

1973

January 15, 1973

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 15, 1973" (1973). *Minutes*. 522.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/522](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/522)

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](mailto: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 January 15, 1973

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Shuff, Lenihan

STUDENT VISITORS: Jerry Idoux, Tom Davenport, Roger Locke, Allen Grosboll

FACULTY VISITORS: A. Blankenbaker

In the absence of Mr. Lenihan, Mr. Doughty presided. Mr. Doughty dispensed with the normal procedures so that Bob Hennings might present the Resolution passed by the Council of Faculties, 8 January, 1973.

The minutes of January 8, 1973 were approved as published.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Doughty reported that the Budget Committee is meeting Wednesday, January 17, 1973, at 4:00 p.m.
2. Downs reported the progress of the Election Committee.
3. Johnson reported that the Committee report for Reapportionment of University Councils will not be ready until January 22, 1973.
4. Smith reported on the progress of the Committee studying the Student Bill of Rights.

COMMUNICATIONS

1. Memorandum from President Fite expressing his agreement on the Faculty Senate's position on the Lincoln State University.
2. Letter from Ben Morton, Executive Officer, Board of Governors, concerning the Senate's position on Lincoln State University. Mr. Morton wrote that he had recommended that the work on Lincoln State University be deferred until the 1974 Legislative session.
3. Memorandum from President Fite concerning the Senate's recommended personnel procedures changes.

A motion was made by Elliott, seconded by Downs, that the memorandum from President Fite be published. (See Appendix A)

A motion was made by Smith, seconded by Knott, to amend the motion to include the original personnel procedures. (See Appendix A) The motion passed unanimously.

4. Memorandum from R. White concerning the Report on Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Higher Education.
5. Student Senate minutes of January 9, 1973.

The meeting adjourned at 13:00.  
The next meeting will be held on January 22, 1973 at 12:00.

AGENDA

1. By-Laws, January 29, 1973
2. Reapportionment of University Councils, January 22, 1973
3. Student Bill of Rights, January 22, 1973
4. Textbook Rental Plan, February 5, 1973
5. Criteria for Distinguished Faculty Award, February 5, 1973

Robert C. Wiseman  
Secretary

Appendix A

RESOLUTION ON CHANGES OF THE PERSONNEL POLICY (Vol. 1 - 27)

1. The pay raise (amount) that is recommended for each faculty member on the new contract will be made known to that individual at the time the recommendation is made by the departmental personnel committee.
2. Any changes made in that amount at any level after leaving the departmental personnel committee must be made known to the faculty member at the time the change occurs.
3. The faculty member will have the right to appeal all decisions made at all levels.
4. The faculty member can bypass a level in appealing if a change has been made at that level and the appeal was denied.
5. All criteria for promotion, tenure, and salary must be made known to each individual faculty member prior to his/her evaluation.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Lenihan

DATE: January 9, 1973

This is a response to your memorandum of December 26 in regard to personnel procedures. I regret that I can approve only part of the five procedural changes which the Faculty Senate has recommended.

As you know, I have already approved point one and that principle is already current policy as indicated by the instructions which went out to departments on January 6.

In the case of point two, I do not believe that anything worthwhile would come from a requirement to notify a faculty member every time a change was made in the salary recommendation after it left the department. I believe this policy would reduce openness and frankness in recommendations, that it would generate controversy and generally enhance confusion. Therefore, I cannot approve procedure two.

I want to deal with procedures three and four together. These both deal with appeals. We already have full and thorough policies on appeal beyond the department. That procedure calls for appeal to the elected University Personnel Committee. There is nothing that I can see in procedures three and four which is not already in practice. That is, a faculty member has the right to appeal decisions made in the regular process of evaluations and the UPC has, as a part of its investigative powers and procedures, the right to look at all aspects of a problem. In other words, the UPC is the investigative

agency once it accepts an appeal. Therefore, I consider procedures three and four redundant and unnecessary. They add nothing to faculty rights and privileges.

I agree with point five, but again in light of what has been done recently I see no need to restate the procedure or principle. As you know, departments have been asked to develop their own criteria for salary, promotion and tenure. The policy statement which went out on November 22, 1972, and which had been approved by the University Personnel Committee and myself said, "Departments should provide the dean and the University Personnel Committee with a statement setting forth the evaluation criteria adopted by the department to guide its personnel committee. These criteria should be worked out very carefully and discussed fully in departmental meetings before formal adoption by the department." When this policy is followed, I cannot imagine any faculty member not being fully familiar with the criteria developed and put into use. Again, procedure five seems to me to be dealing with something which is already being implemented and hardly needs a restatement.

If these matters need further discussion, I am sure that both the University Personnel Committee and I will be happy to visit with you.

Gilbert C. Fite

cc: Dr. Wood  
Vice President Moody