

1971

May 10, 1971

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "May 10, 1971" (1971). *Minutes*. 464.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/464

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.

E A S T E R N I L L I N O I S U N I V E R S I T Y

FACULTY SENATE

Proceedings of May 10, 1971

MEMBERS PRESENT: Katsimpalis, Trank, Lenihan, Whitlow, Downs, Funk, Owens, Whalin, Nichols, Rawls, Barford, Elliott, Kluge, Shuff, Foreman.

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

Student Observers Present: Grosboll, Marks

The meeting was called to order by Chairman, Roger Whitlow.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

1.) The Board of Governors will meet at Eastern on Wednesday and Thursday, May 12th and 13, 1971.

2.) Mr. Whitlow recommended the quarterly faculty meeting be held from 2:00 pm to 3:00 pm Tuesday, May 18, 1971, in the Library Lecture Room. The topic will be the proposed amendment to exclude Executive Assistants from the Faculty Senate Constitution. It was moved by Funk and seconded by Rawls to hold the meeting as recommended. The motion passed 10 yes, 2 no, 2 abstentions.

3.) Mr. Whitlow requested that the secretary send the weekly proceedings of the Faculty Senate to Dr. Gilbert Fite.

4.) The following changes were made in the Faculty Senate for the 1971 Summer Session:

Fred Hattabaugh will replace Dick Funk, Cal Smith will replace Lawrence Nichols, Earl Doughty will replace Pat Lenihan, and John Rearden will replace Bob Barford.

5.) Mr. Whitlow read a letter from Mr. Gibala, Executive Director, State Universities Retirement System, which was a part of the Faculty Newsletter of May 6, 1971, relative to the funding of the retirement system, Senate bill 1136. Mr. Gibala stated that this would change the authority for funding. Rawls moved and Funk seconded a motion to have the Chairman write the members of the Senate Labor and Commerce Committee stating the Faculty Senate's opposition to Senate Bill 1136. The motion passed unanimously.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Ad Hoc Committee on Distinguished Faculty Award

The Committee stated that a letter will be prepared and sent

The letter was discussed in regard to the commodity budget and other budgetary matters. It was moved by Rawls and seconded by Downs that the Faculty Senate communicate to Vice President Holt the urgency to find funds to supply faculty with instructional materials to complete the 1971-72 school year. The motion passed with 12 yes, 2 abstentions.

C. A communication was received from Dean Ringenberg regarding the appointment of an assistant dean.

TO: Mr. Whitlow

DATE: May 6, 1971

Following is an extract from the minutes of the Letters and Science Department Heads meeting of 4 May 1971. I am sending this to you for the information of the Faculty Senate.

Lawrence A. Ringenberg

I. Dean Ringenberg announced that Dr. Kenneth Hadwiger of the Department of Speech has been appointed Assistant Dean for the College of Letters and Science effective September 1, 1971. (His appointment specifies that he will teach one-third time in the speech department.) The Dean noted that the minutes of the Faculty Senate recently carried a letter from Dr. P. Scott Smith of the Personnel Committee objecting to the procedures used in selecting an Assistant Dean. Dean Ringenberg offered the following comments to the department heads in reaction to Dr. Smith's letter. Dean Ringenberg said he would send a copy of his statement to Dr. Smith, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President. After some discussion, Dean Ringenberg agreed to send a copy to the Faculty Senate also.

According to Dr. Smith the Personnel Committee objects to the "procedures used in selecting an assistant to Dean Ringenberg." The Committee took the position that no new assistant dean should have been appointed this year. The administration took the position that one should be appointed. This indicates a difference in judgement, not improper procedures.

The Personnel Committee objected to the title Assistant Dean and suggested that some may view the matter of title as unimportant. I am not one who feels that the title is unimportant. I feel that a faculty member whose principal duty is to assist a dean, and who has certain duties delegated to him by that dean, should be called an assistant dean. The fact that we disagree about what the title should be does not of itself imply that improper procedures were followed. The fact that the appointment was made with the title requested does not imply that improper procedures were followed.

Dr. Smith's next point is concerned with the Personnel Committee's position regarding the search committee and the role of the department heads in the appointment. The search committee for this appointment represented diverse segments of the College. All department heads had an opportunity (and most of them took it) to meet the candidate from off campus who was here for interviews. What we did a month before Dr. Smith made his announcement of 26 April 1971, was what Dr. Smith said should have been done.

According to Dr. Smith, the Personnel Committee felt that significant portions of the Letters and Science faculty were not consulted sufficiently in the proceedings that culminated in the appointment of an assistant dean. I informed the L and S department heads in November 1970 that the position had been approved, and in December an official announcement was sent to each department head with a request to please post. In my opinion, there was ample opportunity for interested faculty members to consult with me regarding the appointment.

In discussing the position vacancy with department heads in November, I pointed out that my preference was for someone not in mathematics or natural science. (Dr. Smith erred when he said physical science.) I said it was reasonable to appoint someone from the social studies or the humanities and natural science. All department heads seemed to agree with this position. Dr. Smith asserts that it "appears inconsistent not to allow others to consider the matter of area suitability." In my judgement others had ample opportunity to consider the matter of area suitability. Again, this is not an instance of improper procedures.

Since no procedures had been prescribed for the appointment of assistant deans, it seems proper to conclude that what is proper is a matter of judgement. As a result of the experience in this particular instance, I expect procedures to be prescribed for future assistant dean appointments. I expect the Personnel Committee to react to any proposed procedures before they are formally prescribed. And I am confident that prescribed procedures will be followed when the College of Letters and Science is allotted its second assistant dean.

In conclusion, I solicit your support of Dr. Hadwiger as he begins his new duties in September.

Funk moved and Owens seconded that this communication be published. The motion passed with 12 yes, 1 no, and 1 abstention.

A discussion ensued regarding new appointments as opposed to replacement of faculty who have resigned. Rawls moved and Funk seconded a motion that the Senate respond to Dean Ringenberg.

indicating support for Dean Hadwiger, as he begins his new duties. The motion was amended by Barford and seconded by Foreman to indicate that this motion did not indicate either approval or disapproval as to the procedure used in selection. The amendment passed with 7 yes, 3 no, and 4 abstentions. The main motion was defeated with 3 yes, 7 no, and 4 abstentions.

D. A motion was made by Funk, seconded by Lenihan to place on the agenda an item designed to recommend procedures for the creation of new administrative positions and the selection of new administrators. The motion passed unanimously.

E. The Student Senate Minutes of April 22nd were distributed to the Members of the Senate.

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Whitlow referred to a draft of a proposed policy on selection of department heads prepared by a Faculty Senate committee and published in the proceedings of November 16, 1970. A motion was made by Nichols, seconded by Whalin that this proposed policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate with any necessary changes made subsequent to action by the Board of Governors. An amendment was made by Funk and seconded by Katsimpalis to indicate that the appointment of a department head be made by the President after consultation with and approval by the departmental staff and a search committee, including individuals outside of the department, if necessary.

Kluge moved a substitute motion which was seconded by Trank, which stated, "The Faculty Senate shall recommend to the Board of Governors the adoption of the proposed policy on selection of department chairman as submitted by the Council of Faculties." Lenihan moved the previous question which was seconded by Downs, the motion passed 10 yes, 3 no, and 1 abstention. The substitute motion was defeated with 5 yes, 8 no, and 1 abstention. The amendment was defeated with 5 yes, 7 no, and 2 abstentions. A motion was made by Owens and seconded by Katsimpalis to adjourn. The motion lost with 4 yes, 8 no, and 2 abstentions. Mr. Funk called for a roll call vote on the original motion. The main motion passed with 7 yes, 6 no, and 1 abstention.

A motion was made for adjournment, which was passed unanimously. Roll call vote: Trank, Lenihan, Whalin, Nichols, Foreman, Barford, and Elliott voted yes; Katsimpalis, Downs, Funk, Owens, Rawls, and Kluge voted no; Shuff abstained.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be at 12:00 noon in the Heritage Room of the University Union on Monday, May 17, 1971.

AGENDA:

1. Personnel Matters
2. Master Plan, Phase III
3. Distinguished Faculty Award
4. Constitutional Amendments
5. Senate Constitution ByLaws
6. Classroom Visitation
7. Registration
8. Enrollment Policy For Faculty
9. Creation of and Selection for
Administrative positions

Donald A. Kluge
Secretary, Pro Tem