

1975

March 11, 1975

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "March 11, 1975" (1975). *Minutes*. 598.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/598

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.

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of March 11, 1975

MEMBERS PRESENT: Buchanan, Doughty, Elder, Goodrich, Hackler, Johnson, MacLaren, Murray, North, Price, Rearden, Weidner, Wiseman

MEMBERS ABSENT: Connelly, Knott

FACULTY VISITOR: Jon Laible

STUDENT VISITOR: Joe Natale

The meeting was called to order at 1405.

The minutes of March 4, 1975 were approved as published. Special thanks are due student helpers in the Placement Office and the Botany Department for typing and assembling election materials attached to the minutes.

COMMUNICATIONS

1. a. Minutes of the BOG Meeting, February 13, 1975.
b. Agenda for March 13, 1975 BOG meeting at Eastern. At this meeting, the Executive Officer is scheduled to recommend to the BOG that departments which refuse to award merit (i.e. to differentiate among staff) should not share in the merit monies.
c. Copy of the EIU report at the March BOG meeting.
2. Memorandum from Jimmie Franklin, March 5, 1975, with a request for Faculty Senate comments on EIU's Affirmative Action Plan.
3. Memo from Fred Schram, Chairman, Council on Faculty Research, concerning the Faculty Research Policy Statement. Schram will be invited to discuss this policy with the Senate.

REPORTS

1. Faculty Advisory Committee to the BHE---Laible

Items discussed at the February 28, 1975 FAC meeting included:

- a. Proposal for the initial development of educational TV in Illinois. The FAC previously opposed the purchase of Channel 20 in Chicago for this purpose. There was concern that the money for this program would come out of present university budgets. Nevertheless, the BHE approved \$750,000 in Gov. Walker's Accelerated Capital Improvement Program to begin this program, although with a few technical stipulations.
- b. Mike Booker, Chairman, Student Advisory Committee to the BHE, reported that this group is opposed to the arbitrary nature of the BHE study committee's proposal that tuition at state universities be:

- (1) 1/3 of undergraduate instructional costs.
- (2) 4/9 of graduate instructional costs.

There was also discussion of the fact that ISCC scholarship monies which were to help balance the economic base of students are making the rich richer; i.e., there is more ISCC money per student at U of I than at Edwardsville.

c. Master Plan, Phase IV.

2. Student-Faculty Relations Committee---Johnson

The Committee provided the Senate with a report listing "Number and percentage of "yes" responses of 350 faculty returning questionnaires (70%) in the Faculty Senate survey on student evaluation conducted in Spring, 1975." In addition, the Committee provided a compilation of some of the numerous statements appended to the returned questionnaires.

There was considerable discussion of the present student evaluation system.

The Committee will meet again and make recommendations to the Senate.

3. Grade Appeals System Committee---Johnson

It was reported that there have been a large number of grade complaints recently and that there is, apparently, no formal means provided to take care of this problem.

The Senate discussed the need for an appeals committee, either departmental or university-wide. No consensus was reached.

The faculty on the committee (and the Senate) would prefer an all-faculty committee. The students prefer a $\frac{1}{2}$ student- $\frac{1}{2}$ faculty committee. No action was taken on this item.

4. Nominations-Elections Committees---Price

Preparation for the election is complete. Absentee ballots are being cast.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Tenure Study Committee Report. There was discussion of the report. Questions included:

- a. Is there adequate funding to permit the proposed early retirement?
Answer: probably not.
- b. Is the percentage tenure at EIU (70%) a significant problem?
Answer: in most departments, no.

It was moved by Murray, seconded by Doughty, to commend Wiseman and his colleagues for their work on this important and sensitive committee. The motion passed unanimously.

- Indications of an imbalance in amounts of travel money available to administrative personnel for purposes of professional development (conferences, programs, visitations, etc.) and amounts allowed teaching faculty for like purposes.
- Lack of consistency and even treatment by unit heads in passing out uncommitted travel funds to staff members.

In making the study the committee had the cooperation of the Business Office, university administrators and other members of the professional staff. Basic information was furnished upon request. Still, answers to questions about how travel funds are shared and spent all across the university are not altogether obvious and clear. Nevertheless, on the basis of the committee's inquiry and extended discussion of the subject, the Faculty Senate offers a number of recommendations to the President, the Council on University Budget, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Council of Instructional Officers.

The Senate realizes that the total amount of money available for purposes of professional travel is not nearly enough to meet demonstrable and legitimate needs. The recommendations relate to administering and accounting for whatever amounts are in existence for on-the-road activities.

1. Deans and Directors should involve the staff of each unit, perhaps through advisory committees, in working out guidelines for governing distribution and use of travel funds. Individual staff members should be informed of these guidelines so that there is greater general awareness within units as to how travel funds are budgeted and spent. The Senate recommends wider participation by faculty in discussions of travel budgets.

2. The uses to which travel funds are put would be better understood if reports were available showing for what purposes and by whom funds are actually spent. A stricter sense of accountability is urged upon those administering travel funds. To help remove the mystery surrounding travel budgets, the Faculty Senate recommends that units issue reports at the end of the fiscal year which break down specifically how funds are utilized.

3. There seems to be a tendency to favor smaller departments and units in assigning money for travel purposes. For example, in the case of two departments whose needs appear on the surface to be similar, one with four full time members has a \$400 allocation while a forty-five member department is limited to only \$1600. The Senate recommends that after special and extraordinary needs are considered, the amount for professional travel be allocated more nearly on an equal per capita basis.

4. The need for many officials in the administrative personnel ladder to reserve discretionary funds is obvious to the Faculty Senate. As special needs become known, money may be allotted accordingly. However, the practice of holding back generous shares of available money gives substance to the impression that only a small percentage ever actually filters down to individual faculty members. It is recommended that the level of unallocated funds be reviewed carefully and generally reduced. It is preferred that most discretionary funds be placed at the departmental level where they can be monitored more easily by department members.

2. Travel funds recommendations. Goodrich distributed a memorandum which he suggested be sent to the Council on University Budget along with the Travel Funds Committee Report. The Senate agreed by consensus to the suggestion.

MacLaren distributed a memorandum concerning travel funds which he prepared in response to discussions in the Senate. It was moved by Wiseman, seconded by Doughty, the Senate accept and publish this memorandum. The motion passed unanimously (see memorandum attached).

The Senate moved into executive session to discuss personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 1603.

The next Faculty Senate meeting is scheduled for March 18, 1975 in the University Union Martinsville Room.

Terry M. Weidner
Faculty Senate Secretary

MEMORANDUM

TO: President Fite
Council on University Budget
Vice President Moody
Council of Instructional Officers

FROM: Faculty Senate
Fred MacLaren, Chairman

A special committee appointed by the Faculty Senate (M. Goodrich, Ch., J. Knott, T. Floyd, E. Bryden) recently conducted a study of the policies and practices which govern the allocation of travel funds at this university. The committee has reported to the Senate on what it learned of the procedures that appear to operate as travel funds are distributed and expended. The study was undertaken out of concerns on the part of members of the Senate and in response to questions on the topic from numerous other faculty over a period of time.

Some areas of concern are:

- Limited involvement of teaching faculty in determining how funds for professional travel should be used.
- Absence of provisions requiring heads of units to report on how available travel monies are distributed and ultimately utilized.
- Apparent inequities in allocations of travel funds among various units and edpartments.

5. There have been many reports from faculty critical of the manner in which unit heads dispense funds for travel, particularly with regard to timing. Numerous instructors are denied money early in the year and pass up away-from-campus opportunities only to learn later in the year that funds are being released to others. Others complain that those who move out at the beginning of Fall Semester quickly use up all available funds leaving none for those with end of year needs. The Faculty Senate recommends that unit heads give greater consideration to differing travel calendars as they approve requests for travel funds.

6. Many treat as common knowledge that administrators use a disproportionate share of what is, at the beginning, a very limited travel budget. There is indeed evidence to bear out this conclusion. The Senate is aware that those in many offices of the university must travel out from campus in order to carry out assigned tasks and to conduct the business of that office. Those expenses are not being called into question. However, a glance at the distribution of funds reveals that many administrative officers have far more than the average faculty member for travel for purely professional development. The Faculty Senate is calling for a more equitable sharing between administrator and teaching faculty of whatever funds are available.