

1971

December 6, 1971

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "December 6, 1971" (1971). *Minutes*. 485.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/485

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
Minutes of December 6, 1971

MEMBERS PRESENT: Read, Hattabaugh, Trank, Elliott, Lenihan, Maurer, Katsimpalis, Kluge, Shuff, C. Smith, Barford, Whalin, Downs, Owens

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STUDENT OBSERVERS: Alan Grosboll, Mary Ann Hayes

The meeting was opened by Chairman Whitlow. The minutes of the special meeting of November 22, 1971 were approved as published.

EXECUTIVE REPORT

1. It was announced that the Board of Governors will meet Wednesday and Thursday, December 8 & 9, 1971 to discuss FY 1973 operating budget.
2. The Chairman presented a request to submit the proper name of the University Union to the Board of Governors at their next meeting. A motion was made by Maurer and seconded by Lenihan to name the building "Martin Luther King, Jr. University Union". The motion passed with 11 yes, 3 abstentions.
3. It was announced that the secretary of the Faculty Senate has submitted his resignation. Maurer nominated Elliott for the position of secretary. This nomination was seconded by Hattabaugh. A motion was made by C. Smith and seconded by Hattabaugh to elect Elliott by acclamation. The motion carried with 13 yes and 1 no.

BUDGET COMMITTEE

Shuff reported on a meeting of the Budget Committee held Friday, December 4, 1971. The meeting was called to revise the original distribution of funds (reported in the minutes of November 22, 1971) as it was not based on the resolution of the Board of Governors which indicated that 4.6% was to be used as a base for increases in salary. The re-distribution of funds is as follows:

Personal Services Money Restored to the Budget	\$533,710
Restoration of Student Help Money	\$64,190
Restoration of Civil Service Money	65,687
Academic Increases at 4.6% level	331,200
Money for Contingency & Early Contracts	18,600
Balance to be distributed	<u>479,677</u> 54,033

The committee made the following distribution of the balance:

Travel - Professional	\$20,000
Equipment	15,000
Student Help (RA's)	19,000

COMMUNICATIONS

1. From President Fite in response to the Faculty Senate's request for a reduction in load for members of the Personnel Committee,

Chairman of the Faculty Senate and a Recording Secretary for the Faculty Senate. His response indicated that the request touches on three important matters: (1) cost, (2) whether the members can be spared by the departments and (3) whether the future work of these groups will require as much time as is experienced at present. The President did approve a one course reduction during the spring quarter for members of the Personnel Committee providing it can be worked out with the three departments. A reduction in load for the Chairman of the Faculty Senate was not approved because the reduction would involve two members of the same department. A part-time recording secretary was not approved. The President's reasoning centered about the present heavy workload of the two groups which involves the development and revision of personnel policies. President Fite did provide for a reconsideration of the request at the beginning of the next fiscal year.

2. Copy of a letter to P. Scott Smith from Robert A. Carey regarding Smith's recent proposal to exclude students from the Teacher Evaluation process.
3. From P. Scott Smith in response to Dr. White's previous memo. Kluge made a motion which was seconded by Elliott to refer all communications on Teacher Evaluation to the Faculty-Student Relations Committee. The motion carried unanimously. C. Smith moved to publish the communication from P. Scott Smith. The motion was seconded by Hattabaugh. The motion carried with 11 yes, 1 no and 2 abstentions. The communication is as follows:

"I am reluctant to reenter the discussion of the usage of student evaluations. However, it is a most important issue and as a member of the University Personnel Committee I feel compelled to attempt to straighten out a few points of the controversy raised recently by Dr. Robert White. I do not speak for the committee as a whole inasmuch as we have felt it wise to refrain from taking a committee position.

It is unfortunate in my view that Dr. White in objecting strongly to my suggestions to the student evaluation committee did not see fit to answer difficulties the plan attempted to surmount. I cannot believe he was attempting to scuttle use of any student evaluations whatsoever, for he has stated that he considers teaching competence of prime importance in assessing a faculty member's overall competence.

He objected strongly to "not allowing students with cumulative C.P.A.'s under 2.7" to evaluate (though I had stated the evaluations performed by these students would go to the faculty members themselves for impact so that each faculty member would know whether he were succeeding with this group). The plan I submitted was to limit the evaluations going to administrative personnel files to those from students of higher than a 2.7 C.G.P.A. It is entirely false to construe from this that I consider those students with less than 2.7 G.P.A. (a majority of 50 to 60 percent)

as not entitled to opinions on teaching worth.

In my past work with the University Personnel Committee I have been made aware that many faculty members feel threat against giving low grades lest they incur low student evaluations in return. The point, as I shall develop, is not whether students so react (which I will take no position on) but that some faculty members think they do. In fact, there are a number of indications that, if student evaluations reflect on "bread and butter" issues (salary, promotion, etc.), faculty members will feel greater classroom pressure from lower grade-point students and accordingly to satisfy all students there will inevitably be a grade-point inflation. Certainly requiring less of students for a good grade will lower the standards of our degree offerings and I believe students and faculty alike would not wish to have that happen. Furthermore, I have always abhorred the use of grades by faculty members in any way as punitive action toward "the unfriendly" student and it would be inconsistent to cause any faculty member conscientiously rendering judgments on student performance, to feel backlash pressure. (A tyranny of students is no more to be desired than a tyranny of the faculty.)

Incredibly, Dr. White never refers to this main argument (which I attempted to bring out in my previous memorandum). Hence, I would conclude he either believes (a) good grades for less effort and accomplishment is an unimportant concern, (b) there would be no adverse effects of grade-point pressure upon faculty members (evidence to the contrary notwithstanding), (c) students of 2.7 grade-point and higher are less capable of evaluating faculty members, or (d) the whole evaluative scheme should be forgotten as part of any personnel instrument.

I do not believe that students with G.P.A. of 2.7 and higher will give a high rating to a teacher who takes an "elitest point of view" toward lower grade-point students in his classes. I believe they will hold him to as high standards of student rapport as lower grade-point students will. I further suggest that, if this plan is disenfranchisement, then establishing honor societies, Dean's lists, etc. which base their sole purpose of existence on recognizing excellence, should the much more be abolished as undemocratic.

I believe responsible segments of this university will try to see that nothing shall be done in the name of evaluation that would tend to lower standards in the university or lessen the quality of its degrees.

(A suggestion for the student evaluative committee if it should decide to use C.G.P.A.:

Have the student monitor bring to class along with the evaluation sheets a roster listing C.G.P.A. up through the previous quarter of each student in the class. As the monitor reads off the names from the roster he records on each evaluation sheet only "<2.7" or ">2.7" (not the student name) or whatever gradepoint division the committee decides upon. (This would achieve, also, the desirable end of retaining evaluation sheets for absent students as well and, of course, preserve anonymity.)"

4. From Dan Thornburgh on the proposal to name the Student Services Building as the Francis Palmer Hall. The Chairman mentioned that no communication had been received from the Student Senate in this regard.
5. From Don Kluge resigning as secretary to the Faculty Senate.
6. From Lynn Trank, Chairman of the Summer School Committee. Lenihan moved and Katsimpalis seconded a motion to publish this report. The motion carried. It is as follows:

"The committee appointed to study summer school concluded from preliminary study that summer school 1972 would proceed largely as planned. The committee consulted with Dean Taber and Vice President Moody and has received comments from nearly all Deans and Directors. Critical points considered were:

1. The budget committee indicates that Summer 1972 could be funded at a rate similar to Summer 1971 with the exception that non self supporting workshops be cancelled.
2. A different length session starting during mid-June would weight the July and August budget heavier than desirable. The shortened session would be more expensive because the undergraduate teaching load would be two classes in place of three.
3. Rumors of complete cancellation of summer session could best be stopped by proceeding as planned and announced.

the committee would like to work with the calendar committee to look at summer 1973 and the entire school year."

7. From Vice President Moody on the election of department heads in specific areas such as the Lab School and the Student Teaching Department.
8. From Mary Elizabeth Scott, Chairman of the Library Personnel Committee on the UPC's proposals on Tenure and Termination, Salary and Promotion, and the composition of the Departmental Personnel Committee.

9. A copy of a letter from President Fite to Alan Grosboll, Speaker of the Student Senate, indicating that the NCAA rule is clear in that a faculty majority is required for the Athletic Board.
10. Petitions from faculty members requesting that the Faculty Senate hold an election to find out if a majority of faculty favor collective bargaining. A motion was made by Barford and seconded by Maurer to receive the petitions and that the Senate take no action because of the absence of enabling legislation on the part of the State of Illinois. The motion failed with 5 yes, 9 no. A motion was made by C. Smith and seconded by Trank that the Chairman appoint a committee to draw up a questionnaire seeking appropriate information about the topic of collective bargaining. This questionnaire would be distributed to the faculty with a future copy of the Senate minutes. The motion passed with 10 yes, 2 no and 2 abstentions.
11. From William J. Crane on Elected Department Chairmen and a University Senate.
12. From Janet Norberg on Student Evaluations and Departmental Personnel Committees.
13. From Richard L. Smith, John M. Speer and Terry M. Weidner on the Guidelines for the Election of Department Chairmen.
14. Student Senate minutes of November 11 & 16, 1971.
15. Council of Faculties Minutes of November 1, 1971.
16. From Dean Mary Ruth Swope on Student Evaluation.
17. November copy of the Journal of the Illinois Board of Higher Education.
18. From Vice President Holt regarding the option of having pay checks on a 9 or 12 month option. Mr. Holt indicated that this option would not be possible until July 1, 1972 because of the mid-year salary adjustments and the new insurance program.

It was the consensus of the Senate to adopt the following procedure for communications: The Executive Committee will screen communications and make subjective judgments for referral to committees, items for brief action by the Senate and items to be placed on the agenda.

The next meeting will be devoted to the proposal for an interim University Senate. Whalin moved which was seconded by C. Smith that the Faculty Senate go on record to oppose the principal of a University Senate.

A motion was made by Downs and seconded by Kluge to adjourn. The motion passed with 8 yes, 4 no and 2 abstentions. The next meeting of the Senate will be held in the Heritage Room of the Martin Luther King, Jr. University Union at 12 noon, Monday, December 13, 1971.

AGENDA

1. Personnel Matters
 - a. Interim-to-tenure policy
 - b. Promotion
 - c. Tenure
 - d. Dismissal
 - e. Election of Department Chairmen
2. Classroom Visitation
3. Registration
4. Creation and Selection for Administrative Positions
5. Recognition for Retiring Faculty
6. Calendar for 1972 Summer Session
7. Summer Rotation Plan
8. Teacher Evaluation
9. Composition of Apportionment Board
10. Eastern's Graduated Tuition Plan

Donald A. Kluge