

1-13-1975

Academic Council Meeting Agenda and Minutes, January 13, 1975

Barbara Dreher

Wright State University - Main Campus

Follow this and additional works at: http://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact corescholar@www.libraries.wright.edu.

Date: January 3, 1975

To: Members of the Academic Council

From: Barbara Dreher, Secretary, Steering Committee

Subject: Agenda, Academic Council Meeting, Monday, January 13, 1975

COUNCIL WILL MEET AT 3:10 P. M. , IN ROOM 041 OF UNIVERSITY CENTER

- I. Call to order.
- II. Approval of Minutes of December 9, 1974, meeting.
- III. Report of the President.
- IV. Report of the Steering Committee.
- V. Reports of the Standing Committees:
 - A. Curriculum (Attachment A)
 - B. Faculty Affairs
 - C. Library
 - D. Student Affairs
- VI. Old Business:
 - A. Approval of Revised Promotion and Tenure Document for Main Campus (continued; discussion by Article). (Attachment F to June 3rd Minutes; Proposed Amendments Attachment D to October 7th Agenda)
 - B. Approval of additional amendments to the Revised Promotion and Tenure Document (see Attachments A and B to November 4th Agenda).
 - C. Approval of a further amendment to the Revised Promotion and Tenure Document (see Attachment B to December 2nd Agenda).
 - D. Approval of proposed amendment to the Faculty Constitution (see Attachment C to the December 2nd Agenda).
- VII. New Business:
- VIII. Adjournment.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

January 13, 1975

Minutes

I. The January meeting was called to order by Chairman Pro Tem Vice President Murray at 3:15 P. M., in Rooms 041-043-045 of the University Center.

II. Minutes of the December 9, 1974, meeting were presented for approval.

Mr. Zamonski of the Library Committee referred to Page Three, paragraph 2, the Library report, and asked for deletion of the second phrase of the sentence. It should read -

"Researching of graduate program funding is continuing."

Minutes, as amended, were approved by voice vote.

III. Report of the President, Mr. Spiegel reporting in Mr. Kegerreis' absence.

Mr. Kegerreis was in Columbus, meeting with the Inter-University Council and with the Chancellor.

One of the problems to be discussed in Columbus is one causing some consternation here: The past legislature approved legislation removing sovereign immunity from public secondary schooling, which includes state universities, and the Attorney General's office has ruled illegal the purchasing of public liability insurance either with public funding or from private funds. In essence this allows a university to be sued but does not allow it a means of protecting itself through insurance. It is obvious that new legislation is needed to permit the purchase of liability protection, Mr. Spiegel said.

Also under discussion today will be the 1.3 billion dollar budget proposed by Chancellor Norton, cut by former Governor Gilligan to just over a billion. Which areas cut by Mr. Gilligan are unknown, as are any plans Governor Rhodes and the present legislature might have.

Probably to be discussed also will be public collective bargaining legislation, which would mean public employees could legally collectively bargain if they so desire.

As brought out in the news media, the allocation of the "discovered" eighty million dollars surplus at the state level is now under consideration. Mr. Spiegel expressed the hope that some part of that might be used to help make up the over-earned subsidy which the University has not been given. He explained that Wright State has received 78% of the over-earned amount of \$709,000, and it is the difference between that \$489,000 received and the total amount that the University would hope to receive from the state surplus or some other source. He did admit that he is not hopeful in this direction however.

Preparation of the budgets for next year are a current concern. Meetings will begin at the vice-presidential level very soon.

Mention was also made of the increased enrollment for the Winter Quarter, up 8.7% over last year's Winter Quarter. As further anticipated, this is down from the Fall Quarter just completed, but, nevertheless, is a help in the budget situation.

Interchange between Mr. Spiegel and Council members:

Mr. Sachs wondered if there were future plans for asphaltting the walk-way between Brehm Lab and the University Center, and perhaps more parking area.

Mr. Spiegel agreed that the parking situation has been as bad this year as anyone can recall, but indicated that cutbacks in capital expenditures - such as walks and paved parking areas - had been made because of the inability to collect the subsidy relied upon when planning the current year's budget. He did assure Council that he would look into the matter.

In response to a resolution approved at the December meeting of the University's A. A. U. P. chapter, a recommendation by the Graduate Council concerning an increase in the stipend for graduate assistants will be sent to the Provost, perhaps the first week of February. This will be taken into account when the final budget is put together. It was agreed that graduate assistants are hard hit by inflation, more so than many in other positions.

Referring back to the over-earned subsidy problem, Mr. Gray wondered if there was a possibility of the Board of Regents estimating the enrollment of the University for the coming year at a level nearer the level anticipated by the administration.

Mr. Spiegel expressed the feeling that uncertainty prevailing at the state capitol made this impossible to know. In line, however, with this uncertainty, Mr. Spiegel said that University budgeting for the coming year will be more conservative, not making use of any anticipated increase in enrollment subsidy.

Mr. Neve asked if there was any further information regarding the Board of Regents' "regionalization plan", discussed by Mr. Kegerreis at the last faculty meeting.

Mr. Spiegel responded that it has been difficult to get any indication from Columbus regarding this, or anything related even remotely to budget, but that he felt the Board of Regents at this time probably were considering their own continued existence or restricted existence rather than the regionalization plan contemplated earlier.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, Mrs. Dreher reporting.

At last month's meeting, Dr. Cargan of the Artists and Lecturers Series Committee was interviewed and it was decided that broader representation was needed, particularly from the College of Science and Engineering. In line with this decision, Raymond Lewkowicz of the Math Department was made the newest member of the group.

Varied input has been received by the Committee in response to their stand taken on voting to be permitted at the University Petitions Committee meetings (only members whose names have been presented to Academic Council being allowed to vote). Further study will be given the matter, with a report at a later date to the Council.

Mrs. Dreher asked that the following item be entered under New Business for this meeting:

"Approval of the Revision of the Bylaws of the University Research Council."

Copies will be sent as an attachment to the Minutes of this meeting.

V. Reports of the Standing Committees:

A. Curriculum Committee, Mr. Clark reporting.

Mr. Clark's brief report called attention to those courses processed by the Committee, Attachment A to the Agenda of this meeting.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee, Mr. Skinner reporting.

The Committee has arrived at a reworded revision of Article IV of the Promotion and Tenure Document that they feel is acceptable. It has been discussed with the Deans but copies are not available today. Copies will be sent to Council members as soon as possible.

The Committee has been reviewing a draft statement of procedures to be followed should a financial exigency occur. The statement is actually one borrowed from another university, but with revisions might cover such a situation here at Wright State.

The subject of fixed-term contracts is being considered, brought to mind at this time by an article in the campus newspaper. Mr. Skinner pointed out that there were reasons why this might be good, both for the University and for individual faculty members. He elaborated by saying that in a small department, where a number of faculty were tenured, the incoming faculty member would wonder if by some slim chance he might gain tenure. With a fixed-term contract, he would know from the beginning that tenure would not result. Thoughts related to fixed-term contracts included - the need to have the contract actually look different from the regular contracts, with bold type indicating the length of employment; the understanding that it could not later be converted to a regular contract (otherwise the concept would be lost); that faculty so hired should have full faculty rights (voting, etc.); and that there might be changes needed in the Promotion and Tenure Document with regard to such faculty. The expressed feeling of the Committee is that such a system would work, with the proper safeguards and perhaps some added guidelines that might occur to Council members. The Faculty Affairs Committee solicits input now on the subject, before they put together a statement or document and bring it to the Council for specific approval.

Mr. Levine asked Mr. Spiegel if Council approval was needed for this kind of contract, or if a department, with administrative approval, could use this type of fixed-term employment.

Mr. Spiegel felt that Academic Council approval was not needed but that he would not want to use such an instrument without first having discussed it with faculty members, without having it reviewed by Faculty Affairs Committee, and if opposition to it was found, then it would probably not be used. In order to ascertain the feeling toward such contracts was his intent in bringing up the subject when meeting with various groups and at the faculty meeting, Mr. Spiegel explained. The contract format has been worked out by the University and should a department wish to use it, they probably would be allowed

to implement it if there was no strong feeling against its use.

Mr. Murray also encouraged input from the faculty, suggesting ideas and thoughts be submitted either to Mr. Spiegel, Mr. Skinner and the Faculty Affairs Committee, or to himself.

Mrs. Sherwin asked for confirmation of her understanding that there would be no way a three-year fixed-term contract could be renewed, even if the renewal would be of an obvious advantage to the University.

Mr. Skinner stated that discussion by the Committee had covered this, and they came to the conclusion that that was the only practical way to handle use of fixed-term employment. They felt the possibility of renegotiating a contract should be ruled out, even if death or resignation occurred within the department where the particular faculty member was employed. The alternative was offered that a faculty member could be given the suggestion of taking a job elsewhere for a year, and then the University make an offer of a regular contract. He emphasized that the University would have to be "hard nosed" in order to make such a system work.

Mr. Martin asked about the possibility of - by mutual agreement - cancelling the fixed-term contract and writing a regular contract.

It was brought out that Mr. Spiegel had suggested just that avenue, but the Committee had not gone along with the suggestion. Mr. Spiegel admitted that the more he had thought about it, the more he had felt the Committee to be correct - the reasoning of the Committee had convinced him that this would not work, and Mr. Skinner interjected that a faculty might just as well be given a regular contract when renegotiation could occur.

Mr. Sachs stated the impression he had gained from two members of the Faculty Affairs Committee was that they were opposed to the idea of such a rigid contract.

Mr. Skinner reiterated that he was expressing the feeling of the majority of the Committee at the time of discussion.

Mr. Nussbaum offered the possibility of the formation of a search procedure after such a person's term of employment had expired, and the inclusion of that faculty member's name as a candidate in such a search, and Mr. Spiegel agreed that could be done.

Mr. Nussbaum then questioned if such a fixed-term contract guaranteed that term of employment, over and above regular contract holders, in the event of financial exigency.

Mr. Spiegel assured Council that the contract states explicitly that the faculty member is evaluated annually as are all faculty, and so clearly would not have the advantage over regular faculty. He reaffirmed that the search method would be one way available toward hiring a person formerly holding a fixed-term contract.

At the January 10th meeting, Dean Frommeyer advised the Committee that the additionally released Library acquisition money, in the amount of \$37,592, had been distributed to the various colleges.

Mr. Zamonski called attention to the data sheet distributed to members (see Attachment A). A comparison can be drawn between Wright State and other state universities with regard to acquisition budgets. An additional report, from Akron, was not clear so the figures are not included in this list. A further breakdown of the Wright State collection is set forth as item 2 in the attachment.

Questionnaires regarding funding of continuing graduate programs are being received; thirty of these were sent out by Dean MacKinney, twelve to graduate program coordinators and the remaining eighteen to Deans and persons in other positions related to such programs. No real conclusion has been reached, although some suggestions are forming from data received thus far.

No recommendations are forthcoming at this time from the subcommittee on periodicals mutilation.

Mr. Zamonski reported that the "targeting" of library materials under the new security system has been completed. The total cost of the system was approximately \$30,000, with half of this cost being for installation. The continuing cost for maintaining security for 12,000 books will be \$2,000 per year. Feedback thus far indicates the system is working very well, with no serious complaints. Difficulties that were anticipated due to the use of some D.C. motors on wheelchairs has not developed. Review of the system will continue.

A request by the Library for representation on the Academic Council will be channeled to the appropriate persons or committee prior to the spring elections this year.

Closer coordination between the Library and newly developing programs is a Library goal mentioned.

The Committee will next meet on January 31st, and requests agenda items.

D. Student Affairs Committee, Miss Tanamachi reporting.

The Committee has received from Dr. Harden a report on food services; this will be reviewed.

~~TWO~~ ^{THE} recommendations related to student publications have been referred to the subcommittee for that purpose. The reaction of that subcommittee will be returned to Student Affairs by the end of this month. After review of candidates, Dr. Spetter has been appointed to chair the subcommittee on student publications.

At last meeting the review of the student stipend and wage policy began.

Mr. Murray thanked those reporting for the Standing Committees, and turned attention to -

VI. Old Business:

A., B., C., Approval of Revised Promotion and Tenure Document for Main Campus (continued: discussion by Article). (Attachment F to June 3, 1974, Minutes; Proposed Amendments Attachment D to October 7, 1974, Agenda; additional amendments Attachments A and B to November 4, 1974, Agenda, and Attachment B to December 2, 1974, Agenda.)

Mr. Gray placed a motion to limit debate on the document to one hour; this motion was seconded.

It was agreed that this meant one hour limit for the document and not per paragraph or Article.

The motion carried by voice vote.

Mr. Murray reminded members of progress made thus far; Articles I, II, III, V, and VII have been approved, as well as paragraphs A and B of Article VI. Article IV has been referred back to Faculty Affairs Committee for rewording. This places discussion at paragraph C of Article VI.

Mr. Skinner moved for adoption of the amendment to paragraph C, under date of 10-28-74, reading:

In first sentence, fourth line, delete "and" before "the Schools of Medicine and Nursing", and add "and Western Ohio Branch Campus". In the sixth line add "and Western Ohio Branch Campus" following "Nursing".

Mrs. Dreher seconded the motion; discussion was opened.

Mr. Nussbaum asked for the justification of having the Dean of Western Ohio Branch Campus on the University Committee, since that Branch has its own promotions and tenure document.

Mr. Skinner explained that recommendations from the Branch go to the University Committee, not directly to the President, and therefore that campus would act in the same manner as a college in having its Dean on the Committee.

Brief discussion clarified that the motion placed was merely for approval of the amendment suggested under date of 10-28-74, and not approval of the entire paragraph with the incorporation of all proposed amendments to it.

The motion to add representation from the Branch was passed by voice vote without opposition.

Mr. Skinner placed a motion to -

Delete "the President" from line 2.

Mr. Skinner explained that the President had, at an earlier time, served as chairman of that Committee, but that of late the Provost or Vice Provost had served in that capacity, and such was the intention for the future.

Mr. Sachs seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by voice vote.

Mr. Skinner asked for approval of -

Insertion of "or departmental" after the word "School" in line 8.

Incorporating this change, the last line of the paragraph would read:

"No person who holds an administrative position at the University or College or School or departmental level shall be eligible for election to the Wright State University Promotions and Tenure Committee."

Mr. Sachs seconded the motion, but asked for further clarification of the word "administrative" with reference to departmental level. Did this, he questioned, mean only department chairmen, or extend to program coordinators or assistants to department chairmen.

Mr. Skinner referred members to the rationale stated by the Steering Committee when they submitted this amendment.

Mr. Gray questioned this rationale, stating that assistant chairmen or coordinators might well have sufficient input at an earlier level (as mentioned applying to department chairmen), and not having the title of Department Chairman did not mean you would not have input.

Mrs. Dreher explained that the thought was that a candidate received an evaluation from the Department Committee, the Department Chairman wrote his separate evaluation of the person, and the Steering Committee had felt that the Chairman did not necessarily need to speak again at the University level.

Mr. Roehm questioned why the Department Chairman should be excluded.

Mrs. Dreher reversed the question by asking Mr. Roehm if he felt there was a point in excluding Deans.

Mr. Levine declared his feeling that the option of electing to the University Committee should be left to faculty of the Department or College, stating that if the point being considered was duplication of input, this might also occur even though the Department Chairman were excluded from being elected.

Mr. Sachs gave background on the sentence under consideration, stating that he had a number of years ago proposed the statement as it now stands in the paragraph. It was felt that there were already administrators on the University and College level committees. Mr. Sachs pointed out that departments exist that are so small that their only eligible-for-election faculty is the Department Chairman and if he is excluded so is the possibility of faculty sitting/serving on the University level committee. He went on to say he personally is in favor of having the Department Chairman be permitted to serve if he is elected by members of the College.

Mr. Murray called for voting.

The motion to amend the last sentence of the paragraph was defeated by voice vote.

Mr. Skinner asked for the approval of the inclusion of the University Library in the appropriate places in the first part of the paragraph so that area would be represented by their Dean and a Professor. He brought out that there are now eighteen faculty members in the Library area and as the document now stands, they are the only faculty group not represented.

Mr. Sachs asked if there were any full-status Professors in the Library.

Mr. Skinner withdrew his motion in order to present a different motion that would take into account the lack of full-status Professors at this time in the Library.

The second to Mr. Skinner's motion was also withdrawn.

Mr. Skinner placed the motion for inclusion of the University Library as previously stated and the addition of the following sentence to the paragraph:

"A College which does not have a full Professor eligible for election may elect a Professor from another part of the University to serve as its representative."

Mr. Sachs seconded the motion.

Mr. Hughes questioned if this was "may" or "must".

Mr. Skinner stated his motion gave the option with "may".

Mr. Nussbaum asked how this would help the Library, unless it were converted to a "College".

Mr. Skinner stated that Library is considered an academic unit.

Mr. Nussbaum pressed for clarification, asking if the Library is a parallel to a College or other academic unit.

Mr. Skinner stated the Library does indeed function as such.

Mr. Nussbaum expressed his understanding that the courses in Library Science were offered under the College of Education.

It was pointed out that the lack of representation referred to Library Administration, and Mr. Nussbaum asked then if these were Library administrators who had been given faculty positions in order to extend to them the fringe benefits of the faculty member.

Mr. Iddings offset this impression by stating that the Reference Librarian and the other people in the Library also perform teaching functions, even though somewhat different from those teaching Library Science.

Mr. Nussbaum questioned how such faculty would be evaluated in terms of research, teaching, and service, as are other teaching faculty members.

Mr. Skinner pointed out that such people have been evaluated by a variety of things they do and how well they do their job, speaking from his experience of having been on the University Promotions and Tenure Committee. He went on to point out that Library faculty work not only with students, but also with other teachers - and asked if Mr. Nussbaum had never had a Librarian work with him in teaching a course. Continuing, the interaction of Library faculty with faculty of the Graduate School, with faculty of all areas of the University was recognized as a means of input, and Mr. Skinner used this to illustrate the ways in which evaluating is done.

Mr. Nussbaum pressed the subject further, questioning if there might be other administrators of the University who might feel that they are also appropriate candidates to be included - would the inclusion of Library administrators open the possibility of further requests. Mentioned was the personnel and Dean of Graduate Studies.

Mr. Murray explained that administrators hold faculty rank in some other department - Dean Mackinney in Management and Psychology, Dr. Dolphin in Administrative Science and Finance, as examples.

Mr. Nussbaum stated he would like to see the subject considered further before making the inclusion.

Mr. Murray recognized Dean Frommeyer.

Mr. Frommeyer affirmed that the Library administrators have been a recognized and established faculty since the University was founded in 1964. He further stated that the entire issue had been examined closely in 1969-1970 and at that time it was determined that Library people constituted a separate faculty, an academic unit with faculty rank in Library Administration. As such they have the equivalency of a College and report to Mr. Murray even as do the other various colleges. Faculty with terminal degrees, Ph. D.'s, etc., are included in this group, all holding twelve-month contracts, and fitting into the Promotions and Tenure Document. Several persons have been promoted, using the same criteria for evaluation as used for others on campus - teaching, research, and service. He assured all that service is their strong point, but they also participate in research and teaching. He concluded by stating that Library faculty have fit into the promotions and tenure procedure for a number of years, but have simply not been designated as being included nor their position clarified.

Mr. Nicholson, of the Faculty Affairs Committee, stated that if this matter was to be referred again to the Committee, he would like some specific reason for the referral, rather than just someone's objection to the inclusion of an area of faculty.

Mr. Sachs asked Mr. Frommeyer if there are at this time any faculty holding the rank of full Professor, and Mr. Frommeyer replied there are none at this time, but that there are two nine Assistant Professors and two Associate Professors, plus a number of assistants. *in interests*

Mr. Sachs questioned if there would be any holding the rank of Professor within the next five years, and Mr. Frommeyer expressed confidence that there would be several.

Mr. Sachs clarified his thought by asking Mr. Frommeyer if he felt the Library would need to elect a representative from another area of the University for a relatively short period of time, and Mr. Frommeyer agreed.

Mr. Harvey asked the rationale in Library's electing a person from another area, his feeling being that the representative might not have all the insight and background knowledge necessary to fully represent the Library.

Mr. Skinner explained that a representative from the Library who was not a full Professor could not serve a full role in giving recommendations and voting, whereas he expressed confidence that Library would be able to find one or more full Professors within the University with sufficient interest and personal familiarity with Library operations to serve well. He suggested the possibility of a faculty member serving on the Library Committee, as an example. In such capacity the representative could well meet with members of the Library faculty, ascertain facts and present them effectively before the University Committee. He felt this the best way to assure strong representation for the Library group.

Mr. Iddings suggested one point that Council might want to consider: the Committee now consists of sixteen members, and the addition of two more would mean a larger committee - perhaps this might be a matter of concern as additional academic units develop.

The motion made by Mr. Skinner to include University Library and to allow election from another academic unit was passed by voice vote, with the only opposing vote being that of Mr. Nussbaum.

Mrs. Dreher asked for the implementation of the full title of the "Vice Provost for Academic Affairs" in the first sentence of the paragraph, since there are now two "Vice Provost" positions.

This was considered a typographical error, and the full title will be used.

Mr. Skinner moved for approval of the full paragraph as amended:

"The Wright State University Promotions and Tenure Committee shall consist of the Provost or Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, who chairs the Committee; the Deans of the Colleges of Business and Administration, Education, Liberal Arts, Science and Engineering, the Schools of Medicine and Nursing, Western Ohio Branch Campus, and the University Library; one (full) Professor elected annually by the faculties of Business and Administration, Education, Liberal Arts, Science and Engineering, Medicine, Nursing, Western Ohio Branch Campus, and University Library; and one (full) Professor-at-Large elected annually by the Academic Council. No person who holds an administrative position at the University or College or School level shall be eligible for election to the Wright State University Promotions and Tenure Committee. An academic unit which does not have a full Professor eligible for election may elect a Professor from another part of the University to serve as its representative."

Mr. Sachs seconded the motion.

It was ascertained that at this time there would be two academic units voting for representation outside their own units.

Paragraph C, Article VI, as amended, was approved by voice vote.

Mr. Skinner moved for approval of Paragraph D, Article VI; the motion was seconded by Mrs. Dreher.

There was no discussion on this paragraph:

"The Wright State University Promotions and Tenure Committee shall forward its recommendations for promotion and/or tenure to the President for his consideration and recommendation to the Board of Trustees for final action."

Paragraph D, Article VI, was approved by voice vote without opposition.

Mr. Skinner placed a motion for the approval of Paragraph E, Article VI; this was seconded.

For the Faculty Affairs Committee, Mr. Skinner made a motion for the amendment of this paragraph by the addition of the words "above the departmental level" in lines 1 and 2, after the word "committees", the sentences to read:

"All members of promotion and tenure committees above the departmental level must be tenured. Members of committees above the departmental level cannot act on promotions to ranks higher than those which they currently hold."

The motion for amendment was seconded; discussion opened.

Mr. Sachs questioned the status of the Deans, in fact of the Provost or Vice Provost, making known the possibility of these persons not being tenured if newly arrived to the campus. His expressed feeling was that the intent - outlined in Paragraph C of this Article - was that Deans should chair and serve on the College level committees, and felt that perhaps the paragraph should be reworded to take into account only the elected people.

Mr. Skinner agreed that this was a good point and withdrew his motion; Mr. Martin withdrew his second, and Mr. Skinner moved for the following amendment:

"All elected members of promotion and tenure committees above the departmental level must be tenured. Members of committees above the departmental level cannot act on promotions to ranks higher than those which they currently hold."

Mr. Martin seconded the motion; there was no discussion, and Mr. Murray called for the vote.

The motion to amend was passed by voice vote, but with opposition.

There appeared to be quite a bit of misunderstanding as to what actually was voted upon, so the vote was cancelled.

Mr. Skinner restated his motion, as above, which, in essence, would remove any restriction that might occur in connection with an untenured Dean, Provost, or Vice Provost.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Martin.

Mr. Nicholson suggested that perhaps "elected" should also be inserted as the first word of the second sentence, but Mr. Skinner stated his preference not to include the word at that point.

Mr. Levine offered the following amendment:

Members of the promotions and tenure committee will be elected by the Department and College. Members of the committee may act on promotions to ranks higher than those which they currently hold. A faculty member whose major responsibility is an administrative position outside his department may serve on the departmental committee only if invited by a majority of the faculty of the department.

Mr. Gray seconded this motion for amendment.

Mr. Skinner wondered exactly how this amendment related to his motion, and stated his feeling that this constituted a major rewording of the entire paragraph. He suggested that Council might want to vote on his amendment and return to that of Mr. Levine.

Mr. Levine agreed to withdraw his amendment, with the understanding that he could again place it, and further agreed that his amendment actually constituted a replacement for the paragraph.

Mr. Eakins, Parliamentarian, ruled that Mr. Levine was out of order.

Mr. Skinner spoke concerning the proposed amendment, calling to the attention of the Council that there had been discussion at some length in the Committee and indicating a difference of feeling between members there. The question concerned itself with how much flexibility should be allowed at different levels. Some people felt that right through the department level there should not be anyone permitted to consider promotions to ranks higher than they currently held; others - particularly some from Liberal Arts - felt that was not right. Mr. Skinner pointed out that the recommendations reached ultimately involved tenure and then the question could arise as to where the recommendations originated and whether they were made by qualified people. If it were found that recommendations were made by a number of junior persons, then the University might have serious difficulty in justifying what might result. Mr. Skinner recommended the approval of the amendment, feeling that the amount of flexibility was good but cautioning that departments must think seriously to make sure that decisions are reached in a responsible manner.

It was clarified that the amendment to be voted upon at this time related only to the addition of the word "elected" following "All" in the first sentence and the adding of "above the departmental level" in both lines 1 and 2 following the word "committee".

Mr. Martin reaffirmed his second to this motion for amendment.

The motion passed by voice vote, with some opposition.

Mr. Skinner moved for adoption of the entire paragraph, as amended.

Mr. Sachs seconded the motion; discussion began.

Mr. Levine placed a motion for approval of the following amendment/replacement of the paragraph:

Members of the promotions and tenure committee will be elected by the Department and College. Members of the committee may act on promotions to ranks higher than those which they currently hold. A faculty member whose major responsibility is an administrative position outside his department may serve on the departmental committee only if invited by a majority of the faculty of the department.

This motion was seconded.

Mr. Sachs questioned why Mr. Levine had included the second sentence, pointing out that the same content would result with its omission.

Mr. Levine supported the inclusion of the sentence, stating that by specifically stating that such action is permissible, there could be no question of the legality of the action or the wisdom of the faculty in acting in such manner.

Voice voting was unclear and a show of hands requested.

Results of hand voting were:

Against	14
In favor	9

The motion to amend the paragraph failed.

There was no further discussion and Mr. Sachs called for the question.

A two-thirds vote needed for this was reached by voice vote without opposition.

Mr. Murray called for voting on the original paragraph, as amended:

"All elected members of promotions and tenure committees above the departmental level must be tenured. Members of committees above the departmental level cannot act on promotions to ranks higher than those which they currently hold. A faculty member whose major responsibility is an administrative position outside his department may serve on the departmental committee only if invited by a majority of the tenured faculty of the department."

Paragraph E, Article VI, as amended and presented by Mr. Skinner, was passed by voice vote with only slight opposition.

Mr. Murray turned attention to Paragraph F of Article VI.

Mr. Skinner spoke in favor of ending debate at this point, his reasoning based on the relationship between that paragraph and Article IV, which had been referred back to the Committee. He suggested that Council might well consider Article IV at next meeting and then move back to Paragraph F, since both related to time periods for notification of reappointment or non-reap-

pointment. etc. Such consideration would be consistent. Mr. Skinner agreed to get copies of the reworded Article IV to members of the Council as early as possible, perhaps within the coming week. (See Attachment B.)

Time permitting, Mr. Harvey asked if he would be in order in submitting two amendments to the document under consideration, related to student membership on promotions and tenure committees. This was permissible.

Mr. Murray asked where specifically the amendments would relate, and Mr. Harvey stated particularly to Article VI, but also to any point in the document where committee membership was considered.

Mr. Harvey placed the following motion to amend:

All other provisions notwithstanding, the University Promotions and Tenure Committee shall have one student member, who shall be selected to serve for one academic year by the Student Caucus.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Levine.

Mr. Harvey moved to table the motion until next meeting; this motion was seconded and passed by the necessary majority vote.

Mr. Harvey placed the following additional motion to amend:

All other provisions notwithstanding, the College and Department level Promotions and Tenure Committees may seat one student per committee subject to the rules and regulations that the College and/or Department may choose to require.

This motion was seconded.

Mr. Harvey moved to table this motion until next meeting; the motion to table was seconded and passed by majority voice vote. (See Attachment C.)

There remaining less than two minutes of the hour assigned to discussion of the Promotions and Tenure Document, Mr. Murray ruled Council should move on to the next item of business.

D. Approval of proposed amendment to the Faculty Constitution (Attachment C to the December 2nd Agenda).

Mrs. Dreher moved for approval of the following updating of Faculty Constitution:

Article III, Section 8, paragraph A., Officers and General Duties:
"(A) The Chairman of the Academic Council shall be the President of the University and shall preside. The President may delegate this duty, respectively, to the Provost, to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, to the Vice Chairman of the Academic Council,

to the Chairman of the Steering Committee, or to another member of the Academic Council."

The motion to approve was seconded.

Voice vote was unanimous for approval of the motion.

VII. New Business:

- A. Approval of the Revision of the Bylaws of the University Research Council (see Attachment D).

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 P. M.