

MINUTES
Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
May 6, 1986

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Schiavelli at 3:39 p.m. in Andrews 101. A quorum was present.

CORRECTION TO MINUTES:

In the minutes of the last faculty meeting of April 1, 1986, change "maximal" to "minimal" in the next to last sentence of point 5 on page 2.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. A reply has been received, as a letter from the President on behalf of the Board of Visitors to the Secretary, in response to the resolution on South African investments which emerged from the March 11, 1986 meeting. The Secretary read the reply (Appendix I) aloud. The import is that: (1) the Board has decided to hold to its December 1985 policy relating to such investments, and (2) the investment portfolios of both the Board and the Endowment Association currently contain only securities of companies that are signatories of the Sullivan principles.

2. Mr. Kranbuehl, referring to the recently distributed report from his office on externally funded grants, contracts and fellowships for 1984-85, noted that the \$6.4 million obtained for instructional and research projects from outside sources was 33% higher than the previous year, with the increase in Arts and Sciences being 66%. The associated growth in indirect cost monies has made one additional Summer research grant and one additional semester research assignment available this year. Similar increases in the number of available internal grants are anticipated next year. Moreover, \$87,000 in unrestricted revenue was returned to departments last year. The faculty are congratulated for their efforts. Many other outside opportunities are available, and only need to be explored.

3. Following the good news, some bad. Mr. Schiavelli noted that on the Monday before graduation last year there were 115 late senior grades. There are 373 late senior grades as of today. This places an extra burden on the Registrar's Office, and on Sharon Reed and her assistants especially, in view of the 2,804 grades which are still outstanding and not due till Thursday noon. Last year Ms. Reed had to work through the night in order to meet the graduation deadline. Faculty should do everything possible to make such efforts unnecessary this year.

REPORTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS:

President Verkuil made remarks concerning several matters.

1. He was pleased to have someone of Mr. Schiavelli's qualities to work with as the new Provost. Those in Arts and Sciences would not have Mel to kick around anymore.

2. He hoped to improve communication among the five schools in the coming year, perhaps via a Faculty Senate. There are now forty-three committees in the College, yielding one spot per faculty member. This seems excessive. A new governance unit, including a restructuring of the committee system, is desirable, both to help us fulfill our responsibilities better and to help us communicate better. For example, the resolution on South African investments might better have come with a university-wide endorsement.

3. Several important matters will soon be addressed: (1) a feasibility study for the fund-raising campaign, (2) the campus master plan, and (3) the selection of a successor to Mr. Schiavelli as Dean. The Faculty Affairs Committee has discussed this last topic with the President and the Provost, and it is agreed that a search should begin promptly. It may or may not be possible to find a replacement by the Fall. A search committee has been appointed, consisting of Morton Eckhause (chair), Cirila Djordjevic, David Finifter, Howard Fraser and Joel Schwartz.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES:

Nominations and Elections: John Oakley (for Anne Netick, Chair)

A ballot (Appendix II) containing the names of candidates for one-year replacement positions on the International Studies and Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committees was distributed and reviewed. There were no nominations from the floor. Later in the meeting the results of the election were communicated: David Dessler to International Studies and Richard Terman to Retention, Promotion and Tenure.

Educational Policy: Richard Palmer, Chair

The previously distributed report of the committee (Appendix III) was referred to. There were no questions.

The previously distributed memorandum from the EPC and the Committee on Academic Status concerning continuance requirements and Q.P.A. for graduation (Appendix IV) was referred to. The Chair moved that the proposed revision of these requirements and their description in the College Catalog be approved. The motion was seconded.

Discussion began with Cathy Elliott, Chair of Academic Status, summarizing the rationale for the proposed changes. (1) Not all students in danger of failing to meet continuance requirements are so identified by the present system. The proposal that an official warning letter be sent to any student with less than a 2.0 Q.P.A. in any semester will solve this problem. (2) The present system, which treats Summer school courses on the same footing as regular semester courses except with respect to continuance standards, is inconsistent. (3) A semester review of each student's records and a more rigorous mechanism for placing students on probation will avoid situations like that of 1984-85, in which 29 of 53 dropped students were never placed on academic probation. (4) At present a student can actually pass continuance requirements with a Q.P.A. of 0.83. The proposed changes would eliminate such anomalies, would allow a computer search of student records (as opposed to a manual search) to be made, and would help to anticipate and avoid problems arising from the ten-semester rule. Finally, the proposed new standards are not really any stricter than current standards.

Discussion continued with Mr. Thompson recalling that proposals for 2.0 Q.P.A. requirements had been defeated in the past, it having been generally felt that while 2.0 in the concentration was necessary, 2.0 overall should not be. Mr. Palmer responded that while the specific 2.0 value might be modified, it would not be possible to drop the concept of a Q.P.A. requirement without affecting the whole structure of the proposal.

Mr. Clement, referring to statistics in Appendix IV on students graduating with overall Q.P.A. below 2.0 and to a separate handout (Appendix V) summarizing the history of credit hour requirements for continuance at the College, observed that

rather few students were likely to be affected by the changes. There was as much chance for disasters to occur in the existing system as in the proposed. The new system would be easier on freshmen, and make it easier to get off probation. It would also make it more difficult for students to get in too deep too soon.

Mr. Garrett moved to amend the proposal thus - that the first point (at least a 2.0 Q.P.A. required for graduation) be eliminated, and that the first sentence ("In order to graduate,...") of the second point of the proposal (Appendix IV) be also eliminated. The motion was seconded.

Discussion of the motion to amend began with Mr. Palmer commenting that substantial alteration of the main body of the proposal would also need to be made if the amendment were passed, and that rather than engage in a piecemeal revision here he would rather take the proposal back to the committee(s) for reworking. Mr. Edwards said he favored the amendment. While the 2.0 requirement, obviously somewhat arbitrary, might catch a few students it would do so rather late. It would certainly increase anxiety among students. On balance it wasn't needed. But the continuance requirements were fine.

Mr. Holmes said that although originally in favor of the proposal he was now less certain of its desirability. How did the committee feel? The Chair responded that the committee had been essentially unanimous, except for one dissenting vote on the 2.0 (as opposed to some other number) requirement. Both the EPC and the ASC considered the proposed changes to be liberalizing. Mr. Kranbuehl wondered whether average Q.P.A.s at other schools with a 2.0 Q.P.A. requirement were not higher than here, adding that he didn't want to see the students penalized and therefore supported the amendment.

Mr. Johnston opined that it didn't make sense to separate the various items. Students should not be required to maintain a Q.P.A. they didn't need in order to graduate. The proposal should be sent back to the committee for reworking. Ms. Elliott reiterated the feeling of the committee(s) that the 2.0 Q.P.A. requirement could not be entirely separated. Mr. Jenkins (the minority committee vote referred to above) said he thought the items could be voted on individually. Mr. Edwards reiterated his earlier observations.

Mr. Holmes wondered whether certain things were not almost self evident, e.g., a C average as a requirement for graduation. What of specially recruited students (e.g., athletic admits): should they be permitted to graduate with a greater than 3.0 Q.P.A. in their major and less than 2.0 in everything else? Mr. Thompson asked, wasn't it true that the great majority of those graduating with a Q.P.A. below 2.0 were in fact only slightly below? Ms. Elliott confirmed that of the 163 graduates in the last ten years who were below 2.0, 54% were at or above 1.9, 40% were between 1.7 and 1.9 and only 6-7% were below 1.7.

No further discussion developing, the motion to amend was put to a vote and closely defeated.

Discussion resumed on the original motion, with Mr. Hausman saying he would like to know more about the probable effects of the proposal on minorities and athletes. Ms. Elliott said she had the relevant figures. Mr. Rapoport worried that perhaps as many as 25% of the minority students who would otherwise graduate would fail to do so under the proposed new requirements. Mr. Cobb echoed these concerns and moved that the proposal be referred back to the committee. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Clement, noting the criticisms of the present system voiced in the recent Self-Study, asked that the motion be withdrawn. Mr. Schiavelli suggested that both motions be withdrawn and that the committee(s) then move those points they wished to see acted upon now. Mr. Palmer and Ms. Elliott responded that the proposal was too integrated for such treatment.

Mr. Archibald said he thought the issues of continuance requirements and a required Q.P.A. should be separable, that he was skeptical of the latter because it would provide students with another reason to select "easy" courses, and that he therefore favored recommitting. Mr. Henry Coleman wished that a decision on the whole package could be reached today, adding that the proposals were a good way of reminding students of required standards of performance. Mr. Meyers urged that the proposal be recommitted, asking also why Summer school courses did not presently count towards continuance requirements. Mr. Palmer said there seemed to be some feeling that they weren't as demanding. Mr. Sadler confirmed that skepticism concerning the full equivalence of Summer courses existed. It had often been a painful duty of his to inform students that such work did not count towards continuance requirements. To refer the package back to committee would leave this problem unresolved for yet another year. Mr. Hausman asked whether the committee thought the Summer school issue could be resolved, and Mr. Palmer responded that it was too complex to do here. Ms. Walker suggested that surely the committee(s) had discussed all these issues thoroughly, and therefore the motion to recommit should be defeated. Neither Mr. Cobb nor Mr. Palmer would agree to withdraw their motions.

The motion to recommit was put to a vote (requiring a detailed count) and defeated.

Discussion of the original motion resumed. Mr. Shaver moved to amend the proposal thus - replace the 2.0 by a 1.8 Q.P.A. requirement. The motion was seconded. No discussion developed, and put to a vote the amendment was easily defeated.

Discussion of the original motion resumed yet again, with Mr. Thompson suggesting that if it was this controversial it should be defeated. No further discussion developed. The motion was finally put to a vote (also requiring a detailed count) and passed.

The Chair explained the second item on which action was desired, a recommendation to change the drop period from ten to eight days, contained in a separate and previously distributed memorandum from the committee (Appendix VI). He moved its adoption. The motion was seconded.

Discussion began with Mr. Axtell saying he was opposed to the proposal because it still incorporated the existing ten class day add period, which was unrealistically generous. Mr. Palmer responded that this was a separate question. No further discussion developing, the motion was put to a vote and passed strongly.

The hour being late and with other reports needing to be heard, Mr. Palmer said that the other two items of Appendix VI on which action was desired could be postponed to the next meeting.

Faculty Affairs: Vinson Sutlive, Chair

Since the last report to the faculty the committee has met five times. Some of the more important activity was the following.

1. At an April 2 meeting with Mr. McGlennon and Mr. Schifrin of the Advisory Committee on Retention, Promotion and Tenure, procedures for the evaluation of faculty members appointed outside existing departmental structures were discussed. At the meeting of April 16 a set of procedures was recommended.

2. Liability coverage of faculty was discussed at an April 10 meeting with Phyllis Katz, Assistant Attorney General, Alfred Kaulfers of the Office of Risk Management, Andrew Fogarty and Billie Brandon. Mrs. Katz said that it was difficult to imagine a case brought against a faculty member in which counsel and defense would not be provided by the Attorney General. The consensus of the guests was that: (a) a faculty member is covered by the State when acting within the scope of his/her authority; (b) the State has limited its tort liability to \$25,000; (c) if a State employee is sued as an individual, where the individual is acting within the scope of his/her authority, the State self-insurance program covers the employee in amounts in excess of \$25,000; (d) if members of the faculty still are concerned about their positions and performance of their duties for which they may be the defendant in legal action, they may obtain information about a personal liability policy.

3. Health insurance plans were discussed at an April 23 meeting. Mr. McKnight presented information about KeyCare as an alternative to Blue Cross/Blue Shield.

4. At a May 2 meeting the search for a new Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences was discussed. A list of names to be considered for the corresponding search committee was submitted.

The Chair introduced Craig Wilson, from the Office of Employee Relations, who could respond to questions concerning the health care alternatives. Mr. Wilson noted that literature on the four major plans available had been sent to faculty already, and that additional copies were available in the back of the room.

Mr. Eckhause asked and it was answered that under KeyCare the maximum annual out-of-pocket expenses that could accrue were \$1,000 per individual and \$3,000 per family. Mrs. Freeman inquired about KeyCare coverage while travelling outside the KeyCare area. Mr. Wilson said that indeed, except for emergencies, one might not be covered in such case, or that a preadmission review might be required. Mr. Welsh suggested that in view of the uncertainties regarding the extent of KeyCare coverage the College should not drop the dental part of the Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan. Mrs. Djordjevic asked, what would happen if one did nothing? Mr. Wilson indicated that one would automatically remain with the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Standard plan. One had until 5:00 p.m. on May 16 to change if one wished.

As the final item of business, Mr. Sutlive read and moved the following resolution:

George R. Healy, provost of the College, and for fifteen years its senior administrative and chief academic officer, will retire at the end of this academic session. He has served the College and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences with integrity, civility, and humane wisdom. He has always exemplified in his personal and professional relations with the Faculty those qualities of intellect and spirit prized and nurtured by our various disciplines. For these qualities, and for his constant support of the importance and value of a liberal education, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences hereby expresses its deep respect for and appreciation to Mr. Healy, and wishes him happiness and success in the years ahead.

The resolution was simultaneously seconded and passed by a spontaneous, vigorous and prolonged standing ovation for Mr. Healy.

Mr. Sutlive continued: George, during your 15 years of service to the College you were faced with mountains of paperwork containing veritable blizzards of verbiage or "snow". You were undaunted, and surmounted the bureaucratic landscape with strength and skill. To assure you safe travel in your treks about your Maine farm, the faculty is pleased to present you with this gear and to wish you Godspeed.

Mr. Healy opened a large and intriguing box and held up an impressive pair of snowshoes. Another enthusiastic round of applause followed.

Mr. Healy said the gift was very appropriate, at least partly because his previous pair had been stolen. His fifteen years here had contained elements of fun, aggravation and frustration, but had always been challenging and interesting. He had never been bored. He had recently attended a retirement ceremony for several people who had been here more than twice as long as he had; nevertheless, 15 years was time enough for roots to sink, especially in a hot and humid climate. He considered it a privilege to have served here, and would look forward to the next snowstorm.

After yet another burst of applause Mr. Schiavelli remarked that Mr. Healy would be a tough act to follow. It had been a privilege and an honor to have served as Dean for two years. In contrast to an earlier Dean, who had also gone on to become a Provost, he would remain here.

After a last bit of applause the meeting adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary C. DeFotis
Secretary to the Faculty

- Appendix I: Letter from the President to the Secretary concerning the resolution on South African investments
- Appendix II: Ballot, from the Committee on Nominations and Elections
- Appendix III: Annual Report of the Educational Policy Committee for 1985/86
- Appendix IV: Memorandum from the Educational Policy Committee and the Committee on Academic Status, on Continuance Requirements and Q.P.A.
- Appendix V: Historical Comparisons of Credit Hours Required for Continuance
- Appendix VI: Memorandum from the Educational Policy Committee on Drop/Add Period, Internships, and Rescheduled Final Examinations