

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Faculty Senate Bills

Faculty Senate

5-10-1973

**FINAL REPORT OF THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATIONS TO AMEND THE UNIVERSITY MANUAL
REGARDING FACULTY EQUIVALENCY POSITIONS**

University of Rhode Island Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/facsen_bills

Recommended Citation

University of Rhode Island Faculty Senate, "FINAL REPORT OF THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO AMEND THE UNIVERSITY MANUAL REGARDING FACULTY EQUIVALENCY POSITIONS" (1973). *Faculty Senate Bills*. Paper 876.

https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/facsen_bills/876

This Legislation is brought to you by the University of Rhode Island. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Bills by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu. For permission to reuse copyrighted content, contact the author directly.

Serial Number 72-73--41
UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

FACULTY SENATE

BILL

Adopted by the Faculty Senate

RECEIVED
UNIVERSITY OF R. I.
MAY 15 1973
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

TO: President Werner A. Baum
FROM: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

1. The Attached BILL, titled FINAL REPORT OF THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATIONS TO AMEND THE UNIVERSITY MANUAL REGARDING FACULTY
EQUIVALENCY POSITIONS

is forwarded for your consideration.

2. The original and two copies for your use are included.

3. This BILL was adopted by vote of the Faculty Senate on 73-5-10
(date)

4. After considering this bill, will you please indicate your approval or disapproval. Return the original or forward it to the Board of Regents, completing the appropriate endorsement below.

5. In accordance with Section 8, paragraph 2 of the Senate's By-Laws, this bill will become effective on 73-5-31 (date), three weeks after Senate approval, unless: (1) specific dates for implementation are written into the bill; (2) you return it disapproved; (3) you forward it to the Board of Regents for their approval; or (4) the University Faculty petitions for a referendum. If the bill is forwarded to the Board of Regents, it will not become effective until approved by the Board.

May 15, 1973
(date)

Stephen B. Wood /s/
Chairman of the Faculty Senate
Stephen B. Wood

ENDORSEMENT 1.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate
FROM: President of the University

1. Returned.

2. Approved _____ Disapproved _____

3. (If approved) In my opinion, transmittal to the Board of Regents is not necessary.

(date)

President /s/

(OVER)

ALTERNATE ENDORSEMENT 1.

TO: Chairman of the Board of Regents.

FROM: The University President

1. Forwarded.
2. Approved.

_____/s/
(date) President

ENDORSEMENT 2.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Chairman of the Board of Regents, via the University President.

1. Forwarded.

_____/s/
(date) _____
(Office)

ENDORSEMENT 3.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

FROM: The University President

1. Forwarded from the Chairman of the Board of Regents.

_____/s/
(date) President

Original received and forwarded to the Secretary of the Senate and Registrar for filing in the Archives of the University.

_____/s/
(date) Chairman of the Faculty Senate

~~C. Recommendation: The President authorize the Vice President for Business Affairs to expand the University Central Stores to include a University Laboratory Store. This store shall maintain an inventory of laboratory supplies commonly used in instruction and research as determined by a faculty committee drawn from departments utilizing the store.~~

Item 3

- ~~A. Intent: To improve the position of inventors relative to income derived from inventions patented while the inventor is employed by the University of Rhode Island.~~
- ~~B. Justification: The present policy stated in the University Manual unnecessarily restricts the portion of patent derived income which is paid to the faculty member whose invention has been patented. The disposition of income derived from a patent in excess of \$25,000. is not specified in the University Manual.~~
- ~~C. Recommendation: Amend section 10.41.13 of the University Manual to read as follows (changes are underlined)~~

~~If the patent is obtained by the University, the inventor or assignor shall be paid the first \$2,500. received as income from the patent after the University has been reimbursed for all expenses incident to securing and/or defending the patent, then 50% of the income above the original \$2,500. If more than one inventor or discoverer is involved, the \$2,500. and any additional income received shall be divided as agreed by the inventors or discoverers. If the investigator(s) bears the expense of obtaining the patent, the University shall receive no income from the patent.~~

~~Amend Section 10.41.14 as follows~~

~~Second and third sentences to read ... "If the University fails to agree to pay the costs of filing for letters patent within six months after the invention or discovery is announced to the University by written notification of the chairman of the Research Committee, or decides that it does not wish to assume full responsibility for a patent, then all rights and title to patent petition shall remain in the name of the inventor or discoverer. If the inventor or discoverer contracts with a collaborating agency for the purpose of securing a patent and developing it commercially and is responsible for all the negotiations involved, the inventor or discoverer, and not the University, shall receive all proceeds from license fees, royalties or other income resulting from the patent.~~

~~Amend Section 10.41.15 by placing a period after "thereafter in the last sentence and eliminate the last phrase, "up to a maximum of \$25,000."~~

Item 4

- A. Intent: To provide each department with a budget for graduate research based upon the number of graduate students enrolled in that department.
- B. Justification: In these days of tightening budgets, it is too easy to cut back on graduate education to meet increasing demands of undergraduate courses. When this happens, U.R.I. fails to attract or loses quality students who can be better provided elsewhere. As a result, the entire university suffers. The loss of inspiration and leadership from these people is felt not only at the graduate level, but also as it would extend to the quality of undergraduate programs and faculty research.
- C. Recommendation: Each department sponsoring a graduate degree shall be given a budget separate from that for undergraduate education. A specific sum of money shall be allotted to the department for each graduate student enrolled in a thesis program. The amount would be determined by the academic vice president according to the needs of research programs, varying considerably among departments. According to his descretion, the department chairman shall distribute these funds either directly to the student or to his faculty advisor to be used for materials or activities which would best benefit that student's research.

Item 5

- A. Intent: To provide administrative flexibility in the employment of professional personnel on noncontinuing grant or contract funds.
- B. Justification: Present classification of faculty positions is such that professional staff often cannot be employed on noncontinuing grant or contract funds at levels of compensation equivalent to that of regular faculty. All new faculty positions must be approved by the State Board of Regents where approval is normally restricted to teaching positions. Employing faculty on noncontinuing funds is risky because the University may become obligated to tenure positions when the funding supporting these positions is terminated. However, the stimulation and vitality to be gained by including non-teaching faculty on the staff of research programs when funding is available should not be compromised. This problem can be resolved by extending the rank of faculty equivalent to all professional appointments funded on noncontinuing fiscal resources. Such positions shall carry all rights and privileges afforded regular faculty including salary, fringe benefits, promotion but not tenure.
- C. Recommendation: Amend section 4.12.12 of the University Manual to read as follows (changes are underlined)
- 4.12.12 Temporary and part-time appointments shall be classified according to their equivalent faculty rank for the determination of salaries and salary increases. This category includes lecturer, Adjunct professor, research associate, faculty equivalent, and others employed under limited programs of instruction or research.

Amend section 4.12.14 of the University Manual to read as follows (changes are underlined).

4.12.14 Faculty equivalency appointments (c.f. 7.10.10) shall be of two types. In the College of Resource Development, they shall include home demonstration agents, county agents, 4-H agents, and urban agents. These positions shall be related to youth and adult education through the Cooperative Extension Service. Throughout the University, they may include personnel associated with limited programs of instruction or research such as those supported by non-continuing grant or contract funds. All equivalency positions shall be based on appointment by the President and shall not carry faculty rank or tenure, but salaries and increments would ordinarily be on a scale comparable with that published for the faculty.

Item 6

- A. Intent: For the Faculty Senate to express an opinion concerning the role of research as part of a university faculty workload.
- B. Justification: Currently the Joint Board-Association Workload Study Committee is preparing a policy statement concerning the workload of URI faculty. The Senate Research Policy Committee believes that such a statement might minimize the position of research as a legitimate and essential function of a university faculty. To help offset this possibility and assure that the workload policy state^{ment} truly reflects the priorities of the URI faculty, the Senate should provide recommendations to the Workload Committee in those areas where there is faculty concern.
- C. Recommendation: The following statement be approved in principle by the Faculty Senate and forwarded as a recommendation to the Joint Board-Association Workload Study Committee.

STATEMENT ON RESEARCH IN A UNIVERSITY FACULTY WORKLOAD

The conduct of original investigative study, usually termed research, is not only a desirable but an essential activity of a university faculty. In formulating a workload statement for the university faculty, provision must be made for time devoted to research.

The amount of research time assigned to any one academic unit will depend upon that unit's participation in a graduate program or its involvement with an official research agency of the state. In any event, the faculty of all academic departments should be involved in some research activity. Wise allocation of university resources to research requires that areas of excellence be identified and supported consistent with a coordinated program of graduate education for the Northeast region and the needs of the state of Rhode Island.

THE PROPOSAL

Each academic department will be assigned a number of man-hours, expressed as full-time equivalents, for research as well as for teaching, administration, counseling, etc. The number of full-time equivalents for research assigned to a department will depend upon the research expectations of that department as established by university policy on research priority.

Within each department, the faculty will determine the distribution of research time among its members. Potential for quality work, capacity to secure external support, and involvement in the graduate program should constitute the basis for research time allotment.

Research time should be allotted in increments equivalent to other academic assignments, e.g. if one three-credit course is considered a one-third assignment, than research time should not be allotted in units less than one-third of a full time assignment. Individual faculty may range from no research time to full time research.

The contract of each faculty member should specify the portion of his time, if any, to be devoted to research. Research time allocation should be reviewed annually and adjustments made as warranted to maintain a quality program and meet the objectives of the department.

In this way, the university, each department, and the faculty concerned will know how much and where resources for research are being allocated. In addition, accountability for research performance can be exacted with equity.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Bhonsack
Lewis D. Conta
Leon Goodman
Marilyn M. Harlin
Richard J. Hull, Chairman
William R. Rosengren
Irving A. Spaulding

3-23-73

Exec Comm

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
KINGSTON, R. I. 02881

Office of the President

November 13, 1973
RECEIVED

NOV 15 1973

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
FACULTY SENATE

Professor Maury Klein
Chairman, Faculty Senate
116 Washburn Hall

Dear Maury,

This is in response to your letter of October 29, 1973 in reference to Senate Bill Number 72-73-41 "Final Report of the Research Policy Committee-Recommendations to Amend the University Manual Regarding Faculty Equivalent Positions."

Although I am aware that section 4.12.14 in the University Manual specifies that only members of the faculty with tenure are eligible for sabbatical leave, I am also aware that in the past some members of the College of Resource Development with faculty equivalent appointments who are not eligible for tenure were granted sabbatical leaves. I would not want the treatment of these individuals in the past to be used as a precedent some time in the future for granting sabbatical leaves for the new category of faculty equivalent appointments which are recommended in Senate Bill Number 72-73-41. Therefore, I think it is very important that this matter be clarified before the provisions of the Bill be enacted.

Please give me a few days so that personnel in my office can search the records to determine whether or not some special provisions were made for those members of the College of Resource Development with faculty equivalent appointments which made them eligible for sabbatical leaves. In addition I will review this with Dean Donovan of the College of Resource Development. As soon as I have all of the pertinent information together, I will be in touch with you again to see how this matter can best be resolved.

Sincerely,



William R. Ferrante
Acting President

WRF/lm

cc: Dean Gerald Donovan

October 29, 1973

Dr. William R. Ferrante
Acting President
220 Administration Building

Dear Bill:

In response to your letter of September 27, 1973, pertaining to Faculty Senate Bill #72-73--41 "Final Report of the Research Policy Committee Recommendations to Amend the University Manual Regarding Faculty Equivalency Positions," I enclose a copy of a letter from Kay Stitely, Chairwoman of the Constitution, By-Laws and University Manual Committee.

The feeling of her committee, which is shared by the Executive Committee, is that the sections cited by Kay do in fact cover the matter you raise. If you are still not satisfied on this point, then let me know and perhaps we can schedule a meeting with the Constitution, By-Laws and University Manual Committee. The Executive Committee feels that this committee is the more appropriate body to handle the matter, since it involves a question of clarification rather than of substance.

Cordially,

Maury Klein
Chairman, Faculty Senate

MK/lw

Enclosure

October 10, 1973

Professor Gary Carlson
Pharm. & Toxicology
345 Fogarty Hall

Dear Gary:

I enclose a letter from President Ferrante stating a reservation about the wording of Faculty Senate bill #72-73--41. The Executive Committee feels his point is well taken and would like your committee to consider the substance of the matter and give us your recommendation within two weeks if at all possible.

To expedite action, I am submitting a copy of the legislation and President Ferrante's letter to the Constitution and By-Laws Committee for their advice on the technical question of the Manual language and what change would be required to clarify the point raised by President Ferrante.

Cordially,

Maury Klein
Chairman, Faculty Senate

MK/lw

Enclosure

cc: Professor Caroline Stitely

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
KINGSTON, R. I. 02881

Office of the President

September 27, 1973

Dr. Maury Klein
Chairman, Faculty Senate
Eleanor Roosevelt Hall
Campus

Dear Maury:

I am returning herewith Faculty Senate Bill 72-73--41 "Final Report of the Research Policy Committee Recommendations to Amend the University Manual Regarding Faculty Equivalency Positions" for further clarification. It is not clear whether or not it is intended that all persons with faculty equivalency appointments including temporary and part-time appointees ^{ARE} to be eligible for sabbatical leaves. In the past persons holding faculty equivalency appointments as currently defined in Section 4.12.14 of the University Manual have been granted sabbatical leaves. I believe that the legislation should be specific on this point since it would expand considerably the category of persons who would be eligible for faculty equivalency appointments.

I apologize for the delay in handling this legislation. It is my judgment that if this proposal is approved, it will have to be referred to the Board of Regents.

I shall be happy to meet with the Research Committee to discuss this if they wish me to do so.

Sincerely,



William R. Ferrante
Acting President

btc

Enc.

Bertha Coombs

October 30, 1973

Sheila Grubman

Acting President Ferrante took no action on Senate Bill #72-73--41 and sent three copies back to the Senate with his explanatory letter of September 27, 1973. If Acting President Ferrante plans to take any action on Bill #72-73--41, please contact the Senate Office and we will be glad to send Bill #72-73--41 back to him.

SG/lw