

# UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

## FACULTY SENATE

### MINUTES

February 8, 1973

The seventh meeting of the Faculty Senate for the year 1972-73 was convened in Nicholson Auditorium on Thursday, February 8, 1973. Checking the roll as present were 75 voting members of the faculty, 1 member of the Administrative Committee, and 6 non-members. Vice Chairman Frank J. Sorauf presided.

The following items were considered and action was taken as indicated.

#### I. MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 7, 1972

Reported for Action

*Approved*

#### II. CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF THE TENURE CODE

The chairman of the Tenure Committee was then requested to present sections 6 through 12 of the Proposed Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure. In making the presentation, he noted that the Tenure Committee had not received suggestions or comments concerning the sections under review.

In the course of the discussion which ensued, there were no objections with the exception that section 11.2 will be reconsidered by the Tenure Committee and that a change in the wording will be presented at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.

At this point in the discussion, the chairman of the Consultative Committee presented the following amendment to Section 18 of the existing Tenure Code:

*The effective administration of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure is the responsibility of the President. He shall appoint an Advisory Committee on Faculty Tenure, representative of the various faculty ranks of the University, and which includes student members. (The amendment is italicized.)*

The proposed amendment was then amended to stipulate that student membership should be limited to one undergraduate and one graduate student and that total membership should be not less than 9.

The chairman ruled that if approved, the proposal would be presented to the University Senate which at its last meeting had approved 4 student members of the Tenure Committee. The proposal, as amended, was then *approved*.

The Faculty Senate then began discussion of Section 13. A motion was

offered to delete the subsection requiring that the unit's initial recommendation to the administrative officer include information on the vote, the grounds for the recommendation, and the minority view. The motion was *defeated*.

Discussion then centered on voting procedure in tenure matters and the recommended concurrence of two-thirds. A motion was approved to require at least a majority unless the department should decide in advance on a higher percentage.

The Faculty Senate adjourned.

W. DONALD BEATTY  
Clerk of the Faculty Senate

Meetings of the Faculty Senate have been scheduled as follows for the spring quarter, 1973:

April 5

May 10

May 31

June 6

These meetings have been scheduled for 2:30 p.m. in Room 325 of the Science Classroom Building (at the east end of the bridge).

## Appendix

### ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by vice chairman Frank Sorauf, professor of political science. He announced that, since a quorum did not exist, a vote on an amendment to the tenure code adding students to the Tenure Committee would have to be delayed until more members appeared. The minutes of the December 7 meeting were approved.

Carl Auerbach, acting dean of the Law School and chairman of the Tenure Committee, commenced the discussion of Sections 6 through 12 of the proposed tenure regulations, indicating that his committee had received no comments on those sections. He summarized briefly the content of each section, which included regulations for each level of faculty appointment, special contracts, specifications for written notice, resignation, and academic freedom.

Kent Bales, associate professor of English, was concerned that tenure-granting bodies should have jurisdiction over all appointments including those hired at a tenured rank. Mr. Auerbach assured him that the tenure regulations would not deal with the whole question of initial appointments and that a new document following the guidelines of the revised tenure document would be required. Samuel Krislov, professor of political science, suggested that faculty members should not be held responsible for seeing that their addresses appeared on University address cards. Mr. Auerbach responded that the committee would welcome alternative suggestions for ensuring that faculty members received written notices. Morton Hamermesh, professor and head of physics and astronomy, objected to requiring written notice of resignation to the President of the University. Mr. Auerbach replied that the committee wanted to ensure that an officer of the University would be notified and that it seemed logical that the chief administrator should be that person. The suggestion was made that deans would be the appropriate officers to be notified of current addresses and resignations. Speaking on the termination section, Leonid Hurwicz, Regents' professor of economics, held that the requirement that the Judicial Committee terminate a case if a faculty member resigned while proceedings were pending without issuing its findings should be changed. He pointed out that the proceedings might be slow, that the faculty member might receive another offer and would not be able to clear his name. He suggested that the comment be changed to provide for issuance of the findings at the faculty member's request. Fred Morrison, professor of law and member of the Tenure Committee, proposed to add, "if the committee agrees to do so." It was agreed that the wording would be presented at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.

A quorum being present, Mr. Krislov, speaking as chairman of the Consultative Committee, presented the proposal for amending the existing tenure code to include students on the Tenure Committee. Toni McNaron, associate professor of English, said that students were concerned in decisions such as who goes and who stays on the faculty, and she pointed out that students would not be serving on hearing panels. Mr. Krislov, speaking against the motion, urged that the balance in the present Constitution be preserved, that a Tenure Committee of faculty members followed the pattern of having a Faculty Senate. He added that it was a question of structure, and that administrators, too, should not vote on tenure, just as they should not vote in the University Senate. Burnham Terrell, professor of philosophy, said that,

since the committee was purely advisory and reported to the Faculty Senate, safeguards were provided. He said that it would provide a way for student voices to be heard and an opportunity for them to participate in debate. There were a number of other comments favoring the motion, following which John Webb, associate dean of liberal arts, moved to amend the motion by specifying that student membership be limited to 1 undergraduate and 1 graduate student and that membership be not less than 9. Mr. Sorauf ruled that, if approved, the proposal would be presented to the Senate which, at its last meeting, had voted for 4 student members. The Webb motion was then approved.

Herbert Johnson, head of agronomy and plant genetics, said there were some well-qualified students who wanted to serve on the committee. He questioned whether they would be representative of a large student body and whether it would be hard to get a quorum if they were added to the committee. Marcia Hanson, student and chairman of the Senate Committee on Student Affairs, argued for student members, indicating that they had a strong interest in tenure matters and that they had a status different from that of administrators, who served *ex officio* on the committee. Leonard Shapiro, assistant professor of mathematics, said quorums should be easy to achieve due to student concern. The Krislov motion, as amended, was then approved for forwarding to the University Senate.

Section 13 on reappointment, nonreappointment, and tenure on probationary appointments was taken up next. Mr. Auerbach said the objectives were to create new rights for probationary faculty members; to ensure faculty participation in decisions on tenure; and to delineate the course of administrative review. He reported that the question had been raised about requiring evaluations by those taking classes from the faculty member under consideration. He said the committee felt that making such evaluations only on those being considered for tenure would be unfair, but that their use was a matter for the Educational Policy Committee to take up. Another question, he said, was whether the contents of the file on a probationary candidate for tenure should be open to that individual, and it had been suggested that, if it were, he should have a full opportunity to respond. The file would not include the identity of the faculty members who wrote about him. Leon Green, professor of mathematics, asked for deletion of the section requiring that the unit's initial recommendation to the administrative officer include information on the vote, the grounds for the recommendation, and the minority view. He was concerned, too, about the operational effects, claiming that the professional judgment of the people in the field of study would be bypassed and pushed on to higher levels of administration, where he felt the decision should be on other than professional grounds. Mr. Morrison responded that for some units collegiate review was by division committees, and that the section was intended as a safeguard for the faculty member in providing for a judgment outside the small group of people who were immediately involved in applying their standards. The Green motion was then defeated.

Mr. Bales moved to change the voting procedure calling for concurrence by two-thirds of those voting (including a majority of those present and voting) to a simple majority requirement. He said two-thirds would be impractical for small departments and would give a reactionary majority great power. Mr. Morrison responded that after a faculty member had served 6 years, a vote should be by more than a simple majority. He pointed to instances of large numbers of abstentions in voting and indicated that a requirement of

a two-thirds consensus would force faculties in such cases to face up to their responsibilities. John Dahler, professor of chemical engineering and materials science, held that, because of the diversity in size of departments, there could not be a uniform policy. Caroline Rose, professor of sociology, moved to provide for either option. Mr. Hurwicz felt that the reviewing body would exercise more care in its decision where a recommendation came to it having been approved by a close vote under a simple majority requirement. Thomas Bacig, assistant professor of English, UMD, and member of the Tenure Committee, indicated that the committee had been divided on the issue. He said it felt there would be more protection to the faculty member than under simple majority vote. Warren Ibele, associate dean of the Graduate School, held that tenure decisions were closely akin to decisions on shaping the direction of a department, and that a two-thirds vote by people of equal competence would work toward achieving departmental goals. The ensuing discussion concerned the options available, including simple majority and two-thirds majority, and definition of voting constituency as those eligible and that present at the meeting. At length, the Dahler and Rose proposals were combined in an amendment calling for at least a majority unless the department decided on some other percentage. The mechanism would then become a part of the department constitution. Their proposal was approved, and the body moved on to consider the basis for deciding voting procedures, i.e., whether to include abstentions, total attending the meeting, total eligible. Mr. Auerbach said the committee would present options at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m., an extension on the 5:30 p.m. deadline having been voted during the meeting.

MARILEE WARD  
for Wilbert Ahern  
Abstractor pro tem