Volume XI

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of November 25, 1974

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Meeting Notice: 126 Clinton Hall, 3:30 p.m., November 25, 1974

Order of Business:

I. Calling of the Meeting to Order

II. Informal Proposals and Statements

III. Approval of the University Senate Minutes of November 11, 1974

IV. Orders of the Day: None

V. Unfinished Business: None

VI. Committee Reports:

A. Ad Hoc Collective Bargaining Committee - Mr. Glenn Miller (Attachment B)

B. Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure - Mr. Paul Ackerman (Attachment C)

VII. New Business:

A. Report on General Studies - Ms. Frances Stephens

B. Report on Scheduling Committee - Mr. Stephen Brady

VIII. Adjournment

Wichita State University Senate Attachment A

Wichita State University

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

To President Clark Ahlberg, Vice President John Breazeale, and Members of the University Senate Date 11/11/74

From Ad Hoc Committee on Collective Bargaining

Subject Interim Report of 11 November 1974

The members of the committee have been examining, since the appointment of the group, an effective information and education program which should help faculty to understand more fully the nature and effects of collective bargaining by university faculty and the legal framework of such bargaining in Kansas. A recommended program will be presented to the Central Administration and to the University Senate on 25 November; while not completely worked out at this writing, the report probably will recommend:

1. Distribution of a moderate amount of material relating to collective bargaining by faculties to each faculty member.
2. Provision of additional material to the Dean's Office of each college (and to Ablah Library) for checking out to faculty members who wish to read further on the subject.
3. A series of faculty meetings (for colleges or divisions of colleges) to discuss, with members of the committee as resource personnel, questions that may have been raised but not answered by the reading materials made available.
4. A small number of meetings for the entire university faculty with off-campus, possibly a few out-of-state, speakers who are knowledgeable on the subject of collective bargaining by faculties. Possibly video-taped materials can be utilized.

(continued)

The latter parts of the above proposal will be presented in more detail on 25 November. They will be suggested with a time schedule that will permit completion of the entire program before 1 April 1975; adherence to that timing will permit studied and careful deliberation by faculty and administration by the end of the academic year. Thus, it is believed important that the first step in the proposal be implemented as soon as possible so that materials will be in the possession of each faculty member before the close of the semester. The members of the committee recommend distribution of about 120 pages of material; the specific items are listed in the attached covering letter and commentary that would accompany each packet of material.

The committee asks that the Central Administration and the University Senate approve distribution of the attached memorandum and the listed materials as the first step in the education effort outlined above.

GWM:mb

Wichita State University

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

To All Wichita State University Faculty Date 11/11/74

From 'Ad Hoc Committee on Collective Bargaining

Subject Materials Relating to Collective Bargaining by University Faculties

This memorandum accompanies a packet of selected materials which, we believe, will help each of you to understand more fully the issues, institutions and results of collective negotiations between university faculties and administrators. We have attempted to keep the packet at the minimum size that seems compatible with an adequate presentation of relevant information, but the issues that arise cannot be answer simplistically.

The following items are included:

1. The Public Employee Relations Act of Kansas.
2. "State Bargaining Legislation," AAUP Bulletin, Autumn, 1974.
3. "On Resolving Impasses in Collective Bargaining: Two Views," AAUP Bulletin, Winter, 1972.
4. Orientation Packet, Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service. The following items are included in the packet:
   a. Academic Collective Bargaining: History and Present Status
   b. Legal Principles of Public Sector Bargaining
   c. Legislation in the States
   d. Some Suggested Advantages and Disadvantages of Collective Bargaining
   e. Faculty Professional Associations

(continued)

f. Academic Bargaining Models

g. 212 College and University Faculties with Collective Bargaining Agents

h. What's Actually in a Faculty Contract

i. Selected Bibliography

j. Glossary of Labor Terms

In reading and discussing the accompanying materials, and much more, members of the committee have addressed themselves to questions such as:

1. What types of institutions of higher education now have collective bargaining? Do they differ significantly from Kansas Regents' Institutions?
2. What are the steps for setting up a bargaining unit in a Kansas College or University and what are the possible consequences of each step?
3. What criteria are considered when a bargaining unit is to be determined?
4. What procedures are followed in the determination of the designated bargaining agent?
5. Can a composite state-wide unit (on some issues) and single campus unit (on other issues) be established?
6. Since at Pittsburg State University a single campus bargaining unit has been established, is this a guarantee that state-wide bargaining is not now an option under Kansas law?
7. If a bargaining unit is created on a single campus, with whom do the parties meet and confer?

(continued)

8. If a state-wide unit should be created, with whom would the parties meet and confer?
9. Who selects the members of the bargaining team and by what process?
10. What specific differences are there between a "meet and confer" law and one stipulating collective negotiations?
11. Under Kansas law, what matters are negotiable?
12. How compelling are the provisions of the Kansas Public Employee Relations Act?
13. What happens to faculty or University senates under collective bargaining?
14. Will political activity of faculties be limited or expanded under collective bargaining?
15. Are groups which are excluded from the bargaining unit, by decision of the State Board, entitled to set up their own separate bargaining unit?
16. What part do students or alumni play in negotiations? Are they to be considered participants in the process of higher education?
17. What has happened to traditional patterns of tenure and promotion under collective bargaining?
18. How much of the economic and leadership resources of a university will be drained off to the negotiation process?
19. Will collective bargaining have an impact on the resources budgeted by the state for higher education in general, and for unionized institutions in particular?

(continued)

20. Will collective bargaining at Wichita State University have an effect on Wichita State University's general image in Academe? Among legislators? Among the general public?
21. Will collective bargaining affect Wichita State University's ability to attract high-quality faculty?
22. Will collective bargaining affect fund-raising efforts from the private sector?
23. Will institutional goals, strategies, and aspirations be affected by collective bargaining?

The above questions are suggestive, not exhaustive. You may have other questions in your mind or others may arise as you read these materials or discuss the subject with your colleagues. We invite your thoughtful consideration since the subject is to be examined in considerably more depth during the current academic year.

The charge to the committee was to recommend, to the University Senate and the Central Administration of the University (for implementation during the second semester), a several-step information and education program intended to enable faculty members to become better informed on the subject of collective bargaining by university faculties. Thus, the committee will not recommend, nor will individual members, speaking as representatives of the committee, recommend, policy which individuals, the entire faculty, or the administration are asked to adopt. Members of the committee may serve, if requested, as resource persons in discussions and explorations of the issues related to collective negotiations by faculties.

(continued)

Ad Hoc Committee on Collective Bargaining

Phyllis Burgess

William Ford

Gerald Hoag

Sajon Joyner

Lawrence E. McKibbin

Glenn W. Miller, Chairman Glenn.

Martin M. Perline

Gordon B. Terwilliger

GWM:mb

Wichita State University Senate Attachment B

Wichita State University

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

To President Clark Ahlberg, Vice-President John Breazeale, and Members of the University Senate Date 11/25/74

From Ad Hoc Committee on Collective Bargaining

Subject Committee Report Part II

When Part I of the committee report was approved at the Senate meeting of November 11, 1974, it was indicated that additional information would be forthcoming. That information (Part II) is presented herein.

To extend further the information of the faculty on collective bargaining, it is recommended that not fewer than two mini-libraries be established in each college of the University (six for LAS). Each library should include:

Lipset and Ladd, Professors, Unions, and American Higher Education.

Educational Commission of the States, Collective Bargaining in Post-secondary Educational Institutions.

Thomson, An Introduction to Collective Bargaining in Higher Education.

Contracts from the following schools:

Nebraska State Colleges
Temple University
Southwestern Massachusetts University
Central Michigan State

Kansas State University Senate Statement on organization.
Pittsburg ruling and article showing vote.
A bibliography to serve as a guide for further individual research.

It is recommended that these mini-libraries be established by December 2 with an announcement sent to the faculty on or before that date and a reminder sent to the faculty on December 12. It is further recommended that the main library place on 3-day reserve all material in the mini-libraries and other relevant materials on the subject of collective bargaining in higher education.

It is proposed that informational meetings be held with the faculty in four phases.

Phase one would encompass separate meetings comprising of the faculty, administration, and student government representatives of each college (three such meetings for LAS). Two members from the Ad Hoc Committee on Collective Bargaining would be available as resource persons, of whom one should be a faculty member. These meetings are to be scheduled by the Dean of the College and should be held between January 7 and February 15, 1975. It is assumed that participants will have read the appropriate material before coming to the meeting. (Any person not able to attend the meeting of his or her college is urged to attend a meeting of some other college.)

Phase two of the informational meetings would involve inviting organizations interested in faculty collective bargaining (such as the American Association of University Professors, American Federation of Teachers, Kansas Higher Education Association, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities) to submit a videotape presentation of responses to an identical list of questions submitted by the committee to each participating organization. (This should not exceed 30 minutes in length.)

These videotapes will be presented for faculty viewing on Tuesday and Wednesday, 24 and 25 February, 1975. These will be shown in a central location (the Campus Activities Center, if feasible) six or eight times each day so that all faculty can attend; whatever their scheduled university duties.

Phase three of the program recommends calling a general faculty meeting (recommend 3:30 P.M. on Monday, 3 March) at which time all interested organizations will be invited to send representatives to make very brief presentations and participate in responding to questions from the faculty.

Phase four of the program recommends bringing to the campus a nationally-recognized academic who has researched and written on the issues of collective negotiations in higher education. This meeting should be held on Monday, 17 March at 3:30 P.M.

Finally, it is suggested that a scheduled Senate meeting for full debate and possible recommendation to faculty take place no later than 14 April, 1975.

Committee Members

Phyllis Burgess
William Ford
Gerald Hoag
Sajon Joyner
Lawrence McKibbin
Glenn W. Miller (Chairman)
Martin Perline
Gordon Terwilliger

GWM:mb

Wichita State University Senate Attachment C

Wichita State University

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

To Dr. Kay Camin Date October 10, 1974

From Paul Ackerman, Psychology

Subject Ad Hoc Committee recommendation to the Senate regarding AAUP Tenure Quota Statement

After due discussion and deliberation, the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure Quotas recommends that the University Senate adopt the October 20, 1973, AAUP statement, "On the Imposition of Tenure Quotas," as official university policy.

The committee and myself will be present at the Senate meeting if you so desire to 1) give our rationale in recommending adoption and 2) answer questions as regards the AAUP statement itself.

On the Imposition of Tenure Quotas

The statement which follows was approved by the Association's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure on October 18, 1973. The Council voted on October 20, 1973, to concur in the statement.

Many institutions of higher education have had to consider ways of accommodating the number and composition of their faculty to a static or declining financial situation. The Association has developed criteria applicable where a reduction in faculty positions is contemplated because of financial exigency or discontinuance of a program.[1] This statement will concern itself with institutional policies designed to shape the overall composition of the faculty by limiting the number of tenured positions, and especially with those policies which establish a fixed maximum percentage of faculty who may possess tenure at a given time.[2]

The Association, while recognizing the concerns that motivate such quotas, opposes them. They are an unwise solution to the problem they purport to solve, and can have grave consequences for the institutions that adopt them. Moreover, they are not compelled, for there are other more nearly satisfactory alternatives available.

Recognizing that tenure best protects academic freedom, but that it is usually undesirable to afford tenure automatically upon an individual's joining a faculty, the American Association of University Professors has supported the employment of a stated maximum probationary period, of sufficient but not excessive length, during which the academic qualifications and performance of newer faculty members can be evaluated in terms of institutional standards and expectations. Indeed, it is principally to provide each institution with a reasonable opportunity of assessing the skills of probationary appointees in terms of its tenure standards (and the availability of others whom it may also desire to consider for tenured appointment) that this Association has not favored policies of automatic tenure. However, to continue the service of faculty members beyond the maximum probationary period, while withholding tenure, presents an unwarranted hazard to their academic freedom.

Accordingly, institutions may properly set high standards for tenure, but they subvert the functions of tenure standards if they provide that, no matter how clearly nontenured faculty members meet any stated academic

[1] Regulation 4(c) of Committee A's "Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure" (*AAUP Policy Documents and Reports*, 1973 edition, pp. 15-20) reads as follows:

> Where termination of an appointment with continuous tenure, or of a nontenured appointment before the end of the specified term, is based upon bona fide financial exigency or discontinuance of a program or department of instruction, Regulation 5 [dismissal proceedings] will not apply, but faculty members shall be able to have the issues reviewed by the faculty, or by an appropriate faculty committee (such as the faculty's grievance committee), with ultimate review of all controverted issues by the governing board. In every case of financial exigency or discontinuance of a program or department of instruction, the faculty member concerned will be given notice or severance salary not less than as prescribed in Regulation 8 [at least a year of notice for faculty members on continuing appointment]. Before terminating an appointment because of the abandonment of a program or department of instruction, the institution will make every effort to place affected faculty members in other suitable positions. If an appointment is terminated before the end of the period of appointment, because of financial exigency, or because of the discontinuance of a program of instruction, the released faculty member's place will not be filled by a replacement within a period of two years, unless the released faculty member has been offered reappointment and a reasonable time within which to accept or decline it.

See also the Association's statement on "The Role of the Faculty in Budgetary and Salary Matters" (*AAUP Policy Documents and Reports*, 1973 edition, pp. 40-42) and "On Institutional Policies Resulting from Financial Exigency: Some Operating Guidelines" (*Ibid.*, pp. 43, 44).

[2] The report and recommendations of the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, published in 1973, call for "policies relating to the proportion of tenured and nontenured faculty that will be compatible with the composition of [the institution's] present staff, its resources, and its future objectives." See *Faculty Tenure* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973), pp. 45-51, and particularly the Commission's recommendation on pages 50, 51.

standard (and no matter how well they compare with the tenured faculty and all others whom the institution is able to attract to that faculty), the system is such as to require their termination from the very positions in which they have served with unqualified distinction. Holding faculty members in nontenured service, and then releasing them because a numerical limit on tenured positions prohibits their retention, has the effect of nullifying probation. All full-time appointments, excepting only special appointments of specified brief duration and reappointments of retired faculty members on special conditions, should be either probationary relating to continuous tenure or with continuous tenure.[3] To make appointments which are destined to lead to nonretention because of a fixed numerical quota of tenured positions, obviating any realistic opportunity for the affected individuals to be evaluated for tenure on their academic record, is to depart from a basic feature of the system of tenure and thus to weaken the protections of academic freedom.

A variation to nonretention because of a tenure quota, one which Committee A finds wholly inimical to the principles of academic freedom which tenure serves, is the policy adopted at a few institutions of withholding tenure from admittedly qualified candidates who have completed the maximum probationary period but retaining them in a kind of holding pattern, perpetually more vulnerable than their tenured colleagues to termination, unless and until the quota eases for them and they too are granted tenure. Assuming they have fully earned an entitlement to tenure, there can be no justification for continuing them in a less favorable and more vulnerable status than their tenured colleagues.

Committee A, accordingly, opposes the adoption of tenure quotas for the following reasons:

(a) if combined with the possibility of additional term contracts beyond the period of maximum probationary service plainly adequate to determine the individual's entitlement to tenure, the system indefensibly extends conditions of jeopardy to academic freedom;

(b) probation with automatic termination is not probation; those whom quotas affect by automatically excluding them from consideration for tenure essentially are reduced to a terminal class of contract workers rendered incapable of full and equal faculty membership irrespective of the nature of the service they have given and irrespective of the professional excellence of that service;

(c) in designating a portion of the probationary regular faculty as ineligible to continue, in order to cope with needs of staff flexibility and financial constraints, a quota system is a crude and unjust substitute for more equitable methods of academic planning.

Committee A, in registering its concern over the fixing of a maximum numerical percentage of tenured faculty, does not suggest that an institution should be unconcerned with appointment policies which will permit it to bring new members into its faculty with some regularity. A sound academic program needs elements not only of continuity but of flexibility, which is served by the continuing opportunity to recruit new persons and to pursue new academic emphases. It is desirable for a faculty to include those recently arrived from the seminars of our graduate schools as well as those who are well established as scholars and teachers.

Such considerations of flexibility are often adduced in support of tenure quotas. But this misses two central points. First, the system of tenure does not exist as subordinate to convenience and flexibility. The protection of academic freedom must take precedence over the claimed advantages of increased flexibility.

Second, imposing a numerical limit on the percentage of tenured faculty disregards a range of other ways to attain a desired mix of senior and junior faculty. Indeed, it imposes an inequitable burden on a vulnerable portion of the faculty in a facile response to issues of academic staffing that should reflect far more comprehensive planning. Establishing fixed quotas may deprive the profession of a large part of the generation of scholars and teachers which currently populates the nontenured positions at our colleges and universities. It would be preferable by far to employ a variety of other measures—some affecting tenured faculty, others affecting probationary and nontenured faculty, and still others affecting prospective faculty members—to ensure that the necessary burdens of financial stringency and lack of growth are shared to some extent by all academic generations.

While opposing the imposition of tenure quotas, Committee A recognizes that the general proportion of a faculty on tenure can have an important long-range bearing on the nature and quality of an institution of higher education. Given a situation in which there is small prospect for significant growth in the total size of the faculty, considerations which merit attention include:

A. The desired distribution of tenured and nontenured faculty should be viewed as a long-term goal rather than a short-term solution. The ratio of tenured faculty is itself the dynamic consequence of a complex of academic decisions and developments, each of which can be reconsidered. These include (1) the rate of growth of the institution and its faculty; (2) the fraction of those appointed initially to tenured or probationary positions; (3) the use of visiting faculty members; (4) the use of graduate assistants; (5) the average length of the probationary period of nontenured faculty members who ultimately achieve tenure; (6) the fraction of nontenured faculty members who ultimately achieve tenure; (7) the institutional policy on retirement; and (8) the age distribution of the total faculty.

B. A satisfactory long-range plan may well imply that, along the way, the proportion of the faculty on tenure will at first increase and then, as the force of the plan takes effect, decrease. Just as the end of growth in the size of the faculty leads to a gradual increase in the ratio of those tenured, so the gradual aging of the present faculty will ultimately lead to a tendency for the ratio to decline. Most changes in academic person-

[3] See "Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure," Regulation 2(b).

nel policies require some lag in time before full implementation and impact, and there is nothing disastrous in a temporary bulge in the percentage of faculty members on tenure. On the other hand, long-range injury to an institution may result from rigid and hasty application of any single presumed remedy, such as the imposition of a fixed quota.

C. It should be recognized that, in the short run, reducing the proportion of a faculty on tenure produces very little benefit by way of flexibility. It is only over a period of several years that a change in the proportion acquires pertinency. If an institution finds itself, at the beginning of development of a long-range plan, at or near a preferred distribution which it wishes generally to maintain, it may well be sensible to choose consciously to exceed the desired distribution temporarily while the steps necessary to return to that distribution take effect.

D. Equity and institutional morale demand that all or almost all of the burden of satisfying the desired tenure ratio should not be placed upon the probationary faculty. Attractive accelerated retirement opportunities for senior tenured faculty present one possible alternative. Additionally, consideration may be given to planning carefully the proportion of teaching and research done by full-time and part-time tenured and probationary faculty, teaching assistants, and temporary appointees.

Foreclosing promotion to a tenured position because of a numerical quota is unacceptable. Stricter standards for the awarding of tenure can be developed over the years, with a consequent decrease in the probability of achieving tenure. But it is essential to distinguish a deliberate change in standards, retaining a positive probability of an individual's achieving tenure pursuant to well-defined criteria and adequate procedures for evaluation and review, from a situation in which the granting of tenure, for reasons unrelated to the individual's merits, is never a realistic possibility.

Regulations for Annual Meetings

The following regulations, as adopted by the Council, and amended as to Rules of Procedure in 1971, govern the Annual Meetings of the Association:

I. *Program*

Pursuant to its responsibility under Article IV of the Constitution to "determine the time, place, and program of the Annual Meeting," the Council allocates time to Association business and other program items. Association business includes all items requiring the vote of the Meeting.

II. *Agenda*

Within the time allocated to Association business, each Meeting of the Association determines its agenda. The Council shall propose agenda at the commencement of the business portion of the meeting.

III. *Rules of Procedure*

1. The current edition of Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the proceedings of Meetings of the Association in matters not covered in the Constitution, regulations, or rules specially adopted by a Meeting.

2. A complaint against an academic institution, raised by an individual member from the floor of the Annual Meeting, will be referred to the General Secretary for handling in accordance with the Association and procedures. A complaint against the Association, for its handling of a matter or for other reasons, will be received by a Grievance Committee of the Annual Meeting, which will conduct such inquiry as it finds necessary and submit its report to the President and General Secretary or, in its discretion, to the Executive Committee of the Council. The grievant shall be informed of the disposition of his case.

IV. *Resolutions*

1. The President of the Association shall appoint a Committee on Resolutions sufficiently in advance of each Annual Meeting to permit the names and addresses of the members of the Committee to be published in the *Bulletin* not less than thirty days in advance of the Meeting.

2. Members, chapters, and regional groups of the Association may propose resolutions to the Committee on Resolutions, either directly to a member or members of the Committee, or through the General Secretary. Proposals not received at least thirty days before the Meeting may be moved from the floor only if they concern matters that have arisen subsequently. For the purposes of this rule, resolutions shall be construed to mean expressions of opinion by a Meeting, not constituting legislative action of the Association.

3. The Committee on Resolutions shall consider all resolutions proposed to it and shall submit recommended resolutions to the Meeting. The Committee may initiate resolutions and may recommend modifications of the resolutions submitted to it.

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY SENATE ROLL *** DATE: November 25, 1974

Please initial in blank if present. Guests should sign in space provided.

____ Clark Ahlberg	____ Keith Graham	____ Gerald Paske
____ Bert Ali	____ Stephen Gray	____ William Perel
____ James Bartz	____ Gary Greenberg	____ Larry Reece
____ Lloyd Benningfield	____ Geraldine Hammond	____ James Rhatigan
____ Stephen Brady	____ James Ho	____ David Ringer
____ John Breazeale	____ Lowell Holmes	____ Ben Rogers
____ Donald Brewer	____ Martha Houston	____ Elizabeth Searle
____ Jeneva Brewer	____ Bobbye Humphrey	____ Sam Shanmugam
____ Phyllis Burgess	____ Rosa Ireland	____ Douglas Sharp
____ Jack Burnett	____ Charles Jakowatz	____ Jimmy Skaggs
____ Kathleen Camin	____ Jackie Kannon	____ Benjamin Smith
____ Robert Cathers	____ Roger Kasten	____ Betty Sullivan
____ Leonard Chaffee	____ Dorothy Knight	____ Annette TenElshof
____ Allan Cress	____ Paul Magelli	____ Gordon Terwilliger
____ Orpha Duell	____ William Mathis	____ William Unrau
____ Colon Dunn	____ John McBride	____ Carol Weaver
____ Glenn Fisher	____ David McFarland	____ Pete Weigand
____ Dorothy Froning	____ Lawrence McKibbin	____ Betty Welsbacher
____ Albert Gosman	____ Eric Melgren	____ Bill Wix
____ Andrea Goudie	____ Nancy Millett	____ Glen Zumwalt
	____ Carmen Ness	

GUESTS PRESENT:
(please print)

Fran C. Stephens
Richard L. Neumann
Jasper Sghad
Robert M. Smith
Frank Garofalo
Craig Adstegge

UNIVERSITY SENATE
Wichita State University

Minutes of the Meeting of November 25, 1974. (Vol. XI. No. 6)

Members Present: Ahlberg, Brady, J. Brewer, Burgess, Camin, Cathers, Chaffee, Cress, Duell, Fisher, Froning, Gosman, Goudie, Greenberg, Ho, Houston, Humphrey, Ireland, Jakowatz, Mathis, Millett, Paske, Perel, Rhatigan, Rogers, Searle, Sullivan, TenElshof, Unrau, Weaver, Welsbacher, Zumwalt.
Members Absent: Ali, Bartz, Benningfield, Breazeale, D. Brewer, Burnett, Dunn, Graham, Gray, Hammond, Holmes, Kannon, Kasten, Knight, Magelli, McBride, McFarland, McKibbin, Melgren, Ness, Reece, Ringer, Shanmugam, Sharp, Skaggs, Smith, Terwilliger, Weigand, Wix.
Guests Present: Fran C. Stephens, Richard L. Neumann, Jasper Schad, Robert M. Smith, Hannes Zachuries, Frank Garofalo, Martin A. Reif, Craig Holstegge.

I. The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by President Camin.

II. Mr. Greenberg read a statement concerning the recent cancellation of "The Second New York Erotic Film Festival" program. (See Attachment B). Mr. Greenberg proposed a Senate investigation of the cancellation. The Chair said the proposal would go to the Agenda Committee.

Mr. Perel spoke to the Senate about the Bachelor of Engineering Technology Degree approved by the Senate on November 11, 1974. He indicated concern that one of the options (Electrical Technology) contained a computer course listed in the first semester which might not permit accommodation for the proper prerequisite. He also stated that two elective courses (associated with computer technology) had not been discussed with the computer science faculty and might receive criticism when considered at the General Faculty Meeting.

III. The Chair asked unanimous consent to approve the University Senate Minutes of November 11, 1974. Senators Hammond, Ho, Humphrey, Houston, Ireland, Jakowatz, Kannon, Kasten, and Knight asked that the minutes be amended to show them present. There being no further objection, the minutes were approved as amended.

VI. A. Mr. Glenn Miller reported on the Ad Hoc Collective Bargaining Committee Report Part II. He stated that the materials referred to in the document will be collected and distributed with no direct costs to the colleges. Mr. Miller moved adoption of the report. (Attachment B, Meeting of November 25). The motion passed.

B. Mr. Paul Ackerman presented the report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure. As part of his discussion, he spoke on the "quota" aspect of the tenure question. Included in the discussion was the WSU current practive and whether or not it constituted a conflict with the AAUP statement "On the Imposition of Tenure Quotas." Mr. Ackerman stated that the Ad Hoc Committee felt that our current practice was not considered a quota but one member of the committee was concerned that it might evolve into a quota

system. This topic was discussed in the light of the AAUP wording which states "Foreclosing promotion to a tenured position because of a numerical quota is unacceptable." It was moved to adopt the October 20, 1973 AAUP statement, "On the Imposition of Tenure Quotas," as official university policy. The motion passed.

VII. A. Ms. Fran Stephens presented the Report on General Studies. (See Attachment C). After considerable discussion on the upper-lower division status of General Studies courses and requirement of prerequisites, it was moved to accept the report. The motion passed.

Ms. Stephens will report back to the Senate with additional information on the prerequisites of General Studies courses and the transfer status of General Studies courses.

Mr. Paske moved the consideration of Mr. Brady's report from the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Time Format (Attachment D) be postponed until the next meeting. It was seconded. The motion was defeated.

Mr. Brady then reported on the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Time Format. After discussion on the report, Mr. Brady moved the acceptance of the report. Mr. Paske called for a quorum. A quorum was present. A motion was made to close debate. The motion passed. The report was accepted by voice vote.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.