

1976

February 17, 1976

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "February 17, 1976" (1976). *Minutes*. 630.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/630

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 February 17, 1976

MEMBERS PRESENT: Abell, Buchanan, Connelly, Dolton, Goodrich, Hackler, Murray, Nordin, North, Pierson, Price, Rearden, Rooke, Weidner, Wood

FACULTY VISITORS: M. Yu, G. Rommel

STUDENT VISITORS: M. Vise, M. Hepner, B. Halleran, T. Aldridge

The meeting was called to order at 1404.

The minutes of February 10, 1976 were approved as printed.

COMMUNICATIONS

1. Request from D. Price, Senate Elections Committee, for 3 or 4 questions for candidates for election to the Faculty Senate.
2. Memo from D. Morlan, Chairman, Dept. of Speech-Communication, regarding the Report of the Subcommittee on Tenure.
3. Minutes of the Council of Faculties---February 1-2, 1976.
4. Agenda for the February 19, 1976 BOG meeting.
Report of the Executive Officer for the February 19, 1976 BOG meeting.
Minutes of the January 22, 1976 BOG meeting.
5. Memo from Steve Whitley, Chairman, CAA, with a recommendation that the number of student members on the CAA be increased to three.
6. Memorandum from AFT-EIU regarding the Report of the Subcommittee on Tenure.

REPORTS

1. Faculty evaluation---Weidner

As requested last week, Chairman Weidner spoke with President Fite about the use of the term "below normal" in paragraph 6 of his January 5, 1976 memorandum on faculty evaluation. Dr. Fite clarified his position that this term would refer to a performance below that expected of a faculty member and not simply below average. Dr. Fite has communicated with the Senate in writing on this matter. (See attached letter.)

2. The Senate Budget---Weidner

The Senate Travel Budget is down to \$45.53. To permit COF members and other faculty representatives to travel to regular meetings throughout

the state for the rest of the academic year, Weidner will seek additional funds for this line item from outside sources.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Report of the Subcommittee on Tenure---G. Rommel

Dr. Rommel was present to discuss provisions of the Report of the Joint Councils' Subcommittee on Tenure. He stated that the major changes in the document consisted of spelling out procedures to be followed in implementing actual current policy. He further suggested that the provisions of the Report would lead to greater faculty involvement in matters related to tenure. An extended discussion of the subject followed. Questions were raised by the Senate regarding what is meant by "tenure review", and the implications of a limit on the percentage of the total teaching staff that may be tenured. A number of suggestions for changes or clarification of the Report were made. Dr. Rommel indicated his willingness to take these ideas back to the Subcommittee for consideration. An ad hoc committee of Wood, Buchanan, and Rearden was appointed to work with Rommel in summarizing the views of the Senate.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Request for an increase in the student membership on the CAA.

It was agreed to put off discussion of this matter until next week. Members of the CAA and of the Student leadership will be invited to the meeting next week to answer questions concerning reasons for this change.

The meeting adjourned at 1520.

The next Faculty Senate meeting is scheduled for February 24, 1976 at 1400 in the University Union Martinsville Room.

Michael Goodrich
Faculty Senate Secretary

Memorandum

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Office of the President

TO Dr. T. Weidner

DATE February 16, 1976

When I visited with the Faculty Senate a couple of weeks ago, it became apparent that there was considerable misunderstanding regarding the meaning of one point in the January 5 memorandum concerning policies on raises for next year. The guideline that persons "with unsatisfactory or below normal ratings should be recommended for no raise" means a composite rating of two or below. Both terms unsatisfactory and below normal should be considered to mean that a person has an unsatisfactory performance. It does not mean that if a faculty member is rated unsatisfactory or below normal in performance in a single category, or even more than one, a raise would be warranted if the composite was above "below normal."

The rating scale that appears on the evaluation form is as follows:

1. Unsatisfactory - Performance is inadequate and unacceptable. Efforts at improvement have been unsuccessful.
2. Below Normal - Performance is below that normally expected. Assignments and responsibilities are not being handled as well as desired.
3. Normal - Performance meets reasonable and usual expectations.
4. Above Normal - Performance is higher than normally expected in both quality and quantity.
5. Outstanding - Performance is extremely high, is consistently superior in both quantity and quality of work.

I hope this will clarify the questions that you raised.


Gilbert C. Fite