

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

April 6, 1981

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on Monday, April 6, 1981 at 4:00 p.m., with President Toensmeyer presiding. Senators not in attendance were:

Thomas Brill

Michael Cochrane

Donald Crossan

Steve Doberstein

Nancy King

Stuart Sharkey

Peter Warter .

Senators excused were: Edith Anderson, T.E. D. Braun, Hatem Khalil, Donald Mogavero.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA. The Agenda was adopted as distributed.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES. The minutes of the special meeting of January 26 and the regular meeting of February 2, 1981, were approved as written.

III. REMARKS. President Trabant reported on projected changes in the levels of federal funding in the areas of student aid and the Sea Grant program. Regarding Student aid, he said the University's Office of Financial Aid had been active in supplying information to students and their parents and to Delaware legislators, in both the state and federal governments. He said he thought there was a fair chance there will be some change in the package of direct aid or in tax relief for parents.

Regarding the Sea Grant program, President Trabant said the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and its Marine Affairs committee, of which he is the chair, had been very active in working for a continuation of the program. He reported that Senator Roth of Delaware and Senator Weicker of Connecticut, before whose committee he will testify on April 21, had both gone on record as supporting continuation of the program. He noted that, in contrast, an increase had been recommended for research funding in agriculture, and pointed out that the University's recent reorganization of the College of Human Resources and the addition of George Worrilow Hall to the College of Agriculture reflected the administration's anticipation that food would be one of the areas that would attract more federal attention.

President Trabant also reported that Deans Gouldner and Brucker had, the preceding week, hosted a conference at the University on "Productivity," to explore a new or revitalized partnership between government, industry, and universities. He said possible outcomes of the conference could include meeting with Delaware's congressional delegation on the themes and conclusions of the conference, and meeting with the federal Department of Commerce to explore that Department's relationship to Land Grant universities, which should be, as it is described in the founding legislation, similar to that of the Department of Agriculture where there has been great success.

President Trabant concluded his remarks with a reference to the recent assassination attempt on President Reagan, noting that the problem of violence had been addressed at the University some months ago, and he had appointed a group to look into violence on campus; he asked that anyone who wished to contribute to the work of this group contact Prof. Steinmetz or Vice President Sharkey, the co-chairpersons.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS. President Toensmeyer called for any challenges to the Minor in Geology as it was published in the Agenda; there were none, and the minor was declared approved.

Noting that it was the last meeting before the seating of the new senators, President Toensmeyer expressed the Executive Committee's appreciation for the efforts of the present senators.

Pending the arrival in the Senate of the sponsor of the legislation under Old Business, President Toensmeyer moved to New Business.

Item A, a report from the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges on Use of Part-Time Faculty, was introduced by Prof. Martin, past chair of the committee. Prof. Martin noted that the report was the result of a request from the Senate Executive Committee that they carry out the commissions from the last collective bargaining session to study the nature and extent of part-time instruction at the University, and to provide recommendations for an appropriate University policy. He added that the concern at the time was to put some limits on the use of part-time faculty in the face of budgetary problems which might make extensive use of such faculty an alternative to developing an educational policy.

Senator Sharnoff, noting that the report's recommended limit was on the percentage of credit hours taught rather than a percentage of the faculty, suggested that faculty with adjunct and professional appointments should be excluded, since they are unpaid and are not actually employed by the University. Prof. Martin responded that such appointees, unlike full-time faculty who serve on committees, advise students, etc., represented a part-time commitment to the University, usually in a single area of expertise. He said the committee had included them in the part-time group because, in terms of the bargaining unit, they functioned the same.

Senator Haskell asked about the committee's procedures and conclusions in its study of whether there were situations where the use of part-time faculty was "inimical to good educational policy." Prof. Martin responded that they had contacted units where individuals perceived extensive use of part-time faculty, and they had investigated anomalies in the statistical analyses supplied by the Office of Institutional Research and in data from the questionnaire responses from deans and chairpersons, and they had been unable to detect any consistent patterns of substituting part-time for full-time faculty or of sacrificing educational criteria in the interest of the budget. In response to a question from Senator Haskell about the extent of the variance between units in their numbers of part-time faculty, Prof. Martin said the numbers fluctuated a great deal because individual units had different situations at different times, to such an extent that the committee had abandoned an early attempt to set unit-by-unit limits.

Dean Greenfield suggested that if the use of part-time faculty was not found to be excessive and did not negatively affect educational programs it would seem the University was handling it well, and he asked why it was necessary to put a limit on it. Prof. Martin said the limit was not particularly stringent, but it would serve as a safeguard against future budgetary, administration, or policy changes. President Trabant asked what would happen if the per-year limit were exceeded, and suggested that the limit might better be set for a 3 or 5 year period. Prof. Martin said the committee had not been able to establish any long-range patterns because the data have only

existed since 1977, so their recommendations did not dictate what would happen if the 13.3% limit were exceeded, but they did include provisions for a review in 2 or 3 years to determine if that was a workable number.

A senator asked why the committee had set the limit on a percentage of credit hours rather than of faculty, and suggested this might encourage the use of part-time faculty for small sections because that would make it easier to stay under the limit. Prof. Martin responded that if the limit were a percentage of the faculty there might be a tendency to overwork part-time faculty.

President Trabant asked if the committee had considered not having any number limit, but recommending that the Office of Institutional Research make a yearly report to the Senate. Prof. Martin said the committee had felt the best safeguard was a number, with the opportunity for yearly adjustment, together with the second part of the report which recommended general principles and defined abuse in the use of part-time faculty. Senator Sharnoff said he welcomed the philosophy in the second recommendation, but he felt the first one was too rigid and he thought it would be a better system to have the administration compile the statistics and allow the issue to be negotiated every other year. Prof. Haskell asked whether the report had to be acted on by the Senate at all, since the agreement only required that a Senate committee study the question.

In response to a question from Senator Cope, Angela Zawacki from the Office of Institutional Research said the term "part-time appointments" referred only to those appointments for which there are budgeted lines, and did not include appointments on supplemental contracts, which are individually funded by the Provost.

Senator Sharnoff made a motion, which was seconded, that the Senate receive rather than approve the report; there was no further discussion and the motion was approved by voice vote:

*RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate receives  
the report and recommendations of the  
Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges  
on the Use of Part-time Faculty.*

#### V. OLD BUSINESS

Item A, a resolution from the Coordinating Committee on Education regarding Independent Study courses, was introduced by Prof. Vukelich, chair of the Undergraduate Studies committee which had prepared the legislation. Prof. Vukelich requested, as an editorial change, that the word "must" in the parenthetical sentence under "c" be change to "may."

Senator Smith reviewed the concerns raised at the February Senate meeting which had led the Senate to return the item to committee, and objected that the new resolution did not address the problem of providing a vehicle for transfer credits. Prof. Vukelich said that Mr. DiMartile, the Director of Records and a member of the committee, had assured them that the Records Office could deal with that problem by putting transfer credits on a separate numbering system, and the intent of the new resolution was to deal with the other problems by providing for consistency in the use of the Independent Study designation. In response to a question about the content of the contract which would be required between the faculty member and the student, Prof. Vukelich suggested it could contain a specification of the student's objectives,

identification of the activities required, a bibliography of sources needed, a statement of what the student is responsible for producing, and a statement of what supervision and evaluation would come from the faculty member. In response to objections that regular courses do not require such contracts it was noted that the hours, credits and descriptions for regular courses must all undergo a committee approval process.

There was no further discussion and the resolution, as follows, was approved by a hand vote:

*BE IT RESOLVED THAT*

*Departments be advised that*

- a. the course title for 366 and 466 be changed from Special Problems to Independent Study;*
- b. each department must establish, subject to the approval of the Committee on Undergraduate Studies, guidelines for students to qualify for independent study courses, and*
- c. a written contractual agreement must be devised between the individual student and the professor before the student may sign up for the course.  
(Each department may determine if this proposal is subject to review by people other than the professor.)*

VI. NEW BUSINESS

Item B, a resolution from the Committee on Committees to change the charge to the Committee on Academic Freedom, was introduced by Prof. Haskell, a member of the Committee on Committees and chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom. Prof. Haskell explained that in the past couple of years a number of issues had been assigned to the Academic Freedom Committee which were not strictly academic freedom issues, and the intent of the change was to reflect this by including certain civil liberty matters in the charge. He added that academic freedom is a specific civil liberty and it is appropriate that civil liberty issues come before the committee when they arise within the University.

President Trabant, noting that the word "condition" was singular in the first line and the plural form, "conditions," was used in the third line, suggested it should be made consistent. He also questioned why the new charge said, in the first line, "This committee is empowered to study" and, at the end, "and shall report"; he asked if this means some issues can and some may not be studied. Prof. Haskell responded that the use of "empowered" was intended as a move away from the imperative and he had no objection to changing the word, but the larger concern had been to place a limitation on the committee so they would not "take on the universe." Provost Campbell suggested that the name of the committee should also be changed to reflect such a change in its charge, and Prof. Haskell agreed.

A motion by Dean Ames to return the item to the Committee on Committees was seconded and approved by a hand vote.

Item C, a recommendation from the Coordinating Committee on Education to clarify various statements of policy regarding change of grade, was introduced by Prof. Vukelich; she asked that an editorial change be made to make the second paragraph of resolution 1 like the paragraphs in italics in resolution 2. Senator Mosberg asked if the paragraph on cases where a student has filed a grade complaint meant that a decision by the Welfare and Privileges ad hoc committee to change a grade was final, and President Toensmeyer said that that was correct. There was no further discussion and the resolutions, as follows, were approved by unanimous voice vote:

1. *RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate recommends that the Faculty Handbook Section II, Select Academic Policies: 5. Grades, paragraph 3 (p. II-6 of the current Handbook) be changed to read as follows:*

*Changes in grade may be initiated only by the instructor. A change in a permanent grade must also have the approval of the dean of the college where the course is offered; such changes generally will be approved only where computational errors have been made. The instructor must be notified of the dean's action.*

*If a student has an academic grievance, the student must follow the "Student Grievance Procedure" (II-3a, 4 in the Faculty Handbook). In cases where a student has filed a grade complaint under the Student Grievance Procedure the decision of the ad hoc committee appointed by the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges shall be final.*

*The Student Judicial System is mandated to impose an automatic grade of "F" if a student is found guilty of academic dishonesty.*

2. *RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate recommends that the Policies Relevant for Student Advisement manual, VI, Grading System: D. Changes in Grade (p. 18), be changed to read as follows:*

D. Changes in Grade

*Changes in grade must be initiated by the instructor. A change in a permanent grade must also have the approval of the dean of the college where the course is offered. When a student on probation has a temporary grade removed and this transaction results in an increase in the index to a 2.00 or better, the probation status is automatically removed. Conversely, a student may be placed on probation or dropped if the transaction results in a decrease in the index. Petitions for changes of grade or academic status are reviewed by the Committee on Undergraduate Records and Certification. This committee has the final authority in such changes of grade or status.*

*In cases where a student has filed a grade complaint under the Student Grievance Procedure the decision of the ad hoc committee appointed by the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges shall be final.*

*The Student Judicial System is mandated to impose an automatic grade of "F" if a student is found guilty of academic dishonesty.*

Item D, a recommendation from the Coordinating Committee on Education for approval of changes in the requirements for the major in Food Science, was introduced by Prof. Vukelich, who noted that the changes were an upgrading of the current program so the program would meet the requirements for national accreditation. There was no discussion and the resolution, as follows, was approved by voice vote:

*RESOLVED, that the revised requirements for  
a major in Food Science are approved, effective  
with the class of 1985.*

No new business was introduced, and President Toensmeyer declared the meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*H.T. Reynolds*

H.T. Reynolds  
Secretary  
University Faculty Senate