

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

February 5 and 12, 1979

MINUTES

First Session

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

Edith Anderson	William Gaither	Allen Morehart
David Barlow	Irwin Greenfield	Jerold Schultz
John Crawford	Lee Hyncik	Mark Sharnoff
Alexander Doberenz	Peter Leavens	James Summerton
Samuel Gaertner		

Senators excused were: Richard Agnello, William Boyer, Eric Brucker, Dale Buckmaster, Donald Crossan, Ivo Dominguez, Harrison Hall, Barbara Kelly, Michael King, David Lou, Billy Ross, Elliot Schreiber, Francis Tannian, Sarah Van Camp, Peter Warter.

I. Adoption of the Agenda. There were no objections and the Agenda was adopted as distributed.

II. Approval of the Minutes. Senate Secretary Sasser requested that the Minutes of the December meeting be corrected to show that Senator Newman was present. There were no other corrections and the Minutes for December 4, 1978 and January 8, 1979 were approved.

III. Remarks by President Trabant. President Trabant reported that the University's request to the governor for 1979-80 for state funding had been included in the governor's budget bill to the legislature (HB 106). He said the 7% increase requested in the bill was similar to the increase requested for other state bodies, and although the amount the University requested appeared to be in the governor's budget it is distributed in new budget lines and that matter is currently under discussion. He also reported that, following a recent interpretation of the Title IX federal legislation requiring equal benefits for women's athletic programs, the University had requested an additional \$150,000 from the State to provide need-based scholarships for women equal to those already requested for men. President Trabant concluded with a report from the Director of Admissions that in-state applications are up by 15% and out-of-state by 20%, and the students offered and accepting admission to date were better students as measured by SAT score and projected grade index.

IV. Announcements. President Kleinman announced the addition of Ms. Lorraine Driscoll to the Senate Office staff; Ms. Driscoll will handle work related to Senate committees. He also announced that if the Agenda were not completed by 5:30 he would entertain a motion to recess the meeting for one week.

V. Old Business.

Item A, a discussion of the recommendations from the Coordinating Committee on Education and the substitute motions introduced by Senator Schweizer regarding the Freshman Honors Program, which had been tabled at the January meeting, was opened by Prof. Toensmeyer, chair of the Coordinating Committee. A sheet was distributed showing changes to the original resolutions which had been agreed on by the Coordinating

Committee, Prof. Schweizer, Prof. Sharf and Prof. Harward. Prof. Schweizer read a "memo of understanding" (Attachment 1) and said that, with that understanding included in the Minutes he would ask the Senate's permission to withdraw his substitute motions.

Prof. Harward, Director of the University Honors Program, placed on file his detailed response to questions raised in the January Senate about the Freshman Honors Program (FHP). (Note: this response is available in the Senate Office.) He then presented and discussed the 1979-80 FHP budget (Attachment 2). Senator Finner asked about the faculty members currently paid by the FHP budget and Prof. Harward responded that the contracts of all but 2 or 3 expired this year and funding for the remaining ones would be a matter of discussion between the Provost, the Honors Program, and the deans and departments involved. Sen. Finner then asked who would do the teaching of the 9 full-time equivalent core faculty whose contracts are expiring. Prof. Harward responded that much of it will be done by regular full-time faculty where the department permits, and when it is not regular load it will be overload; where that is not possible the department will consider adding a person and releasing them, or hiring them to teach the honors sections. In response to another question from Sen. Finner, Prof. Harward said that all present FHP faculty had received letters of understanding from the Provost and himself regarding the terms and expiration dates of their contracts.

There was no further discussion of the budget and Pres. Kleinman said that if there were unanimous consent from the Senate to Prof. Schweizer's request to withdraw his substitute motions the Senate could then return to consideration of the resolution from the Coordinating Committee on Education; there were no objections and Pres. Kleinman declared the substitute motions withdrawn.

Sen. Braun asked if the changes recommended for the FHP would mean that a student could take only one honors course and still be an honors student. Prof. Sharf, chair of the Adjunct Academic Affairs Committee which prepared the FHP report, responded that the intent was to allow flexibility in the student's program but to require a majority of honors courses. In response to a question about admission requirements it was stated that they generally required at least a high B average and a 1200 SAT score.

There was no further discussion and Pres. Kleinman called for a vote on accepting the Coordinating Committee on Education's revisions to the resolution as it appeared on the Agenda; the vote to accept the revised resolution carried. He then called for the vote on the revised resolution and the following was approved by hand vote:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves the goals and philosophy of the University Honors Program and recommends that the program be changed to meet the spirit of the guidelines as it applies to freshmen provided by the "Evaluation of the Freshman Honors Program" as prepared by the Committee on Adjunct Academic Affairs during the Spring and Summer of 1978.

- 1. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, beginning with September, 1979, honors courses should be made widely available to all qualified freshmen.*
- 2. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, starting in September 1979, the Senate recommends the elimination of extra charges for freshmen participating in an honors program.*

3. *BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, selection of honors courses for freshmen should not be all-or-none.*
4. *BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Faculty Senate recommends the Freshman Honors Program be moved from Dover to the Newark campus effective September 1979.*
5. *BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, early admissions students should be provided with special types of counseling and advise-ment.*
6. *BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Freshman Honors Program should become an integral part of the University Honors Program. This means that decisions regarding courses and staffing for freshman honors courses would be identical to the procedures utilized in the University Honors Program. All decisions would be subject to Departmental approval.*

Item B, a continuation of discussion on the report of the ad hoc Committee to study the Promotions and Tenure Committee, was opened by Pres. Kleinman. He noted that not all of the points raised in the report were in the form of resolutions and suggested that the discussion might serve to illuminate the sense of the Senate so that the Committee on Promotions and Tenure could be asked to come back later with resolutions for Senate action. Senator Oliver, chair of the ad hoc committee, said that was what the committee had hoped would be the result of their report. A discussion followed of the various points raised in the report, beginning with a summary by Sen. Oliver of comments from the January Senate meeting on the role of the Promotions and Tenure committee in the review of departmental criteria.

Criteria Review. Prof. Smith, chair of the Promotions and Tenure Committee, said that his committee preferred the report's third alternative as the one that has been established by past practice and one which they viewed as adequate and effective. Pres. Kleinman expressed the sense of the Senate as being that the Promotions and Tenure Committee should focus on the few deficient departments on a yearly basis in the early part of the year. Associate Provost Halio said he thought the report's first alternative was more consistent with the existing charge to the Committee. There was a brief discussion regarding terms of membership and consistency of the committee. Provost Campbell said that even with extended terms there would still be the problem that statements that seemed to say the same thing in the abstract tended to fall apart when dossier evidence was brought up against them and it was only at that point that extensive comments and evaluations of the criteria were possible by the Promotions and Tenure Committee.

Rough Comparability of Criteria. Senator Oliver then moved to discussion of the ad hoc committee's inability to reach a consensus regarding the responsibility to establish rough comparability of criteria. Prof. Smith said his committee felt the responsibility could be limited to seeing that the criteria were published and that there was comparability in the methods of applying the procedures and in the kinds of dossiers. Senator Braun suggested that since there was already rough comparability of research, through external evaluation, that perhaps quantitative procedures could be established for teaching and service. Provost Campbell said that rough comparabili

did not mean comparing research or teaching in different disciplines but finding indicators of whether it was good, bad or indifferent.

Independent Professional Judgment. Senator Oliver then moved to discussion of the ad hoc committee's recommendation to strike the Handbook language precluding the Promotions and Tenure Committee from making independent professional judgments. Prof. Smith read the charge to the Promotions and Tenure Committee and said that he interpreted it to mean making sure of compliance with the standards, and that he felt the Handbook description was an elaboration on that. Prof. Oliver raised the question of the role of the Promotions and Tenure Committee when a candidate chose to put himself forward without a recommendation from his department and asked whether the committee should be able to exercise professional judgment and make a recommendation contrary to the department. Senator Klinzing asked whether such a decision would then be stronger or more important, i.e., whether the process was vertical or horizontal.

Senator Geiger suggested that there were three possible levels at which the Promotions and Tenure Committee could be seen as exercising its judgment: at a minimum level they certify that the required documents are included and procedures followed; at the other extreme they exercise their "professional judgment" on the quality of the candidate's work as though they were experts in the candidate's own field; but they ought to operate at a middle level in which they express professional judgment not as experts in the candidate's field but as professionals judging the quality of the documentation. Associate Provost Halio added that when review committees function only at the lowest "procedural" level they place a candidate at a disadvantage. Prof. Oglesby said she thought the charge to the Promotions and Tenure Committee also included responsibility for a review function when a candidate felt he had been ill-treated at a lower level.

A discussion followed on the various sources of the Handbook material and it was noted that only the language in the charge to the Promotions and Tenure Committee had actually been approved by the Senate.

At 5:30 a motion was made and seconded to recess until Monday, February 12 at 4:00 p.m.

Second Session

The February meeting of the Senate was reconvened by President Kleinman at 4:00 on Monday, February 12. Senators not in attendance were:

David Barlow	David Hallenbeck	William Moody
William Boyer	Michael King	Billy Ross
Alexander Doberenz	Dene Klinzing	John Worthen
Samuel Gaertner	Peter Leavens	

Senators excused were: Meribeth Bunch, L. Leon Campbell, Robert Carroll, Donald Crossan, Jeffrey Davidson, William Gaither, Lee Hyncik, Ann McCourt, Mary Ann Miller, Franklin Newman, Joseph Noggle, Daniel Rich, Blaine Schmidt, Elliot Schreiber, Victor Spinski, E.A. Trabant, Robert Warren.

Senator Oliver reintroduced the topic of "professional judgment" and Prof. Smith said he thought language could be found to charge his committee to determine that the

conclusions drawn at the lower levels were legitimate in the sense that they were supported by the data in the dossier. Senator Oliver said the concern of his ad hoc committee had been that the policies ought to be clear and consistent, but they were not in their present form in the Handbook. Senator Sharnoff suggested their might be an advantage to the present language and system because it was clear that if the Committee exercised independent judgment they did so at their own peril and accountability. It was also noted that there might be a situation in which the committee thought there should be outside evaluations and the department did not, or where the committee questioned the evaluations, and it would then be necessary for the committee to exercise its professional judgment.

Senator Finner pointed out that as long as the language prohibiting professional judgment was in the Handbook the Committee could be liable under the grievance procedure if a candidate could demonstrate that they had exercised such judgment. He also said that if deans and the Provost could and did make such judgments it didn't make sense to prohibit a faculty committee from doing so.

Dossier Preparation. Senator Vinson expressed his concern about the size of dossiers, the amount of documentation needed to verify evaluations, and the time required to assemble the dossier. He said he would prefer to see the Promotions and Tenure Committee as a committee of appeals.

Senator Summerton said that, as a student, he felt it important that faculty be evaluated on the basis of teaching ability and student evaluations; the consensus was that this is done.

Professor Smith agreed with the ad hoc committee's recommendation that a task force be formed to deal with the process of dossier preparation and the creation of a standard procedure.

Teaching Evaluations. Senator Finner said that if more than one kind of teaching evaluation were required, as the ad hoc report recommended, there should be suggestions as to what they are. Senator Oliver responded that student evaluations are sufficiently controversial that a judgment should not be based entirely on them. Prof. Halio noted that a Senate report on teaching effectiveness detailed nine ways of evaluating teaching.

External Reviews. Senator Vinson objected to the recommendation that external review letters be confidential. Pres. Kleinman noted that because of recent legislation there may be some question about the legality of requiring confidentiality. Dean Gouldner asked who decides what goes into a dossier. Prof. Halio noted that the provision for soliciting outside sources required that the candidate know the request is being made and by whom. Senator Oliver said one department chair had written him saying that no material should be added to a dossier unless it is specified and with the knowledge of the candidate, department and chair. Sen. Schultz said he thought once a letter had been received it should be included.

Evaluation of Service. Senator Finner said he was disappointed that, in light of recent remarks by the President and the Provost encouraging committee service, the ad hoc committee's report had left the evaluation of service up to the initiating unit, and some departments were known to discourage such service. Senator Oliver said the problem lay in the lack of useful documentation. Prof. Smith said most criteria say that service is not weighted on the plus side but is regarded as a necessary part of

faculty activity, and if the Senate wished to require service for promotion they would have to approve new guidelines. Prof. Halio said service was more related to faculty welfare and self-governance than to promotion. In response to a comment that there are economic and numerical factors in promotion decisions Associate Provost Halio said that to his present knowledge there is no rule, written or otherwise, concerning the number of tenured persons affordable and that there is no quota system.

Evaluation of Practice-Oriented Fields. Dean Anderson asked about the comments in the report regarding the meaning of academic rank in practice-oriented fields. Sen. Oliver said the ad hoc committee had felt a study should be made by people in such fields of the evaluation of professional activity in those areas, and Prof. Smith said his committee strongly favored such a study. Sen. Finner said there seemed to be two types of service: professional service in a professional discipline and a more general type. He introduced the following resolution which was seconded and, after a brief discussion, approved by a hand vote:

RESOLVED, that the Executive Committee refer to an appropriate standing or ad hoc committee the question of the role of and evaluation of department, college, University and community service in the promotion and tenure process.

Numerical Vote. Senator Vinson questioned the report's recommendation that all departmental numerical votes on promotion recommendations should be recorded and transmitted. Sen. Oliver said candidates without such information were in a weaker position. Sen. Vinson said if the policy were decided in the department and stated in the criteria that should not be the case. Prof. Smith felt there should be a uniform policy, and Sen. Schultz expressed his concern that if transmitting the numerical vote were required the vote could be misinterpreted later, and that it might also increase internal departmental divisions.

Dissenting Opinion. Senator Finner, referring to recommendation 4 on page 11 of the report, raised the question of inclusion of individual department members' opinions in a dossier, and expressed his concern that such opinions would get different responses depending on the author. A concern was also expressed that the opinions of junior faculty members were excluded. Sen. Braun said that under Robert's Rules any signed opinion should be included as a minority report. Prof. Smith said the concern was that tenured faculty not be excluded from the process. Sen. Warter said there should be some recognized route for dissenting opinions since they probably would be expressed anyway, especially if no numerical vote were recorded and the recommendation appeared to be unanimous. Sen. Fletcher felt that all deliberations should be settled within the department because it would be difficult to tell whether a dissenting opinion in a dossier represented an individual opinion or a minority report.

There was no further discussion of the ad hoc committee report and President Kleinman declared the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Sasser

Myron Sasser, Secretary
University Faculty Senate

MS/b

Attachments: 1. Memo of Understanding
2. FHP Budget

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Concerning my motions: during my meeting with the Coordinating Committee I was led to understand:

- a) That during the 1980-81 school year 3 or less of the temporary core faculty will be remaining. That after August 1981 none of the temporary core faculty will remain in the "honors program."
- b) From 1980 on all of the "honors program" courses will be taught by the faculties of the respective regular University departments [see (a) for exceptions]. If a department cannot mount a course with its regular tenure track faculty and if the Honors Program has available monies to hire temporary (or part-time) faculty, then a department may seek temporary faculty with the Honors Program providing the funding for the temporary budget line.
- c) That each department will be asked to submit a list of courses which it would be willing to mount as "Honors Courses" to be taught predominantly at the Freshman level.
- d) That the teaching of the "honors Courses," at all levels, will be integrated into a department's teaching load and won't automatically call for "overload" payment.

E. Schweizer
February 5, 1979

ES/b

Resolutions Pertaining to the Freshman Honors Program

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves the goals and philosophy of the University Honors Program and recommends that the program be changed to meet the spirit of the guidelines as it applies to freshman provided by the "Evaluation of Freshman Honors Program" as prepared by the Committee on Adjunct Academic Affairs during the spring and summer of 1978.

1. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, beginning with September, 1979, honors courses should be made widely available to all qualified freshmen.
2. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, starting in September, 1979, the Senate recommends the elimination of extra charges for freshmen participating in an honors program.
3. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, selection of honors courses for freshmen should not be all-or-none.
4. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Faculty Senate recommends the Freshmen Honors Program be moved from Dover to the Newark campus effective September 1979.
5. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, early admissions students should be provided with special types of counseling and advisement.
6. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Freshman Honors Program should become an integral part of the University Honors Program. This means that decisions regarding courses and staffing for freshman honors courses would be identical to the procedures utilized in the University Honors Program. All decisions would be subject to Departmental approval.

Memorandum

FACULTY SENATE



DATE: 2/6/79

TO: University Faculty Senators

FROM: Ralph E. Kleinman, President
University Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Continued Senate Meeting
Monday, February 12, 1979
4:00 p.m., room 110 Memorial Hall

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ralph E. Kleinman", written over the typed name in the "FROM" field.

The February 5 meeting of the Senate has been adjourned to Monday, February 12 at 4:00 at which time we will continue discussion of the report of the ad hoc Committee to Study the University Promotions and Tenure Committee and the report of the Adjunct Academic Affairs Committee on Walden and related matters.

Please make every effort to attend.

REK/b

CONSERVE ENERGY SO ENERGY CAN SERVE YOU

