

MINUTES
UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
18 September 1985

The Senate Council met at 3:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Administration Building, and took the following actions.

1. Minutes
Approved as circulated the Senate Council minutes of 11 September 1985.
2. Privilege and Tenure Committee Report: M. Winer, 1984-5 Chair
Chairman Canon offered brief background after which he invited Professor Winer's comments. They follow.

Professor Winer's opening comments expressed thanks to the committee membership for its dedication and perseverance and to President Singletary for his close attention, concern and fairness in dealing with the faculty members involved in the issues brought to him by the committee.

There were a total of 22 appeals made, 7 female and 15 male. Six were resolved in favor of the faculty; seven dropped their appeals (voluntarily); in the judgment of the committee, four cases were without merit; in one case, the P&T committee recommendation was rejected; and four cases is[^] pending. With one exception, all appeals came from Assistant Professors, many of whom were Special Title Series. The exception was an Associate Professor whose case involved an alleged violation of privilege.

The biggest problem the committee had was with the "odd" people; for example, those on Special Title Series appointment in an educational unit where the remaining faculty were regular faculty and those brought into a unit to teach a specific subject area with which no one else in the unit was familiar.

Professor Winer expressed concern with the segment of the Governing Regulations which authorizes a dean to stop the promotion/tenure process for Assistant Professors regardless of the recommendations of the Chairman and departmental faculty. In one such case, the committee convinced ~~to~~ the dean to forward the dossier.

Another concern of the committee is that an Assistant Professor can be terminated without a cause being stated.

The committee has not come up with definite recommendations. These things are being reported to you for your consideration.

Rees: How many were represented by legal counsel? Winer: Very few; no one came to committee meetings with a lawyer. They can always bring an advisor--usually a senior member of the faculty--which I believe is helpful.

Winer: Another problem is that some departments pay little attention to the division of effort forms; these can be interpreted to favor or reject an applicant for promotion/tenure. Ford: In conjunction with this, there are crucial times when there may be an Acting Chairman and/or an Acting Dean in place--neither knowledgeable about fulfilling the obligations. Lyons: From my experience on an Area Committee, the DOEs and STS documents are not always included in the files. These must be requested. Perhaps there should be more specific guidelines about what should be included. BCC: There is a format; it's a matter of enforcement, not a rule being in place.

CPW: What about the Special Title Series people and the shifting criteria? Winer: I believe that is a problem of the past. Currently, one cannot switch over; and there is a specific STS contract.

Winer: I would recommend that the two year review be more strictly enforced, with a specific letter written to the faculty member for inclusion in his/her dossier.

Ford: A specific problem which has come to the fore is that the ability to bring in grant funds is being used as a requirement/criterion for promotion. Grant funds are hard to come by, particularly in some areas. DH: Where is that requirement spelled out in the Regulations? Winer: It's not, but the other side of the coin is that it is a form of peer review.

Having no further questions or comments, the Council thanked Professors Winer and Ford. Chairman Canon indicated that a synopsis of Professor Winer's comments would appear in the minutes and that the SC could decide how to proceed.

3. Discussion with several Senate Committee Chairs (Brunn, Milward, Krislov, Gabbard) on committee activities; Chairman Canon reiterated the Council's interest in identifying a number of policy questions for Senate committees to consider, individually or collectively, in order to become more involved in the process of planning priorities and long-range decision making. Canon pointed out that these goals are particularly timely because of the forthcoming presidential succession.