

76

2142

1973

Year 1972-73

No. 3

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

THE FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES

November 16, 1972

The third meeting of the Faculty Senate for the year 1972-73 was convened in Nicholson Auditorium on Thursday, November 16, 1972. Checking or signing the roll as present were 97 voting members of the faculty, 6 members of the Administrative Committee, and 13 nonmembers. Vice Chairman Frank J. Sorauf presided.

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

Prior to beginning consideration of the proposed Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure, the following recommendations or announcements were made:

1. Henceforth, minor corrections or amendments of the proposed regulations should be made in writing to the Tenure Committee.
2. The chairman of the Tenure Committee should present each section of the regulations and the members of the committee should respond to comments from the floor.
3. No final votes would be taken and speakers should observe the 3-minute rule with the understanding that the person introducing the material would have more time.
4. A member of the Faculty Senate could yield time to a person not a member of the faculty.
5. The chairman of the Tenure Committee announced that the language of the original document should be ignored and that the Faculty Senate should consider the language in the supplements.

The attention of the Faculty Senate was directed to a motion which was made and seconded at the meeting of November 2, 1972, which had not been acted upon. The motion was that the Tenure Committee should define the word "program" as used in the proposed regulations. The motion carried.

A suggestion was made that the comments for Section 2 should be incorporated into the body of the item.

Section 3 of the proposed regulations was then introduced as modified by the Tenure Committee. A motion was made to reduce the requirement that a regular member of the faculty must devote two-thirds of his time to the University to 50 percent. After considerable discussion a substitute motion to refer the matter to a committee to study and report back to the Senate was approved. This motion was subsequently amended to instruct the Committee on Faculty Affairs to study and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate

as to tenure and employment rights and fringe benefits of all part-time members of the faculty.

A motion to delete part 3.312 of Section 3 was defeated.

Section 4 was reviewed only briefly and the Faculty Senate then turned to Section 5. The chairman of the Tenure Committee emphasized that 6 years is the maximum time, not the minimum, for a probationary appointment.

In a brief discussion of the "comments" it was stated that eventually the Faculty Senate will be required to decide whether the "comments" shall be an integral part of the tenure regulations.

The Faculty Senate adjourned.

W. DONALD BEATTY
Clerk

Appendix

ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. It was presided over by Frank Sorauf, professor of political science and vice chairman of the body sitting as a committee of the whole, to consider the tenure document.

Samuel Krislov, professor of political science and chairman of the Senate Consultative Committee, reported that the recommendation of a 2:30 p.m. starting time for Senate and Assembly meetings was not possible at least for the present because space was not available at the earlier hour. The committee also recommended that textual suggestions be communicated directly to the Tenure Committee. Acting on Professor Terrell's suggestion at the previous meeting the committee recommended that the chairman of the Tenure Committee begin the debate on each section of the regulations by explaining the advantages and disadvantages of the revisions. It also suggested that responses to questions from the floor be made by other members of the committee. John Wertz, professor of physical chemistry, was concerned that the body have sufficient opportunity to correct serious discrepancies, and Mr. Krislov assured him that at the final meeting there would be such an opportunity. The Steering Committee's recommendations were then approved.

Professor Sorauf reminded the body that it was meeting as a committee of the whole, that all votes were to be considered "advisory," and that the 3-minute rule for debate and the rule for ceding time to a nonmember were in effect. Michael Perlman, associate professor of statistics, distributed copies of proposed revisions for the foreword and Sections 15, 16 and 17 which he said he would introduce at the December 7 meeting.

Resuming the discussion of Section 2, Charles McLaughlin, professor of political science, pointed out that there were elements of definition in the comments, and he suggested that the committee incorporate them into the text. Fred Morrison, associate professor of law and member of the Tenure Committee, said this would be done. Morton Hamermesh, professor and head of physics and astronomy, repeated his request that "program" be defined; his motion was approved.

Carl Auerbach, acting dean of the Law School and chairman of the Tenure Committee, proceeded to Section 3, Classes of Faculty and Faculty Appointments. He explained that the list of definitions of nonregular faculty was an exclusive one; there would be no other types of nonregular appointments. He called attention to the provision that nonregular status would apply where faculty members depend for their source of funding on other than state legislative appropriations. However, departments would be able to designate as "regular" those appointments where funding is from a variety of sources and there is assurance of at least partial continuation of support. Another point covered was the status of academic administrators in the tenure system. He said the committee recognized the desirability of creating a career administrative service, but that was not within the purview of his committee. Instead, the committee recommended nonregular status for academic administrators in their positions as administrators but nothing prevented an academic unit, on the basis of academic merit, from giving the administrator a regular appointment with continuous tenure. The committee proposed that a regular appointment could be made where a faculty member was on two-thirds time, indicating that the major share of his time was being spent at the University. Any

year where at least two-thirds of the appointee's time was not devoted to teaching and research would not count toward completion of the probationary period.

Paul Rosenblatt, associate professor of family social science, suggested that the two-thirds requirement would work a hardship on women with family responsibilities who are returning to teach, and that a reduction to half time would be more realistic. Several speakers addressed themselves to his point of view. William Shepherd, vice president for academic administration, asserted that a change to half time would have far-reaching implications which should be studied before the Senate considered it further. Walter Lehn, chairman of linguistics and member of the committee, stated that the committee had moved to the two-thirds figure to provide more flexibility, while ensuring that the primary commitment was with the University. Mr. Morrison noted that the woman returning to University faculty employment was only part of the problem and that the substantial number of faculty members with professional obligations elsewhere were the major concern.

Asked about tenure rights while a person was on leave, Mr. Shepherd responded that basic rights of tenure would not be lost. Sue Bobrow, instructor in sociology and member of the committee, said that a half-time figure would show that the University was aware of changes which were taking place in sharing family responsibilities. Leonid Hurwicz, Regents' professor of economics, moved that the proposal for percent time be changed from two-thirds to one-half for persons who did not have comparable employment with other institutions. There was no second to the motion. Arnold Lazarow, professor and head of anatomy, moved that an ad hoc committee be appointed to explore the subject in greater detail and report back to the Faculty Senate. His motion was seconded. Mr. Shepherd said that the incidence of working couples sharing appointments was very low at the University, and he noted that the two-thirds figure was a marked advance over previous policy. He added that issues involved in half-time appointments should be dealt with outside the tenure regulations. Mr. Morris suggested there should be a study of fringe benefits and employment rights of part-time instructional staff, and it was decided that the Faculty Affairs Committee would be the appropriate group to undertake the assignment. Dr. Lazarow accepted the amendment and his motion was approved.

Peter Robinson, assistant professor of French and Italian, proposed deletion of the section on academic administrators, indicating that personnel on such appointments were deprived of rights, and that it would be better to remove the whole section until such time as the status of career service administrators could be clearly defined. Mr. Auerbach responded that a person in administration could be given a faculty appointment with tenure immediately at the time of hiring if an academic unit judged that the individual had sufficient qualifications and that the individual might be entitled to assume academic duties in the unit if he left his administrative post.

When it was suggested that the regulations specify that a chairman would hold a regular appointment, Mr. Auerbach replied that the committee was providing more flexibility in permitting departments to experiment with academic administrator appointments. There was further discussion of the procedure where a person would be serving as an administrator during the probationary period. John Webb, associate dean of CLA, said there should be assurances that administrators' rights would not be jeopardized. Mr. Morris responded that the department could grant the administrator tenure any time during the probationary period. Vernon Weckwerth, professor of hospital ad-

ministration, reminded the Senate that it was talking about the "individual," not the "position."

Edwin Marquit, associate professor of physics, moved deletion of the section providing nonregular faculty status to those holding appointments for a limited time because they were experimental or not funded entirely from legislative funds. Mr. Morrison pointed out that if deleted all those holding such appointments would be treated equally with other faculty regardless of source of funds, so that if such nonlegislative funds ran out the impact would be across the University as a whole. The Marquit proposal was defeated.

Section 4 was then taken up. It outlined requirements for action by the Board of Regents and included a procedure to ensure that new appointees would have written understanding of the terms of their appointments, to which their consent would be secured. Section 5 provided the definition of the maximum period of probationary service and clarified its computation. Neither section evoked discussion.

Mr. Perlman reminded the Senate that the comment in Section 3 pertaining to "adequate cause" for termination of employment had not been approved. Thomas Bacig, instructor in English, UMD, and member of the Tenure Committee, responded that the committee had changed the comments as each section was taken up by the Senate and that there would be another opportunity for review. John Dahler, professor of chemical engineering, said his understanding was that the comments were for the use of future persons working on tenure regulations; Mr. Auerbach responded that they were also intended for clarification.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

JEANNE T. LUPTON
Abstractor