., at least one Associate Professor evaluating an Assistant Professor). This committee may be the same as the Promotion and Tenure Committee under (b). The committee, moreover, need not be composed solely of members of the same department of the faculty member being evaluated.

- b. The Promotion and Tenure Committee of the department, which shall comprise at least all faculty at or above the rank of Associate Professor. This committee may accept, modify, or reject the report of the evaluating committee under (a) above, and its secretary shall forward its recommendation -- including a numerical count of all members voting for the recommendation, against it, or abstaining -- to both the chairman of the department (who of course may also be present at the deliberations) and the dean of the college. (In undepartmentalized colleges, the dean shall serve in place of the chairman, and the Provost or Associate Provost in place of the dean.)
 - c. The department chairman. He shall write his own recommendation of the faculty member to the dean. This may be no more than an endorsement of the recommendation from the department's Committee on Promotion and Tenure, but it may be entirely independent of it.
 - d. The dean or director of the appropriate college or division, who shall transmit all reports together with his own recommendation to the Provost.
2. At least once within every three-to-five-year period, full Professors in each department and college shall be evaluated. The procedure shall be as follows:
- a. The dean of the college shall appoint a secret ad hoc evaluating committee that shall include at least one tenured faculty member below the rank of full Professor.* The committee may also consist of some members outside the department or college that may be competent to the charge given them.
 - b. The ad hoc evaluating committee shall report its findings to the dean of the college, who shall transmit them to the department chairman.

*Because faculty junior to the faculty member being evaluated shall be on these committees, strict confidentiality regarding their membership is essential.

- c. The chairman shall endorse the report of the ad hoc committee or send to the dean his independent evaluation of the Professor.
- d. The dean shall transmit all reports and his own evaluation to the Provost.

B. Evaluation Reports

1. The format of these reports shall remain as flexible as possible to take into account the many different types of activity engaged in by faculty members in different departments and disciplines. All reports, however, shall provide for separate evaluations under the three categories of (1) Teaching, (2) Scholarly, Creative and/or Professional Development, and (3) Service.
2. The faculty member shall himself be requested to initiate the process of evaluation by submitting to his chairman or dean, as and when required, a dossier containing all pertinent evidence under the three major categories for evaluation. Additional evidence may be requested or otherwise provided by the various evaluating units (committees or chairman) as well as a critique of the evidence provided by the person under evaluation review. Upon occasion, as situations may warrant, extramural testimony may be requested.
3. As reports come to departmental chairmen, deans, or directors, they shall become the basis for recommendations for salary increases, promotion, tenure, or termination of service. These recommendations shall in turn, together with the reports upon which they are based, be forwarded to the Provost and (where appropriate) to the Senate Committee on Promotion and Tenure.
4. After each review has been completed, the faculty member shall be provided with a written summary of the review from his chairman (or dean), followed by a personal interview.

C. Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Members

1. Both the evaluating units and the individual faculty members being evaluated must have a clear understanding of the

- criteria and the procedures of evaluation. Therefore, these procedures and criteria should be made available to each faculty member upon being hired. Moreover, under the broad, general guidelines given below, each department and/or college should develop more specific criteria appropriate to their particular disciplines, and all faculty members in each unit should be permitted to contribute to the formulation of these specific criteria. The document that emerges from those deliberations should be reviewed periodically by the faculty for updating or revision as may be necessary or desirable. Finally, it is recommended that separate, specific criteria be established for all three categories designated above, namely, (1) Teaching, (2) Scholarly, Creative, and/or Professional Development; and (3) Service.
2. Since it is not University policy to urge the development of purely homogenous or monolithic departments or colleges, or to inhibit or stifle in any way the professional growth and competencies of individual faculty members, the weight to be given to the various categories shall be the subject of negotiation each year between the colleges and the University (through the agency of the Coordinating Committee for Education); between the department and the dean of the college; and between the individual faculty member and the chairman of his department (or other immediate administrative officer). A written summary of these agreements shall be made available to the faculty member.
 3. A faculty member shall be asked to demonstrate outstanding achievement in either the category of (1) Teaching, or the category of (2) Scholarly, Creative, and Professional Development, in addition to minimum competence or adequacy in the other two of the three major categories (see I. A., B, C).
 4. Since another committee of the Senate is charged with teaching evaluation, this committee has focused mainly upon criteria applicable to the other two major categories of Scholarly, Creative, and Professional Development, and of Service. However, the broad criteria listed below may have

relevance in various ways and degrees to all three categories. The specific applicability and the specific kinds of evidence through which the criteria may be demonstrated remains with the departments and colleges to formulate in greater detail. In the products of his work the following criteria should be brought to bear:

- a. Originality and independence of mind: Breaking new ground, providing new perspectives, resisting fads and fashions in order to discover real truths or values-- these are among the best contributions any faculty member can make to his discipline and through his discipline or service to his university and the society which supports it. Evidence of such contributions is usually not difficult to accumulate, although it may be slow to appear.
- b. Critical awareness, incisiveness, and insight: These qualities in a faculty member, regardless of his particular activity, are of course closely related to the kinds of contributions mentioned under (a) but may be more difficult to demonstrate through concrete evidence. They are also closely related to the kinds of sensibility and sensitivity we should expect among our faculty. At the opposite extreme, the least desirable qualities are critical obtuseness, plodding and routine habits of mind, and vision obscured through bias.
- c. The analytical or acutely intuitive mind: These different but complementary functions of intellect are not often found operating to the same degree in a single mind, although they may be. Both functions, however, are extremely valuable in many fields, and a properly diversified faculty should provide the necessary balance in any discipline and in ways that may be objectively demonstrated.
- d. The ability to synthesize or evaluate: Not everyone may be a strikingly original thinker, but he may otherwise contribute to his discipline or university by bringing together the work of others in new patterns or organizations of thought, or through sorting out valuable from less valuable contributions. In an era of

rapidly expanding knowledge, these abilities are becoming increasingly useful and important.

- e. Effectuality: Regardless of the area of activity, a faculty member should be able to demonstrate his effectiveness--his ability to carry through to successful fruition the activity in which he is engaged. Moreover, the impact of his work upon others is a measure of its value. (For example, in research, do his findings lead to further research and discoveries? Are they referred to by others in his field? In service activities, do his contributions lead to requests for further involvement?)
 - f. Growth and maturity: Every faculty member over a period of years ought to be able to demonstrate significant personal development and growth in the field of his professional competence. Nor need the field remain the same from the time of taking his highest degree to the age of retirement. While dilettantism must always be eschewed, exploration in new or related fields of endeavor should be encouraged if it demonstrates true broadening of interest, competence, and vision.
 - g. Recognition: The recognition awarded a faculty member by his peers both within and especially outside of his university is usually a measure of his usefulness to other scholars, teachers, and workers in his field. To some extent, bias and backscratching may influence honors, awards, offices, and the like, and evaluators must accordingly measure the true nature of such recognition. In any sort of assessment, things cannot be taken simply at face value, but neither should undue or unfair discounting of values become the rule.
5. It is expected that faculty members will strive for excellence under as many of the criteria given above as possible. Markedly low records of achievement under any three or more of these criteria over a span of two evaluations,

during which time the faculty member has been apprised of his deficiencies, shall be sufficient to warrant termination of service for non-tenured faculty, or the inauguration of incompetency proceedings for tenured faculty.

III. Implementation

The provisions of this report shall become operative as soon as adopted, and its contents under I and II (pp. 2-9) shall be printed in the next editions of the Faculty Handbook, with such stylistic revisions as may be required.

11/15/71

Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges:

Jay L. Halio, Chairman
E. E. Schweizer
B. H. Settles
C. Trumbore
P. M. Weil

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

February 28, 1972

MINUTES

The special meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order at 4:05 PM. Senators not in attendance were:

Irma Ayers	Alan C. Goren	John W. Shirley
Mary K. Carl	Arnold L. Lippert	Edward A. Trabant
Edward W. Comings	Francis J. Merceret	Laszlo Zsoldos
William G. DeColigny	Jerzy R. Moszynski	
William S. Gaither	Harry L. Rinker	

I. OLD BUSINESS

- (1) Report from the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges concerning evaluation of non-teaching activities - S.B. 73

Mr. Halio briefly commented on the report, and stated that the report should be interpreted as ultimately a part of a larger report by the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges, and the Committee on Promotions and Tenure. Presently, however, the report comes from the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges and should be interpreted as a report from that Committee.

After lengthy discussion, Mr. Harlan made the following motion:

"That this report be returned to the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges for revisions to include: removal of elements of secrecy; permit departmental autonomy to be applied; and eliminate the provision that calls for outside persons judging colleagues from different fields than their own."

After the motion to close debate carried, the motion to refer report back to the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges passed 26 to 20.

A resolution was made to consider the reports, one from the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, and the other from the Coordinating Committee on Education, as critiques. Since both of these documents contain comments and suggestions, it was requested that the Senate endorse these reports as distributed at the last meeting of the Senate (February 14). The resolution failed.

At the request of several members of the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges who thought that insights from others were needed to meet the requests of the Senate, a motion was made to refer this report to the Committee on Promotion and Tenure. The motion failed 15-17-1. A call for recount was made indicating the same results.

Mr. Olson made a motion extending the Senate's gratitude to the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges for presenting a report which showed obvious commitment and dedication to the charge it was given. The motion passed by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "D. W. Harward", written in a cursive style.

Donald W. Harward, Secretary