

1970

January 12, 1970

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 12, 1970" (1970). *Minutes*. 416.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/416

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
Proceedings of January 12, 1970

MEMBERS PRESENT: Hattabaugh, Palmer, Green, Read, Holley, Gover, Whitlow, Hieronymus, Spaniol, Crane, Kluge, Keiser, Lahey, McCabe.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tingley.

The Proceedings of January 5, 1970, were approved as published.

REPORTS:

- A. Miss Hieronymus reported that the Executive Committee had met as part of the President's Advisory Council on Thursday, January 8. The agenda included three items: the extent of student participation in the decision-making process of the University, remodeling the Practical Arts Building, and the Black Boycott of the Athletic Department. The first item will apparently be the subject of future discussions. The Executive Committee will meet with the Personnel Committee in the near future to discuss the latter's proposal for evaluation of faculty.
- B. Mr. Spaniol presented a complete report of the Council of Faculties meeting of January 7, 1970. The meeting was in part a joint meeting with the Council of Presidents and a large amount of business was accomplished. Mr. Spaniol's notes and copies of various reports are available to faculty members on request.

COMMUNICATIONS:

- A. From President Doudna, a memorandum which reads as follows: "I have long thought that the election procedures being used for the various councils left something to be desired. I did not feel, however, it was my place or obligation to suggest corrections. I am pleased that the Faculty Senate has arrived at something which surely ought to be tried. We shall make appropriate revisions in the Administrative Manual."
- B. From President Doudna, a memorandum concerning the Senate's reaction to the proposal for an eleven-and-one-half month contract. (See minutes of December 15, 1969, Old Business, B.) The memorandum reads in part as follows:

This is in response to your memorandum of December 16.

I am not sure what remaining steps you have in mind when you speak of my proposal as a desirable "first" step. I would appreciate some clarification on that point.

I shall now report on the present status of the program.

I made a trip to Champaign and had considerable correspondence and one telephone call in an effort to work out all the details with the Retirement System and eliminate objectionable features. I succeeded in doing this. What we would have to do is to give two contracts so that one could not take a leave of absence without pay in the summer and pay into the Retirement System. He would simply have to decide whether he wanted his contract or did not, just as is the case now. From his point of view, the only advantage would be that he would be assured that he would be offered a contract for the summer each year if he is in category A or B as I defined them.

It may be possible to get approval from the Board as a whole but I am not optimistic about that. Obviously, the other schools will want the same thing. The fact that two of them run on quite different calendars and that Western no longer operates a regular Summer Quarter seems relevant to me but I feel sure that the presidents and faculties there will want every advantage that Eastern's faculty gets. Thus, I do not know whether I would be successful in promoting the plan with the Board of Governors.

As near as I can tell from a study I asked Vice President Moody to make, only the Faculty of Education and possibly one of the science departments would have any problem in programming in the summer under the proposal. Since the program would be voluntary and individual faculty members could accept the summer contracts or not, as they might wish, one might think this would clear up the matter in the two departments. This is not the case unless I were to be willing to offer a $2\frac{1}{2}$ month contract for someone who teaches two 8-weeks courses which I gather you believe should be done. This I am not willing to do, except within circumstances where someone meets the requirements for a normal annual load as set forth in items 4 and 5 on page 2 of my talk to the faculty this fall. Both groups could do this and the science department that is involved could do it within the present pattern. The Faculty of Education would automatically have to combine the provisions of items 5 and 6 of my talk if it seemed important to avoid having two 8-weeks courses and one 10-weeks course in the Summer Quarter or if there were not enough 10-weeks courses to require the presence of all persons in the categories A and B. I think the objectionable aspects of item 7 would arise in very few situations throughout the university and, for the most part, could be dealt with at the departmental level by careful scheduling.

As I conclude this memorandum, it occurs to me that it is rather long and I am dealing with a complex matter. It may well be that you will want to delegate a small committee or the Executive Committee to talk with me again. If the difficulties cannot be resolved satisfactorily, I think I would want to drop the matter entirely because at best it will be difficult to gain Board approval and perhaps impossible. I believe that both you and the Personnel Committee had the obligation to advise me of your thoughts relative to what you regard as an overload. On the other hand, I reiterate my position that I do not regard this as a sufficiently strong argument against the proposal to warrant, in itself, discarding it.

It was remarked that the Senate had never requested that the proposal be discarded, that the Senate had endorsed the proposal in its principle form (see minutes of December 15, 1969, Communications, D, and Old Business, B), and that the Senate's suggestions were meant to improve the proposal in the faculty's interest. On no occasion has the Senate stated that it would not accept the proposal if its suggestions were not incorporated, but rather it believes that it has clearly attempted to make a sound proposal better. Hence many Senators failed to understand the President's concluding three sentences and especially the last.

NEW BUSINESS:

As a result of subjects raised by Mr. Spaniol's report on the Council of Faculties meeting, it was moved (Kluge) and seconded (Lahey) that the following three items be placed on the agenda and referred to the proper committees: The relationships of the Faculty Senate and the Council of Faculties, competitive recruitment of faculty by schools under the Board of Governors, and what specifically is meant by the word "major" in the following revision of the Board By-Laws, p. 26, Policies Section VI, 9, C as recommended by the Council of Presidents: "To advise the presidents on the creation of major administrative positions and the appointment of administrative officers." The motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

- A. The Senate agreed to wait for the additional information it has sought before taking further action on the Intercultural Council.
- B. Discussion of the Constitution was preceded by a review of the substance of the twenty-one written and oral comments received by the committee before January 7. They are as follows: Five want ratification by half of the eligible voters. Six object to the Senate's power over other committees. Six believe that section (V) should specify major committees. One thinks that section (V.3) ought to specify or qualify other committees. One believes that section (V.1) ought not to include administrative committees or student-faculty committees. Five hold that section (V.3) must have more than ten petitioners for review. Two believe that the draft makes too much work for the Senate and is impractical. Two contend there is too little Senate accountability. One believes that it should provide real Senate autonomy and power, and not be merely advisory. One holds that it should provide for student autonomy from faculty. Three prefer a representative Senate. Two prefer a University Senate. Two wish to exclude administrators and non-teaching staff from faculty. Two wish to exclude students from the Faculty Senate. One wishes to include Vice Presidents in at least an advisory capacity in the Senate. Two object to section (III.2) concerning six quarters eligibility for membership. One requests definition in section (I.2) of academic staff. One contends there is too much power provided vis-a-vis the President. One holds that in section (II.3) thirty days is not enough. One requests that section (VII) allow the President to call a faculty meeting. One believes section (VI.5) should provide for open meetings for faculty, but that the press be excluded. One holds that quarterly faculty meetings are too many. One

holds that section (VI. 3) should provide for a Senate quorum of more than ten. One requests a better definition of executive session. One requests a simpler means of faculty overrule of Senate action. One asks that reasons for recalling a Senate member be specified. One asks that recall power be changed from 10% to 20%. One requests that section (VIII. 2) be changed to increase the number of faculty needed for constitutional amendment from fifty faculty to twenty per cent of the faculty. One contends that the Senate would be inconsistent by approving the Preamble after having approved the Holderman paper. One believes that the constitution should make specific reference to improved instruction. One contends the project is being done too hastily, railroaded. Two believe the constitution is a good draft, but Four contend the constitution is excellent.

It was remarked that under the constitution adopted for the Faculty Senate at Western, the Senate appoints all major committees. However, the recall provision is so liberal that action under it has tied up the Senate all year. Representation is regional or by divisions which has meant that Senators are accountable to their divisions instead of the university as a whole, and this system has widened the gaps instead of increasing a community spirit.

No recommendations were made to the committee by the Senate as a group.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p. m. The next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate is on Monday, January 19, from noon to 2 p. m. in the Heritage Room of the University Union.

AGENDA

1. Constitution
2. Evaluation (Visitation)
3. Proposal for Nominations and Elections Procedures
4. Eleven-and-one-half Month Contract (Sabbatical)
5. Selection of President
6. Recognition of Retiring Faculty Members
7. Campus Disorders, Local Policy
8. Scholarships for Children of Deceased Faculty Members
9. Faculty News Sheet (Secretary)
10. Intercultural Council
11. Grievance Committee
12. Proposal for University Government
13. Budget for Higher Education
14. Policy Statements of Higher Board
15. Evaluation of Faculty Research Projects
16. Relationship of Senate to Council of Faculties
17. Competitive Recruitment
18. "Major" Administrative Positions

John H. Keiser
Secretary