

1968

November 6, 1968

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "November 6, 1968" (1968). *Minutes*. 372.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/372

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of November 6, 1968

MEMBERS PRESENT: Smith, Green, White, Gover, Crane, Holley, Price, Ferguson, Fagan, Lahey, Rawls, Bouknight, Hieronymus.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tingley, Spaniol.

REPORTS:

- A. Traffic and Safety Student-Faculty Board. Minutes describing recent actions and pending items.
- B. Harbison Award, by Dr. Hieronymus. Several names have been given to the committee for evaluation. Five possible candidates were offered by the committee. The Senate went into executive session and one person was selected as a potential recipient of the award. Because he has not accepted the candidacy, his name does not appear here.
- C. Minutes of the general faculty meeting of October 31. Attached to these minutes.

COMMUNICATIONS:

- A. From Dean Ringenberg on membership of the Council on Teacher Education. The description of Administrative Organization on pages 39 and 40, dated March 18, 1968, says that three of the ten elected members of the Council on Teacher Education are: one from the faculty of Sciences and Mathematics, one from the Humanities faculty, and one from the Social Studies faculty.

Dean Ringenberg has recommended to the President that paragraphs B., 2., k., l., and m. of Administrative Organization be revised as follows:

- k. One member from Group 1 of the College of Letters and Science faculty (English, Foreign Language, Philosophy, Speech, Speech Correction, and Theatre Arts)
 - l. One member from Group 2 of the College of Letters and Science faculty (Art, Economics, Geography-Geology, History, Library Science, Psychology, and Sociology-Anthropology)
 - m. One member from Group 3 of the College of Letters and Science faculty (Botany, Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics, and Zoology).
- B. From Vice President Moody about overloads and underloads. It was noted in the Senate minutes of October 23 that an instructor who overloads by one full course may underload by one course in another quarter of that school year. Dr. Moody reported that "The underload would normally occur in the following summer quarter when student demand is lowest. However, in some cases the underload might occur in the spring or even winter quarter if enrollment that quarter were low in the particular discipline. The quarter underload is determined not so much by instructor

choice as by course requirements. As a general rule I suppose one might say that a full overload in any quarter will be compensated by a corresponding underload in the next following quarter when student enrollment allows such underload. But in every case a compensating underload must be accomplished within three quarters following the overload."

Dr. Moody also commented on the 12 hour teaching load which had been stated as being fairly common. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities has found that there are more institutions with an average load of more than 12 hours than there are institutions with an average load of 12 hours. The range for all reporting member institutions was from a low of 9.9 hours to a high of 18.5 hours with a 50th percentile of 12.5 hours.

- C. From the President of the Student Senate on the membership of the Personnel Committee. It was recommended that there be a student member, in some form, on the Committee. Dr. White will answer the letter by describing the purpose of the Personnel Committee.
- D. From the President of the Student Senate, a request for regular meetings with representatives of the Faculty Senate. Dr. White will answer the letter.
- E. From Vice President Moody, a copy of his response to the requests evidently made by the Student Senate to President Doudna. No action will be taken until there is a clarification of the communication listed in D. above.
- F. From Dr. Jon Hopkins offering a compromise on the issue of a franchise for department heads in the selection of an EIU representative to the Council of Faculties. He suggested that department heads might be given the right to vote for a representative or two although they may be ineligible to serve as representatives.
- G. The minutes of the Student Senate meeting of October 24, 1968, were distributed to the members of the Faculty Senate.

OLD BUSINESS:

- A. The constitution of the Faculty Senate. The members of the Senate made a comparison of the revision offered by its own committee with that recommended by the AAUP. Chairman White had compared the two copies and found 23 differences. These were gone over point-by-point so that all members had the same information. Some points of difference were considered critical and some were thought to be minor. It was felt that a voting list or eligible grouping should be set up since there had been a great deal of comment on the point. The discussion ranged around the inclusion of department heads and division chairmen and the location of the library staff in relation to the term "faculty." Points were made in regard to the number of courses taught, a definition of half-time, the equating of hours, a definition of "total faculty," and the duties of department heads.

It was moved (Ferguson) that the faculty be defined as those members teaching a minimum of 16 quarter hours in the academic year. The motion was seconded (Rawls.) A motion was made (Price) to amend the previous motion by changing it from 16 hours to 12 hours. The motion was seconded (Rawls) and failed to pass. A motion was made (Smith) to change from 16 to 24 hours and it was seconded (Rawls.) The motion failed to pass. The original motion was voted on and failed to pass.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 a. m.

CALENDAR

| | |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| September | University Calendar |
| October | Welfare |
| November | Budget |
| December | ----- |
| January | ----- |
| February | Welfare |
| March | Committee Nominations |
| April | Elections |
| May | Buildings and Grounds |

AGENDA

1. Constitution
2. Major and minor committees and councils
3. Overloads

William J. Crane
Secretary

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
GENERAL FACULTY MEETING
October 31, 1968

The meeting was called to order by Chairman White.

As stated by the chairman, the sole purpose of the meeting was to consider the proposal for a Council of Faculties. No voting was intended at this meeting, because the present proposal is not an official document and no request has been received from the Board of Governors for ratification by Eastern. The proposal for the Council of Faculties should not be confused with the proposal for a constitution for the Senate. Both documents are currently under discussion in the Senate, but this meeting is to consider only the former. A campus hearing will be held later on the constitution. The Faculty Senate has not reached any conclusion about the proposal for the Council of Faculties and the purpose of this meeting is to discuss, but not vote.

Max Ferguson presented the background of the proposal. He was appointed to the Joint Faculty Salary Committee in 1967 and at the first meeting of the Committee, at which there were representatives of the four colleges under the Board of Governors, time was spent discussing the possibility of joining the members of the Joint Faculty Policy Committee and form a faculty senate. It was decided to form an ad hoc committee made up of representatives of the two groups to put together a plan for a senate for the four colleges. The ad hoc group met only once. In February of this year, instructions came from the executive office of the Board to form a committee to work on the same problem. Our Faculty Senate, through Gretchen Hieronymus, asked for more information about the committee by sending a letter to Dr. McKelvey, Executive Office of the Board of Governors, but no answer was received. In April of this year, an election was held to fill the request of the Board of Governors for members of the committee. Ferguson and Hieronymus were elected. They attended two meetings and, because Dr. Hieronymus was off campus this past summer, William Crane was selected to serve in her place.

When the committee was being formed, it was understood by the Senate that only full-time teaching faculty were to be represented in the group. At the first meeting of the committee, three of the four representatives of the Chicago schools were department heads. Actually, only a few members of the committee were full-time teaching faculty. The committee was made up of the four college Presidents, two representatives of each college or university, the Executive Secretary of the Board, and three Board members. The President of Western did not attend any of the meetings, however. The Chairman of the Board was at all meetings. One Board member did not attend and one other Board member was at several, but not all of the meetings. In all, four meetings of the ad hoc committee were held.

For his own information, Max Ferguson presented a questionnaire to our faculty in an attempt to canvass opinion about the Super-Senate. Over half of the respondents expressed an interest in having a direct line of contact with the Board of Governors.

At this stage, Chairman White asked for questions or statements from the faculty members present.

QUESTION: Are the Joint Faculty Policy Committee and the Joint Faculty Salary Committee still in operation or have they been disbanded, or will they be disbanded?

ANSWER: Both committees will disband as soon as the Council of Faculties comes into existence. This information comes from the Executive Secretary of the Board. At present, both committees are operative.

QUESTION: Is there a feeling that this Council will achieve more than the past Joint Committees? The question referred especially to the Joint Policy Committee.

ANSWER: There was a feeling of a lack of accomplishment by the members of the Joint Faculty Policy Committee and some feeling that little would be accomplished because of implications of manipulation by the Executive Secretary of the Board, who was also a member. Some things were done by the Committee, but the members thought that if they could talk to a Board member, more understanding could be gained and more could be achieved.

QUESTION: Is there any guarantee that, if we do have this new council, the Board members will listen to us any more than they did then?

ANSWER: Chairman White said that in his opinion, the present plan requires confrontation, at least. Whether this guarantees hearing, is another problem. There will be eight faculty members present at all Board meetings, although only one of these members, according to the proposal, will be empowered to speak directly to the Board. The present plan does speak explicitly of the need for complete communication among the Council of Presidents, the Council of Faculties, and the Board of Governors. Those communications will be published.

QUESTION: Does the statement that voting by proxy is excluded mean that an alternate member to the Council cannot vote?

ANSWER: Chairman White felt that the statement meant that the alternate would attend whenever the regular member could not attend and the alternate could vote. However, it appears that no one may carry a vote to the meeting at which a regular or alternate member is not present.

QUESTION: If there is a general chairman elected from the group, does he have voting power?

ANSWER: Since the meeting is conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order, he would not be able to vote. Thus, the school having the Chairman would lose one vote.

QUESTION: Is the Board doing this in lieu of a labor union?

ANSWER: Yes.

STATEMENT FROM THE FLOOR: This whole business is done backward from the original establishment of the Joint Policy Committee. When the Policy Committee was set up, one or two Board members said to the members of the

Committee that the Board couldn't tell the faculty members what kind of organization they should have. What the faculties need is to set up an organization and present it to the Board, but the Board is not going to say that you have to have a policy committee. Now, this whole business is being reversed. The Board is telling us that we should set up a general faculty committee.

RESPONSE: Dr. White felt that, relating to the present proposal, there was, bodily, equal representation of the organizations involved. It may seem that the committee was loaded, but the numerical representation was precisely equal. There were four from the Board, four Presidents, and eight faculty representatives.

STATEMENT (Cont.): In other words, this is a way of making the faculty be a part of the administration of the system rather than having the faculty being actually distinct and represented.

RESPONSE:(Cont.): The Council of Faculties is separate just as the Council of Presidents is separate. At the meetings of the ad hoc committee there was free discussion and rather free expression of faculty opinion. It seemed that there was a lot of effort to put into the document what the faculty members wanted.

STATEMENT: The fact remains, however, that this document was not written by faculty members exclusively. This was a joint effort, and it is true that it is not strictly faculty effort presented to the Board.

RESPONSE: When the question of who was going to write the document came up, no one volunteered. So, it was sort of shoved into McKelvey's lap. The issue is what we have now and do you think it will work. This is the fifth draft and each draft has represented more and more a move toward a stronger faculty voice.

QUESTION: In section B, item 7, under Meetings, it says, "The Council of Faculties shall meet monthly on the first Monday during the academic year." Who pays for the expenses of the delegates to this meeting?

ANSWER: The institution from which the delegate is sent. The idea that all expenses of the delegates to the meeting would be paid by the institutions could be written into the document.

QUESTION: Under section B, 2 and 3, I would like to inquire into the background of the idea of restricting eligibility both to vote and to serve. If I count this correctly, you are taking the vote away from more people on this staff than there were on the staff when I became a faculty member. Somehow, I feel left out of this whole picture. Where is my representation? (From a department head.)

ANSWER: (from the floor) My understanding was that your representation was through the Council of Presidents. (from Dr. Hieronymus) That seemed to be the one point on which there was unanimous agreement among the faculty representatives even those who were full-time administrators or part-time administrators. There seemed to be a very strong feeling on the part of that group and no objections from the Presidents or anyone else. (from Dr. White) This seems to me one of the critical questions about the proposal, speaking personally and not as Chairman of the Senate. I don't think we can pass it off as lightly as we seem to be doing. It is a critical one and the issue on which the proposal may fall or stand.

STATEMENT: I wonder why we have written into a constitution of this type a proposal of that sort. Because if opinion is as unanimous as related, the faculty simply would not elect those people. This step to disenfranchise one portion of the faculty and make them ineligible seems superfluous.

RESPONSE: (from Chairman White) This seems to be an internal as well as an external problem. We are going to face it in each of our constitution struggles coming up. And when you are considering this proposal, whether to ratify or to amend it, this is one of the areas that will have to be considered.

STATEMENT: I am disturbed by the method of adoption of this plan. It simply says by majority of those voting. It doesn't say a majority of the faculty has to approve.

RESPONSE: (by Chairman White) As far as this institution is concerned, the vote is almost certain to be by ballot.

STATEMENT: Under the voting, section 8, page 3, it says, "A quorum shall consist of a majority of the membership." That, as I read it, can be seven. It continues, "Action shall require the approval of a majority of those present and voting. . .", which could be as few as four. Most of these could represent one institution. I would want at least a majority, three out of four, of the institutions voting.

RESPONSE: It appears here that the obligation you have is to get all of your representatives to the meetings. Several other methods were discussed in the committee, but this is the one that was decided upon.

(Chairman White) It is going to be very difficult to write a quorum and voting rule which would avoid the difficulty in the original proposal of having institutional membership as quorum decision and a program like this which would allow as few as four members to make a decision. I would suggest that anyone who can propose a better arrangement should, by all means, present such a proposal to us before we send this back. This proposal is a compromise and we would welcome any suggestions for bettering the compromise.

STATEMENT: I would agree that all these provisions are not perfect. But, may I remind you of this. It is better to have some representation to go to the Board than not to have any at all. . . Institutions need some way to get their voice felt, so don't turn this whole thing down. I think we need work on it, but I think it is very, very important that we get to the Board of Governors.

QUESTION: There is one topic that concerns me, because it isn't there. On page 7, there is a section which is entitled Relationship to the Institutional Senates, and another, Relationship to the Council of Presidents, but there is no section on relationships to the Board.

STATEMENT: I would make this observation. I do think that the administrative group will organize and I do think they will represent a powerful voice and I do think that, by forming a cleavage, you may lose some of the leadership that would normally come from this group. It seems to me that Mr. Aulabaugh had a very good point when he said that if the faculty does not want to elect such people, they will not do so. It appears to me that, in general, the faculty did use administrative representation, because they thought it was desirable. But as far as whether or not we are represented, I think we will have some representation. I do not think we have it at the moment. By no stretch of the imagination do I consider that the Council of Presidents represents me.

Several illustrative comments were made to this point, following which the meeting was adjourned.