

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

January 5, 1976

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Senators not in attendance were:

Val E. Arnsdorf	Roger K. Murray
E. Paul Catts	Judith A. Runkle
George Cicala	Stanley I. Sandler
Andrew Hepburn	Barbara Stafford
Harry Hutchinson	Robert M. Stark
Kenneth Lewis	Richard W. Tarpley
William E. McDaniel	John E. Worthen

After a brief discussion the Agenda was adopted; the minutes of the December 1, 1975 meeting were approved as written.

President Braun made the following announcements: 1) The name of the Department of Speech-Communications has been changed to the Department of Communications. 2) The Senate Executive Committee has appointed Mr. William Redd, the Mayor of Newark and a member of the Personnel Department of the duPont Company, to the vacancy on the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Productivity and Workload. 3) There will be an election at the next Senate meeting to fill the unexpired portion of Prof. Finner's Senate term; nominees are Profs. Jack Ellis and Frank Newman.

No questions were addressed to Dean Lippert, and the first item of new business was introduced. Prof. Teis, Chairperson of the Art Department, was present to answer questions about the proposed degree of Bachelor of Fine Arts and, after a brief discussion, the Senate voted unanimously to approve the establishment of the degree as recommended by the Coordinating Committee on Education.

The Senate then considered the recommendation from the Coordinating Committee on Education for approval of the establishment of a School of Life and Health Sciences. In response to a question from Senator Mosberg Dean Gouldner defined a "school" as differing from a "department" because a school can contain a variety of disciplines; she stressed the importance of retaining the proposed School within the College of Arts and Science in order to maintain cross-contact with the natural and social sciences and the humanities. Prof. Sheppard, who chaired the Provost's committee which proposed the new School, discussed the practical advantages to be gained. In response to a question from Prof. Oglesby, Dean Gouldner clarified the roles of the director and the coordinators as they were defined in the Sheppard Committee report; the director would function like a department chairman and would report to the Arts and Science dean. The coordinators would not be administrators in the usual sense, but full time faculty members who were elected to represent the various disciplines within the School and to advise the director.

A concern was expressed that some programs in Biology and Health Sciences, both of which would be entirely absorbed in the new School, might not get the same attention in a school which had a health orientation; a discussion

of the goals of the School followed. In response to a question about the extent to which concerned faculty members were consulted, Prof. Sheppard and Provost Campbell reviewed the procedures by which faculty input was solicited. Prof. Mosberg asked Prof. Lurie, Acting Director, whether the proposal met with the approval of his Division of Health Sciences; Prof. Lurie described the various opportunities the Division had had to participate in the proposal and indicated that it did meet with their approval.

Pres. Braun then called the question and the Senate voted unanimously to accept the report of the Coordinating Committee on Education recommending the establishment of a School of Life and Health Sciences.

Prof. Scarpitti, Chairperson of the Committee on Committees, initiated discussion of the Svec proposal to abolish the Senate Promotions and Tenure Committee (introduced in the Senate at the September 8, 1975 meeting and referred at that time to the Committee on Committees). He proposed a substitute motion in which the Committee had made a slight change in the existing Charge and had added to it a set of operating guidelines, the purpose of which is to 1) formally assign to the Committee on Promotions and Tenure the responsibility to establish rough comparability of the criteria of the various units within the University; 2) provide for the continuation of the Committee as a University-wide faculty body exercising independent judgment regarding the compliance of the various units with the previously established criteria and 3) provide an opportunity for the introduction of more evidence or for rebuttal before final promotion and tenure decisions are made. In response to questions about establishing comparability of the criteria Prof. Wriston, the present chairperson of the Promotions and Tenure Committee, described what that Committee views as an on-going procedure under the proposed guidelines. Prof. Oglesby asked whether the functioning of this Committee would weaken departmental autonomy; Prof. Wriston felt that the role of the department in developing and applying the criteria remained the same, but that the "burden of proof" of the validity would also lie within the department. Prof. Soles inquired about the phrase "roughly comparable standards" and 1) whether the Committee viewed this as a centralization or decentralization of authority 2) whether they were dealing with minimal standards only and 3) how specific the criteria needed to be. Prof. Wriston replied that they would deal with minimal standards only and added that there was the possibility of appeals in individual cases. Prof. Soles felt that in legitimizing present practices the Committee on Committees had not addressed itself to the criticisms of Prof. Svec. A discussion followed of the phrase "recommend to the Senate" and the role of the Senate in the approval of unit criteria. Prof. Mosberg moved that the word "criteria" be changed to "policies" throughout the Charge; the motion was not seconded. Prof. Finner, a member of the Committee on Committees, suggested that the intent was to have the Promotions and Tenure Committee review the dossiers only in the context of their compliance with unit criteria, but not to make individual judgments; the procedures to be followed are given in 3 and 4 of the proposed Guidelines. Prof. Sharnoff noted that the reason for having faculty members on the Committee was that they must be trusted to form some kind of academic judgments; it was added

that the Committee must also be prepared to provide the reasons for such judgments.


Pres. Braun called on Prof. Svec for his comments and Prof. Svec restated his earlier objection that the inclusion of this Committee in the promotions and tenure review process made the procedure too lengthy but, since he felt that such a Committee would probably be formed in any case, he agreed that it was better to have it appointed by the faculty and he expressed his support for the proposed revision.

Prof. Gaither moved that, in order to clarify the job of the Committee, the word "criteria" be changed to "University-wide policies" throughout the Charge, that the word "units" be inserted in line 6 between "that" and "criteria" and that "units' " be inserted in line 9 between "the" and "published criteria." This motion to amend the revised charge carried. Prof. Wriston noted that his Committee could carry out this responsibility through its annual report to the Senate; he added that the criteria statements of the various units would be available in the Senate Office files.

Pres. Braun then called for the vote on the amended substitute motion, and it was unanimously accepted as the principle motion; he then called for the vote and the revised charge and guidelines were adopted as amended. (The "Charge" and "Guidelines" are attached.)

Pres. Braun then introduced the recommendation from the Committee on Student Life regarding the Freshman residence requirement which the Committee prepared in response to a letter from Senator Paul Schweizer. Senator Ross Hall, a member of the Committee on Student Life, gave a brief background to the Committee's recommendation in which he noted the University's financial need to keep the residence halls filled. Mr. Schweizer responded that he did not feel that anyone could tell you where you had to live if you were over 18. Provost Campbell made a motion that the matter be tabled until the chairperson of the Committee could be present; the motion was unanimously approved. The same motion was made with regard to item V-E, from the same Committee, and that motion was also unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.


Marjorie R. Recke, Secretary
University Faculty Senate

MRR/b

Attachment: "Charge" and "Operating Guidelines" for the
Committee on Promotions and Tenure

COMMITTEE ON PROMOTIONS AND TENURE

I. Charge

This Committee shall recommend to the Senate University-wide policies and procedures relating to promotions and tenure and shall advise the faculties of the colleges and departments and the President of the University on the formulations of these policies. It shall ensure that these University-wide policies and procedures are made known within each department and throughout the University, and that unit criteria are roughly comparable throughout the University. The Committee shall review proposed promotions and the granting of tenure to ensure compliance with the units' published criteria, and shall either endorse or question recommendations. The Committee shall also review adverse recommendations by departments, colleges, or other administrative units that are formally brought to its attention by individual faculty members, and shall advise the appropriate departments and colleges in such cases. In all cases considered, the Committee's formal recommendation shall be made known to all appropriate faculty and officers of the University, but unendorsed recommendations and the reasons thereof shall be made known only to the individual faculty member concerned, the department chairman and/or dean of the college, and the Provost.

This Committee shall consist of three tenured professors and two tenured associate professors; at least one member of the Committee shall be a woman.

II. Operating Guidelines

The following represent the sense of the Senate as guidelines for the activities of the Committee on Promotions and Tenure.

1. The University Promotions and Tenure Committee shall set the time schedule for promotion and appeals procedures.
2. Each Spring the University Promotions and Tenure Committee shall annually review unit criteria to assure University comparability and shall inform units of the acceptability or unacceptability of their promotion and tenure criteria.
3. In accordance with its published schedule, the University Promotions and Tenure Committee shall review dossiers of all candidates for promotion and tenure. The purpose of this review is to provide independent judgment that dossiers are in compliance with unit criteria.
4. If the University Promotions and Tenure Committee does not agree that the dossier meets unit criteria, reasons for the disagreement must be communicated to the unit and the unit's reply solicited. If the Committee desires additional information, it must return to the originating unit for that information.
5. The University Committee on Promotions and Tenure will forward to the Provost the names of all faculty members considered by them for promotion and tenure together with their recommendation and those of other participating units.
6. The University Committee on Promotions and Tenure will provide a statistical summary of all actions at all levels in its annual report to the Senate.