



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The April meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Monday, April 1, 2002, beginning at 5:00 PM in the Langone Center Forum. Professor Michael Payne will preside. If there are any amendments to the March, 2002 minutes, please send them to Andrea Halpern, Secretary of the Faculty, in advance of the meeting.

AGENDA

1. **Amendments to March 2002 minutes**
2. **Announcements and remarks by the President and members of his staff**
Question 3c from March, 2002 agenda
3. **Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty**
Report on the planning process
Nominations for University and Faculty Committees
See attached page for ballot prepared by the Faculty Council
4. **Old Business**
Report from the Committee on Instruction: George Exner (see February, 2002 agenda)
5. **New Business**
Report from Committee on Staff Planning:: Tony Massoud.
Course load reduction survey (see attached)
Report from Personnel Committee: Kim Daubman
Tenure clock motion (see attached)

 Committee on Planning and Budget Report
RESULTS OF 3-2 TEACHING LOAD SURVEY

BACKGROUND

In May 2001, the Committee on Staff Planning (CSP) sent departments and programs a request for an updated curriculum planning study. Part II of that document specifically concerned itself with the issue of course load reduction. The goal was to collect information about how a reduction of the teaching load to five or five and one-half courses per year would impact departments and programs (most departments devoted most of their attention to discussing the five course scenario). We anticipated that such a policy would have an unequal effect across departments and we were interested in how departments could handle such a reduction, assuming no additional staff. More specifically, we asked departments to assess the impact of such a policy on the following issues: core courses of the major, electives for majors and non-majors, class size and development of new courses.

METHODOLOGY

Toward the end of fall 2001, CSP had collected the responses from 37 departments and programs. Members of CSP read all of the responses pertaining to the course reduction question with the objective of systematically summarizing the results. We decided that it would be most useful to interpret and place the information in tabular format. Some departments provided very detailed data, while others responded in general terms. CSP did not wish to read between the lines and draw inferences where none were intended. Thus, for some of the questions in which the responses were ambiguous we coded such data as “missing data” and “not applicable.” For those questions in which we felt there was enough information to render a judgment, we required a consensus of CSP members to reach a particular coding.

We coded responses for the following questions:

- 1) Is it feasible for a particular department or program to implement a five-course teaching load without additional staffing?
- 2) Will a five-course load have a negative impact on
 - department core courses or required offerings?
 - department electives?
 - class size?
 - CLA offerings?
- 3) How many additional positions would a department require to implement a five-course teaching load?

RESULTS

1. Feasibility of implementing five-course load without additional staffing.

Responses	Frequency	Percent
Perhaps	1	2.7
No	9	24.3
Yes	27	73.0
Total	37	100

2. Will implementation have a negative impact on core courses?

Responses	Frequency	Percent
No	28	75.7
Yes	9	24.3
Total	37	100

3. Will implementation have a negative impact on electives?

Responses	Frequency	Percent
No	7	18.9
Yes	30	81.1
Total	37	100

4. Will implementation have a negative impact on class size?

Responses	Frequency	Percent
Missing Data	6	16.2
No	15	40.5
Yes	16	43.2
Total	37	100

5. Will implementation have a negative impact on CLA?

Responses	Frequency	Percent
Missing Data	3	8.1
No	13	35.1
Yes	12	32.4
Not Applicable	9	24.3
Total	37	100

6. How many additional positions are needed?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Positions Needed
0	26	70.3	0
.50	1	2.7	.5
.67	1	2.7	.67
1.0	1	2.7	1.0
1.5	1	2.7	1.5
2.0	3	8.1	6.0
2.5	1	2.7	2.5
3.0	1	2.7	3.0
3.5	1	2.7	3.5
Total	36	97.3 (1 missing)	18.67

Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel report March 25, 2002

We have been meeting to draft revisions of the Faculty Handbook to bring it in line with current practice and to reflect faculty motions on policy issues. Given the scope of the task, this work will likely continue into next academic year.

We learned that the American Association of University Professors recently adopted a resolution allowing up to 2 "dead years" for faculty in provisional appointments. That is, faculty are entitled to stop the clock twice, resulting in no more than two one-year extensions of the probationary period. The resolution is responsive to work-family conflicts often experienced by faculty in provisional appointments.

The rationale provided by the AAUP reads in part: "The resolution of pretenure family-work conflicts is critical to ensuring that academic opportunities are truly equitable. Such conflicts often occur just when the research and publication demands of the tenure process are most onerous, and when many faculty members have responsibilities for infants and young children. Institutions should adopt policies that do not create conflicts between having children and establishing an optimal research record on the basis of which the tenure decision is to be made.

"Tenure remains a fundamental requirement for protecting academic freedom. The administration and the faculty of an institution must determine the specific academic standards governing the tenure decision at their institution. Academic standards, however, can and, in this instance, should be distinguished from the amount of time in which an institution's academic standards can be met.¹¹ Specifically, institutions should allow flexibility in the time period for achieving tenure to enable faculty members to care for newborn or newly adopted children.

"A probationary period of seven or fewer years allows faculty members to establish their record for tenure. Historically, this probationary period was based on the assumption that the scholar was male and that his work would not be interrupted by domestic responsibilities, such as raising children. When the tenure system was created, the male model was presumed to be universal.¹² It was assumed that untenured faculty—whether men or

women were not the sole, primary, or even coequal caretakers of newborn or newly adopted children. 13 An inflexible time factor should not be used to preclude women or men who choose to care for children from pursuing tenure within a reasonable period of years. One study found that 80 percent of "leadership campuses" enable faculty members to exclude a certain amount of probationary time for specific reasons, such as the birth or adoption of a child.14

"The 1974 AAUP statement Leaves of Absence for Child-Bearing, Child-Rearing, and Family Emergencies provided for 'stopping the tenure clock' for purposes of child bearing or rearing when a professor takes a full or partial leave of absence, paid or unpaid. The AAUP now recommends that, upon request, a faculty member be entitled to stop the clock or extend the probationary period, with or without taking a full or partial leave of absence, if the faculty member (whether male or female) is a primary or coequal caregiver of newborn or newly adopted children.15 Thus, faculty members would be entitled to stop the tenure clock while continuing to perform faculty duties at full salary. The AAUP recommends that institutions allow the tenure clock to be stopped for up to one year for each child, and further recommends that faculty be allowed to stop the clock only twice, resulting in no more than two one-year extensions of the probationary period.16 These extensions would be available whether or not the faculty member was on leave."

In light of the AAUP resolution, we propose the following motion: A provisional faculty member, regardless of years of service, is entitled to stop the tenure clock or extend the probationary period, with or without taking a full or partial leave of absence, if the faculty member (whether male or female) is a primary or coequal caregiver of newborn or newly adopted children. Thus, faculty members are entitled to stop the tenure clock while continuing to perform faculty duties at full salary. The tenure clock can be stopped for up to one year for each child, but faculty may take no more than two one-year extensions of the probationary period (for child-bearing/child-rearing or for any other reason, such as a full-time untenured faculty leave).

Ballot for 2002 Elections

Personnel

1 tenured: Allen Schweinsberg, Tom DiStefano
 1 year replacement untenured: Ben Vollmyer-Lee, Amy Wolaver
 1 spring semester untenured: Lynn Hoffman, Ghislaine McDayter
 1 spring semester tenured: Jeff Bowen, Jean Peterson

Faculty Development

1 Humanities: Jackson Hill
 1 At-large: Jim Swan, Ned Ladd, JT Ptacek

Staff Planning

1 Humanities: Glynis Carr
 1 Engineering: Constance Ziemian, Jerry Mead

Instruction

1 Social Science: Jan Knoedler, Tom Travis
 1 Engineering: Aarne Vesilind, Rich Kozick

Planning and Budget

- 1 At-large: Tom Solomon, Geoff Schneider
- 1 year replacement At-large: Tom Shawe, Owen Floody

University Review Committee

- 1 Humanities: Gary Steiner, Harold Schweizer
- 1 Engineering:
- 1 year replacement Social Science: Greg Krohn, Steve Willits

Complementary Activities

- 2 At-large: Jim Orr
- 3 year replacements At-large: Eric Santanen, Chris Boyatzis, Susan Tabrizi
- 1 spring semester At-large: Jim Lavine, Dick McGinnis

Faculty Hearing

- 1 Engineering: David Cartwright
- 1 Social Science: Andrea Stevenson Sanjian, Skip McGoun
- 1 new At-large: Kathryn Nottis, Richard Fleming
- 1 year replacement for Natural Science/Math: Mary Beth Gray, Dee Casteel
- 1 spring replacement for Humanities: Gary Grant

Faculty Council

- 1 Humanities: Erik Lofgren, Bill Payn
- 1 year replacement Social Science: Paul Susman
- 1 year replacement Natural Science/Math: Katarina Vollmyer-Lee

Faculty Representative to Trustee Finance Committee

- 1 At -large: John Miller, Dave Jensen

Academic Freedom and Tenure

- 2 untenured: Coralynn Davis, Jamie Hendry, Phillipe Dubois
- 2 tenured: Tammy Hiller, Peter Morris-Keitel, John Kirkland, David Schoepf
- 1 tenured, Engineering: Maurice Aburdene

(CAFT has its own nominating committee composed of 3 faculty at large, appointed by the chair of the faculty and the chair of the committee.)