

1975

April 8, 1975

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "April 8, 1975" (1975). *Minutes*. 601.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/601

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 April 8, 1975

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

MEMBER ABSENT: Hackler

FACULTY VISITORS: Vice President Moody, George Rommel, Janet Norberg, David Maurer, Jimmie Franklin, Marina Yu, Richard Dulka, Don Rogers, Scott Smith, Gerald Pierson, Leonard Wood, Floyd Merritt

STUDENT VISITORS: Joe Natale, Scott Weaver, Pat Woodard

The meeting was called to order at 1405.

The minutes of April 1 and April 2, 1975 were approved as published.

COMMUNICATIONS

1. Memorandum on merit salary increases from the Department of Foreign Languages.
2. Student Senate Meeting Minutes---March 13, 1975.
3. Residence Hall Association Minutes---March 13 and April 3, 1975.
4. Memo from the Department of History concerning measurement of teaching effectiveness.
5. Copy of the March 13, 1975 BOG Meeting Minutes.
Agenda for the April 10, 1975 meeting. Executive Officer's report for the same meeting.
6. Memorandum from Richard Dulka, AFT-EIU, with a request for the Senate to approve holding a faculty referendum on an AFT-suggested resolution.

REPORTS

1. Council of Faculties---Rommel and Norberg
 - a. Report of items discussed at a joint Council of Presidents-COF meeting.

Means to permit early retirement.

Proposed non-tenure contract.

Should Lincoln's and Washington's birthdays be observed as is Martin Luther King Jr.'s? One holiday for all?

Standard contract language.

Means to report minority Council of Presidents-COF positions to the board.

New (suggested) policy for tenure in which tenure would normally be granted after 6 years of service on a campus. There would be some exceptions in which tenure would be granted after the 5th or 7th year

b. Council of Faculties meeting

Discussion of FY 77 budget in which a 12% raise with an additional 1½% catch-up monies would be added to complete catch-up begun in FY 76.

Discussion of IRS investigation of Missouri state retirement system for possible disqualification and subsequent individual tax penalties.

Request to Faculty Senate that it regularly have a report from a State Universities Retirement System representative.

- c. It was reported that J. Sachs, Acting Executive Officer of the BOG, stated that great flexibility would be permitted in awarding merit monies as long as merit was not awarded across-the-board. The COF and Council of Presidents recommended the 80:20 (basic: merit) split but recommended nothing concerning the procedures to be used in distributing merit money.

2. Vice President Moody---the merit guidelines

Moody reported that he and the UPC (with one dissenting) will recommend to the President that a merit increase determined for any person in the current evaluation be awarded for 1975-76 only and not become a part of the base salary for the following years.

There was considerable discussion of the merit distribution. Some concern was expressed that merit money, not part of the basic salary, might be lost to the university in subsequent years. There was discussion of the alternatives available to the Senate for action on the merit question.

It was moved by Connelly, seconded by Murray, that the Senate conduct a faculty survey as soon as possible to determine faculty opinion concerning alternative policies for determining merit salary distribution; i.e., the present one with its limited distribution and super-committee structure or one similar to that used in Spring, 1974. The motion passed; 12 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain.

3. Executive Committee appointments---MacLaren

The following committee was appointed to plan for the Distinguished Faculty Awards and for a reception for retiring faculty:

Wiseman, Chairman
Murray
Buchanan

It was moved by Wiseman, seconded by Price, that the Senate award two Distinguished Faculty Awards this year. The motion passed unanimously.

The criteria for the Distinguished Faculty Award are appended to these minutes. Please respond to this call for nominees.

It was moved by Connelly, seconded by Murray, that the Faculty Senate hold a reception for retiring faculty. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Grade appeals system---Johnson

Recommendations concerning a grade appeals system were presented to the Senate for consideration and action at a subsequent meeting.

5. Student evaluation of faculty. It was moved by Rearden, seconded by Johnson, that the results of the Faculty Senate survey on student evaluation be published. The motion passed unanimously. The results are appended to these minutes.

The Senate moved into executive session to discussion personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 1615.

The next Faculty Senate meeting is scheduled for April 15, 1975 in the University Union Martinsville Room.

Terry M. Weidner
Faculty Senate Secretary

DISTINGUISHED FACULTY AWARD

The Faculty Senate encourages members of the faculty to participate in the nonination of candidates for the Distinguished Faculty Award. Following is a listing of general criteria which will serve as guidelines in identifying outstanding faculty members worthy of this award.

Please forward the name of the candidate, along with supportive statements, to Robert Wiseman, Buzzard Education Building. Deadline for the receipt of nominations is 12:00 AM, April 21, 1975.

The Senate Committee on the Distinguished Faculty Award knows that there are many ideas concerning faculty achievement. Recognizing that even the best faculty person may not fully satisfy all the suggested criteria, and that your reasons for nominating any individual as outstanding may not be listed, the Committee hopes that the following general criteria will aid in formulating your statement and identifying the distinguished faculty member.

1. Possesses a comprehensive knowledge of his field.
Has a scholarly grasp of the subject matter and an abiding interest in the area of study.
2. Organizes and presents subject matter effectively.
What is taught makes sense to the student and is consistent with the objectives of the course--interrelationships are suggested between the subject matter of the course and other fields of learning or human activity.
3. Stimulates thinking and develops understanding.
The student's intellect is challenged--critical thinking and an open-minded attitude are encouraged to the end that he becomes more self-directing in this field of knowledge.
4. Develops interest.
The student likes what he is experiencing--he finds it significant in personal terms and in relation to his educational purposes.
5. Demonstrates resourcefulness.
Makes a good use of human and material resources that are available--uses methods and techniques of teaching appropriate to the course and the specific class or situation.
6. Assists students in solving their individual and group problems.
7. Participates in worthy student and community activities.
8. Contributes to research in the area of subject matter taught.
9. Contributes to the professional literature of the field or equivalent.
10. Contributes to the development of the Department, College and University.

Number and percentage of "yes" responses of 350
 faculty returning questionnaires (70%) in
 the faculty senate survey on student
 evaluation conducted in spring 1975

Question	Number answering	Number YES	% YES
1. Do you approve of, in principle, student involvement in evaluating quality of instruction?	343	301	88
2. If so, what purposes should be served?			
a. Self-improvement of individual instructors.	315	314	99
b. Recommendations concerning salary, promotion, and tenure.	278	130	47
c. Publication of results for review by students.	273	81	30
3. What methods do you favor for eliciting student opinions on instruction?			
a. Student evaluation of teaching through means devised and conducted by the administration.	239	28	12
b. A universal program developed and conducted by the teaching faculty.	257	120	47
c. Essentially the evaluation program presently conducted by the student government.	255	54	21
d. Evaluation methods developed and administered within each depart- ment.	312	235	75
e. Evaluation developed and admin- istered by the individual instru- ctor.	251	146	58
4. Do you believe mandatory participation by instructors should be a feature of student evaluation programs?	327	136	42