

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH MINUTES
October 10, 1980

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m., Joseph Moldenhauer presiding.

Mr. Moldenhauer reminded the Department that the General Faculty would meet on Tuesday, October 28 at 4:00 p.m. in Hogg Auditorium. President Flawn will present the President's Associates Teaching Awards at this meeting; two of these \$5,000 awards will be awarded for excellence in English composition teaching and one will be awarded for contributions to Plan II. Mr. Moldenhauer urged all faculty to attend this important meeting.

The next Department meeting will probably be held on Friday, October 24 and will concern itself in part with senior recruitment and in part with departmental governance.

Robert Twombly spoke briefly about the Honors Program. During the next two weeks he and Larry Carver will be interviewing prospective members for a few slots that will become open in the Spring 1981 semester. Mr. Twombly asked all faculty to encourage promising students to apply to the Program. In addition, Mr. Twombly appealed to the Department for its help in spreading the facts about the Honors Program. English Honors is an alternative degree program designed to reward and encourage superior undergraduate scholarship. It is designed for students who are independent and self-motivated. Students have the option of enrolling in Honors seminars or in an English Honors Tutorial course under the direction of a chosen faculty member (a creative writing project, for example, would be appropriate in the tutorial course). More information about eligibility and requirements can be obtained in the Undergraduate Advising Center in Parlin 114. Mr. Twombly stressed that the Department should not lose excellent candidates because of misinformation or a lack of information about the Program. There were several suggestions for improved outreach in the Program. Mr. Moldenhauer asked concerned faculty members to contribute their suggestions in writing to the Honors Committee (Twombly, Carver, Ayres, Lidoff).

Alan Friedman, Chair of the Governance Committee, introduced the scheduled business of the meeting: the Governance Committee Report of October 1980, distributed in three parts prior to the meeting. Mr. Friedman said that today's meeting was intended as a follow-up to the Department meeting of April 18, 1980, when the Committee presented its preliminary report.

Mr. Friedman briefly described the background of the Executive Committee in the Department. In 1968 the Department approved an alternative form of the Budget Council known as the Executive Committee; the Executive Committee was comprised of both tenured

and non-tenured faculty. The HOP stipulates that the EC must be reviewed every three years and proposals for eliminating, revising, or continuing the EC must be forwarded to the Dean for his recommendation to the President. The last review was held in November 1978; however, it has received no administrative approval.

Mr. Friedman read to the Department the HOP guidelines for Budget Councils (§ 2.05. Budget Councils, copy attached). He interpreted the provision for changes in departmental governance to be as follows:

- (a) Recommendations for change would be voted on by mail ballot; and
- (b) Voting constituency could be interpreted in two ways:
 - (1) All voting members of the Department must vote to change to a new system of governance; or
 - (2) Changes in an existing alternative system (i.e., modifications in the EC Constitution) could be approved only by the tenured faculty members unless they choose to include all voting members in the decision.

Therefore, Mr. Friedman suggested that a tenured member of the faculty move to either limit the decision to tenured faculty (as per § 2.05, paragraph 5) or extend the decision to include all voting members of the Department (as per § 2.05, paragraph 3). Max Westbrook moved to include all voting members of the faculty in the decision on revisions and modifications of the existing EC. Warwick Wadlington seconded the motion. Mr. Friedman directed only the tenured members of the Department to vote on the motion; the motion passed.

In response to a procedural question, Mr. Friedman explained that it was true that the Department could not decide on EC revisions in plenary session; that must be done by mail ballot only. However, the purpose of the meeting was to determine what should be included in this ballot; it was therefore important for the Committee to receive departmental input on this matter. With regard to a timetable for the discussion and ensuing mail ballot, the Governance Committee would like to discuss first its recommendations for changes in the EC Constitution, then the "Constitution" or "Organization" of the Department, and then the Glossary. Mr. Friedman emphasized that not everything in the report had been reconciled; there were a couple of potential discrepancies for which reconciliation didn't seem crucial until the Committee knew general departmental sentiment. It seems to the Committee that the best way to proceed is to go through the entire report, letting the Department accept, reject, or modify

portions of the document as it sees fit. The Governance Committee will then meet again to conform language and intention throughout the document according to departmental sentiment and for preparation for a final ballot.

Before beginning general discussion on the Committee's recommended changes to the EC Constitution, Mr. Friedman reported on the Committee's solicitation of the Department for its views of the make-up of the present Executive Committee. The survey resulted from a meeting of the Executive Committee with Deans King and Weinstock on 12 September. The Deans presented the EC with documents which included the excerpted paragraph that was distributed with the survey. The Deans indicated that they had heard a number of complaints from some unspecified members of the Department (unspecified as to who they were and how many there were); the exact nature of these complaints was also unspecified. The EC decided that an investigation of the extent of the discontent within the Department should be conducted; the Governance Committee was asked to solicit complaints from the Department about the distribution of membership on the EC. The Committee asked for anonymous responses so that everyone would feel free to be honest and forthright. Mr. Friedman shared the results of the survey with the Department. Out of 108 ballots distributed to the voting members of the Department, 30 responses were received. (One was an attack on the Committee for doing the survey; it was not on "official" paper nor was it enclosed in an "official" envelope. It was deemed irrelevant to the Committee's inquiry.) Mr. Friedman read a portion of the report from the Chairman to Dean King of October 8:

Six responses agreed [with the Dean's position] that the EC disproportionately reflects the work and interests of the department, and that some restructuring should occur. However, these six differed among themselves on the categories for EC membership division, on the causes and nature of the imbalance, and on modes of correcting the imbalance. One, for instance, named "literary history" as an under-represented faculty interest. Another stressed that women are under-represented. Some of these responses make no suggestions for remedies; others suggest such things as "internal reform" and abolition of the EC.

Twenty-two of the responses were explicitly supportive of the present EC structure or took issue with the Dean's position; in general, these responses contained detailed and carefully constructed arguments. Some of the recurrent themes were [quoting from the

October 8 report to the Dean]:

- (a) That the categories in the decanal memo are unsatisfactory because many faculty members fit into two or more categories and because the department properly encourages such overlappings.
- (b) That the EC is not a curriculum and policy committee, but rather a committee on salary and promotions. The membership of the EC should, therefore, not so much reflect area-group interests as reflect the interests of the department as a whole. That task can best be achieved by electing the most discriminating, good-willed, and intelligent faculty available, regardless of area of interest.
- (c) That the imposition of an EC structured according to interest-group categories would create divisiveness.
- (d) That several groups other than those named in the decanal memo might legitimately seek greater representation: women, Medievalists, Renaissance scholars, for example, and the vast group of AIs and Instructors, who teach most of the department's lower-division writing courses and yet are virtually disenfranchised.
- (e) That the teaching of writing and the teaching of literature are completely intertwined, that the English faculty teaches writing in all of its courses, and that the abstraction of writing, per se, from our other intellectual activities is philosophically opposed to the ideals of the liberal arts.
- (f) That researchers in writing actually teach very little writing.
- (g) That there is no bloc-voting in the department, or that the bloc-voting is confined exclusively to assistant professors, and that bloc-voting is their right. One writer believes that the composition group has been the most frequent bloc-voting element in the department.
- (h) That the Hare system is expressly designed to counter bloc-voting.
- (i) That no evidence is offered that the EC is imbalanced and in need of restructuring.

The Department then turned its attention to the proposed revisions in the Executive Committee Constitution. Mr. Friedman again explained that the Department would now be voting on the proposals for inclusion in the mail ballot that would be distributed to all voting members of the Department; the Department was not voting on the proposals themselves for recommendation to the Dean.

Proposal (a). Add II.(E) as follows: "Minutes of the EC meetings will be taken by one of its members."

Mr. Friedman moved that the recommendation be accepted as written. Mr. Wadlington seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Proposal (b). In paragraph III.(A)(L), add the underlined words and delete the bracketed words: "Tenured and tenure-track members of the Department's faculty who hold a full-time university appointment shall be eligible to serve on the Executive Committee. [Also eligible are] This includes Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors, and Instructors on joint appointment who have taught at least one course in the department during the three semesters preceding the election. 'Tenure-track' refers only to those non-tenured faculty whose appointments are understood by the EC as leading to a tenure decision."

Joseph Malof explained that this proposal was intended to clarify potential ambiguities in the document; it reflects the current practice of the Department. James Kinneavy objected to the proposal because it excluded Instructors on temporary appointments. Mr. Kinneavy believed that "tenure-track" was an illegal distinction and that the exclusion of Instructors violated the HOP. Mr. Moldenhauer defended the distinction; the UT administration distinguishes between those untenured faculty who are expected to come up for a tenure decision and whose appointments are renewed each year and those untenured faculty whose appointments are explicitly limited to one or two semesters. A motion by Mr. Kinneavy to delete the phrase "'Tenure-track' refers only to those non-tenured faculty whose appointments are understood by the EC as leading to a tenure decision" was defeated.

A motion by William Sutherland to change the phrase "...who have taught at least one course in the department during the three semesters preceding the election..." to "...who have taught at

least one course in the department during the two semesters preceding the election..." was approved.

The proposal as amended read:

"Tenured and tenure-track members of the Department's faculty who hold a full-time university appointment shall be eligible to serve on the Executive Committee. [Also eligible are] This includes Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors, and Instructors on joint appointment who have taught at least one course in the department during the two semesters preceding the election. 'Tenure-track' refers only to those non-tenured faculty whose appointments are understood by the EC as leading to a tenure decision."

Mr. Friedman's motion that the Department accept the proposal as amended was seconded. The motion passed. [See page 11 of the Minutes for a further revision proposed by Mr. Wadlington.]

Proposal (c). In paragraph III.(A)(2), add the underlined words: "Faculty members on visiting or other temporary appointment shall not be eligible to serve. A temporary appointee whose transfer to tenured or tenure-track status. . . ."

Mr. Kinneavy objected to the motion because he believed it discriminates against temporary faculty and establishes an illegal definition of "tenure-track" or "tenure accruing." Mr. Friedman's motion that the recommendation be accepted as written was seconded; the motion passed.

Proposal (d). Change III.(A)(3) as follows: "Faculty members with approved leaves of absence for any part of the term for which the election is being conducted, or who will retire during the term, or who will be on terminal-year appointment during the term, shall not be eligible to serve."

Mr. Friedman explained that the purpose of this proposal is to clarify eligibility with respect to leaves of absence, retirements,

and terminal appointments. A faculty member may not know at the time of the election whether or not he will be on leave for part of the term. The proposal should minimize special elections and serve to increase EC stability and continuity. Mr. Friedman moved that the motion be accepted as written; the motion was seconded. The motion passed. Later, Mr. Moldenhauer asked for reconsideration of the motion. He moved that the word "non-contingent" be inserted before "approved"; such a modification, he said, would eliminate a potential drain on the pool of candidates for EC elections. [This drain occurs because all faculty applying for URI research grants in November must have "approved" leaves of absence (contingent upon receiving the award); the awards are announced in March -- one month after EC elections.] His motion was seconded and passed. The recommendation as amended reads:

"Faculty members with non-contingent approved leaves of absence for any part of the term for which the election is being conducted, or who will retire during the term, or who will be on terminal-year appointment during the term, shall not be eligible to serve."

Proposal (e). Change paragraph III.(A)(4) to read as follows:
"Members are eligible to serve one full term (i.e., two years) and thereafter are ineligible for a period of one year. Terms of less than two years shall not count in the computation of eligibility."

Mr. Wadlington wondered if the benefits of the broader representation for which the proposal is intended would not be outweighed by the penalties such a proposal would impose. Wouldn't the Department gain from the experience of someone who has served longer on the EC than two years? Mr. Wadlington moved that the recommendation be amended as follows:

"Members are eligible to serve two full terms (i.e., four years) and thereafter are ineligible for a period of two years. Terms of less than two years shall not count in the computation of eligibility."

The amendment was seconded and approved. Mr. Friedman moved that the proposal as amended be approved; his motion was seconded. The motion passed.

Proposal (f). Change III.(A)(6) to read as follows: "Membership on the EC of anyone promoted to a different panel during his or her term in office shall terminate on March 1 unless the member has been elected to a position in his or her new panel."

Mr. Friedman's motion that the recommendation be accepted as written was seconded; the motion passed.

Proposal (g). Revise Paragraph III.(B) as follows: "All voting members of the Department's faculty are eligible to vote in Executive Committee elections. Members who are on leave shall be permitted to vote, although they shall not be entitled to have ballots sent to them through the U.S. mail. Visiting faculty shall not be eligible to vote."

In response to a question from Mr. Kinneavy, Mr. Friedman explained that "voting members of the Department" does include temporary faculty on 100% appointment. Mr. Friedman's motion to approve the recommendation as written was seconded; the motion passed.

Proposal (h). Add a new paragraph, III.(C)(5), as follows: "When unusual problems arise regarding an Executive Committee election, or EC membership, appropriate action shall be determined by a committee consisting of the departmental Chair, the elections officer, and the Chair of the Governance Committee. If the last two offices are held by the same person, the Associate Chair shall be added to the committee."

Mr. Friedman said that this recommendation is intended to provide a systematic way of responding to unusual problems; these problems have been handled ad hoc in the past. The Chair of the Governance Committee will be included only if that Committee becomes a Standing Committee of the Department (proposal included elsewhere in the Committee's Report). Mr. Friedman moved that the recommendation be approved as written; the motion was seconded. The motion passed.

Proposal (i). At the end of paragraph III.(D)(1), add the following: "If the first runner-up is unable to serve, the second runner-up shall be elected, and so on. In any case, however, the number of runners-up succeeding to each panel shall not be more than the number of seats filled on that panel in the previous election. If additional vacancies occur, a special election shall be held."

Mr. Friedman's motion that the recommendation be approved as written was seconded; the motion passed.

Proposal (j). Re-number paragraph III.(D)(2) as paragraph III.(D)(5).

Mr. Friedman's motion that the recommendation be approved as written was seconded; the motion passed.

Proposal (k). Add a new paragraph, III.(D)(2): "If a member of the Executive Committee, by resigning, leaves more than one year in the unexpired term, his or her seat shall be filled by a member of the same panel, if any, who had been elected to a one-year term. The seat of the latter shall be filled by a runner-up as described in III.(D)(1). The one exception to this rule is described in III.(D)(3)."

Mr. Friedman noted that this recommendation is intended to regularize the succession to vacancies. His motion to accept the recommendation as written was seconded; the motion passed.

Proposal (l). Add a new paragraph, III.(D)(3): "If a member of the Executive Committee resigns between February 1 and the distribution of the final ballot in the regular annual election, his or her seat will be filled by that election."

Mr. Friedman noted that the regular EC election is held at the end of February; this recommendation is intended to avoid using runners-up for unnecessarily short terms (three weeks) and to prevent

special elections just prior to the regular election. Mr. Friedman's motion to accept the recommendation as written was seconded; the motion passed.

Proposal (m). Add a new paragraph, III.(D)(4): "If a member of the Executive Committee goes on leave of absence, his or her seat shall be declared vacant and shall be filled according to the procedures above."

Mr. Friedman explained that currently there is no provision in the EC Constitution for the status of the unexpired term for a faculty member who goes on an unanticipated leave; recommendation (d) addresses the issue in terms of eligibility to stand for election. The Governance Committee wondered if the decision to relinquish a term on the EC should be mandated or optional. The Committee decided, however, that the burden of heavy committee work should not be imposed upon a faculty member on leave; conversely, EC responsibility is not something that should be slighted by the faculty member on full-time research assignment. Kurt Heinzelman voiced William Scheick's objections to the proposal. [Mr. Scheick was unable to attend the meeting.] Mr. Scheick disagrees with the proposed standardization of procedures and feels that the option should be left with the individual faculty member. Mr. Friedman's motion that the recommendation be approved as written was seconded; the motion passed. [See page 11 of the Minutes for a further revision proposed by Mr. Wadlington.]

Proposal (n). In paragraph IV.(C), replace the second sentence (beginning "Members of the Department should transmit . . .") with the following two sentences: "Members of the Department shall be annually notified by the Chair how to transmit to the Executive Committee (e.g., through their Executive Committee reporter) all such information. The Chair, rather than the EC, will make salary recommendations for EC members; but the Chair will be guided by an annual review of each EC member by another EC member serving as reporter."

Mr. Friedman's motion to accept the recommendation as written was seconded. The motion passed.

Proposal (o). In paragraph V., add the first clause and the underlined words: "As required by HOP (p. 35) every third year the Department, after receiving the recommendation of the Governance Committee, shall review the operation of the Executive Committee and shall vote to continue, modify, or replace it."

Mr. Friedman's motion to accept the recommendation as written was seconded. The motion was approved.

Proposal (p). Change "Chairman" to "Chair" throughout the Executive Committee Constitution.

Mr. Friedman's motion to accept the recommendation as written was seconded and approved.

General discussion about other changes in the EC Constitution not specified by the Governance Committee followed.

Mr. Wadlington asked the Governance Committee to further modify section III (Elections) to include in the appropriate places the following:

- (1) When a member of the Executive Committee is appointed to a decanal position or to a comparable post in the central administration, his or her seat shall be declared vacant and filled according to the procedures outlined above. [See proposal (m) on page 10 of the Minutes.]
- (2) A faculty member serving in a decanal position or a comparable post in the central administration shall be ineligible for election to the EC. [See proposal (b) on page 5 of the Minutes.]

Such proposals, Mr. Wadlington believed, would prevent conflicts of interest and preserve confidentiality on the Executive Committee. There was disagreement as to whether or not the EC's relationship with the administration was necessarily adversary. The motion, however, was seconded and approved.

Mr. Kinneavy objected to the absence of representation on the EC for the Assistant Instructors and Instructors on temporary assignment. The HOP prevents their participation directly on the EC; the Department, however, can and should restructure governance so that these people are represented, especially in the areas of salaries and merit raises, Mr. Kinneavy contended. He called attention to the fact that the EC presently refuses to consider AI salaries. Mr. Sutherland disagreed with Mr. Kinneavy's view of the purview of the EC; Executive Committees and Budget Councils have never recommended on AI salaries. Mr. Moldenhauer explained that the Dean has instructed the Department to recommend merit raises only for those faculty members on "hard" lines; temporary faculty members are paid from "soft" monies. In point of fact, Mr. Moldenhauer said, in 1979 the EC made an unsolicited and rather strong request in connection with its merit increase recommendations that the pay scale for temporary Instructors and Assistant Professors be raised. A procedural difficulty with merit increase recommendations for the temporary faculty, he continued, is that their reappointment is contingent upon (a) the Department's staffing needs (often not known until a few weeks before the semester begins), and (b) the faculty member's teaching record; it is quite a paradox to recommend someone for a merit increase in December for the coming academic year and then to not reappoint that person in September.

The Department members present expressed sympathy with the plight of AIs and Instructors, and it was agreed that further discussion within the Department was necessary. Mr. Kinneavy reiterated his concern that AIs and part-time Instructors have no voice in departmental governance as outlined by the EC Constitution, and thus no voice in salary and budget matters. Kurt Heinzelman proposed the following resolution:

"The Department deems the question of AI salaries to be a matter of the utmost urgency that the Department should address expeditiously."

The motion was seconded and approved.

There was discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of the service of Assistant Professors on the Executive Committee. Mr. Wadlington believed that the service commitments for Assistant Professors should be kept at an absolute minimum; their time would be better spent on scholarship and teaching. Mr. Westbrook noted

Department of English Minutes
October 10, 1980
Page 13

that Assistant Professors who serve on the EC feel a deep sense of duty to represent other Assistant Professors; their performance is very conscientious and this tends to increase their workload even further. Mr. Malof agreed with Mr. Wadlington that perhaps adjustment of the workload within the EC may relieve the service burden to Assistant Professors without diminishing their representation in departmental governance. Mr. Wadlington urged that all committees of the Department, not just the EC, be aware of the burdens imposed upon the untenured faculty and should purposely keep these burdens to a minimum. Another suggestion was that the size of the EC be increased so that the workload would be lessened for everyone. The Department agreed to defer the question of Assistant Professor responsibilities in departmental committees until further discussion of the Governance Committee Report at the next departmental meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Attachments: EC Constitution, revised November 1978
Handbook of Operating Procedures § 2.05. Budget Councils

Distributed October 30, 1980.

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Constitution of the Executive Committee

Revised November, 1978

I. Authority of the Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall serve in lieu of a Budget Council as the committee in charge of recruitment, promotions, terminations, and faculty salaries.

II. Membership

(A) The Executive Committee shall comprise the Chairman of the department (ex-officio) and nine elected members. If not an elected member, the Associate Chairman shall be ex-officio without vote. The Chairman of the department shall serve as Chairman of the Executive Committee. The nine members shall consist of five Professors, two Associate Professors, and two members drawn from the ranks of Assistant Professor and Instructor.

(B) Elected members shall serve two-year terms.

(C) A quorum shall consist of six members (the Chairman included). A majority of those present shall prevail. The Chairman shall vote only to break a tie.

(D) At the first meeting of the Executive Committee each year, the Chairman shall appoint one of the current members to serve as presiding officer in the event of the Chairman's absence.

III. Elections

(A) Eligibility to serve

(1) Members of the department's faculty who hold a full-time university appointment shall be eligible to serve on the Executive Committee. Also eligible are Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors, and Instructors on joint appointments who will be teaching at least one course in the department during the two-year term.

- (2) Faculty members on visiting appointments shall not be eligible to serve. A visiting appointee whose transfer to permanent status has been approved by the administration at the time of the election shall be eligible.
- (3) Faculty members who will be on leave at any time during the term for which the election is being conducted shall not be eligible to serve.
- (4) Members are eligible to serve two full consecutive terms (i.e., four years) and thereafter are ineligible for a period of one year.
- (5) An Associate Professor whose promotion has been approved by the administration at the time of an election shall be classified as a Professor on the ballot. The same principle shall apply for persons at other ranks.
- (6) Membership on the Executive Committee of anyone promoted to a different panel during his or her term in office shall terminate at the time the promotion takes effect unless the member is elected to a position in his or her new panel.

(B) Eligibility to vote

Members of the department's faculty who hold a full-time university appointment are eligible to vote. Members who are on leave shall be permitted to vote but shall not be entitled to have ballots mailed to them. Members on visiting appointments shall not be eligible to vote.

(C) Election Procedures

The members of the Executive Committee (except for the Chairman) shall be elected as follows:

- (1) Annual elections shall be held as soon as possible after the beginning of Spring semester; new terms begin on March 1.
- (2) Members of the department carrying heavy responsibilities elsewhere may request that their names be withdrawn from the list of eligible candidates by submitting a letter of explanation to the Chairman.

(3) After the elimination of ineligible and withdrawn names, there shall be a nominating round for choosing as members of Panel A half of the remaining eligible Professors, for choosing as members of Panel B half of the remaining Associate Professors, and for choosing as members of Panel C half of the remaining Assistant Professors and Instructors. The number shall be half-of-one more than half if the total is odd. All eligible voters at the rank of Professors shall be entitled to nominate for Panel A by checking half of the names on the nominating ballot, with no indication of preference. Those chosen shall constitute Panel A on the final ballot. Similarly, all eligible voters at the rank of Associate Professor shall be entitled to nominate for Panel B, and all eligible voters at the ranks of Assistant Professor and Instructor shall be entitled to nominate for Panel C.

(4) All members of the department eligible to nominate are also eligible to vote. The final balloting shall be conducted according to the Hare system, with every voter voting on all panels, marking priorities separately for the different panels.

(D) Vacancies

(1) Any vacancy occurring between annual elections shall be filled by runners-up in the previous election, in order of preference on the final ballot.

(2) If it is impossible to make a quorum at any time when Executive Committee business must be conducted, vacancies will be filled by faculty who have most recently completed their terms on the Executive Committee. The number chosen will be sufficient to bring and keep the Executive Committee up to a quorum but not to exceed the ordinary strength of the Committee (i.e., nine elected members). As much as possible, Executive Committee panels shall be respected.

IV. Functions

- (A) The Department as a whole, in its regular meetings, shall set its general policies, including general policy on recruitment and appointment; but within the limits of the policies thus set, the Executive Committee shall be empowered to act on all matters of recruitment as well as appointment, promotion, and budget, subject to the approval of the Dean and the higher administration. In maintaining its responsiveness to the Department, the Committee shall seek the advice of colleagues on pertinent matters; it shall promptly call a special open meeting when twenty percent of the voting members of the Department request it to do so. Individuals and groups of faculty members may request opportunity to appear before the Executive Committee.
- (B) Promotion recommendations. Before drawing up the tentative list of persons to be recommended for promotion, the Executive Committee shall inform itself of the relevant activities of the members of the department. In addition, persons who wish to be considered for promotion may send a written request to the Chairman.
- (C) Salary recommendations. Before making its yearly salary recommendations, the Executive Committee shall review each person's Annual Report and other relevant information. Members of the department should transmit to the Executive Committee any additional information or clarification that they want taken into account. As soon as possible after the Executive Committee completes its budgetary deliberations, the Chairman shall inform each member of the department of the recommendation made for him or her by the Executive Committee and by the Chairman. Faculty members shall have the right to appeal those recommendations by writing a letter to the Executive Committee or to the Dean through the office of the Chairman. The departmental budget for the current year shall be available for inspection by members of the department.
- (D) The Executive Committee shall advise the Chairman in preparing assignments to the various appointive committees of the department.

V. Review

Every third year the department shall review the operation of the Executive Committee and shall vote to continue, modify, or replace it.

§ 2.05. Budget Councils

All the full professors in a department conjointly, or all the associate professors conjointly in case there is no full professor, constitute the budget council of the department, each member being entitled to one vote, there being no seniority. No person on modified service because of age shall be a member of a budget council. The chairman of the department serves as chairman of the budget council.

Changes in the budget council organization are permitted under the following circumstances:

1. A departmental faculty, budget council or chairman may develop a plan whereby the authority of the budget council is vested in an executive committee or committees of size, composition by academic rank, and mode of selection as specified by that plan.
2. A departmental faculty, budget council, the chairman, or the Dean may initiate a proposal to extend membership of the budget council to one or more of the departmental faculty with the ranks of Associate Professor or Assistant Professor, or to one or more members of the faculty of another department or departments.
3. After one or more proposals to be presented to the department faculty under Paragraphs 1 and 2 have been circulated to all voting members of the department for at least one week, a meeting of the department shall be called during the long session at a time which will ensure full participation of its members. The meeting shall assess the merits of the proposal or proposals and determine whether they are in a form appropriate for submission to ballot. One week after the close of debate on the proposal or proposals, votes on them shall be taken by mail ballot sent to all voting members of the department, including those on leave. A modification shall take effect if approved by a majority vote of the members and by the Dean and the President.

(This page should be substituted for the original p. 35 in the Handbook of Operating Procedures.)

- 4. A dean may determine that operation of a department has deteriorated because of actions or lack of actions of the budget council or because of irreconcilable differences within the membership of the budget council, and that change in the budget council organization is essential to the effective administration of the department. Under such circumstances he may request the approval of the President to establish a temporary budget committee for the department. With the approval of the President, the dean may then establish a temporary budget committee for the department. This action by the dean shall be effective for a period of not more than three years. During the period, re-organization proposals according to Sections 1, 2 and 3 may be effected.

- 5. During the third or terminal year of operation under any of the foregoing plans and each third year thereafter, the departmental faculty members with tenure shall vote to continue the existing organization or to return to the previous budget council operation. This recommendation shall be forwarded by the chairman of the department for the approval of the dean and the president. The departmental faculty members with tenure may instead propose modifications in the mode of governance for consideration by the department in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3.