

1972

October 16, 1972

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "October 16, 1972" (1972). *Minutes*. 516.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/516

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 October 16, 1972

MEMBERS PRESENT: Doughty, Elliott, Katsimpalis, Trank, Downs, Lenihan, Owens, Smith, Wiseman, Maurer, Johnson, Whalin, MacLaren, Knott

MEMBERS ABSENT: Shuff

FACULTY VISITOR: Audrey Blankenbaker

STUDENT VISITORS: Roger Locke, Jerry Idoux, Ron Hinson

The minutes of October 9, 1972 were approved with the following changes. The minutes should have included a memorandum from W. S. Lowell. (See Appendix A)

COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Lenihan reported on the Board of Governors meeting. Most of the report concerned the phasing out of the Laboratory School.
2. Doughty reported on the comparison of AFT and UPC policies. Doughty requested that written comments be sent to him or brought to the Senate by October 23, 1972.
3. Downs reported on the School Calendar for 1973-1974. The discussion centered around the Spring vacation that is scheduled at the middle of the semester. The question asked was why not have the Spring vacation at the Easter break similar to other colleges and universities. This would also coincide with the local public schools. Comment was asked from the Student Senate.
4. Downs reported on two replacements as alternates on the Library Advisory Board and Faculty Research Committee.

A motion was made by Owens, seconded by Elliott, that we accept the recommendation of Richard Lawson as alternate to the Library Advisory Board and Fred Schramm as alternate to Research Committee. The motion passed unanimously

5. Whalin reported for the Committee on the Improvement of College Teaching. The report listed the following suggestions for improving teaching:
 1. More frequent Student-Faculty evaluations.
 2. Retention and comparison of all evaluations received by each faculty member.
 3. Greater recognition of teaching as the activity with the highest priority at the institution.
 4. Bring in experts in the different disciplines for short visits, who have national reputation as outstanding teachers. The purpose would be to give inspiration and advice to faculty members in their teaching field.
 5. Improve professional travel allowances to encourage faculty members to attend more meetings in their fields.

A motion was made by Maurer, seconded by Trank, that the faculty be required to participate in student evaluation process and that Department Personnel

Committees consider the results when evaluating members of the department.

A motion was made by Smith, seconded by Downs, to table the motion for two weeks and publish the motion for faculty response. The motion passed with 9 yes, 2 no.

COMMUNICATIONS

1. Memorandum from S. R. Steele.

A motion was made by Downs, seconded by Maurer, to go into executive session on the memorandum from S. R. Steele. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Minutes of the Student Senate meetings of October 5, 1972 and October 12, 1972.

A motion was made by Owens to publish the Student Senate's Teacher Injustices Program as presented in the October 5, 1972 minutes and ask for Faculty comment (See Appendix B). The motion passed unanimously.

3. List of Student-Faculty Boards for 1972-1973.

4. Memorandum from President Fite concerning departmental status of Student Teacher Coordinators. President Fite rejected the recommendation of the Faculty Senate on the basis that it is possible for a Student Teacher Coordinator to be denied departmental affiliation.

A motion was made by Maurer, seconded by Smith, to invite the President, Provost, Director of Student Teaching, and Dean of Arts and Science to meet with the Faculty Senate. The motion passed with 7 yes, 4 no, 1 abstention.

5. Memorandum from G. Rommel. (See Appendix C).

6. Memorandum from B. Keppler supporting the Faculty Senate's Ad Hoc Committee regarding the revision of the Academic Councils.

A motion was made by Trank, seconded by Johnson, to publish all communications concerning restructuring of University Academic Councils. (See Appendix D). The motion passed unanimously.

7. Request from Ron Hinson to speak to the Faculty Senate in regard to the Ad Hoc Committee report on the reorganization of the COTE.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

The next meeting will be held on Monday, October 23, 1972, at 12:00 p.m.

AGENDA

1. By-Laws
2. Reapportionment of University Councils
3. Improvement of College Teaching
4. Student Bill of Rights
5. Trimester System Committee Report due on November 6, 1972.
6. Teacher Evaluation, Fall, 1972

Robert C. Wiseman
Secretary

Appendix A

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
Interdepartmental Communication

To: Faculty Senate

Date: October 9, 1972

Subject: Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation--
Restructuring University Academic Councils

From: W. S. Lowell

I refer to the Faculty Senate Minutes of October 2, 1972 (Appendix A), in which the Ad Hoc Committee has made recommendations on the representation on University Academic Councils.

I believe that equity of representation on the academic councils should be based upon numbers of majors and numbers of graduates. I would suggest that a study of the total number of majors and graduates in each discipline for the last five years (or more) be used as a guide in the apportionment of members on the councils. With the above statement as my premise for justification, I believe that the School of HPER should be given one seat on the CAA, one seat on the CGS and one seat on the COTE. I do not believe there should be any "at large" candidates for the three committees because I feel that such a category would again result in politicking around campus for the two seats. I reluctantly accept students on committees. Personally, I think they should be in class. If we are to accept students on these three committees, I think they should meet the same academic criteria as all the athletes on Eastern's campus; that is;

Be currently enrolled in 11 hours and have successfully completed 12 hours the previous quarter with a Cum. GPA of 2.0. The two students elected to the CGS should be fulltime graduate students in good standing. The two students on each committee should come from different Schools or Colleges. I believe that the School of Education should have a much larger representation on the CGS than two members, because of their large enrollment in graduate school. I believe also that the Schools of Industrial Arts and Home Economics should each have a member on COTE.

The following is my recommendation for representation on the Academic Councils:

	<u>CAA</u>	<u>CGS</u>	<u>COTE</u>
Arts & Science	4	3	2
Education	2	3	3
Business	1	1	1
HPER	1	1	1
Music, Ind. Arts, Home Economics	1	1	
Home Economics			1
Ind. Arts			1
Students	2	2	2

Respectfully submitted,

W. S. Lowell, Dean
School of Health, Physical
Education, and Recreation

WSL:ag

cc: President Fite
Vice President Moody

Appendix B

PURPOSE: To establish rules and operating procedures for the Academic Affairs Committee in hearing student complaints of teacher injustices and acting upon such complaints.

OPERATING PROCEDURES:

- A. Any student having a complaint against any instructor will present his complaint to the committee, in person, at the time specified by the Chairman of the Committee.
- B. The Academic Affairs Committee will decide, without the presence of the complainant, after hearing the student's complaint, whether or not it will take action on the complaint.
- C. Should the Academic Affairs Committee decide that no action on their part is necessary, their decision can be overridden only by the Student Senate if the student brings the complaint to that body in person.
- D. Should the Academic Affairs Committee decide that action is warranted, it shall decide the nature of such action. Normally, action taken by the Committee may involve one of two alternatives:
 1. To act immediately.
 2. To add the complaint to a list of complaints against a particular instructor until the committee feels it has sufficient cause to act.
- E. Action taken by the Academic Affairs Committee will involve, but is not limited to, the following steps:
 1. Call for a meeting with the named instructor in the complaint.
 2. If no solution results from step 1, then a meeting will be held by a joint meeting of teacher, department head, student, and Academic Affairs member. At this time all pertinent evidence shall be provided by both instructor and student (ie. tests and papers). Also any Teacher Evaluation reports shall be made available by the Speaker of the Senate or Teacher Evaluation Head to the Academic Affairs Committee before the joint meeting to be reviewed for obtaining possible background material on the instructor in question.
 3. If no solution is thought to have resulted from any of the preceding steps, then the committee may present the nature of the complaint to the Student Senate and call for whatever action it determines to be necessary--possibly even demanding that the instructor be dismissed.
- F. If a solution is thought to have resulted from any of the preceding steps but it is discovered later that a solution has not resulted, then the committee, upon a majority vote, may re-open their investigation at the point (step) at which a solution was thought to have been found.

RULES:

1. All students having a complaint against any instructor must identify himself to the committee when registering such a complaint.
2. All students registering a complaint have the right to request that the committee not reveal his identity throughout the course of their investigation, or thereafter, and this request shall be honored automatically by the committee.
3. No committee member shall discuss with anyone outside the committee the nature of any complaint presented to the committee (Any discussion will be done at the risk of removal from the committee).
4. All decisions by the committee on such matters as 1) whether or not action shall be taken 2) the nature of such action 3) reopening a case 4) deciding whether or not a solution has been reached shall be by simple majority vote.

Appendix B (con't)

5. The complainant has the right to be present during the committee's performance of any of the steps outlined in section E.
6. Under no conditions shall the press be allowed to sit in on the hearings of any student complaint.
7. Only committee members may be present for the hearings.
8. The instructor named in the student complaint has the right to be present during the committee's performance of any of the steps outlined in section E.
9. The instructor's department head has the right to be present during the committee's performance of any of the steps outlined in section E.

Appendix C

October 13, 1972

To the Faculty Senate:

The most recent Illinois Pension Code proposals concerning improvements in our retirement system (State University and State Employees Retirement Systems) do not include a merger with Social Security. Please publish this comment in your minutes to allay the concern I find among the faculty.

G. Rommel

Appendix D

To: Dr. Pat Lenihan, Chairman Faculty Senate

Date: 10 Oct 72

Subject: Faculty Senate Minutes

From: Bill Keppler-
Department of Zoology

Dear Chairman Lenihan:

I would like to support the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee with regard to the revision of the Academic Councils which appeared with the 2 Oct 72 minutes.

The composition as suggested with unquestionably be more appropriate and undoubtedly more representative. Many instances these important Academic Councils are the result of apathy and unequal representation from various University segments.

Sincerely,
William J. Keppler

MEMORANDUM

13 October 1972

To: Faculty Senate

From: R. White, English

I write to request that the Senate table the question of restructured University councils until a more accurate representation system can be devised than the one published in Senate minutes of 2 October 72. I see three problems with the published proposal.

Primary is the matter of proportions. It seems apparent that if they are to

Appendix D (con't)

be proportionally representative, councils should reflect the actual quantity of teaching going on in the represented areas; elsewhere in the University the means toward this end is a count of student credit-hour production. No figures for 1972-73 are available to me as yet, but I present credit-hour production figures for the latest available normal term, Fall 1971. From these figures I would first conclude that HPER ought not be combined with other schools, since it has the second highest productivity on campus; the end of compulsory service courses in P.E. will diminish the productivity, but surely the Senate can obtain current figures. My second conclusion would be that L & S ought have a significantly higher representation. Indeed, excluding at-large and student representation, one might well argue that the CAA, e.g., ought be comprised of six members from L & S; one each from Business Education, and HPER; and one from the combined areas Home Economics, Industrial Arts, and Music. It is obviously for the Senate to work out the most reasonable system of representation, but surely it is important that the system reflect actual rather than estimated data.

A second problem, less important, may be simply a matter of interpreting the published proposal: Is the first note (No more than one member from a department may serve at one time) controlling over the third note (May be elected from any segment of the University)? I would hope not, and that the term "At Large" would really mean at large.

Finally, I do not see that the presence of the Provost as ex officio member of all academic councils would inhibit faculty participation; if I am mistaken, it is a sorry commentary on our faculty. Indeed, I seriously doubt whether the needs of the University at large can ever be sufficiently apparent in any council where the Provost is absent. Thus I would urge membership for the Provost on all academic councils.

SCHOOL	CHP, FALL 1971	Percent
L & S	82655	65
HPER	13723	11
Business	10836	9
Education	10399	8
Music	4460	4
Home Economics	2798	2
IA & T	2092	2
HPER + HoEc + Mus + IAT equals	23073	18
Music + HoEc + IAT	9350	7.4

cc: V. P. Moody