

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

November 13, 1989

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order on Monday, November 13, 1989 at 4:00 p.m. with President Dilley presiding.

Senators not in attendance were: George Basalla, Edmunds Bunkse, Donald Conlon, Mark Clark, Judith Roof, Christopher Smith

Senators excused were: Donald Crossan, Helen Gouldner, Scott Jones, Frank Murray, Linda Pellicchia, R. Byron Pipes, Krzysztof Szalewicz, E. A. Trabant, Carolyn Thoroughgood, David Usher

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Dilley requested approval of a modification of the agenda: that Item A, Old Business, be combined with Item A, New Business.

Hearing no comments or objections this and the remainder of the agenda were approved as distributed.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Hearing no comments or objections the minutes were approved as distributed.

III. REMARKS BY PRESIDENT TRABANT and/or ACTING PROVOST MURRAY

President Trabant was unable to attend and Acting Provost Murray had no remarks.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Pending approval of the Senate, President Dilley announced that the Executive Committee had agreed to a modification of policy regarding transcripts of Faculty Senate Meetings. It will no longer be necessary to seek permission of the Executive Committee to gain access to such transcripts. No objection or comments being expressed by the Senate, the policy modification stands.

ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR CHALLENGE

The following Announcements for Challenge were presented by President Dilley and approved:

1. Change in name of the Department of Plant Science to the Department of Plant and Soil Sciences
2. Change in name of the Department of Political Science to the Department of Political Science and International Relations
3. Disestablishment of the Institute of Neuroscience and Behavior

V. OLD BUSINESS

Item A was a recommendation from the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Senate on the awarding of honorary degrees. [This recommendation was originally on the October agenda but tabled until November.] With the approval of the Senate, discussion of this item was coupled with Item A of New Business (Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Honorary Degrees, Arthur Metzner, Chairperson).

President Dilley first presented the background which led to the formation of the Ad Hoc Committee on Honorary Degrees and to the drafting of the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the Charter of the University of Delaware, Paragraph 5111, page A-5, states that the faculty "shall have authority, with the approbation of the Board, to confer degrees and grant diplomas," and otherwise is silent on the matter of granting degrees, and

WHEREAS, the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees state that the faculty shall "Determine the requirements for degrees and recommend candidates for diplomas, degrees and certificates," and

WHEREAS, there are certain honorary degrees which ordinarily do not connote educational distinction but may represent honors awarded for significant public service or for financial and other support of this University, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the University Faculty Senate declare that the Board of Trustees has the power to award such honorary degrees as mentioned above, provided that the degree not be awarded in the name of the faculty unless that faculty has given its assent.

Professor Metzner then discussed the deliberations and conclusions of his Ad Hoc Committee, the general import of which was that neither the Charter nor the Bylaws are clear concerning where authority resides for the awarding of honorary degrees. Professor Metzner then presented the following recommendation from the Ad Hoc Committee: (Report from the Ad Hoc Committee is at Attachment 1).

"The Committee on Honorary Degrees and Awards shall consider all nominations for honorary degrees and awards, and shall report their recommendations to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees."

After further discussion of the implications of this recommendation, Senator David Bellamy offered a substitute motion reaffirming existing policy: a joint faculty-trustee committee submitting its nominations to the Faculty Senate. The substitute motion was seconded and subsequently approved by the Senate.

Item B was a resolution introduced at the October meeting by Senator Kelly Teeven, DUSC, on the plus/minus grading system.

President Dillely announced that Senator Teeven had asked that the matter be decided by secret ballot. The Senate then approved the use of a secret ballot. DUSC President Jeff Thomas then presented arguments for the resolution. Professor Jeffrey Raffel then summarized the conclusions of the Committee on Graduate Studies, of which he had been chairperson when the plus/minus grading system was presented to and approved by the Faculty Senate. After additional brief discussion of the merits of plus/minus, Senator Nancy Signorielli moved to close the debate. The motion was approved by the Senate and the following resolution was subsequently defeated:

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate has implemented a plus/minus grading system to commence in the 1990 fall semester, and

WHEREAS, the plus/minus system has not been adequately researched and does not necessarily provide a better evaluation of student performance, and

WHEREAS, the proposed system will not be implemented uniformly throughout the University, thereby contradicting the intention of a more consistent grading system, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the decision to implement a plus/minus grading system be rescinded.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

Item A was covered under Item A, Old Business.

Item B was a recommendation from the Coordinating Committee on Education (L. Goldstein, Chairperson), on the establishment of a Department of Finance in the College of Business and Economics. The following resolution was carried:

- WHEREAS, the College of Business and Economics wishes to reorganize its faculty members, such that 11 faculty currently listed as belonging to the Department of Business Administration would now become a Finance Department, and*
- WHEREAS, this reorganization has been extensively discussed and approved within the College of Business and Economics, and*
- WHEREAS, the current Department of Business Administration is by far the biggest department (48 faculty) within the College of Business and Economics, and*
- WHEREAS, the creation of this new Department, for the present, would not result in the granting of any new degrees, and*
- WHEREAS, the College of Business and Economics already has a secretary assigned to do the work of the Finance faculty, and already has a faculty member employed as Assistant to the Chair of the Business Administration Department for the Finance Concentration, and*
- WHEREAS, this faculty reorganization will result in the creation of a new Department of Finance with no significant new costs to the University, and with no significant program changes, be it therefore*
- RESOLVED, that the Department of Finance will be established in the College of Business and Economics as soon as it can be conveniently approved by the Board of Trustees.*

Item C was a recommendation from Senator Theodore Braun regarding the voting rights of professionals who do not have academic appointments and serve on Faculty Senate Committees. The following resolution was defeated:

- WHEREAS, professionals who do not have academic appointments serving on University Faculty Senate Committees charged with course, curriculum or other academic matters can offer the Committees important advice on the implementation of policies, but*
- WHEREAS, professionals who do not have academic appointments should not participate in the academic policy decisions made by these Committees, and*

WHEREAS, professionals who do not have academic appointments serve on only one University Faculty Senate Committee charged with course, curriculum or other academic matters, be it therefore

RESOLVED, that professionals without academic appointments serving on University Faculty Senate Committees charged with course, curriculum or other academic matters be non-voting members, and be it further

RESOLVED, that this policy be implemented immediately.

Item D was a recommendation from the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Senate for the approval of the Workload Policy Guidelines. Senator Ludwig Mosberg offered an advisory amendment to the Revised Timetables, Item 10, line 3, as follows: [amendment in bold type] "If a policy has not been submitted, for whatever reasons, the unit administrator will prepare a workload policy **which is consistent with the unit's past practices** by May 9, 1990 for review, modification and adoption by the faculty." Senator Mosberg's advisory amendment was approved. The Senate then approved the resolution with textual modification to accommodate the advisory amendment. (Revised Timelines at Attachment 2).

WHEREAS, the Collective Bargaining Agreement negotiated between the AAUP and the University administration stipulates that:

Procedural guidelines for establishing an approved workload policy shall be developed by a Committee consisting of six members, three from the AAUP and three from the Administration. These procedural guidelines will be submitted to the Faculty at large for their review and comment. The procedural guidelines developed by the Workload Committee and reviewed and commented upon by the faculty at large shall be approved pursuant to the procedure set forth in Article XVI, Section 16.3, in sufficient time to permit each department to develop and have approved workload policies in place by December 31, 1989,

and

WHEREAS, all faculty received copies of the Workload Policy Guidelines in June 1989, and the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges has found no fault with the substance of the proposed policy, and

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Senate has noted that the proposed guidelines allow each department to retain its present workload or negotiate a modified one as that department sees fit, be it therefore

RESOLVED, that the University Faculty Senate approves the Workload Policy Guidelines if amended as proposed, recognizing that the timetable needs renegotiation by the AAUP and the administration.

The Senate voted to adjourn at 5:28 p.m.

Dutifully submitted,



Kenneth Ackerman
Secretary
University Faculty Senate

rg

Attachments:

1. Report from the Ad Hoc Committee
2. Revised Timelines

Memorandum

September 25, 1989

TO: Professor Frank B. Dilley
President, University Faculty Senate

FROM: Your ad hoc Committee on Honorary Degrees

We have discussed, quite carefully, the current situation concerning honorary degrees, the mechanisms used to select candidates at several other universities, and how we might best proceed in the future.

We have contacted a total of seven other universities. Two of these (University of Virginia and Pennsylvania State University), do not award any honorary degrees. Four universities (Florida State, Maryland, Minnesota, and Princeton) proceed via a committee much as our Trustee-Faculty committee, with final approbation being given by the Trustees. In all cases except that of Minnesota, the faculty are a minority on the Trustee-Faculty committee. The last of this group of seven universities - Houston - also proceeds in the same fashion, but the Regents of that institution may also select additional recipients not considered previously by the Trustee-faculty committee.

We believe that honorary degrees may be of two kinds, one of them not reflecting academic distinction in the traditional sense. Therefore, the Faculty Senate should not be involved in the selection of these latter candidates. We recommend, therefore, that the Senate officers petition our Board of Trustees to modify the last paragraph of their by-laws (Section G, page 16) to read as follows:

"The Committee on Honorary Degrees and Awards shall consider all nominations for honorary degrees and awards, and shall report their recommendations to the Executive Committee."

This shortened phrasing, and shortened procedure, will eliminate the opportunity for future conflicts and appears to bring our procedure into greater conformity with that used by other institutions.

Respectfully submitted,

Professor William I. Homer
Professor Arthur B. Metzner, Chairman
Professor Emeritus John A. Munroe
Professor David W. Smith
Professor James R. Soles
Professor Ulrich C. Toensmeyer

Revised Timelines for Implementation of Section 11.2, collective bargaining agreement between the University of Delaware and the Delaware Chapter of the AAUP.

(Substitute for #9 and #10)

9. Faculty in a unit shall have until December 15, 1989 to prepare and submit a proposed workload policy for implementation in the Fall 1990 semester. If a faculty submits a workload policy by that date, the proposed policy will be transmitted to the AAUP as described in step two above. The approval process outlined in steps two through five must be completed no later than February 21, 1990 if they are to be used as the workload policy to govern Fall 1990 course schedules.

If the faculty in a unit, for whatever reason, does not prepare and submit a workload policy by December 15, 1989, past practice within that unit will prevail for developing Fall 1990 course schedules.

10. All departments will, however, be expected to develop and have approved workload policies in place by September 21, 1990. To that end, faculty in a unit shall have until April 25, 1990 to prepare and submit a workload policy for implementation in the Spring 1991 semester. If a policy has not been submitted, for whatever reasons, the unit administrator will prepare a workload policy by May 9, 1990 for review, modification and adoption by the faculty. In response, the faculty of that unit will have until May 23, 1990 to adopt a policy which may be the one submitted by the unit administrator, or a modification thereof, or a totally new policy.

If the faculty has still not adopted a policy by May 30, 1990, then the version prepared by the unit administrator for the September 21, 1990 deadline will be transmitted to the AAUP as described in step two above.

In either event, the approval process outlined in steps two through eight must be completed no later than September 21, 1990.

IV SAME

V SAME

11/9/89