Members of the University Senate,

I send this email to provide you with a preview of next week’s University Senate meeting (Thursday, December 5, 4:05, Education Room 113 – NOTE THE LOCATION CHANGE). There are a number of important issues up for our consideration, including proposed changes to the tenure and promotion policy, and a proposed amendment to the UND Constitution. As always at the December meeting, the list of candidates for fall graduation will need Senate approval.

Attached to the December 5 Senate agenda (attachment #3) you’ll find proposed changes to some Senate committees’ charges (agenda item #7). In each case the recommendation comes from the committee governed by that charge. At least one member of each of these committees will be at Senate to answer questions that you may have about the recommendations.

Agenda item #8 concerns recommendations from the Academic Cabinet related to tenure and promotion policies which appear in the Faculty Handbook. There are two separate recommendations (see attachment #4), which can be summarized as:

1. Amend the Faculty Handbook, Section II.5.3.B.2, to remove the Dean of Graduate Studies as a separate stop on the promotion approval process.
2. Amend the Faculty Handbook, Section II.8.2, to add a point (to be labeled P. in that section) that indicates that the President will not recommend tenure if someone is not also recommended for promotion to Associate Professor. Language will also be added to clarify exactly what options are available in this case.

The proposed constitutional amendment (agenda item #9) is from the Senate Executive Committee, and pertains to eligibility for University Council membership (appearing in Section II of the Constitution – a copy of which can be found by going to the University Senate webpage). Currently some, but not all, non-tenure-track faculty are considered eligible. The proposed amendment, if adopted, would extend Council membership to all benefited faculty – to include lecturers, instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors. See attachment #5 to your agenda to see the exact nature of the recommendation.

Why make this change? Currently staff, students, and many faculty are represented on Senate. The one group not fully represented, however, are those faculty who are not in tenure-track positions. There is actually a significant amount of inconsistency for this group. In some colleges many non-tenure-track faculty are considered eligible to serve on the University Council; in other colleges this is not the case.
The proposed constitutional amendment, if adopted, will bring consistency by extending the privilege of Council membership to all similar faculty positions across campus.

How many people will this impact? The numbers from AY 2012-13 are:

- Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty: 504 (49% of the total faculty)
- Non-Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty: 519 (51%)
  - Benefited: 324 (32%)
    - Instructor, Assistant Prof, Associate Prof, Prof: 251 (25%)
    - Other: 73 (7%)

Based on this information from 2012-13, the proposal would add at least 73 faculty to the University Council. The number is almost certainly higher since of the 251 benefited, non-tenured/tenure-track faculty, some are likely not full-time, and thus would not have Council membership under the Constitution as currently worded. The information I have does not allow me to know how much higher than 73. However, it’s probably safe to estimate that 10%-20% of the faculty would gain Council membership under this proposed amendment. This is the only group of individuals on campus who currently have no explicit representation under our collaborative governance structure. The SEC feels it is appropriate to extend to the benefited individuals in this group the same privilege that all staff, students, and most faculty, already enjoy.

I do hope everyone will be able to attend the Senate meeting on December 5 – remember, now in Education 113. If you have any questions between now and then, please let me know.

Enjoy the Thanksgiving break!

Ryan