

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

December 3, 1979

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order on December 3, 1979 at 4:00 with President Smith presiding. Senators not in attendance were:

Gerard Mangone
Joseph Noggle

Elliot Schriber
James Summerton

Senators excused were: Edith Anderson, Ellis Bolton, Eric Brucker, Philip Flynn, Edward A. Trabant.

- I. Adoption of the Agenda. In the absence of objection the Agenda was adopted as distributed.
- II. Approval of the Minutes. Approval of the November Minutes was postponed until the January meeting because the Minutes had not yet been distributed.
- III. Remarks. None.
- IV. Announcements. President Smith welcomed the newly-elected graduate student senators, Ms. Facciolo and Ms. Reddy.

Copies of a resolution approved by the Delaware Undergraduate Student Congress (DUSC) regarding the Iranian crisis were distributed. President Smith said that, as called for in the resolution, the DUSC officers had written the Senate Executive Committee requesting that the Senate follow a course similar to theirs, but their request had arrived too late for inclusion on the December Agenda. He reminded the Senate that the Constitution therefore prohibited action on the request at the present meeting, but he suggested the Senate could adjourn to a quasi-committee of the whole, endorse the resolution, and report it back to the general meeting. A motion by Senator Boyer to adjourn to a quasi-committee of the whole and to endorse the DUSC statement was seconded. In the discussion which followed, Prof. Kleinman said he was not comfortable with the "whereas" section of the resolution which cited "irrational acts of nationalism on the part of American students" without balancing the statement by reference to the other side. Senator Boyer said that, although he had no problem with the document, he was willing to amend his motion to restrict endorsement to the resolution portion. There was no further discussion and the amended motion to endorse the three resolutions from DUSC was approved by the quasi-committee of the whole by unanimous voice vote. President Smith said the report would appear for Senate action at the January meeting.

President Smith read portions of a letter in which President Trabant expressed to the Executive Committee his concern about the intellectual climate on the University campus and the increase in the number of disruptive behavior cases in the Student Judicial System. He requested a meeting to discuss the Senate's role in these issues. President Smith said the matter had been referred to the Committee on Student Life and he asked that any senators who wished to submit comments send them to Prof. Nathan, the chair, or to the Senate Office.

President Smith called for a count of senators who anticipated not being able to attend the February 4 regular meeting of the Senate, which would fall between Winter

Session and the Spring term. The poll indicated there was no substantial problem with that date.

V. Old Business.

Item A, a recommendation for adoption of a revised statement on promotion policies, was introduced by Prof. Oglesby, a member of the Committee on Promotions and Tenure, who said that the proposal was the same one which had been submitted to the Senate in the Spring. She noted that the statement proposed only one procedural change: that the Promotions and Tenure Committee review only those dossiers where there had been negative recommendations. She also explained that in an attempt to make the language of the statement less ambiguous the Committee had also tried to clarify the role of the Promotions and Tenure Committee in approving criteria, to define "rough comparability," and to include definitions of minimal requirements at each rank. With regard to the Committee's role in reviewing dossiers, she said the proposal would require them to determine whether a dossier met the criteria rather than to review specific instances of scholarship.

In response to a question from Senator Vincent about promotion requirements for candidates from colleges where the professional degree level is not necessarily the Ph.D., Prof. Oglesby said the proposal would place the responsibility for defining and documenting criteria in the departments.

In a discussion about the number of dossiers receiving positive recommendations at all levels it was determined that in 1979 it had been about 30 out of 48 or 49.

Dean Greenfield asked why the proposal tended to decrease the activity of the college committees, and Prof. Oglesby said the Committee felt the people who have expertise in a discipline are the best evaluators of research and the bulk of the scholarly review should therefore be done at that level. Dean Greenfield objected that college committees in the professional colleges would have a better mix because they can contain people with expertise in all of the areas of the college, and they should not be relegated to just a review of compliance with criteria which will be reviewed again at the University level. Dean Gouldner questioned the right of the University Promotions and Tenure Committee to tell college committees what their criteria and procedures ought to be. Prof. Oglesby responded that the University Committee and the Senate were within their rights and responsibilities when they acted to determine the procedures by which criteria are evaluated, and no change in the present statement was being proposed in this area. Referring to Dean Greenfield's question, she said she thought evaluation was in fact done at both the college and the University levels, but the intent was to place the emphasis at those levels on criteria review. Senator Warter said he thought the proposal put the emphasis in the wrong place because, while it might be difficult to make judgments within the departments where the members worked closely, the college committees had both enough awareness of standards and the detachment needed to make better judgments; he added that the deans and the Provost make decisions on a presumed assessment of quality and that ought not be denied to the college committees.

Senator Braun felt the proposal would reduce the role of the college committees to simply ensuring compliance with written departmental criteria, and he suggested that the charge to the University Committee (p. 11, paragraph 6: to "act as professional, i.e., professorial, judges of the relevance and appropriateness of the credentials offered to support the recommendation while abstaining from judgments of the content or importance of the candidate's body of research, scholarship, or creative activity") was also appropriate to the college committees. He also

expressed his concern about the ability of the University Committee to test broad comparability if they reviewed only those dossiers with negative recommendations. Prof. Oglesby responded that the University committee's responsibility was to insure rough comparability of the criteria, and approval of individual candidates by the departmental and college level committees would indicate they had met the approved criteria.

Senator Marler said he felt the second paragraph, p. 2, lines 14-17, should be revised to place greater importance on teaching. Dean Gouldner agreed, and added that the first paragraph discussion of publication also needed re-writing to include the work of the actors, musicians and artists on the faculty. President Smith read Webster's definition of publication: "to make generally known, to make public announcement, to place before the public" and said he thought that was adequate. Senator Christensen felt there was too little emphasis on teaching in the criteria for each rank as they are given on page 10.

Provost Campbell asked why the same document, which had been returned to committee by the Senate in May so they could address these concerns, was before the Senate again. He made a motion, which was seconded, to return the document to the Promotions and Tenure Committee to do what it was asked to do in May. President Smith said the Executive Committee, in consultation with the Promotions and Tenure Committee, had decided to bring it before the Senate again because the Senate's previous discussion had provided insufficient instruction to the Committee, and he suggested they would be helped by a paragraph-by-paragraph review of the document.

Senator Vincent said he would like further discussion by the Senate before the document was returned to committee; he thought it should be emphasized that if a department writes its guidelines no higher level can contravene them. Senator Braun made a motion, which was seconded, to amend the motion so the document would be returned to committee after Senate deliberation and with specific instructions to the Committee; the motion to amend carried. President Smith reminded the Senate that its actions would then be for the instruction of the Committee, and the re-written document would be returned to the Senate for approval.

At a suggestion from Senator Warter, Dean Gouldner made a motion, which was seconded, that consideration of the document be made the basis of business at a continuation of the meeting, and that the Senate move to consideration of the other items on the agenda; the motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

VI. New Business.

Item A, a request for confirmation of a committee appointment, was introduced; there was no discussion and the following appointment was approved by unanimous voice vote:

Physical Planning & Utilization - Prof. Ronald Rainey, chair.

Item B, an interim report of the ad hoc Committee to Evaluate the President, was presented by the Committee's chairman, Prof. Olson (Attachment 1). Prof. Oglesby asked about the Board of Trustees' relationship to the evaluation, and Prof. Olson responded that it was the Board's prerogative to select the University president, and the Committee's report would be considered as advisory to them. In response to a question as to whether the Board had ever conducted a formal review of the President, Prof. Olson said the Board described its review as an on-going procedure, but there did not seem to be any formal review process. In response to questions from Dean

Greenfield about the proposed survey, Prof. Olson said it was intended to find the breadth of opinion on campus, but they did not intend to compare the response with other institutions.

Item C, a recommendation for a revised undergraduate curriculum in Nursing, was introduced by Prof. O'Neill, chair of the Coordinating Committee on Education. He explained that the change would provide a base of college courses for the students before they began their professional courses after the second semester of their sophomore year. Dean Gouldner noted that it would cost Arts and Science \$30,000 to \$35,000 to implement the E301 course in the program, and she suggested that such costs should be included in future considerations of curriculum changes. Senator Sharnoff suggested that the Nursing curriculum should include a foreign language requirement; Prof. Hecht, the Assistant Dean of Nursing, said languages could be taken as electives.

There was no further discussion and the following was approved by voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the revised curriculum for the undergraduate College of Nursing program is approved beginning September, 1980.

Item D, a recommendation for provisional approval of a Ph.D. in Applied Sciences-Climatology, was introduced by Prof. O'Neill, chair of the Coordinating Committee on Education. He noted the program would begin on a limited scale with a few students per year, that it would not result in additional costs, and that there is presently a demand for climatologists. There was no discussion and the following was approved by unanimous voice vote:

RESOLVED, that provisional approval for the Ph.D. program in Applied Sciences-Climatology is granted for a four-year period beginning September, 1980, allowing for a final review during Spring, 1984.

At 5:35 President Smith declared the Senate recessed until 4:00, Monday, December 10, 1979.

Second Session - December 10, 1979

The continued December meeting of the Senate was convened by President Smith. Senators not in attendance were:

Eugene Chesson	James Leathrum	James Summerton
Maurice Cope	Gerard Mangone	Frederick Swain
Donald Crossan	Harold Neikirk	Frank Valenti
Alexander Doberenz	Joseph Noggle	Robert Warren
Ivo Dominguez	Saroja Reddy	Stephen Woodward
Chris Facciolo	Elliot Schreiber	John Zikakis
Irwin Greenfield		

Senators excused were: David Ames, Edith Anderson, Ellis Bolton, William Boyer, L. Leon Campbell, Mary Ann Miller, Gerald Straka, Francis Tannian, Edward A. Trabant, Sarah Van Camp, Thomas Watson.

President Smith opened the second session with the reminder that at the conclusion of its December 3 discussion the Senate had adopted an amended motion to return the promotion and tenure revisions to the Committee after a seriatum consideration of the new proposal, and with specific instruction to the Committee. The chair then ruled that further amendments to the motion to re-commit would be permitted, to enable the Senate to instruct the Committee.

President Smith then recognized Senator Warter who introduced for Senate consideration a proposal he had prepared and distributed to senators during the week (Attachment 2). Senator Warter said he felt there should be a more complete peer review process than was provided for in the Promotion and Tenure Committee's document, and that the college committees are where decisions are apt to be crisply made, divorced from departmental pressure. He also said he felt the Committee's proposal did not have an adequately strong and adequately broad University-wide committee, and he would like to have the University level committee elected by the faculty, rather than appointed by an elected body. He therefore proposed that the Promotions and Tenure Committee's statement be looked at by some other committee, or an ad hoc committee, to re-write it to provide for an elected committee and a procedure based on strong faculty peer review.

Professor Oglesby, a member of the Promotions and Tenure Committee, responded that although the Committee felt that the strongest review belonged at the departmental level, it had not been their intention to make weak committees at the college and University levels. She also questioned the usefulness of another ad hoc committee, noting that an ad hoc committee had been appointed about 18 months ago and the Promotions and Tenure Committee had looked at their recommendations and had tried to address their concerns in the present proposal.

A discussion of the earlier ad hoc committee followed and President Smith presented a summary of their recommendations. He noted that there had been several issues on which they had not been able to reach a consensus and the ad hoc committee and the Promotions and Tenure Committee had therefore brought their report to the Senate for debate.

Senator Warter said his suggestion for a special committee had come from his feeling that the Promotion and Tenure Committee was committed to the proposal as they had presented it. Prof. Oglesby responded that although the Committee felt the importance of departmental review, they were seeking instructions from the Senate. A discussion followed on the desirability of relative strengths in the departmental, college, and University committees. Senator Warter said if the Promotions and Tenure Committee were willing to consider widely diverging points of view he would like to change his earlier motion to a motion to return the document to the Promotions and Tenure Committee, without a seriatum review but following the present discussion of the issues. President Smith ruled that it would require a separate Senate action to rescind the earlier vote for seriatum review, and suggested that the Committee still needed a detailed consensus statement from the Senate to guide its re-writing.

The discussion returned to page 2 of the document. Senator Marler introduced a motion (Attachment 3) which was seconded, to revise paragraph 2 by increasing the emphasis on teaching in the promotion process. He explained that he did not see the wording of his proposal as binding, that the intent was one of emphasis rather than wording. A motion to instruct the Committee to revise the second paragraph on page 2 along the lines of Senator Marler's proposal was approved by voice vote.

Senator Sharnoff said he thought the document should be more descriptive of the range of activities to be allowed in lieu of publication. After a brief discussion,

a motion to instruct the Committee to search for language that doesn't leave a narrow view of scholarly accomplishments but does include a range of accomplishment was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Senator Warter suggested that page 3, lines 3, 4 and 5, should be re-written to put the emphasis on University-wide or college-wide standards. Senator Vincent suggested that these lines reflected a basic disagreement in the Senate on the promotion and tenure philosophy. He argued that it is the strength of the departments that gives the University its standing, that it is the departmental line which extends beyond the University along discipline lines, and there is therefore a better level of judgment within the departmental group.

Senator Braun introduced a proposal (Attachment 4), which was seconded, to allow each college to charge its own committees and to establish the type of review system that best fit the college's needs. Prof. Reynolds noted that the promotion and tenure document did not refer to "weak" or "strong" committees and he felt those terms were interpretive and prejudicial. Dean Gaither suggested there were two extremes being discussed, with those cases where there are strong departments on one end of the spectrum and on the other end somewhat weak and parochial departments which need strong college oversight. Senator Flynn agreed and said he would like to strengthen the document's language for both the college and departmental levels. Dean Brucker noted that colleges also varied in size, structure, and the proportion of faculty at the various ranks.

Senator Murray opposed Senator Braun's proposal, arguing that it would work against serious review at the college level, and would create chaos at the University level. Senator Schultz asked whether the different review processes in the colleges would affect the way dossiers were evaluated at the University level and by the Provost; Associate Provost Halio responded that the Provost's office gives greater weight to dossiers with strong college backing.

Senator Murray called for the question; in response to a request for clarification from President Smith, Senator Braun said he did not intend the wording of his proposal as binding, but that the document should be worded to leave each college free to charge its own committees as it chose. The motion was defeated by a voice vote.

President Smith noted that it was 5:30 and asked the senators how they wished to proceed. He reminded the Senate that there was still a motion from Senator Murray before them, to charge the college promotion and tenure committees to review the merits of the candidates' dossiers as well as to ensure reasonable uniformity on promotion at the college level. In the absence of objection President Smith declared the meeting recessed for one week, to be reconvened on December 17 at 4:00.

Third Session - December 17, 1979

President Smith convened the continued December meeting; Senators not in attendance were:

Richard Agnello	David Hallenbeck	Elliot Schreiber
David Barlow	James Kent	Mark Sharnoff
Eugene Chesson	James Leathrum	Gerald Straka
Maurice Cope	Charles Marler	James Summerton
Donald Crossan	Anne McCourt	Frederick Swain
Jeffrey Davidson	Mary Ann Miller	Frank Valenti
Alexander Doberenz	Harold Neikirk	Robert Warren
Chris Facciolo	John Pikulski	Stephen Woodward
Robert Gilbert	Saroja Reddy	

Senators excused were: Ellis Bolton, William Boyer, Eric Brucker, Walter Vincent, Edward A. Trabant.

A quorum call determined that a quorum was not present. After a brief discussion, it was agreed that since the purpose of the meeting was to obtain the sense of the Senate in order to instruct the Promotions and Tenure Committee, and since the Committee's document would be brought back to the Senate for formal action, continuing the discussion would be of value to the Committee even if a quorum were not present. (A transcript of the discussion has been transmitted to the Committee on Promotions and Tenure for their use.)

Respectfully submitted,

Ulrich C. Toensmeyer

Ulrich C. Toensmeyer
Secretary
University Faculty Senate

UCT/aw

Attachments: 1. Interim Report, ad hoc Committee to Evaluate the President
2. Warter proposal
3. Marler proposal
4. Braun proposal

REMARKS TO THE FACULTY SENATE

December 3, 1979

The Ad Hoc Committee to Review the President was formed last April as a result of the report by the Executive Committee of the Senate. As you will remember the report was a complete and scholarly examination of the literature on presidential evaluations. This document led to the formation of this committee, and it is now appropriate that the Senate be given an informal progress report of the activities of the committee.

The charge to the committee is quite short and leaves room for the committee to decide exactly what is to be done. For your information, the charge reads as follows:

WHEREAS: Formal periodic evaluation of chief administrative officers is recommended by many higher education organizations, including the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Association of University Professors, and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education; and

WHEREAS: such evaluations serve the interests of the University community by clarifying institutional goals and reassuring progress toward them, by generating constructive advice for improving University Administration and by providing relevant information to the Board of Trustees for its decisions concerning the leadership of the University; and

WHEREAS: faculty participation in such evaluations is also recommended; and

WHEREAS: no such formal evaluation has been carried out during President Trabant's tenure in office; and

WHEREAS: the Board of Trustees has indicated willingness to consider seriously an evaluation initiated by the University Faculty Senate;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED;

- 1. that the Senate endorse the formation of an ad hoc committee to evaluate the effectiveness of the President of the University in the performance of his duties;*
- 2. that the ad hoc committee consist of past presidents of the University Faculty Senate;*
- 3. that the committee be empowered to select its chair, determine its operating procedures, formulate evaluation criteria, solicit input from all University constituencies, and devise and employ appropriate instruments to elicit such input;*
- 4. that the committee seek to involve the President in the evaluation at appropriate stages and seek presidential input on a preliminary version of the evaluation prior to completion of the final report;*
- 5. that the University provide sufficient funds to engage an outside consultant(s) with executive experience comparable to that of a university president to advise the committee, but that the committee carry out its evaluation regardless of the availability of such funds; and*
- 6. that within one year the committee submit its report to the President and the Board of Trustees.*

The Committee began operations in late April. The committee members originally were the past presidents of the Senate: Gordon R. Bonner, Theodore E. D. Braun, Ludwig Mosberg, Jon H. Olson, John J. Pikulski and F. Loren Smith.

Ralph E. Kleinman initially declined membership to the committee because the membership of the committee was to be "past presidents;" this fall Mr. Kleinman joined the committee.

In retrospect, the efforts of the committee have fallen into two phases, the initial development plans for a very complete review, and a more recent set of internal debates on the best way to proceed.

In the beginning, we thought that the efforts of the committee should follow the paths of presidential reviews described in the literature of the last fifteen years. Specifically we hoped to secure the services of an outside consultant, typically either a past president of an institution of similar stature or a management consultant firm with expertise in academic institutions. Further we hoped to secure the full and enthusiastic cooperation of the Board of Trustees and the President. Finally we planned a fairly complete review of the President's performance of the tasks of his office.

The literature teaches that the outside consultant ideally should be an individual or firm with whom the President is comfortable. After all, the President should be willing to share confidential information with this consultant, and it is therefore necessary to hire a quality individual capable of forming and holding trust. Our discussions with President Trabant established that finding a suitable consultant would not be an easy task. Further a request for special funding to the University Faculty Senate was turned down by the University. Rather than ask the faculty for out-of-pocket donations or creating a series of bake sales, the committee has elected to forego the services of a consultant for the moment. This decision will be amplified below.

The literature also teaches that presidential evaluations usually are initiated by the President, the Board, or both. Our review obviously was initiated by this Senate, and our efforts have not been embraced warmly by the President or the Board of Trustees.

At the December 1978 Board meeting a resolution concerning the earlier Senate resolution for joint Trustee-Faculty evaluations of administrative officers was tabled. The executive committee of the Board placed this resolution on the agenda for the June meeting where it was approved. This resolution reads in part:

" . . . WHEREAS, it is considered to be a responsibility of the Board of Trustees to appoint and evaluate the President of the University and to retain in the presidency the responsibility for evaluation of Vice Presidents,

" . . . the Executive Committee declares its position as not in approval of the Faculty Senate resolution."

Although this resolution is a very clear statement of the Board's position on the Senate initiated joint Faculty-Trustee evaluations, Board members did express their individual willingness to consider communications from the faculty or Senate delivered through proper channels. This Committee is of the opinion that a well done report will be read and considered.

During the summer and early fall the committee developed outlines for a complete review, i.e., a plan for what should be done under ideal conditions. A portion of this plan was transmitted to President Trabant. The President was very prompt arranging a meeting with the committee. In this meeting he expressed strong reservations about a traditional review but urged the committee to be more creative in accomplishing a useful service. The President also noted that he did not have

the time to engage in an activity which serves a very limited purpose.

The debate in our weekly committee meetings during the last six weeks has centered on developing a workable review plan given the limitations of our time and resources. Some committee members were quite unwilling to spend valuable time in a process which has uncertain payout. However we now are in agreement that our review will cover only one of the several tasks we initially planned.

We now plan to determine the opinion of the faculty upon the following responsibilities of the President: (1) planning; (2) administration; (3) enhancement of academic stature and atmosphere of the institution; (4) growth of facilities and endowment. We believe that a candid and honest expression of faculty opinion will be useful to the President and the Board. Further we feel that the expression of this opinion is what the Senate members were after last April when the resolution was debated.

These four topics hardly describe all of the activities of a President, but they do provide a suitably loose framework around which discussions can be based. We plan to conduct 50 half-hour discussions with randomly-selected faculty members. The purpose of these discussions is to find the reasons faculty view the President the way they do and to gather workable suggestions for improvement in the office. After these interviews we will send a SHORT questionnaire to all faculty members which we encourage you to complete in a cooperative spirit. Finally if you are particularly eager to be interviewed, please contact Ms. Barbara Martin in the Senate office. We will try to contact you after the random sample has been completed.

Dean Gaither sent a memo to this committee urging us to complete our task quickly. We hope to complete our work by the end of the Winter term; given the inevitable slippage in work schedules, we will nevertheless complete our report early in the Spring. We will request a final meeting with the President to discuss the report more fully. We will report to the Senate on the merits of our review process after our report has been sent to the President and the Board. The committee believes the tasks outlined can be done reasonably well with the resources at hand.

The committee members are present to answer questions.

Jon H. Olson, Chair
for the ad hoc Committee
to Evaluate the President

JHO:alw
1/23/80

MEMORANDUM

December 5, 1979

TO: Fellow Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Peter J. Warter
SUBJECT: Promotion and Tenure Procedure

I would like to offer several thoughts for you to consider prior to next Monday's debate.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Promotion and Tenure decisions are among the most important decisions made in any university. I believe that the proposed procedures do not provide effective faculty input, or even the right kinds of faculty input into this process. Although there are only a few basic concerns, they permeate the document presented. An in sereatum consideration of the document is appropriate only if the document is basically correct but needs minor revision. This is not the case; it needs to be totally rewritten. I suggest a special committee be appointed for this task.

I concur completely with the observation that the role of high quality teaching in the promotion and tenure decisions is not properly addressed.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS: The procedure as proposed, largely converts the promotion and tenure process to one of administrative decisions which, if negative, are subject to faculty review. To me this is totally backwards. We need faculty decisions subject to administrative review.

Although the subject matter experts are most likely to be in the department it does not follow that the departmental review will give the best assesment of the quality of scholarship. First, scholarly areas are not so compartmentalized that faculty in "adjacent" areas cannot make excellent judgments on the quality of scholarly work. Furthermore, not all people in one department are knowledgeable about all areas of activity in their department. It is often the case that those in other departments are closer to specific activities. Second, and often more important, departmental decisions are made on the basis of a number of factors that come from working closely together which may improperly color judgments as to the quality of scholarship.

Our experience in Engineering shows that a top college committee is the bulwark of a good promotion and tenure review process.

I am further confused by the proposed procedure which seems to accept the legitimacy of scholarly judgments made by the Deans and Provost, but does not accept similar judgments by peers of recognized stature.

It may be that in the College of Arts and Sciences the range of activities is so broad that the kind of detailed review made by the Engineering College committee is not possible. If this is the case, I suggest that there be three committees in Arts and Sciences, one for each of the well-defined groupings in that college.

SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS: I propose that we have strong college (or group in the case of Arts and Sciences) committees which are charged with the review of the qualifications of the candidates as well as the procedures employed in the departments. The college committee should also help in preparing dossiers where they feel that a stronger case can be made. I propose that the committees be composed of one member from the senior faculty of each department, elected by the faculty from that department.

I propose that we have a strong University committee also charged with substantive review of the qualifications of the candidates as well as of the department and

college procedures. I propose that the committee be small, with each member elected from among the senior faculty within a definite group of departments by the faculty in that group. Something like four or five groups would be ideal. A possible arrangement of the faculty into five groups of departments and colleges is listed below. This committee should elect its own chairperson. The provost should serve as a non-voting ex-officio member of this committee.

The strong committee structure would complement the review of candidates by the Department Chairpersons, Deans and the Provost which I see continuing roughly as at present and as in the proposed procedure.

Possible Grouping of Faculty

GROUP 1

- Education
- Human Resources
- Physical Education

GROUP 2

- Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Business and Economics
- Urban Affairs

GROUP 3

- Humanities and Arts

GROUP 4

- Life Sciences
- Agricultural Sciences
- Nursing
- Marine Studies

GROUP 5

- Natural and Mathematical Sciences
- Engineering

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
NEWARK, DELAWARE
19711

Attachment 3
Minutes - December, 1979

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
WILLARD HALL, EDUCATION BUILDING, ROOM 219
PHONE: 302-738 2954

December 4, 1979

MEMORANDUM TO: The University Faculty Senate
FROM: Charles D. Marler, Senator *CDM*
Educational Studies
SUBJECT: Proposed Changes in the Promotion Policy
to Be Discussed on December 10, 1979

Page 2, lines 14-17 (Proposed changes are underlined.)

The University's primary obligation to research and scholarly production notwithstanding, a major goal of any educational institution must be to encourage and to demonstrate excellence in teaching. Furthermore, advising, committee responsibilities, and community service are not to be neglected on the ground that research, coupled with scholarly production, and teaching have higher priority. Each faculty member is expected to make a balanced contribution to the University.

Page 10, lines 3-20

Instructor. The Master's degree (or its professional equivalent); high standards of scholarship; satisfactory teaching ability; and clear promise of development in scholarship, teaching, and productive activity.

Assistant Professor. The Ph.D. degree (or its professional equivalent); record of scholarly accomplishment; above average ability as a teacher (except in cases of research professorship or other appointment not requiring teaching); and evidence of continuous development.

Associate Professor. All requirements for Assistant Professor, and: established reputation in scholarship, artistic creation, or other scholastic or professional activity; and documented improvement in teaching expertise (except in cases of research professorship or other appointment not requiring teaching). Tenure decisions also demand some indication of excellence in research and/or teaching and/or service.

Professor. All requirements of lower ranks, and: a marked capacity for the direction of research; scholarship of more than local recognition; consistent contribution to chosen field of learning; and recognized excellence as a teacher (except in cases of research professorship or other appointment not requiring teaching).

Memorandum

DATE: December 6, 1979

TO: The University Faculty Senate

FROM: T.E.D. Braun, Senator-at-Large *T.E.D. Braun*
College of Arts and Science

SUBJECT: Proposed Changes in the Promotions and Tenure Policy
For Senate Discussion of December 10, 1979

Page 7, line 11, through page 8, line 6, to be replaced by:

Each college is free to charge its promotion committee as it will.

Some might choose to charge their committees with making substantive judgements on the nature and quality of each candidate's qualifications, and might even offer assistance to candidates in the preparation of their dossiers.

Some might prefer to charge their committees to act as professional, i.e., professorial judges of the relevance and appropriateness of the credentials offered to support the recommendation while abstaining from judgments of the content or importance of the candidate's body of research, scholarship, or creative activity. Those latter judgments are more appropriately made by peers in the candidate's discipline. The Committee would not, for an extreme example, attempt to judge the substance of Einstein's general theory or its importance to the future of physical science; it would judge whether the substance and importance of the theory had been appropriately evaluated by appropriate people, in accordance with the criteria stated by the Department of Physics. The Committee must exercise its best professional judgment as to the adequacy of the evidence in meeting the unit's published criteria, but must assiduously avoid letting its own affections or disaffections concerning the substance or importance of the individual's contributions sway its judgment. In this way it will protect the interests of both the candidate and the University.

Some might decide on yet other means of charging their committees.

In all cases, the college committee's charge and role will be made in writing, and will include ensuring compliance with the written departmental criteria and rough comparability among the departmental criteria within the college.

TEDB/b

