

1970

February 23, 1970

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "February 23, 1970" (1970). *Minutes*. 421.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/421

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 February 23, 1970

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Green.

The Proceedings of February 16, 1970, were approved as published.

REPORTS:

- A. Miss Hieronymus reported on the meeting of the Board of Governors which took place February 20 and 21. She noted the increased consideration given to faculty concerns by members of the Board. Eastern's ten year plan was presented at the meeting. Among other things, President Doudna spoke about administrative organization and faculty participation in decision making at Eastern. Vice President Moody emphasized that Eastern, in the next decade, should extend the concept of teacher preparation beyond the elementary and secondary levels to those of the junior college and the university. He also stressed the necessity for increased use of the library. The Library Association recommends that a university have 175,000 volumes before it opens. Booth Library has less than 200,000 volumes, but the Vice President stated that at this stage it should have 500,000. While the university should spend 5% of its internal budget on the library (it has not been doing so), the Vice President remarked that this would be more feasible with an increase in the operating budget. To illustrate the problems of funds for higher education, it was noted that Governors State had its budget cut by more than one-half and was asked to open a year earlier than planned. Among other things, it was noted that a resolution was passed by the Board in opposition to the proposal to merge the State Universities Retirement System with the State Employees' Retirement System.
- B. Mr. Whitlow reported that the nominations committee had selected four persons as possible nominees for positions on councils which received an insufficient number of nominations from the faculty. It was moved (Tingley) and seconded (Crane) that the suggestions be accepted. The motion carried by a vote of twelve in favor and one opposed. The names will be published in these proceedings upon acceptance by the persons involved.

COMMUNICATIONS:

- A. From President Doudna, a copy of a letter to Mr. Gregory Crockett of the Afro-American Association urging that the latter supply the Senate with more information on the proposed Intercultural Council so that some action can be taken.
- B. From the Student Senate, the minutes of its meeting of February 12, 1970. Received and distributed.

- C. From Mr. Edward S. Gibala, Executive Director of the State Universities Retirement System, a copy of a letter summarizing several bits of proposed federal legislation involving pensions. One section reads as follows:

"The Board of Trustees of the State Universities Retirement System has gone on record in support of the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the following proposal be incorporated in the Illinois Constitution. Consequently, you should feel free to contact your Con-Con representative regarding this matter.

"Vesting of Pension Rights of Public Employees

"Pension rights of public employees are an integral part of the contract of employment, and these rights are vested in the employee at the time he accepts each employment contract. The General Assembly shall not take away or diminish these vested rights either during the employment period or after retirement. "

The letter was referred to the Budget Committee for study and possible recommendation.

- D. From Mr. Daniel J. Koenig, a copy of a letter meant to be an appeal of a personnel matter to the Senate from the University Personnel Committee. The letter reads in part as follows:

"I have been financially punished for advocating opinions which incur the displeasure of the administration of this university.

"I find it necessary to observe that I have, to a very high degree, fulfilled the objective criteria which are specified by the Board of Governors (pp. 32-34) for advancement in this institution and which constitutes part of my contract. These criteria are in writing and have been set forth by the president of this institution (to the Faculty Senate) as the criteria on which advancement is based.

"In fulfilling these criteria, I consistently receive very superior evaluations by my students in anonymous questionnaires sponsored by the Student Senate. I have all of these available to prove my teaching quality. In the last quarter, for example, approximately 70% of the students in my classes ranked me in the top fifth of all teachers at this university. I have also conducted research for the state, published, served on a University committee (by appointment of the faculty senate), chaperoned a dance, been responsible for supervising other student activities, voluntarily taught a course in the Experimental Program of Studies, without compensation, and actively participated in a professional convention as well as attending others. Moreover, I have consistently exceeded minimum standards in fulfilling my other responsibilities. My personal life is without blemish.

"Last May, I was offered a substandard salary increment which amounted to an actual loss in take home pay although prices had risen by 7%. By that time, I was forced to sign the contract since it was too late in the year to

seek another job within the ten days allotted to me to make a decision about signing my contract. I did, however, file a formal protest to the president of the university before signing the contract and since that time have formally appealed to the University Personnel Committee and the Faculty Senate.

"The explanation for the low increment which was offered by the president was absurd. He contended that I was being overpaid as a consequence of a prior mistake. This explanation is ridiculous on its face since none of the last eight people hired by my department received a lower salary than mine, (although some did receive a higher initial salary) even though some had less experience and professional achievements.

"I also asked the Dean for an explanation, but received none. Only my department head would offer a justification and that was that I had exercised 'poor judgment.' Despite repeated attempts to have these instances of 'poor judgment' specified in writing so that they could be refuted, the university president maintained silence on this matter.

"The 'poor judgment' presumably is the failure to be a 'yes man.' I have marched with black students and anti-war faculty in peaceful demonstrations on campus. I spoke at the October moratorium on the war. I twice opposed the wishes of the president in connection with his activities on the Lecture Series Board. I argued with the president that classes should be smaller and that the faculty load should be closer to that which exists at the better universities. Perhaps my 'poorest judgment' was to contend that students are effected by decisions of the faculty and administration and should have some voice in those decisions--or at least should know about them. I have also volunteered to recruit black faculty if the president was serious in his statements about desegregating the faculty.

"My salary raise was determined in a very irregular matter, commonplace at this university, but in opposition to the criteria of the AAUP. In the first instance a departmental committee, appointed on an ad hoc basis by the head, makes a recommendation to the head. The untenured head, after many communications from the administration, then made a recommendation. This recommendation then went to the administrators. I wound up with different figures in this process--two of the changes being made by the administration.

"If there are any bona fide instances of 'poor judgment', rather than an expression of views, I would like to have these charges publicly made so that they can be formally rejected. Obviously, I do not feel that there is any substance to claims of impropriety on my part. "

- E. From Mr. Leonard Wood, a letter plus copies of two others. It was moved (Crane) and seconded (Spaniol) that Mr. Wood's correspondence not be published and that the Proceedings indicate simply that it was "received." The motion lost by a vote of three in favor, nine against, and one present. It was then recommended that the cover letter be published in toto. It reads as follows:

"I am appealing to the Faculty Senate to take any action it can to expose and correct a situation at Eastern which is potentially threatening to every faculty member. As President Doudna appears to interpret his role in the University structure, he is not to be held accountable to the faculty for any of his actions. Department heads, as personal choices of the President, are responsible to him alone and may not be thought of as in any way accountable to the members of their departments.

"Such an authoritarian system must depend for its smooth functioning on the broadness of vision and the sense of fairness of the President and particularly of the agents he selects. It breaks down and becomes oppressive and intolerable when his agents lack these qualities. This has happened in a number of departments (by no means all) at Eastern, but most particularly and most flagrantly in the department of which I am a member.

"President Doudna recently announced that he intends to retain as Head of the History Department a man who is rejected by a majority of the tenured members of the department. In reaching this decision, the President quashed the recommendation of the Faculty Personnel Committee, the body to which every faculty member looks for redress of grievance in personnel matters.

"Five years ago, when President Doudna denied a request from eight of the eleven members of the department for a new head, he at least indicated that the situation in the department called for some adjustment. The department head made a few changes on paper to serve as window dressing, but no substantive improvements were made or attempted in departmental governance. Several members subsequently left and replacements were hired. As soon as the new men experienced firsthand the oppressive atmosphere, some of them began to seek a change. Rebellion was quelled for a time, more resignations followed, but the problem remained. It erupted again this summer, involving department members who questioned arbitrary procedures of the head. A complaint was made to the Personnel Committee, which began an investigation that led to the recommendation for removal rejected by the President.

"A majority of the senior staff, most of whom played no part in the events of this summer, now face an uncertain future because they gave honest answers to questions put to them by the Personnel Committee concerning the functioning of the department.

"I ask the Faculty Senate to read carefully the lengthy memorandum which President Doudna sent to Dr. Syndergaard on January 30, 1970 and the memorandum which I sent to the President on February 2 (copies attached). The President's decision to retain the present head of the History Department flies in the face of all logic, distorts the nature of the division in the department, implies that the department endorsed Dr. Syndergaard in a vote that was never taken, and is unaccompanied by any indication or suggestion that the Head of the History Department will or should act in a less arbitrary manner. There is no indication that he will or should hold department meetings (there have been none since October) or that he should consult department members on anything. Instead, there is a strong hint that the

resignations of nine people would be welcomed and a gentle admonition to the department head to seek a more "compatible" staff in future hirings. Memoranda of protest to the President and requests for clarification of his decision have gone unanswered.

"I implore the Faculty Senate to intercede with the President and with the Board of Governors in an effort to correct a situation which daily becomes more scandalous and oppressive. The History Department has already been damaged irreparably. Dedicated scholars who came here to teach and write are being abused in the most childish fashion by a vindictive department head, apparently in the expectation that they will find it intolerable and leave. If this kind of unwarranted and unprofessional pressure is allowed to continue, it is bound to deprive the department of some of its most productive members and damage the intellectual image of Eastern for years to come.

"What is happening today in the History Department should be of wide faculty concern. It is an example of what can happen under the existing system of faculty and staff evaluation. The problem basically is to introduce a two-way accountability into the structure and governance of the university. Perhaps the Faculty Senate in conjunction with the Personnel Committee can work out and propose to the President and the Board of Governors a system of evaluation procedures that will help correct the shortcomings of the one-way system now in operation. Corrective measures are a matter of great urgency in more than one department. Involved are fundamental precepts of academic freedom that are the badge of a healthy academic community."

NEW BUSINESS:

There was no new business.

OLD BUSINESS:

- A. The matter of student evaluation of teaching faculty was discussed in terms of a recommendation from the subcommittee on student-faculty relations. Most concern centered about the language and intent of the proposed evaluation questionnaire. Because of a shortage of time for complete discussion it was moved (Crane) and seconded (Spaniol) to table the issue. The motion carried by a vote of eight for, four against, and one present.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p. m. The next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate is on Monday, March 16, from noon to 2 p. m. in the Heritage Room of the University Union.

AGENDA

1. Evaluation
2. Selection of President
3. Recognition of Retiring Faculty Members
4. Intercultural Council
5. Grievance Committee
6. Proposal for University Government
7. Budget for Higher Education
8. Policy Statements of Higher Board

9. Relationship of Senate to Council of Faculties
10. Competitive Recruitment
11. Catalog Changes
12. Library Budget
13. Evaluation of Council of Faculties
14. Status of Delegate to Faculty Advisory Council

John H. Keiser
Secretary

f