

1980

April 29, 1980

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "April 29, 1980" (1980). *Minutes*. 768.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/768

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 29, 1980

MEMBERS PRESENT: Hockman, James, Johnson, Knoop, Laible, Lasky, Pier-
son, Preston, Rearden, Rogers, Sullivan, Weiler, Wood

MEMBERS ABSENT: Smith, Summers

FACULTY VISITORS: George Rommel

STUDENT VISITORS: Bonita Gower (EN), Bob Glover, Bonnie Bijak

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

The minutes of April 22, 1980, were accepted. (Notes to these minutes:

Note 1: There will be some changes made during the summer in the material provided in Appendix A. See Nominations Committee report below.

Note 2: From time to time the Senate receives copies of communications sent to other bodies. These are for information only; such a case in point is Joan Schmidt's communication to President Marvin.)

COMMUNICATIONS:

1. Jill Nilsen - to IAB - Ad Hoc Title IX Committee Report: Results and Conclusions (copy)
2. COF - minutes of April 13-14 meeting at WIU
3. Valerie Averill (Pres., Resident Hall Assoc.) - arguments in support of a Fall break
4. William Weiler (Chair, EIU Distinguished Faculty Award Selection Committee) - to Wood - notification that Committee's selections are Dr. Michael Leyden and Dr. Lawrence Ringenberg
5. Petition from faculty objecting to CAA ruling on repeat grades - see New Business below.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. The Senate will meet on May 7 at 10 a.m. rather than on May 6.
2. Summer schedule of Senate meetings: June 24, July 8, July 22, August 5 (tentative)
3. September 2 will be the first meeting of the Fall semester.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

1. Retirement - Dr. George Rommel reported on matters that he will detail in the Faculty Newsletter of May 2.
2. Nominations - Bob Gower and Cary Knoop noted problems that need to be worked out this summer with respect to nominations on various faculty/student boards. Bill Weiler suggested that in the Fall the new Nominating Committee contact the various boards and committees and get information on current membership, goals, needed replacements, and so on. The Senate praised Knoop for his work on the Committee.

3. Social - Jerry Sullivan reported on final details of the retirement tea and the end-of-the-semester dinner.
4. Executive - Leonard Wood called attention to the announcements.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Faculty petition objecting to CAA action accepting certain courses to meet the G.E. distribution requirement for social science (see April 8 minutes) - After some discussion, a motion (Lasky/Weiler) was put on the agenda for next week (see Appendix A).
2. Preservation of tile and wainscoting in Old Main - According to administrative sources, both are safe.
3. Spring elections for Senate officers, and released time for the Senate secretary - Both will be taken up in the Fall.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Faculty petition objecting to CAA action on grade-repeat policy (see CAA minutes of April 17) - After discussion of whether the Senate has jurisdiction in this case, the issue was put on the agenda for next week.
2. Space re-allocations for various departments - The specific case in question is the possibility of moving the English Department to Blair Hall and the Accounting Department to Coleman Hall, though apparently other moves are being contemplated as well. Noting that such a move would demand much renovation in both buildings to accommodate their new functions, the Senate voiced its strong opposition to spending money needlessly.

PROGRAM:

1. Steve Whitley (Chair, CAA) gave an annual report on CAA activities. At the direction of the Provost, the CAA has been engaged in examining general education as it currently exists at EIU, the possibility of an honors program, alternate forms of education, the size of majors, and so on. After much hard work and many hearings, it has made various recommendations on distribution requirements, language requirements, and so on. With respect to item No. 1 under the Senate's New Business, Dr. Whitley pointed out that the new recommendation concerning a grade-repeat policy is stricter than the present one.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

On a motion (Johnson/Laible) the Senate went into Executive Session to discuss two items.

SUMMER SESSION COMMITTEE REPORT:

A motion (Hockman/James) to publish the Committee's draft proposal passed on a voice vote. The Committee will continue working on the proposal during the summer but invites faculty response. The draft appears in Appendix B.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on Wednesday, May 7, at 10 a.m. in the Martinsville Room of the Union.

Dick Rogers
Faculty Senate Secretary

Appendix A

The members of the Faculty Senate think that the primary consideration raised by the faculty petition which requests the reversal of the decision of the Council on Academic Affairs allowing three courses outside of the Social Sciences (HE 2831, Tech. Ed. 1413, EDF 1000) to satisfy the Social Science distribution requirement for General Education is the opposition of virtually all faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences to this decision. A canvass of the Social Science Departments and of allied areas sustains the judgment that there is almost unanimous opposition to the action of the Council on Academic Affairs. Were the appeal to us based on the nature of course content, we would think the appeal inappropriate because the Senate is elected as a governing body. Here, however, the question is one of procedure: how to deal with the opposition of the majority of the faculty to the principle that courses offered in departments far removed from traditionally defined areas be allowed to satisfy course requirements in these areas.

In our view it is very important to secure the consent of the departments constituting the area to be affected. Nor do we find impressive the argument that courses already exist which are allowed to satisfy area requirements though offered from outside that area. Consequently, we think that a more proper procedure for obtaining consent to offer courses satisfying distribution requirements outside of one's own area would be:

1. Consult with departments constituting the area.
2. Seek approval in the curriculum committee representing the area (in this case, the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee).
3. Gain approval in the Council of Academic Affairs.
4. Obtain the consent of the Academic Vice President.

Until the above steps are taken, we strongly urge President Marvin to veto the decision on the Council of Academic Affairs to include courses from the departments outside the Social Sciences (HE 2831, Tech. Ed. 1413, EDF 1000) in the Social Science distribution list. The implications of the failure to do so are great. Once the principle is established that anyone can teach anything, then all notions of scholarship are dead. The idea that all courses are of equal value for all purposes is both fallacious and destructive.

DRAFT

SENATE POSITION PAPER

4/24/80

1 Eastern's summer school program is in serious trouble. In the
 2 summer of 1973 we had nearly 4000 students enrolled¹ and more than
 3 335 faculty teaching.² Five years later in the summer of 1978 there
 4 were only 2735 students and 190 faculty. Summer School Director
 5 Switzer was able to increase these numbers 10% in 1979 but because
 6 of budget cuts (beyond his control) the 1980 summer will see only
 7 180 faculty teaching. Recognizing that there was an upturn in the
 8 enrollment figures for summer school 1979, the projected downturn
 9 in enrollment for summer school 1980 is particularly disturbing.
 10 Although no one can accurately predict future enrollments, should
 11 the decline continue at the same rate it did from 1973 through 1978,
 12 summer school will no longer be viable by the mid-1980's.

13 Eastern is not alone. Schools in Illinois and throughout the
 14 nation are facing declining summer enrollments. That the problem
 15 is universal provides little comfort.

16 In 1973 approximately \$1.2 million was available for faculty
 17 salaries for the summer. In 1979 the figure was only about \$850,000.
 18 Fewer dollars, fewer faculty, and fewer classes, fewer students,
 19 fewer dollars - a self-perpetuating cycle! We must break the cycle.
 20 We must turn it around! All of us must share in the responsibility
 21 to reverse the summer school enrollment decline. This university
 22 (despite collective bargaining) consists of faculty and administra-
 23 tion. The faculty have been paying their share. Campus-wide fewer
 24 and fewer faculty are able to teach each summer with no comparable
 25 decline in administrative staff. We believe the burden should be
 26 shared.

27 The Faculty Senate notes that more than \$2 million in salaries
 28 go each year to administrators and faculty/administrators on 12-
 29 month contracts. An additional \$912,000 and \$822,000 respectively
 30 go to those on 11.5 and 11.0 month contracts. Isn't it interesting
 31 that even in the summer of 1979 the salaries of those on 11 or more
 32 months contracts exceeded the salaries of the teaching faculty? The
 33 figures for 1980 will likely show an even greater differential.
 34 If those persons on contracts for 11.0 or more months³ were to have
 35 their contracts reduced by one week more than \$81,000⁴ in personnel
 36 services funds could be funneled into summer faculty salaries. That
 37 \$81,000 would create at least 38 new one-half time contracts.⁵ That
 38 would mean at least a ten percent increase in the number of classes
 39 offered in our summer school program! Would that create a higher
 40 student enrollment? We believe so. We do know for sure that all
 41 of us would be joining in the effort to breathe life back into
 42 Eastern's summer school.

43 We are disturbed to note that while personnel funds for our sum-
 44 mer school faculty are dwindling, department chairmen have had their
 45 contracts lengthened from 11.5 to 11.75 months (with an additional
 46 increase likely). We fail to see the logic in this move.

47 President Marvin has indicated his support for the summer
 48 school and underscored his concern by appointing a Summer School
 49 Director. Running a program in the summer with so few students on
 50 campus is expensive. Buildings must be cooled and maintained
 51 whether classes are full or not. The Faculty Senate believes
 52 the contract reduction plan outlined above will help. Some of the
 53 additional funds provided might be used to allow a lower tuition
 54 for summer school. Let's begin to work together to find creative
 55 ways to make summer school work again. We'll all benefit from that.

¹Headcount

²F.T.E.

³Excluding vice presidents and the president

⁴\$43,000 + \$19,000 + \$18,500 for 12, 11.5 and 11 month contracts,
 respectively

⁵In 1979 the average monthly salary paid in summer school was \$2110.03.