MINUTES
Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
March 3, 1987

The meeting was called to order by Dean Selby at 3:35 p.m. Sixty-one faculty were present. The minutes of February 3, 1987 were approved without change.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dean Selby

1. Dean Selby announced that five new Chancellor Professors were appointed and installed at our Charter Day ceremonies: Mitchell A. Byrd (Biology); Miles L. Chappell (Fine Arts); Leonard G. Schifrin (Economics); Richard B. Sherman (History); and Rolf G. Winter (Physics). These, along with J. Ward Jones (Classics), brings our total number to six.

2. He announced that Cathy White would be our new student liaison and introduced her to the faculty. Bill Walker, director of University Relations was also formally introduced.

3. He noted that the Employee Benefits Fair will be held March 18th.

4. He then read the following statement:

Statement on the Gumenick Chair of Judaic Studies

I wish to read a statement with regard to recent actions concerning the Gumenick Chair of Judaic Studies.

First a brief chronology to set the actions in context.

1. The present occupant of the Gumenick Chair was appointed in 1985. He received a contract for 1985–86 which was in the form normally issued to new faculty who have had prior service at other institutions. According to AAUP guidelines, such contracts should state precisely when the new faculty person is to be evaluated for tenure. This contract reads, "you would be eligible to be considered for tenure during the 1987–88 session, with tenure effective, if the decision is favorable, in September 1989."

2. In accordance with procedures in the Faculty Handbook, the Department of Religion in which the Gumenick Chair is assigned conducted an evaluation for retention in 1985–86 and recommended continuation. Again in the fall of 1986, and again accord with the Faculty Handbook, the department evaluated the holder for retention and recommended that he not be continued beyond the spring semester 1987. The Advisory Committee on Retention, Promotion, and Tenure concurred in this recommendation.

3. As acting dean of the faculty, I concurred in the department's recommendation not to retain the incumbent, but recommended to the provost that the holder receive a terminal contract for 1987–88.

4. After considering these recommendations, the provost ruled that the holder should be evaluated for tenure in 1987–88, in effect restating the terms of the original contract.
5. Since there is disagreement between the department and the present holder whether the Gumenick Chair should continue in the Department of Religion or be reconstituted as an interdisciplinary position at large within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the provost instructed me "to appoint a broadly-based and well-qualified ad hoc group from within the Arts and Sciences whose first purpose it will be to review, with all parties concerned, the duties and expectations of the holder of the Gumenick chair."

6. After the provost's ruling, the chair of the Advisory Committee on Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, as well as other faculty members, asked the Faculty Affairs Committee to look into the matter. The Faculty Affairs Committee, of which the dean of the faculty is a member ex officio, held two lengthy meetings, first with the provost, and then with the chair of the Advisory Committee. Although individual members of the Faculty Affairs Committee reserve their opinions on the prudence of some judgements that have been made in this case, the committee concludes that there has been no violation of policy in this matter on the part of the department, dean, or provost, and that there has been no arbitrary exercise of administrative authority. The Faculty Affairs Committee has authorized me to convey these opinions to you.

7. In accordance with the provost's direction and in consultation with the Faculty Affairs Committee, I have asked the following persons to constitute a "broadly-based and well-qualified ad hoc group" to review the issues concerning the Gumenick Chair as the provost directed.

Morton Eckhause, Professor of Physics
David M. Jones, Professor of Philosophy
R. Wayne Kernodle, Professor of Sociology
Leonard G. Schifrin, Professor of Economics
Richard B. Sherman, Professor of History

Professor Eckhause will serve as convenor until the group selects its own chair.

8. I have directed the following charge to the group. The provost has reviewed this charge and agrees that it conforms to his instructions to me.

**Charge to the Ad Hoc Group on the Gumenick Chair.**

My charge to you is in two parts.

A. I ask you to review with all parties concerned the duties expected of the holder of the Gumenick Chair of Judaic Studies, and particularly to advise, first, whether the definition of Judaic Studies may be sufficiently interdisciplinary to warrant reassigning the chair as an interdisciplinary position at large within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences or whether it should be retained within the Department of Religion; and, second, should you conclude that the definition of Judaic Studies will support constituting the Chair as an interdisciplinary at-large appointment, whether the resources that the College may reasonably be expected to commit to the interdisciplinary field at this time will be sufficient to insure a program of high intellectual and pedagogical quality.

B. Should you recommend, and the administration agree, that the
Gumenick Chair continue in the Department of Religion, the usual procedures for tenure evaluation within a department will apply. But should you recommend, and the administration agree, that the Gumenick Chair be constituted an interdisciplinary appointment at large within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the position will fall under the Evaluation Procedure for Appointments with Tenure Outside the Existing Departmental Structure, which has been drafted by the Faculty Affairs Committee and approved by the Procedural Review Committee.

If the latter is your recommendation, I ask you to propose the criteria by which the holder of the Gumenick Chair will be evaluated for tenure at large during 1987-88. According to the procedures for appointments outside the departmental structure the criteria for evaluation should include "the general criteria set forth in the Faculty Handbook, including evaluation of the candidate's teaching ability" as well as any specific criteria you may recommend in defining the interdisciplinary position.

Further, you are requested in defining these criteria to recommend the appropriate administrative reporting structure for the at-large position.

9. To conclude, I would like to review for the benefit of faculty members who are not familiar with the procedures referred to above other salient provisions of these procedures in addition to those quoted in the charge to the ad hoc group.

"The evaluation committee shall consist of not less than five nor more than seven members from those departments in which the appointee has competence or specialties."

"The committee shall be appointed by the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in consultation with the Dean's Advisory Council and the Faculty Affairs Committee."

"The levels of review shall be the same as for any other candidate for tenure."

I will now also issue my only ruling from the chair so far this year by holding that questions may be raised about the chronology and procedures described above, but that questions relating to the personnel evaluations mentioned are out of order because such questions may influence further evaluation in 1987-88.

Following Mr. Selby's statement, Mr. Livingston asked to speak. He strongly questioned the logic of the whole procedure. He then proceeded to review the history of how the chair had been created and how this issue had arisen.

He was interrupted on a question of order—if this was an announcement by the Dean, was it open for deliberation. Dean Selby stated that he had already acted on this matter and there was nothing to debate at this point. Any faculty wishing to express views should arrange to speak with the appointed committee.

Mr. Tiefel then asked to speak. He explained that the Department of Religion was a passive recipient in this whole process, in that this action had been taken without consultation. He noted that although the Provost apparently has the power to act in
this fashion, it was authoritarian and raised serious issues of concern to the faculty as a whole. Selby noted that the Faculty Affairs Committee had discussed the question of whether the Provost had the right to move in this way without consultation. They had concluded that he had not obligation to do such. Mr. Tiefel continued to elaborate his point but was also interrupted on a question of order. Mr. Selby noted again that he had already taken this action, that this was just an announcement of what had been done and was not being brought before the faculty for deliberation, and that all views would be welcomed before the committee. Mr. Schwartz expressed his concern with regard to the more general issue and requested that Mr. Selby provide further clarification in the future regarding how this came up and the steps taken to handle it. Mr. Selby agreed to provide such.

A motion was then passed to go on to other business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Graduate Studies: Alan Ward

1. The Ph.D in American Studies has been approved by the State Council. Three new faculty will be hired. Mr. Ward expressed his thanks in behalf of all to Bruce McConachie for his direction of this expansion of our program.

2. Efforts are underway to continue development toward a Ph.D program in Applied Science. An ad hoc committee has been formed, Group to Revise the Applied Science Program (GRASP). Accelerator Science and Material Science are the areas of focus. Proposals will be submitted in 1988 and with the hope that the program can be in place in 1990.

3. Mr. Ward noted that the Graduate School application forms had undergone a color change.

There were no other reports and no new business. The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

James D. Tabor
Secretary to the Faculty