



University Senate Archives

University Senate

Academic year 1982-1983

Volume XIX

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of September 27, 1982

Additional information: Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at:
<http://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/15278>

one side

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY SENATE

AGENDA

Meeting Notice: September 27, 1982, 126 Clinton Hall, 3:30 p.m.

Order of Business:

- I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
- II. Informal Proposals and Statements
- III. Approval of the minutes for the meeting of September 13, 1982 (Vol. XIX, No. 2).
- IV. Old Business:

Adoption of statement on faculty ethics--
Dr. James Clark, Chair, Welfare Committee
(Attachment A)

V. New Business:

Report on fall enrollment and related matters--
William E. Wynne, Registrar

Addition to Constitution: Sabbatical Leave
Review Committee (SLRC)--Dr. James Clark,
Chair, Welfare Committee

* (Attachment B)

VI. Adjournment

* Senators, please consult the Sabbatical Leave statement in the Faculty Handbook (yellow cover), page 32, for a comparison to the Sabbatical Leave Guidelines being proposed.

Wichita State University

ATTACHMENT A
To Agenda 9/27/82

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

To University Senate members Date Sept. 20, 1982
From Gary Greenberg, Social Sciences Senator
Subject Draft of AAUP Professional Ethics Statement

The attached is a copy of the 1966 AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics. I have changed the statement from the original only in the use of gender free language.

I have paranthetically inserted key passages from the Welfare Committee document which represent changes from the original which seemed substantive to me.

*Amended, passed, referred to editing committee
For final version see Attachment A 11-8-82*

the development of a Handbook of Student Rights and Responsibilities (which has been in the air in recent years) and offered him whatever help we could give. The Handbook could offer an extended discussion of what constitutes plagiarism and other forms of cheating, and the catalog could refer to this.

Once cheating has been defined fairly well and the definition is available to all students, it will be appropriate to attempt to delimit what sorts of penalties are appropriate for various forms of cheating. The latter question is one of those raised by the Student Academic Court. In the absence of any clear delineation of what constitutes cheating that is available to all students, our committee did not feel that we could impose standardized penalties.

STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

I. The professor, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognizes the special responsibilities placed upon him/her. His/Her primary responsibility to his/her subject is to seek and to state the truth as he/she sees it. To this end he/she devotes his/her energies to developing and improving his/her scholarly competence. He/She accepts the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgement in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. He/She practices ["accepts the need for"] intellectual honesty. Although he/she may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise his/her freedom of inquiry.

II. As a teacher, the professor encourages the free pursuit of learning in his/her students. He/She holds before them the best scholarly standards of his/her discipline. He/She demonstrates respect for the student as an individual, and adheres to his/her proper role as intellectual guide and counselor. He/She makes every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that his/her evaluation of students reflects their true merit. He/She respects the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. He/She avoids any exploitation of students for his/her private advantage and acknowledges significant assistance from them. He/She protects their academic freedom.

III. As a colleague, the professor has obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. He/She respects and defends the free inquiry of his/her associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas he/she shows due respect for the opinion of others. He/She acknowledges his/ academic debts and strives to be objective in his/her professional judgement of colleagues. He/She accepts his/her share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of his/her institution.

IV. As a member of his/her institution, the professor seeks above all to be an effective teacher and scholar. Although he/she observes the stated regulations of the institution, provided they do not contravene academic freedom, he/she maintains his/her right to criticize and seek revision [omitted from the Welfare Committee document]. He/She determines the amount and character of the work he/she does outside his/her institution with due regard to his/her paramount responsibilities within it ["They avoid any involvement in other activities which might result in their failure to adequately perform their responsibilities as faculty members"]. When considering interruption or termination of his/her service, he/she recognizes the effect of his/her decision upon the program of the institution and gives due notice of his/her intention.

V. As a member of his/her community, the professor has the rights and obligations of any citizen. He/She measures the urgency of these obligations in the light of his/her responsibilities to his/her subject, to his/her students, his/her profession, and to his/her institution. When he/she speaks or acts as a private person he/she avoids creating the impression that he/she speaks or acts for his/her college or university. As a citizen engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, the professor has a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry "and to further public understanding of academic freedom" [This passage is omitted from the Welfare Committee document.]

[6. "To assist them...." This paragraph, added by the Welfare Committee does not appear in the AAUP Statement, nor should it since the organization adopts this position in the 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom on Tenure, which this University and the Board of Regents have already adopted as official policy.]

To Agenda CommitteeDate Sept. 17, 1982From Jim Clark, Chair, Welfare Committee*Document 5*Subject Sabbatical Leave Review Committee (SLRC)

11. Sabbatical Leave Review Committee (SLRC)

a. Composition (7 members)

1. Faculty representatives (4)
2. Administration representatives (3)

b. Selection: Faculty representatives are nominated by the Committee on Committees and elected by the Senate for three year staggered terms. The administration representatives are selected by the Vice President for Academic Affairs for one year terms.

c. Charge: The Sabbatical Leave Review Committee reviews applications for sabbatical leave and forwards recommendations on the applicants to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The committee also continuously reviews the University guidelines on sabbatical leaves and makes recommendations for changes as appropriate.

Amended as above and passed

University Guidelines--Sabbatical Leaves

Wichita State University's policy on sabbatical leaves is based on the Board of Regents Policy on Leaves as adopted 12-16-61 and amended 4-17-69 and 6-25-71, and reads as follows:

In strictly meritorious cases, a faculty member who has served continuously at one or more of the six state schools for six years or longer may, upon the recommendation of the president, be granted leave of absence with part pay for a period not exceeding one year, for purpose of pursuing advanced study, conducting research studies, or securing appropriate industrial or professional experience. Nine-month faculty members may receive up to half pay for an academic year or up to full pay for one semester. Twelve-month faculty members may receive up to half pay for 11 months or up to full pay for five months. Regents' policy limits the number of sabbatical leaves in any fiscal year to not more than 4 percent of the equivalent full-time faculty with rank of instructor or higher. (Wichita State University Faculty Handbook, 1978, page 32)

A faculty member applying for sabbatical leave is required to file an official Application for Sabbatical Leave and sign a Sabbatical Leave Agreement by which he/she agrees to return to the service of ~~one of the state in~~ ^{the institution} ~~stitutions under the Board of Regents~~ ^{from} for a period of at least two years immediately following expiration of the period of leave. In the event of failure to return, the faculty member agrees to refund all sabbatical pay, or, on failure to remain for at least two years, to refund that portion of sabbatical pay which is in proportion to the amount of time not served as required by the agreement.

Sabbatical leave requests should be prepared on official forms which are obtainable in a packet from the Office of Academic Affairs. Leave requests are due in the Academic Affairs Office no later than December 15 of the academic year preceding the proposed leave. Leave requests are then referred to the Sabbatical Leave Review Committee (SLRC), a committee whose charge is to review leave proposals in terms of merit, solicit additional information where needed, and make ranked recommendations to the Vice - President for Academic Affairs who performs the final evaluation. The SLRC

makes its recommendations no later than March 1, and institutional decisions concerning sabbatical leaves are made no later than March 15. Each applicant is informed of University action on his/her sabbatical leave request by March 30. Requests approved by the University are submitted to the April meeting of the Board of Regents for Board action.

Procedures and policies established for sabbatical leaves are as follows:

1. The applicant requests and receives from the Office of Academic Affairs a packet which includes the WSU Application for Sabbatical Leave, the Board of Regents Sabbatical Leave Agreement form, and the WSU Summary of Review form.
2. Each leave application form is completed in sufficient detail to permit review by the SLRC and evaluation by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The application is first submitted to the applicant's chairperson, who transmits the form through his/her dean to the Vice - President for Academic Affairs for delivery to the SLRC.
3. Recommendations from the chairperson and the dean, detailed on the Summary of Review form, accompany the application when it is transmitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The recommendation must include a statement from the applicant's chairperson or dean concerning provision to be made for the work load of the applicant during his/her absence. The statement should cover the direction of those graduate students for whom the applicant is the thesis or dissertation advisor. It should also indicate whether any additional expense to the University, apart from sabbatical salary, would occur if the leave were granted. Applications involving such additional costs are not ordinarily approved without special justification.

4. If the proposed program of work is contingent upon the applicant's receiving additional financial aid from the University, apart from sabbatical salary, or from external sources, details concerning such contingency should be included on the Summary of Review form. The sources from which external support is being sought should be identified and the nature of any services required in connection with the receipt of such support should be related to the purpose of the leave.
5. No later than 60 days from the first day of classes in the semester of the faculty member's return from sabbatical leave, he/she is required to submit a Final Report on the sabbatical projects. A form for filing this report will be sent to the faculty member early in the semester of his/her return to campus. The completed Final Report is to be submitted, through the chairperson and dean, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. It will be referred to the SLRC and the President, then transmitted to the Faculty Records Clerk in the office of Academic Affairs for filing in the permanent records of the University. If appropriate, the Final Report should include a description of specific plans for sharing the results of the sabbatical leave with the recipient's departmental colleagues or other groups on campus.

The Sabbatical Leave policy of the Regents' system, and Wichita State in particular, is based on the assumption that such leaves do not occur automatically at stated intervals, but are awarded on merit and are clearly designed to encourage scholarly and professional achievement for the mutual benefit of the faculty member and the University.

The scope of activities that may be undertaken by WSU faculty on sabbatical leaves is quite broad, encompassing not only the traditional purpose of scholarly research, but the more non-traditional purposes of professional development or redevelopment. At WSU, leaves have been granted for advanced study, for specific research projects, for creative projects, for curriculum/instructional development, for residencies to observe the programs and methods of other institutions, for travel related to academic and professional development, for occupational experience designed to enhance professional qualifications, and many other similar purposes. Work toward a graduate degree does not normally qualify as an acceptable program for a sabbatical leave.

Sabbatical leave programs properly serve the interests of the faculty member and the University as a whole. Faculty who have accumulated service with the University benefit from having a period away from normal campus obligations in order to pursue special interests or projects related to their professional lives. The period of renewal offered by such leave also benefits the University, which welcomes back at the conclusion of a successful leave a faculty member with new ideas, enthusiasm, and accomplishments.

The sabbatical leave application process contains some features designed to enhance the probability of successful sabbatical leaves. In the application materials, faculty are asked to demonstrate special aptitude for their proposed projects, indicating previous professional or scholarly work related to the area of activity proposed for the leave. Sufficient documentation must be presented to enable the University to conclude that the goals of the leave probably will be accomplished and that the project cannot be completed without such a leave.

A particular concern of the University is the difficulty of granting leaves to faculty in small departments. A disproportionate negative effect may be felt by students and colleagues when a faculty member who is the only person with programmatic expertise needed on a regular basis by the department takes a sabbatical or other type of leave. Faculty members in small departments, therefore, need to plan their leaves in advance, and obtain assurance from their department and college that arrangements can be made to cover their responsibilities while absent. As previously indicated, Regents' policy limits the number of sabbatical leaves in any fiscal year to not more than 4% of the equivalent full-time faculty with rank of instructor or higher. The University further stipulates that the number of leaves in any fiscal year may not be so great in any department, division, or college, or on the campus as a whole, as to disrupt the continued and regular course offerings, or to affect the quality of education offered to the students. Final approval of the sabbatical leave for a faculty member being reviewed for continuous tenure is contingent upon the awarding of tenure.

Questions regarding the sabbatical leave policies and procedures of the University may be addressed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

UNIVERSITY SENATE
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

NO SENATE MEETING OCTOBER 11, 1982

The Agenda for the next meeting will
be distributed at a later date.

UNIVERSITY SENATE
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the meeting of September 27, 1982, (Vol. XIX, No. 3).

Members Present: Aagaard, Billings, Breazeale, Brewer, Carmody, Chaffee, Clark, Crown, Davis, Dreifort, Duell, Egbert, Fox, Gosman, Graham, Greenberg, Hunt, James, Janeksela, Kruger, Mathis, McCabe, McCollum, McLeod, Meisch, Menhusen, Milbrandt, Millett, Myers, Nelson, Olson, Rhatigan, Rozzelle, Schoenhofer, Schrag, Sojka, Soles, Tanner, Thibault, Thomann, Throckmorton, Tilford, Wilhelm, Wilkerson, Wineke.

Members Absent: Ahlberg, Alexander, Brinkman, Childs, Harmon, Lee, May, Terrell, Zoller.

Guests: Bill Wynne, Virgil Pangburn, Paula Rhoads.

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Mathis called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

II.
INFORMAL
PROPOSALS
AND
STATEMENTS

Vice President Breazeale announced that the architectural firm of Schaefer and Associates, Wichita, has been appointed to design the Ablah Library expansion.

President Mathis reported briefly on the activities of the Council of Senate Presidents. This group, which includes the Senate Presidents at the state Regents institutions, has met three times this year, with most of its discussions devoted to comparison of the way in which separate institutions have addressed the problem of reducing their budgets. Except where particular personnel situations have obliged them to adopt unique policies, the institutions have gone about cutting their budgets in similar ways.

President Mathis reported that the Senate Presidents have renewed discussion of improvements in fringe benefits for faculty at Regents institutions and observed that no formal action has been taken on last year's proposals. He said that the Senate Welfare Committee has been asked to solicit the opinion of faculty on the issue of fringe benefits.

President Mathis also announced that the Welfare Committee has been asked to look into the possibility of the University's withdrawal from participation in the Social Security system.

Senator Clark, chair of the Welfare Committee, announced that that committee is putting together a questionnaire asking faculty members to indicate the priority they attach to fringe benefits, relative to salary, and to identify the particular fringe benefits they prefer.

Senator Hunt reminded the Senate of the coming voter registration campaign sponsored by SGA and ASK and urged senators to register to vote.

Senator Dreifort expressed frustration over the fringe benefits issue, observing that efforts to increase them have been made for a number of years with no result. He noted that one of the main obstacles to improvement has been a lack of consensus among the different institutions. He urged the Welfare Committee to act promptly.

President Mathis agreed that there is a lack of consensus among the Regents institutions; this has been evident from discussions among the Senate Presidents.

III.

APPROVAL OF
MINUTES

The minutes of the September 13, 1982, Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

IV. OLD
BUSINESS

Statement on
Faculty
Ethics

President Mathis reminded the Senate that the motion on the floor was the substitute motion made by Senator Greenberg at the previous meeting of the Senate. He ruled that, as a substitute motion, it was subject to only one amendment. He then opened the floor for discussion.

AMENDMENT

Senator McLeod, speaking in support of the substitute motion, offered as a friendly amendment a change in the language, which would be to put the word "professor" and all the pronouns which refer to "professor" throughout the document into their plural forms. Senator Greenberg, preferring the singular forms of those words, declined to accept the motion as a friendly amendment. Senator McLeod then moved the change as an amendment. Senator Dreifort seconded.

Senator Nelson observed that use of the plural has become a standard alternative to use of the masculine pronoun in documents. Another device has been the use of masculine and feminine pronouns in alternate paragraphs.

Senator Dreifort stated that use of the plural would promote clarity.

Senator Graham observed that the statement on faculty ethics proposed by the Welfare Committee uses the plural in referring to faculty members and an "each...their" construction in identifying the responsibilities of faculty members. He thought this an acceptable compromise.

Senator Clark stated that he would support such a change as a friendly amendment.

After some discussion, Senator McLeod's amendment was changed to require that the word "professor" remain in the singular and be preceded by "each." Pronouns referring to "each professor" would be cast in the plural form.

Senator Schrag stated that this revision would result in a document less felicitous than the original. He doubted that it would serve the interests of clarity.

Senator Mathis reminded the Senate that if the substitute motion passed, the document could still be amended.

VOTE

The motion to amend the document passed.

Senator Greenberg spoke on behalf of the substitute motion, arguing that it has the weight of the AAUP behind it and that it is a clearer, more forceful statement on faculty ethics than that proposed by the Welfare Committee.

Senator Clark spoke against the substitute motion, arguing that the statement proposed by the Welfare Committee, which was based on the AAUP statement, is more specifically related to conditions at this institution in the present time, particularly on matters related to student rights.

Senator Duell expressed concern over the effect of the amendment just passed, should the substitute motion pass.

Senator Dreifort, acting as parliamentarian, pointed out that the substitute motion could then be treated as a main motion, subject to amendment; the document could also be referred to an editing committee.

Senator Greenberg, in response to an argument of Senator Clark's, stated that the AAUP document is clear in its support of student rights.

Senator Dreifort, in support of the substitute motion, observed that the statement proposed by the Welfare Committee seems to attempt to legislate behavior for every contingency. He doubted that this could be done.

Senator Davis questioned the use of "professors" in the statement and asked if the document shouldn't cover all faculty.

Senator Clark replied that his committee's proposal was written with teaching faculty in mind.

VOTE The substitute motion, to adopt the AAUP statement on faculty ethics, passed.

MOTION Senator Dreifort moved to have the document submitted to an editing committee chaired by the Secretary of the Senate for stylistic revision. Senator Gosman seconded.

VOTE The motion to submit the statement on faculty ethics to an editing committee passed.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Report from the Registrar
Mr. Wynne, Registrar, reported to the Senate on fall enrollments and other matters. He announced that the University has experienced its highest fall enrollment this year. For state-reporting purposes, 17,187 students enrolled for a total of 155,758 credit hours--percentage increases of 1.4 and 2.7, respectively. He noted that the vast majority of new students are undergraduates and that, for the second consecutive year, the average credit hour load per student has increased. On the other hand, enrollments by continuing education students have declined, as have enrollments in evening, weekend, and off-campus classes. The percentage of female students has risen to 51.5.

Senator Thomann asked what was meant by the phrase "state-reporting purposes." Mr. Wynne replied that there are classes (such as certain off-campus classes and ROTC classes) that we cannot count. Also, we may not count students who enrolled but then withdrew from the university.

9/27/82

-4-

Senator Thomann expressed concern about a situation in which enrollments are increasing while our budget is being reduced.

Senator Dreifort observed that it seems easier to find parking places on Tuesday and Thursday than on the other days of the week. He asked if it would be possible to compile statistics on enrollment patterns according to days of the week. Mr. Wynne replied that it could be done, but that his office was not currently doing it.

Senator Gosman asked if the decline in evening enrollments was the result of decreased demand or decreased availability of courses. Mr. Wynne answered that he did not have information on that but that he suspects that both factors have contributed to the decline.

Senator Sojka, noting that legislative committees have been making enrollment projections for a number of years, asked how those projections could be reconciled to the actual figures.

Vice President Breazeale acknowledged that these projections have been made and that they have generally projected declines in enrollment. He did not know how they could be reconciled with present enrollments. Vice President Rhatigan added that he has had some experience with projections on a state committee and observed that these projections have not been very useful.

Vice President Breazeale announced that 80% of our returning students were enrolled last year, while the remainder were "stop out" students.

Senator Rozzelle asked if it were true that, while an increase of enrollments is no real advantage to the University, a decrease in enrollments is a distinct disadvantage, in terms of funding.

Vice President Breazeale reviewed the relationship of fee income to budgeting, pointing out that a decrease in enrollments results in a fee deficit, which affects budgeting for the following year. On the other hand, a fee surplus, if sustained over the fall and spring semesters, would not be reflected in the budget for two years. Any increase, moreover, would be modified by what he described as the "corridor effect."

Senator Thomann asked if budgetary projections were not complicated by our lack of knowledge of legislative behavior in the future. Vice President Breazeale replied that they were.

Mr. Wynne briefly discussed a study of preregistration that has been conducted by associate deans of the colleges. No immediate changes in preregistration are planned. He pointed out that, of the 8,799 students who preregistered last spring, only 7.5% did not complete enrollment this fall.

Mr. Wynne also discussed progress toward computer registration, which, he advised, would have some impact on students but very little on faculty members. It is not at present an official subject of discussion, though technical circumstances may be moving us toward it. He stated that the University needs to decide what it wants such a system to do and that costs are a consideration.

A long-range goal of the Registrar's office is the development of a single-page degree-progress sheet as a tool for students and advisers. But this, according to Mr. Wynne, is some years in the future.

Sabbatical
Leave
Guidelines &
Sabbatical
Leave

Senator Clark, Chair of the Welfare Committee, presented a proposal for the acceptance of Sabbatical Leave Guidelines and the establishment of a Sabbatical Leave Review Committee to the Senate.

He prefaced his motion by pointing out that an ad hoc committee, appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, has been reviewing sabbatical leave applications for several years. The impetus for the present proposal originated with that committee, who considered it desirable to make the guidelines on sabbatical leave applications more explicit than they now are and to formalize the review process.

Senator Clark stated that the Welfare Committee adopted much of what the ad hoc committee originally proposed. However, where the ad hoc committee proposed an SLRC composition of three faculty members and three administrative representatives, the Welfare Committee is proposing to raise the number of faculty members to four. He stated that the Welfare Committee decided against recommending the composition usual to standing committees of the Senate because this is a specialized committee with a heavy work load.

MOTION

Senator Clark moved adoption, first, of the Sabbatical Leave Guidelines and, second, of the proposal to establish the Sabbatical Leave Review Committee (SLRC).

Senator Greenberg pointed to a statement on page four of Attachment B: "Work toward a graduate degree does not normally qualify as an acceptable program for a sabbatical leave." He asked when a sabbatical leave is ever granted for such a purpose.

Vice President Breazeale replied that fifteen years ago it was not unusual for the University to grant sabbatical leaves for this purpose, although it is quite unusual now. He stated that on occasion a tenured faculty member has been granted a leave in order to pursue doctoral work and that, for certain areas which are undersupplied with faculty members holding doctorates, it is a useful provision to have.

Senator Dreifort asked what motive lies behind the move to formalize the review process with a standing committee.

Senator Thomann replied that the Welfare Committee, aware that very substantial amounts of money are involved, felt that the faculty should have a role in deciding who would be on a committee reviewing leave requests.

Vice President Breazeale added that, in putting together ad hoc committees, he has sought to use care and balance in the selection of members. He pointed out that there is a wide range of quality in sabbatical leave requests; hence the desirability of more explicit guidelines. He also stated that faculty participation increases faculty awareness of how sabbatical leave money is spent.

-6-

Senator Myers expressed concern over the provision to have this committee, which lacks the normal representation of standing committees, make ranked recommendations.

Senator Thomann replied that the Welfare Committee had initially considered making the composition of the SLRC consistent with that of other committees. He stated that, in the end, it was felt that a smaller committee could handle the volume of work more efficiently. Also, there was objection to giving the faculty a seven-to-three majority on the SLRC.

Senator Soles asked if the guidelines and review were intended to apply to administrators or faculty holding administrative positions. Senator Clark replied that the proposal makes no specific reference to that issue, adding that he is not sure whether administrators are eligible for sabbatical leaves.

Vice President Breazeale stated that administrators are eligible but that the practice of granting sabbatical leaves to them is infrequent.

Senator Clark, responding to Senator Myers' concerns, stated that he has no real objection to broadening the SLRC, though he believes that a smaller committee will be more efficient.

Senator Greenberg asked if this proposal amounted to an amendment to the Constitution. Senator Clark replied that it was not and that only the addition of a technical and advisory committee is proposed. Senator Greenberg asked what the composition of a technical and advisory committee is. President Mathis replied that there is no fixed composition for such a committee.

Senator Millett asked if anyone in the room had had experience on the ad hoc committees reviewing sabbatical leave requests in previous years. Senator Throckmorton replied that she served on one two years ago and that that experience had suggested the need for the guidelines and committee proposed. The ad hoc committee often found it necessary to request further information from applicants before making recommendations; it would facilitate the process to have all pertinent information on a request from the beginning. Senator Throckmorton also stated her belief that a small committee would give requests more thorough review than a larger one could.

Senator Dreifort observed that committees with standard composition don't always function well; membership seems to be more important than size.

Senator Greenberg asked what percentage of sabbatical leave requests have been denied in the past. Vice President Breazeale replied that, while there is an upper limit of 4% on the number of faculty who may be awarded leaves in a given year, we have never reached that limit. He estimated that the rejection rate has been under 5%.

Senator Dreifort asked if the legality of the provision requiring faculty members to serve two years after returning from a sabbatical leave has ever been tested in court. Vice President Breazeale replied that, to his knowledge, it has not.

VOTE

The motion to adopt the Sabbatical Leave Guidelines passed.

Vice President Breazeale raised a point of information, asking if it were not true that the establishment of committee composition is the provenance of the Rules Committee and if the presently contemplated action would require an amendment. President Mathis replied in the negative.

MOTION

Senator Thomann moved to amend the proposal by adding the following sentence to the charge of the SLRC: "The committee also continuously reviews the University guidelines on sabbatical leaves and makes recommendations for changes to the Vice President for Academic Affairs." Senator Carmody seconded.

Senator Greenberg asked if this provision gave too much power to the committee. Senator Thomann replied that conditions can change and that the committee ought to be in a position to respond to change.

AMENDMENT

Senator Throckmorton offered, as a friendly amendment, substitution of the phrase, "as appropriate," for "to the Vice President for Academic Affairs." It was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Senator Duell observed that committees sometimes find the guidelines under which they are working to be impediments; a committee with the power to recommend changes could do so without great effort.

VOTE

The amendment to the proposal passed.

Senator Duell, noting that as a technical committee the SLRC would not be required to make an oral report to the Senate each year, asked whether the Senate would want to make such a requirement explicit in the committee's charge. Senator Millett observed that the Senate Agenda Committee is already empowered to request reports from committees.

VOTE

The motion to establish the Sabbatical Leave Review Committee passed as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Donald Wineke, Senate Secretary
Lucille Brodie, Recording Secretary