

Wright State University

CORE Scholar

Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas

Faculty Senate

5-8-1975

Spring Quarter Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes, May 8, 1975

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



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Repository Citation

(1975). Spring Quarter Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes, May 8, 1975. .
https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes/435

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 library-corescholar@wright.edu.

Wright State University

Campus Communication

Date: April 28, 1975
To: All Faculty Members
From: B. Dreher, Acting Chairer, Agenda Committee
Subject: Spring Quarter Faculty Meeting, Thursday, May 8, 1975;
3:10 P.M., Fawcett Auditorium (Room 101)

- I. Call to order.
 - II. Approval of Minutes of Winter Quarter Faculty Meeting, February 26, 1975.
 - III. Report of the President.
 - IV. Report of the Provost.
 - V. Report on University Regional Broadcasting, Inc. (C. Tettermer)
 - VI. Report on Academic Council activities.
 - VII. Old Business:
 - A. Approval of Amendment to Faculty Constitution and Bylaws, 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."
 - B. Approval of Revised Policies and Procedures for the Granting of Promotions and Tenure at Wright State University (distributed to faculty earlier this month).
 - C. Report on proposed Long-Term Disability Plan. (K. Ahmad) (distributed to faculty early in April)
 - VIII. New Business:
 - A. Approval of Graduating Students.
 - B. Election of Vice President-Elect of the University Faculty.

Nominees: P. Batra
G. Graham
E. Nicholson
- Nominations will also be accepted from the floor.

- C. Approval of proposed Amendment to Faculty Constitution and Bylaws, Article III, Section 10, (D) (Attachment A)

NOTE: The following two items of New Business are pending May Academic Council action.

- D. Approval of proposed Amendment to Faculty Constitution and Bylaws, Article III, Section 8, paragraph (C):

Insert the words "except in the case of secret ballot" after the word "decisions" in the sentence reading -

".....The individual voting record of the voting members of the Academic Council on all policy decisions, except in the case of secret ballot, shall accompany the minutes of each meeting....."

- E. Approval of proposed Amendment to Faculty Constitution and Bylaws, Article III, Section 10, (A), (d). (Attachment B)

IX. Adjournment.

GENERAL FACULTY MEETING

Spring Quarter

May 8, 1975

- I. Vice President of the Faculty John Treacy called the meeting to order at 3:17 P.M., in 401 Fawcett Hall.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the Winter Quarter Faculty Meeting, February 26, 1975, were given by voice vote, without correction.
- III. Report of the President, Mr. Kegerreis reporting.

Congratulations were extended by Mr. Kegerreis to Mr. Treacy for an "extraordinarily productive year"; he further stated he felt Mr. Treacy had represented the faculty well in the various councils of the University, and that it had been a pleasure to work with him.

Mr. Kegerreis then welcomed Mrs. Dreher as the new Vice President of the Faculty, assuring her of the cooperation of the administration in the coming year, and extending to her best wishes.

Moving into his report on the financial and fiscal status of the University, Mr. Kegerreis stated two events of the week have a bearing on that:

(1) The Board of Trustees approved the budget proposed and (2) a sub-committee of the legislature produced for consideration by the legislature the budget for higher education in Ohio, a fourth version of that portion of the appropriations bill.

Briefly Mr. Kegerreis reviewed the movement, and reduction, of the budget for higher education; the first figure - offered last fall, supported by the Chancellor, and in line with promises made by campaign managers of the income tax issue in previous years - promised a "leap forward" for higher education. However, the budgets of both Mr. Gilligan and Mr. Rhodes were much reduced from that, and the administration has not had time enough this week to thoroughly consider this latest fourth version, to determine possible effects at the University level.

The first element having a positive effect toward an increase in University income, both in fees and subsidy, has been the increase in enrollment. There has been an average gain of 10% this year, and predicted for the coming fall is a 6% increase (although the Regents' forecast is for only a 4-1/2% increase).

The second positive element is an increase in subsidy rates in almost all categories.

General Faculty Meeting Minutes

May 8, 1975

Page Two

The third contributive element is the medical school, which will be paying to the University a hundred thousand dollars in overhead for its operation, so it will not be acting as a drain on the University's "coffers".

On the other side of the balance, Mr. Kegerreis pointed to "over-earned subsidy" as a factor that might decrease the income of the University, briefly explaining that this is subsidy earned by enrollment over and above that amount appropriated for the University by the legislature. He mentioned the struggle the administration has made in their efforts to encourage the Board of Regents to raise their forecast of enrollment for Wright State. For the third straight year this struggle is continuing, and the University may or may not be paid any subsidy earned beyond that designated by the legislature for the University.

Prior to this year Wright State has also received a supplemental appropriation, based on the rationale that it was an "emerging institution"; now "fully emerged", the University will no longer receive those supplemental appropriations. Last year this amounted to \$175,000, all of which was contributed toward the Library budget.

A third factor was a legislative, mandated increase in the salaries of classified or civil service employees last year, amounting to a cost of about half a million dollars to the University. After months of lobbying, the Regents were authorized to reimburse the University about four hundred thousand dollars. Now another such legislative salary increase is anticipated, again carrying the cost of half a million dollars, but for which the University does not expect reimbursement.

Fourth, interest rates have declined approximately 50% in the past year. Funds that the University is able to invest for short periods of time have now only about half of the earning power they had a year ago.

Also, there is the "cash flow problem" the office of budget management for Ohio (for the first time in history) has the authority to withhold subsidy payment, depending on the status of the "cash flow"; therefore subsidy payments that might ordinarily be used for short-term investment and interest gain may not always be available. Compounding this problem may be the fact that under such circumstances the University may have to borrow to meet expenses. Universities at this time cannot borrow money, so "generously" included in this latest legislative venture is a clause permitting the universities legally to borrow. Not an actuality at this time, but as a first-time possibility, the combination of interest loss on short-term investments and the cost of interest payments could be anywhere from \$300,000 on up.

General Faculty Meeting Minutes

May 8, 1975

Page Three

Referring to the "carry forward balance", Mr. Kegerreis explained that usually the University does not use up all monies in the budget and so has a balance to carry forward for use in the following year; however, this year a larger percentage of budgeted funds is being used because of inflationary factors, and so there is a lower carry forward figure than in previous years. Also, still in the budget is an average 9% increase in salary for faculty, which, coupled with classified salary increases, greatly increases the expenditure side of the budget. Additionally, two new buildings in the coming year will need to be heated, cleaned, maintained, etc. The inflationary impact on the cost index of operation of the University is "fantastic", Mr. Kegerreis reported, individual cost increases varying from 20% to 300%. Even the increased enrollment - a plus factor - also creates or generates additional expenses. The new programs remaining in future plans are, too, an expense factor.

Total budget for the University, not counting the medical school, is increased this year by 8%. A priority list for capital budget items is being developed; budget requests on hand now total 3-1/2 million dollars (including the 1.6 million dollars in capital improvements requests).

Requested and approved by the Board of Trustees is the transfer of \$200,000 from University reserves to the Library acquisitions budget, so it will be funded at the level requested.

Current letters and notices of appointment can now go out, Mr. Kegerreis said, and the University can do business for the coming year, assuming that the legislature does not produce a fifth or sixth version of the appropriations bill.

Concluding, Mr. Kegerreis expressed his sincere appreciation for the support and cooperation of the entire educational community in the arduous task of preparing the budget during the past six months. He expressed his feeling that Wright State has completed another successful year, and his hope that all would work together very fruitfully during the coming year.

IV. Report of the Provost, Mr. Spiegel reporting.

Parking plans for the coming year were the subject of Mr. Spiegel's report, and he readily agreed that there had been quite a number of plans discussed recently. The point by point plan explained by Mr. Spiegel was the result of his earlier meetings with members of the Student Affairs Committee, the Steering Committee, and Student Caucus. At that meeting Mr. Spiegel said he "threw out the possibilities of change" and the group recommended not moving as far as the administration had intended originally.

General Faculty Meeting Minutes

May 8, 1975

Page Four

First, there will be reserved parking for faculty in more than one area, but not surrounding a building, this at the price of a "B" decal. "A" parking, with its increase in price, will also be available. Parking permit cards, ordinarily displayed in the front windshield, will be discontinued and the purchase of a decal will be necessary. Retained will be the distinction between "B" and "C" parking, although the removal of that in the next year is a possibility. Free parking will be available in the "K" lot, with shuttle bus transportation from that lot, providing, Mr. Spiegel said, that money can be found to operate the shuttle buses. This plan is to become operative in the fall. The outlook for the following year would be a no-decal system, with reserved parking for faculty.

Mr. Spiegel supported Mr. Kegerreis' feeling of relief that budget preparation for this year is at an end, but expressed his feeling that it would be necessary to continue looking at the budget throughout the entire year, with the hope that a revision would not become necessary.

Responding to a request for definition of reserved faculty parking, Mr. Spiegel stated that there would be three places - near Oelman, back of Millett, and near the Creative Arts building and the Library. Mr. Grewe is now working on an estimate of the area needed, to be open to faculty with a certain type of decal. This would not encompass an area large enough for all faculty, since not all are anticipated as being on campus at the same time.

Referring to Mr. Spiegel's mention of removal of the distinction between "B" and "C" parking, an inquiry was made if then the cost would be \$20.

This is an item for discussion, Mr. Spiegel stated, perhaps beginning in the middle of the coming year. Funding for the maintenance of the parking areas then would come from a fee charged to everyone, whether they drove or not. Mr. Spiegel admitted this would be a controversial subject, and one that was not faced this year. He continued, that he felt the reserved parking for faculty would solve problems for the coming year, and that there would be the free parking available in the "K" lot. He did acknowledge that even that free parking might engender problems if everyone decided to park there.

A brief discussion between Mr. Martin and Mr. Spiegel revealed that some administrators will be paying the same amount for parking as faculty but having an "A" slot; Mr. Spiegel justified this by saying that as it is to the best interests of the students to have the faculty here, so it is to the best interests of all to have the administrators here rather than just driving around the parking lots looking for a place to park. He was willing, he said, to hear complaints on the matter.

Mr. Gray inquired as to progress made in the study of the early semester system; Mr. Spiegel replied that a lot of information has been gathered on the subject and that he felt it should be given serious consideration in the coming academic year, admitting to his realization that it would be a very controversial issue.

Asked if the ban was still on sabbatical leave, Mr. Spiegel replied that to the best of his knowledge it was. With the establishment of the developmental program here at the University, this would be an item that could be funded from it since such leave can be funded from private monies. The administrators have worked to have the ban lifted but have not been able to change it so far, Mr. Spiegel stated.

Mr. Treacy supported Mr. Spiegel's stand that there simply is no "neat, nice solution" to the many parking problems, since everyone would like to park close to the building in which they spend time but with no charge for that parking.

V. Report on University Regional Broadcasting, Inc., Mr. Tettermer reporting.

University Regional Broadcasting was incorporated as a non-profit organization on February 20, 1975, and is comprised of three institutional members - Wright State, Central State, and Miami. Its expressed purpose is to operate channels 14 and 16 as instructional/educational broadcasting stations in this area. Electing to become non-profit (rather than a joint university venture) allows for the inclusion of public members on the Board, the establishment of relationships with various community groups, and permits participation of the community in the funding of the corporation. Like the University, Mr. Tettermer pointed out that the stations faced budget and cash flow problems as well.

A "pilot" membership fund campaign earlier this year provided information of two sorts: Instead of the anticipated ~~and hoped~~ for response of a thousand pledges, between twenty-one and twenty-two hundred were received. Secondly, the cutting in and out by the two channels in presenting live pledge "commercials" proved much more successful in operation than hoped for, and a feeling of confidence for the future resulted. An additional benefit was the reaction to local programming; there were 161 local participants, with 62 different people on the air at various times.

The corporation serves in opening an outlet to the very populated area in and around Dayton; nine of the members of the Board are from the member universities, the other six are appointed by the universities from the community, thus fostering relationships that were not possible before.

Mr. Tettermer expressed his feeling that the stations are about two years behind, but are trying to get wiring and various other necessary improvements made.

The corporation has provided for the establishment of an 18-member Citizens Advisory Council, drawing these members from the various agencies in the community served by the two stations. This Council will not be related to the corporation in a policy-setting or budget-making way, but will work with the development of program plans, reviewing schedules, and providing input from community sources. This would provide two-way communication, finding out what is needed in the community as well as what the corporation may be doing that is wrong. Mr. Tettemer felt that perhaps this bringing of the community into what is being done might well be the most important function of all.

By July corporation offices will be set up somewhere in south Dayton, where programming will be done, program development will be carried on, engineering of the project, public information, administration, etc., will take place. Operations will continue for one more year out of the Miami University studios and by that time it is expected that an operating center will be built at the Channel 16 transmitter site, with all operating procedures moved into the Dayton area. At that time it is expected too that it will be possible to inject many new local programs into the schedule.

Programs can be developed in two ways: the universities have the production facilities (the corporation itself does not) and programs they develop can be released through channels 14 and 16, or perhaps throughout the state; or the Regional Broadcasting Corporation may contract with a university for the production of a particular program that could be released under the corporation's name.

In response to the question regarding the possibility of getting other educational programs, such as those available through channels 34 and 48, Mr. Tettemer stated that about half of the programs used are acquired through national sources as used by those two channels. He went on to say that cable television would have channels 14, 16, 34, and 48, and that he would hope some sort of cross runs would be worked out whereby viewers would have a wider range of options. A two-way microwave system is also being built, which would have many channels available on a 24-hour basis and, while this would be used for programming, it would also be available for program sharing or course sharing between the various state universities.

Asked if there would be an F.M. station, Mr. Tettemer replied that there would not. He explained that when the student operation here wanted to go into a 10-watt station, a survey had to be conducted to find a frequency to use, and this proved to be very difficult. He pointed out that Dayton is one of 34 cities in the country that does not have a quality or useable F.M. signal. Although federal money is available for the establishment of such a station, it is necessary to prove that there is a frequency available, and the only way to do that would be to combine to put out of operation a number of the high school 10-watt stations or some of the university frequencies.

General Faculty Meeting Minutes

May 8, 1975

Page Seven

Mr. Tettemer made available a URB Factsheet to all in attendance, and inquiries, comments, and suggestions may be directed to the Program Manager, TV14/TV16, P.O. Box 1416, Oxford, Ohio, 45056.

Mr. Treacy thanked Mr. Tettemer for his most informative report.

VI. Report on Academic Council activities, Mr. Treacy reporting.

Mr. Treacy briefly mentioned that the two major considerations this year have been: (1) the University Promotions and Tenure Document, and (2) revisions or amendments to the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws that experience has shown to be necessary.

Referring to the year just past, Mr. Treacy thanked Mrs. Dreher for the outstanding job she has done as Vice President-elect, doing more than her share of the tasks assigned to their two-person area. He further thanked all of the faculty who have worked with him, stating he has developed a "good feeling" toward his colleagues.

Mr. Treacy then asked for the moving of Item C under Old Business to this point in the agenda. Faculty disability insurance, he stated, had been one of the major items under consideration by the Faculty Affairs Committee this past year.

VII. Old Business:

C. Report on proposed Long-Term Disability Plan, Mr. Ahmad reporting.

Mr. Ahmad thanked faculty members for the response to his letter of April 2, and broke down the responses which totalled 205: 181 were in favor of the plan, 5 were in favor but did not sign, 14 were opposed because they already had coverage, and 4 did not express an opinion. It would appear, then, that the faculty is overwhelmingly in favor of a plan that would cover the gap now existing in benefits.

Mr. Ahmad stated that his subcommittee met with Mr. Murray after tallying the responses, in an effort to set some future course of action. Since there were some faculty opposed, it was felt that it would not be fair to take out of the University budget the full amount needed to purchase this coverage for all faculty, but would extend to those who wanted it the option not to be included. It was hoped, Mr. Ahmad said, that the majority of the faculty would decide to join the plan. Following receipt of a response from T.I.A.A., a letter will be sent to each faculty member, offering the opportunity to join. If this is accomplished by June 1st, the plan would become effective in September. However, Mr. Ahmad pointed out that if 25% or more of the faculty do not elect to join, the plan will not be available. The cost to each faculty would be approximately \$6.00 per month.

General Faculty Meeting Minutes

May 8, 1975

Page Eight

Mr. Ahmad urged all faculty members to take a close look at the benefits now available to them under S.T.R.S., checking to see if they are indeed eligible for the 60% coverage. He indicated that many faculty would not be eligible, not having come to Wright State at early enough age nor to have fulfilled the five-year employment requirement. He stressed that each faculty should carefully consider this, not making a hurried decision. Another factor pointed out by Mr. Ahmad is the fact that disability benefits from S.T.R.S. are based on the average salary of three years, rather than the current salary. Neither are adequate retirement benefits available to the totally disabled under S.T.R.S., and the new plan would furnish additional benefits. Further, Mr. Ahmad pointed out a built-in 3% increase in benefits per year under T.I.A.A., to offset inflationary cost of living. He concluded by stating that in another year the University perhaps could assume part of the cost, with a future time assumption of full payment.

Inquiry was made as to whether it would be possible to collect benefits from two sources; Mr. Ahmad stated that one could claim from two sources but T.I.A.A. would pick up only that amount that would bring benefits to a total of 60% of current salary.

The next question concerned itself with whether the enrollment in the plan had to stay above 75%; what would happen if new people came in but did not join the plan. Mr. Ahmad stated the plan is reviewed each year and enrollment does need to be 75% or more.

Two payment plans are offered as well, a salary reduction or a payroll deduction plan - the first would afford an income tax reduction.

Mr. Treacy expressed the thanks of the faculty body to Mr. Ahmad and his subcommittee for their efforts in behalf of all.

VII. Old Business:

- A. Approval of Amendment to Faculty Constitution and Bylaws, Article III, Section 8, paragraph A., Officers and General Duties (as shown in the Agenda), and allowing for Mr. Murray to Chair the Academic Council meetings.

Motion for approval was received, and seconded.

The two-thirds vote required to pass this motion was forthcoming by a unanimous show of hands of the faculty body present.

That portion of the Constitution amended will read:

"(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."

NOTE: Agenda items were not followed in sequence from this point.

VIII. New Business:

B. Election of Vice President-elect of the University Faculty.

The suggestion was made, and accepted by Mr. Treacy, that the election could be conducted during discussion of the Promotions and Tenure Document.

Mr. Treacy introduced those nominees selected by the Agenda Committee:

Prem Batra, Biological Science
Glenn Graham, Education
Edward Nicholson, Business & Administration

There were no further nominations from the floor. A motion to close nominations was heard, seconded, and passed by voice vote.

Distribution of ballots began while Mr. Treacy moved to the next item.

VIII. A. Approval of Graduating Students.

Mr. Maneri offered a motion for approval of the students; the motion was seconded. When asked how many students there were on the list, Mr. Falkner replied "710 for June, and about 800 from last August, last December, and this coming August".

The motion to approve the list of graduates was passed by unanimous voice vote.

RESOLUTION:

Mr. Treacy requested a vote by faculty on the drafting of a Resolution expressing appreciation for services to Wright State University by former Dean Warren Abraham. Too, Mr. Treacy expressed the feeling that the Resolution should be delivered by a delegation from the Faculty.

A motion was placed, seconded, and heartily approved by voice vote.

Professor Piediscalzi was selected to head the delegation for the presentation of the Resolution.

Collection of the ballots took place at this point.

VII. Old Business:

B. Approval of Revised Policies and Procedures for the Granting of Promotions and Tenure at Wright State University (distributed to faculty early in May).

Mr. Treacy referred faculty to the proposed amendments reviewed and presented by the Faculty Affairs Committee, under date of April 30, 1975, and asked for a motion for approval of the amendment listed as No. 1.

Article I, Page 1, lines 14 to 15.

Delete "that of the American Association of University Professors' 1940 Statement of Principles" and

Insert "which is taken from the American Association of University Professors' Statement of Principles, subject to the 1970 Interpretive Comments".

Mr. Treacy explained that this was simply an updating change.

Motion for approval was placed, seconded, and approval was given by voice vote without discussion.

No. 2

Mr. Treacy read the amendment, being that addition of a new paragraph to Article II.

Motion for approval was placed and seconded.

Mr. Levine placed an amendment to the amendment, deleting the word "tenured" in the third and last lines of the proposed paragraph.

Mr. Levine's motion was seconded.

Mr. Sachs' point of order dealt with his understanding that the amendments under consideration were subject only to "editorial changes" but "not to changes in substance".

General Faculty Meeting Minutes

May 8, 1975

Page Eleven

Mr. Treacy stated he "could not bind the faculty not to amend anything that is offered to them", that the amendment to the amendment was in order, and that approval of Mr. Levine's motion would "loosen" the amendment to include all faculty.

Mr. Levine pursued his thought; anything that affects a department should be subject to the approval of the total department, not just a particular group of the faculty of a department.

No further discussion on the amendment to the amendment was offered; Mr. Treacy called for a voice vote but response was unclear. Show of hands was requested.

Hand count voting was for approval of Mr. Levine's deletion of the word "tenured".

Discussion returned to No. 2 amendment, as amended.

Request was made for basis for offering this amendment.

Mr. Skinner, as Chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee, replied that the Committee had not recommended approval, and in essence, he felt it was offered as a means of clarifying or defining the role of people who have special faculty appointments and how they should relate to their departments.

Further objection to the amendment was offered by the point that the amendment carries the reference to "personnel actions", and that the interpretation was that this would apply to an administrator who had been given a "home in a department" and yet he would be disenfranchised with regard to certain actions within the department. This appeared to be an improper limitation on one of the faculty.

Mr. Kmetec spoke in opposition, stating that if approved then certain aspects of the Bylaws would have to be changed with regard to definition of what is a faculty member and what is an administrator. An administrator at the present time, if he wants to be a part of a department, has that choice, and Mr. Kmetec said "it seems to work".

Question was called; the amendment failed unanimously by voice vote.

Ballot counting was completed; Mr. Treacy informed faculty there would need to be a run-off between Mr. Graham and Mr. Nicholson, and ballots were again distributed.

A motion for the approval of No. 3 amendment was placed, seconded.

There was no discussion; by voice vote the motion failed.

Motion on No. 4 was placed for approval and seconded.

Opposition to the amendment was offered, the interpretation being that a department "must give" major responsibility to a faculty member but that decision should be a part of the department's flexibility.

By voice vote the amendment failed unanimously.

No. 5 amendment was placed before the faculty and seconded.

Mr. Skinner gave background: Historically, a number of the faculty were originally hired by Ohio State or Miami and received tenure with those institutions. In the original Wright State document, there had been a sentence stating those tenure commitments would be binding. Essentially this amendment leaves in the document something that was in it previously, indicating a continuing commitment.

There were no further comments on the amendment; it was passed unanimously by voice vote.

Second balloting for Vice President-elect was completed. Mr. Treacy announced the election of Glenn Graham and thanked the Agenda Committee for presenting such a strong slate of candidates. Appreciation was also extended to the three candidates for their willingness to be presented for the position.

Amendment No. 6 was moved for approval, seconded.

Mr. Battino acknowledged authorship of this amendment, stating he felt the University should "go on record in terms of where they place their emphasis" in matters of academic rank. He further expressed his feeling that academic rank or tenure relates to achievements in scholarship or teaching activities; service activities, he stated, are done by all as a part of living in the campus community, and should not be rewarded by academic rank or tenure.

Mr. Kmetec asked for further expression from someone from the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Mr. Skinner pointed out that in some areas teaching and scholarship would be of primary consideration, but there were areas where service should receive primary emphasis. Deciding this point should be left to the department or college, the Committee had felt, and this amendment would tend to "draw narrow lines" or restrict the decision to be made.

Mr. Franklin stated the fact that the University does have many diversified programs, such as Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work in his own department. He said they did not want to speak against good teaching or good scholarship but neither certainly did they want to "play down" the role of service, and would not want to say in relation to the diversified programs that they were really not considered to be as much a part of the academic institution.

Mr. Levine supported Mr. Franklin's stand; he felt it "very important not to downgrade any aspect" of the criteria for promotion and tenure. He stated "performance of service can promote both teaching and scholarship".

Mr. Battino pointed out there were other ways of rewarding service other than with academic rank - such as titles, higher salaries, etc. "Academic rank", he said, "should reflect academic excellence". He did not approve of equal weight to service, stating it is a "support facility", and that certainly secretaries, for instance, are not rewarded for their service by academic rank.

Again opposition to the amendment was voiced, in that individual colleges should be allowed to determine for their own areas where the emphasis should be and not be restricted as they would be if the amendment were approved.

The concluding comment from faculty was that this would have the effect of "undercutting" service, such as on Academic Council.

The amendment by voice vote failed, but with some opposition.

Amendment No. 7 was moved for approval, seconded, and approved by voice vote.

There was no discussion on Amendment No. 8 presented for approval, seconded, and passed by unanimous voice vote.

A motion for approval of Amendment No. 9 was heard and seconded.

Mr. Levine asked for a definition of "administrative evaluation".

Mr. Skinner replied that this would be the role of the faculty member within the department, in terms of department needs. He mentioned that Mr. Levine had asked in Academic Council if this was a requirement for promotion it should be gone into further. Faculty Affairs did not put in a paragraph actually written along those lines but rather felt that "department need" was a "part of the general context in which evaluations are made", a "part of the world in which decisions are made". He illustrated that such need would undoubtedly be considered in a developing department where it might be difficult to find qualified people as well as in a department where a faculty's role was diminishing and he could easily be replaced.

Mr. Levine then opposed the amendment, stating he felt a "de facto" criteria had been introduced, should therefore be listed along with service, scholarship, and teaching, and that all members of the department should be aware of it, not just the administrators.

Mr. Skinner replied that he didn't believe this should be thought of as a new criteria but a part of the real world in which decisions are made, a consideration of practicality in implementing the three criteria for promotion.

Mr. Throckmorton offered an amendment to the amendment, that inserted should be "along with his own recommendation", indicating the Chairman would make his own recommendation in addition to that of the promotions and tenure committee, and wondered if the faculty member would be advised of that recommendation as well.

His question was ruled out of order, and voting requested.

The amendment to the amendment was passed by voice vote with slight opposition.

Main motion, as amended, was called, and passed by voice vote, again with some opposition.

Motion was placed for approval of Amendment No. 10 and seconded. Mrs. Dreher explained that this related to the composition of the college level promotions and tenure committee.

General Faculty Meeting Minutes

May 8, 1975

Page Fifteen

Offered was an amendment to the amendment, changing it to read "tenured professors or associate professors"; the motion was seconded.

Mr. Levine spoke against the amendment, in that it limited the choosing of the people the faculty of a particular college or department felt were qualified to serve. He went on to state that being a professor, associate professor or tenured did not necessarily mean the person was fully qualified.

Mr. Throckmorton expressed his feeling that "conflict of interest" would be introduced by allowing a faculty member without tenure to vote regarding tenure, that it would build into the procedures "bad personnel practices". He went on that he believed the tenuring procedures are "already a qualifying or screening process for making decision judgements". He suggested Mr. Levine might be in favor of abolishing all rank and tenure status.

Mr. Roehm expressed his feeling that if the amendment were passed, faculty would be right back at its starting point in consideration of the Article.

Mr. Battino opposed the amendment to the amendment, preferring "senior faculty members".

Mr. Franklin expressed his opposition, on the grounds that it showed unnecessary concern, further that anyone "who could succeed in stacking a committee at that level deserved tenure".

Question was called and the amendment to the amendment failed by voice vote with some opposition voiced.

Mrs. Dreher returned discussion to the main motion and question was called.

Amendment No. 10 failed by voice vote, with opposition.

Amendment No. 11 was placed for approval and seconded. Mr. Dreher pointed out this related to deletion of the possibility of seating a student on departmental or college promotions and tenure committees.

Mr. Skinner stated Faculty Affairs did not originally recommend the inclusion of students but that in Academic Council discussion had brought about a reasonable compromise and that the Committee felt it should be left as it is rather than deleting.

Mr. Levine expressed his opposition, reiterating his feeling that each department or college should have the right to decide what was best in their particular circumstances.

Mr. Battino supported the amendment, stating students are not qualified for such decision making - lacking in experience and graduate education. As written, Mr. Battino felt the Article unwise and might lead to difficulties since it does not even limit the status of students serving to seniors.

Against the deletion was the fact offered that the document states "may" seat a student and not "must" so leaving the decision to the department or college.

From the faculty body the hope was expressed that faculty would remain consistent when later voting on Article II and permit non-tenured faculty to vote on the college level when voting related to rank but not to tenure.

Mr. Skinner stressed the "uniqueness" of student input and that both tenured and non-tenured have certain viewpoints in common. He did not think the inclusion of students but not non-tenured faculty was inconsistent.

Mr. Franklin opposed the amendment, stating he was willing to trust the judgement of colleagues in deciding whether to seat a student or not.

Question was called and the amendment to delete paragraph C failed by voice vote.

Motion for approval of Amendment No. 12 was placed, seconded.

Mr. Franklin spoke against the amendment, stating there was a split decision in Faculty Affairs on recommending the amendment. He expressed strong feeling that the "first screening is best done by people within the department, whether the people might or might not be tenured". He stressed the fact that not all departments are at the same stage of development and that non-tenured may have the bigger "stake" in the future of the department.

Mr. Battino again referred to the possibility of conflict of interests. He further pointed out that in selecting tenured people to make decisions (in a department not having reached a state of development where they have their own tenured people) could include tenured people from their own discipline from a nearby institution.

Mr. Maneri supported the potentiality of conflict of interest and expressed his feeling that people are not capable of making a decision without taking into consideration the consequences of that decision as related to themselves.

Mr. Throckmorton objected to the argument of conflict of interest, stating such could exist between tenured people as well as non-tenured people.

Mr. Franklin pointed out that if "unwise" decisions were made at the departmental level, higher level committees could "correct" such decisions.

Mr. Collie opposed the amendment, pointing out that faculty brought in who were full professors or associate professors would also be restricted from participating in decision making.

Mr. Maneri felt this was an example of the conflict of interest under discussion.

Mr. Levine felt the conflict of interests could work both ways, when tenured people did not want the thrust of their department changed and considered people with different ideas a danger.

A brief discussion ensued concerning the context of the amendment as related to the Article. An amendment to the amendment was offered to change the word "at" to "above". It was seconded.

At this point inquiry was received if a quorum were now present; count was made and the meeting was adjourned for lack of a quorum. The time was 5:18.