

1972

April 3, 1972

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "April 3, 1972" (1972). *Minutes*. 500.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/500

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 April 3, 1972

MEMBERS PRESENT: Barford, Downs, Doughty, Elliott, Hattabaugh, Katsimpalis, Kluge, Lenihan, Owens, Read, Shuff, Trank, Whalin, Whitlow

MEMBERS ABSENT: C. Smith

STUDENT OBSERVERS: Mike Goetz, Alan Grosboll, Ellen Schanzle

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was held Monday, April 3, 1972, at 12:00 noon, in the Heritage Room of the Martin Luther King, Jr. University Union. The minutes of the March 27 meeting were approved after the following corrections were noted: (1) Mr. R. A. Stipes, Jr. is no longer a member of the Board of Higher Education and should be deleted from the list on page 5 of Appendix 2; and (2) the following motion should be added to the March 27 proceedings: Lenihan moved, seconded by Downs, that the Committee Report on Summer Employment Policy for Faculty Members be published. The motion passed unanimously. (See Appendix 1)

Executive Committee

Mr. Whitlow announced that the University Personnel Committee has prepared a written statement outlining the Committee's procedures. Mr. Lenihan moved, seconded by Barford, that the report be published in order to inform the faculty about the procedures. The motion passed with 8 yes, 3 no, and 1 abstention. (See Appendix 2)

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

1. A copy of the Journal of the Illinois Board of Higher Education dated March, 1972.
2. A copy of a memorandum from Vice President Shaefer to Dr. Szerenyi stating that the University Planning Council had agreed that the gravel parking lot south of the library should be surfaced at the earliest possible date.
3. A copy of the minutes of the University Budget Committee, dated March 23, 1972.
4. A memorandum from Mr. Rommel asking the Senate to sponsor a letter-writing campaign in support of Mr. Gibala's presentation of the needed funding of the State Universities Retirement System. Action was delayed until after the April meeting of the Council of Faculties.
5. A memorandum from President Fite approving the sabbatical leave policy and procedures which the Faculty Senate recently passed to be implemented for 1973-1974.

6. A copy of a letter from President Fite to Stan Harvey, student senator, approving an Apportionment Board consisting of seven students and three faculty members.
7. A copy of the Council of Faculties minutes dated 13 March 1972.
8. A memorandum from the Vice President for Business Services with an attached copy of a release received from Mr. Gibala of the State Universities Retirement System.
9. A petition signed by several faculty members asking for a referendum on personnel policies and procedures.

After discussion, Whalin moved, seconded by Shuff, that a referendum be held on the matter of personnel policies as drawn up by the University Personnel Committee and the American Federation of Teachers. The motion failed with 1 yes, 11 no, and 1 abstention.

Kluge made the following motion: (1) that the Chairman of the Senate appoint a committee to study the proposed personnel policies of the AFT in relation to those of the University Personnel Committee; (2) that the committee report back to the Senate; and (3) that the item be put on the agenda. The motion was seconded by Downs and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Whitlow named Read, Doughty, and Whalin to serve on this committee.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Election Committee

Mr. Downs reported that Mr. Eiler, a nominee for the faculty senate, is ineligible to run for the Senate because he has not been a faculty member at Eastern the required length of time. Mr. Eiler has been notified of this requirement.

OLD BUSINESS

Committee Report on 1973 Summer Session

Lenihan made a motion to remove the report of the Committee on the 1973 Summer session from the table. (The report was published in the February 7, 1972 Senate minutes.) The motion was seconded by Whalin and it passed with 10 yes and 3 abstentions.

A short discussion followed with no action taken at this time.

Change-Over from the Quarter System to the Semester System

Vice-President Moody attended this portion of the meeting to answer questions concerning the change from the quarter system to the semester system. He reported that the Council on Academic Affairs was working on the general education requirements and had tentatively set the following requirements: 6 hours in English; 2 or 3 in Speech; 10 hours in Social Science; 10 hours in Humanities; and 2 in Health Education.

He also stated that 32 hours would be required for majors and 16 hours for minors. He hoped that this would leave more room for electives in most programs. Scheduling problems and teacher loads were other topics discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held in the Heritage Room of the University Union at 12 noon, Monday, April 10, 1972.

AGENDA

1. Personnel Matters--Promotion
2. Classroom Visitation
3. Summer Rotation
4. By-Laws
5. Improvement of College Teaching
6. Textbook Rental Plan
7. Personnel Policies--AFT and University Personnel Committee

Tom Elliott
Secretary

(APPENDIX 1)

COMMITTEE REPORT
ON
SUMMER EMPLOYMENT POLICY FOR FACULTY MEMBERS

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT POLICY COMMITTEE FINDINGS

In setting up summer employment policies, the faculty is analyzed in two groups:

1. Returning full-time members of departments or schools (departments in this sense being those not associated with schools.)
2. Returning faculty with joint appointments.

It is not deemed advisable to attempt to apply rigidly-uniform policies in total or within either of the above two categories.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT ROTATION POLICIES FOR GROUP 1

Below are some of the considerations to be applied to the policies of rotation for full-time department members:

1. Uniformity. Each department will publish a printed policy of rotation of its members. (One copy of the policy will be sent to the Vice President for Instruction and Provost through the Dean of the School by June 1.) The printed policy will adhere as closely as possible to the following principles:
 - a. New Member Employment. The summer status of a new member after his first year of employment should be decided at the time he is hired and stated on his initial contract.
 - b. Limitation on Consecutive Employment. Departments should, where not impairing departmental efficiency, try to set up rotation plans which limit the consecutive employment of any individual. This recommendation therein subscribes to the thesis that an occasional "change-of-scene" is conducive to self-betterment and intellectual growth.
 - c. Inclusion of Administrative Officials in Departmental Rotation. Officers of administration who fill out part of their loads by teaching in given departments will teach in the summer only when no qualified faculty member is available.
2. Exceptions (to uniformity):
 - a. Specialty Offering. Specialty courses by their nature may require the repeated employment of a specialist within the departmental staff, moving that individual temporarily out of the rotation plan. The need for this selective employment must be demonstrated to the Vice President for Instruction.
 - b. Employment of Summer Substitutes. It will be the general policy of heads of departments to employ substitutes only where in their judgement no available member of the permanent staff possesses the required training and experience for the position involved. This must not be interpreted

as in any way prohibiting the employment of a visiting expert who can make a real contribution to the campus.

- c. Doctorate Policy. Non-doctorate members should be assured employment at least 50% as often as holders of the doctorate in the rotation plan.
 - d. Preferential Employment. A staff member may be given preferential employment in the summers preceding and following a minimum of one school-year's leave for formal study.
 - e. Retirement. A person approaching retirement may receive preferential treatment in the department's rotation plan.
3. Pre-planning. In the fall quarter all members of a given department will be given the opportunity to participate in or to make suggestions pertinent to the formulation of the program for the subsequent summer in a full departmental meeting. Following this they should receive a tentative outline of the summer program and should have an opportunity to discuss it in full departmental meeting. Should subsequent circumstances make it necessary to change the program for that department, such changes should be discussed in a full departmental meeting before the program is adopted and published.

NOTE: Temporary Staff Employment. The use of qualified, available substitutes from the community should be encouraged during the heavy enrollment quarters of sequence courses, during leaves of absence of one or two quarters and in any other instances of temporary need. This would result in fewer full-time teachers to be considered in rotation plans.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT ROTATION POLICIES FOR GROUP 2

Preface. The basic approach to group 1 policies above, in which there is an attempt to spell out an essentially uniform policy must be modified for faculty in group 2 for the following reasons:

1. Commitments to more than one department. Many group 2 members have duties in more than one department.
2. Early fall report. Most coordinating teachers report early for fall duty, before the official opening of school (with a correspondingly larger first fall paycheck.)

Policies

This more heterogeneous departmental status of group 2 members requires a more individualized approach to their summer employment.

1. At the time of initial employment the summer rotation of a group 2 faculty member will be stated in writing in his initial contract. (The summer rotation status of present members of group 2 faculty will be determined by the department chairmen involved and stated in writing by October 1, 1972.)
2. Departmental use of this group. Department chairmen should make provision in their rotation plans for these members to teach such needed departmental courses as they may be qualified to teach e.g. (a) general education courses and

(b) departmental methods courses.

3. Cooperative pre-planning. In an effort to assure optimum use of group 2 in these inter-related fields, it is recommended that the chairmen of the departments and schools representing the field(s) of work of these members meet each fall to work out group 2 assignments for the succeeding summer.

(APPENDIX 2)

INTERNAL OPERATING PROCEDURE FOR U.P.C. IN APPEALS CASES

The University Personnel Committee is available at any time to any member of the faculty or administration for consultation and/or appeal in any matter relating to tenure, termination, promotion, salary recommendation, or teaching assignment. Although appeals may be made at any time, they are normally made following annual spring evaluations. Unless the Personnel Committee has entered a case earlier and taken a position, it is available to any member of the campus community who (a) has exhausted due process channels at the departmental level and does not wish to appeal to his academic dean, or, (b) is convinced that his position in the department would be jeopardized by carrying the grievance through departmental channels. (See "Alternative Appeal Channels" footnote.)

The University Personnel Committee receives information routinely from the administration relative to tenure, termination, promotion, and annual salary recommendations. The Committee reviews this information to see if the recommendations comport with university guidelines. If they appear to do so, the recommendations are forwarded to the President. Where there are conflicting recommendations or if there appear to be inequities that need to be corrected, the UPC may recommend changes. The mere receipt of routine information on termination action, etc., shall not bind the committee to a position of support of that action in cases of later appeal. (Typically UPC would have no immediate cause to attempt to investigate and validate terminal recommendations emanating from departments.)

In deciding whether or not to appeal a decision, it is quite proper for individuals to explore the nature of possible UPC assistance, or simply to seek information on procedures and due process. Any of the three members of UPC will entertain formal or informal approaches from persons seeking resolution of problems or clarification of personnel policies or procedures. In any appeals case where a member of UPC is simultaneously a member of the department involved or considers himself too close to either the defendant or complainant, he steps aside and the alternate takes his place.

If, after an exploratory session, it appears advisable for UPC to entertain an appeal, the UPC chairman will arrange a hearing where facts and evidence bearing on the case can be presented to the whole committee. Evidence may be submitted in writing to the chairman or to the secretary with copies to the other UPC members. The appellant and any one else involved in the case should address all inquiries and other communications to the UPC chairman. Upon request, the UPC chairman will set up hearings before the whole committee. UPC operating policy requires individual committee members to inform anyone approaching them that hearings must be before the whole committee. Individual committee members may answer procedural questions but cannot speak for the whole committee or appear in any way to have prejudged a verdict for the whole committee.

UPC has a code of strict confidence between themselves and those seeking assistance. When a case carries over into hearings with other departmental members, the rule of strict confidence extends to cover the additional persons involved. When an appeal is to go forward, the department chairman is informed that he and others will have an opportunity to be heard.

The UPC chairman will review with each appellant the fact that UPC is not by definition an advocate for the appellant but rather reserves the right to refuse support if it believes the appeal lacks sufficient merit. To this end, appellants

must recognize that they have no claim on the committee and should, of course, refrain from seeking preferential treatment.

On the other hand, the UPC members are united in the conviction that committee accessibility for dialogue is an essential ingredient of faculty protection. Hence, collectively the committee seeks to maintain open lines of communication with both defendants and complainants who may feel committee knowledge of or assistance in some facets of the issue concerned is warranted (while, of course, giving no indication in confidential hearings of the likely direction of decision). The committee also insists that "the real reason(s)" of non support are made known in writing to an appellant wishing to know them, whether or not the committee intends to support the claim of the appellant.

Following grievance hearings, the judgment and recommendation of UPC shall be simultaneously submitted to the appellant, the departmental personnel committee membership, the department chairman, the appropriate academic dean, the Provost, and the President. In arriving at a decision, it is understood that the Provost and the President must weigh the faculty voice of protection along with and perhaps in opposition to that of the representative of the Administration over the particular department involved, namely that of the appropriate academic dean.

¹ALTERNATIVE APPEAL CHANNELS

1. Appeals normally should be registered with the departmental personnel committees (but any such committee must recognize that there may be cases where the appellant, correctly or not, believes his position jeopardized by approach to his departmental personnel committee, so that said member may seek external redress, immediately).
2. Depending on the nature of the problem, further appeal beyond the department may be made either to the University Personnel Committee or to the College Dean but not to both concurrently. Beyond his role in this function, the Dean should be prepared to originate recommendations of action or structure Ad Hoc Committees (the latter upon advice of the University Personnel Committee) to ameliorate prevailing conditions within problem departments under his supervision.
3. A further appeal may be carried to the Provost or to the University Personnel Committee if the step 2 appeal has been directed to the College Dean. (Again a concurrent appeal should not be registered with both the Provost and the University Personnel Committee.)
4. If step 3 appeal was directed to the Provost, a further appeal may be directed to the University Personnel Committee, or vice versa.
5. Last recourse following appeals as shown shall be to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate may listen to the complainant and if that body feels there is reasonable doubt that fair hearings have been awarded or feels that inappropriate decision may have been arrived at, the Senate may undertake its own investigation and, if necessary, meet with the Personnel Committee to seek to achieve a common faculty recommendation.

6. In event of appeal to either Dean or Provost following appeal to UPC, the Dean or Provost may upon hearing the complainant decide to undertake his own investigation when he feels there is reasonable doubt full and appropriate hearings have been held. Lacking this doubt, no such obligation is incumbent.

P. Scott Smith, Chairman) University
Leonard Wood) Personnel
Charles Switzer) Committee

April 3, 1972