

1985

October 15, 1985

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "October 15, 1985" (1985). *Minutes*. 923.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/923

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 October 15, 1985

The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m.

PRESENT: Miller, Sutton, Smith, Morice, Wiseman, Ozier, Coon, Stevens, Goodrick, Norberg, Heyduck, Sullivan, Janes

ABSENT: Perkins, Wohlrabe

VISITORS: Dr. Andrew McNitt, Dr. Bob Sonderman, Teri Brown EASTERN NEWS, Joe O'Meara, Todd Miller, Michelle Long, Floyd Akins

Corrections to the minutes of October 1, 1985: Old Business paragraph 1, 1), D, line 1, change "Cramer-Heurman" to "Cramer-Heuerman". line 2, change "Diverstiture" to "divestiture". Paragraph 1, 3), line 2, change "wxpressed" to "expressed". Paragraph 3, line 4, change "academis" to "academic".

Corrections to the minutes of October 8, 1985: Old Business paragraph 3, 1), line 2, delete "10-". Paragraph 3, 2), line 4-5, delete "when ... college". Line 5, change Dickinon" to Dickinson". Motion (Norberg, Sullivan) to approve the minutes as corrected. Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS:

1. From R. Meyerholtz, telephone request for a copy of the Senate position paper to be mailed to Dr. Charles Pastors, WIU and Chairperson of the Council of Faculties of the Board of Governors Universities.
2. From Herb Bartling in reaction to the Senate motion on IBHE course-specific admissions requirements. (W10/13/85;R10/14/85)

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Graduate course utilization of the Textbook Rental Service: Dr. McNitt spoke to the Senate concerning the values and needs for graduate course students to be removed from utilizing the TRS. Dr. Sonderman spoke, as chairperson of a Council on Graduate Studies committee to study this problem, on the committee survey of departmental graduate coordinators interest in this area. Both speakers discussed their impressions of their respective studies with the Senate. Motion (Smith, Morice) that, "The Faculty Senate urges the President to drop the graduate courses from the Textbook Rental Service and implement a purchase system in keeping with the recommendation of the 1982 Textbook Rental Service Study Committee." Motion Failed 4-7.
2. Faculty Senate reaction to proposed Chancellor system: The position paper written by the Senate has been mailed to Executive Director Layzell. A copy of the paper is attached to campus copies of these minutes. Motion (Norberg, Smith) that the Senate Chairperson and as many of the executive committee as can attend the October 24, 1985 BOG meeting at WIU to support the position taken by the Senate. Motion passed.
3. Violation of campus security: Chairperson Ozier reviewed the 339 responses to the Senate survey. In view of the detailed responses and the interest of administrators in this area a comprehensive summary will be prepared for next week.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Joe O'Meara, chairman of the student senate legislative committee, spoke to the Faculty Senate concerning the student senate initiated petition for reinstating a fall break. Motion (Stevens, Sutton) that the Senate poll the faculty regarding the reinstatement of the fall break. Motion passed 10-1.
2. Todd Miller spoke to the Senate concerning current activities of the student senate.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

L. H. Coon
Secretary

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will take place in the Martinsville Room of The Martin Luther King University Union at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, October 22, 1985.

applications of the proposed revisions. An obvious realignment of power shifts emphasis away from the presidents, threatening the autonomy and diversity of the universities in the system. [See Thomas H. Kean, "What States Should Do (and Not Do) To Improve Undergraduate Education," Chronicle of Higher Education, September 11, 1985, p. 128.] Also significant is the diminution or surrendering of leadership by the Board members. [See Involvement in Learning, p. 68.] Removal of the locus of control from the individual campuses would weaken faculty morale, an inevitable result of the perceived lessening of emphasis on faculty governance and collegiality. [See Kean.] In addition to an undesirable centralizing of control, the changes would create another bureaucratic layer, moving administrations, faculty, students, and staff one more level away from the governing board. Moreover, they suggest the potential for other layers such as vice-chancellors and unwieldy multiplication of system support staff. While central control can sometimes expedite the decision-making process, more often it suggests added layers of bureaucracy, with decreases in efficiency and increased costs.

2. Inadequate Evidence for Proposed Changes:

At a time when quality in higher education is a vital national concern, we note the omission from materials supplied for reaction of documented, scholarly studies on the governing policies of universities in systems. We are disconcerted by the absence of supporting evidence that changes similar to those proposed have created a favorable climate for the improvement of other such universities. We have been asked to respond to and the Board is being asked to vote for a change without being given adequate justification of the need for that change. In the absence of such support, we prefer the status quo to the adoption of a corporate model which has not proven successful for many corporations, let alone institutions of higher education.

3. Self-Defeating Provisions:

Although its intent is to increase the efficacy of the Board and improve the status of the universities, the language of the draft itself suggests that the opposite might occur. While a chancellor may be able to represent the system with greater efficiency, academic and administrative needs of the universities themselves are best represented before the Board by the presidents, who have the closest knowledge of the workings of their institutions. [Kean, Chronicle September 11, 1985, p. 128.]

It has been argued that part of the strength of a university lies in its diversity, and that a strong system is impossible without strong members. It might also be argued that a good deal of the strength of our system lies in the diversity of its Board members. This diversity is jeopardized when a Board surrenders its leadership to a single individual who assumes sole responsibility for "developing guidelines, procedures, and interpretations for the application of Board bylaws, policies and regulations," and responsibility as well for recommending to the Board "initiation, continuation, or modification of system and university programs and activities." [Ad Hoc Committee on Executive Reorganization, Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities,

To: Dr. Tom Layzell, Executive Director, Board of Governors
XC: Members of the Board of Governors

From: Eastern Illinois University Faculty Senate

Date: October 8, 1985

Re: Reaction to draft set of BOG Bylaws and Governing Policies Revisions

Thank you for the opportunity to study the proposed revisions of the BOG Bylaws and Governing Policies. We offer below a summary of the procedures we used to conduct our official study, a statement of the position we have formulated, and the rationale which supports that position. We hope that you will consider them in making your final decision.

Procedures

We initiated our official study on Monday, September 16, when each Senator received a copy of the proposed revisions for examination prior to the September 17 Senate meeting. At that meeting, we reviewed the draft item by item, considering carefully the implications of all additions, deletions, and changes of language. We further agreed that before we could reach consensus it would be necessary to solicit system- and university-wide input. In preparation for the September 24 meeting, we obtained information from the Executive Director of the BOG, administrators at EIU, members of EIU's faculty, the Council of Faculties, faculty senators from other BOG institutions, and EIU's UPI local chapter president. We also sought opinions of civil service representatives, department chairs, and deans. In an effort to consider the draft as thoroughly as possible given time constraints, we raised questions proposed by the Final Report of the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education, October 1984) and articles from the Chronicle of Higher Education.

Position of the Senate

Based on its study, the Eastern Illinois University Faculty Senate has concluded that the draft revisions to the BOG Bylaws and Governing Policies would not be in the best interests of the system. We therefore voted unanimously to oppose the amendments as currently formulated and respectfully request that you and the other members of the board not approve the change in form of executive organization within the BOG from the existing Executive Director/President form to the Chancellor form of organization. We point out that our objections are to the revisions as currently formulated, and that we recognize in principle the desirability of a title change as well as, perhaps, some accompanying changes in organizational structure. We urge that the Board refer the draft back to committee for further study and revision.

Rationale

1. Centralization Encourages Abdication of Responsibility:

In general, a change in title from executive director to chancellor presents no problem. Rather the problem lies within the potential

Proposed Amendments to Bylaws and Governing Policies, p. 6.]

We note with special concern the removal from the revisions of certain duties of the President of the university as well as a serious weakening of the function of the Board. Among the President's duties articulated in the current bylaws and conspicuously absent from the revision is "recruitment and retention of a superior faculty of teacher-scholars and of superior university officers and staff." [Proposed Amendments, p. 7.] We do not understand how such an omission can possibly result in a stronger university. [See Kean, Chronicle September 11, 1985, p. 128; also Frank T.H. Rhodes, "Reforming Higher Education Will Take More than Just Tinkering with Curricula, Chronicle of Higher Education May 22, 1985, p. 80.]

4. Problems in Selection and Evaluation:

We fear the absence of clearly delineated qualifications for the office of Chancellor and the omission of presidential and campus input from both the selection and evaluation processes. We note also that the Chancellor bears responsibility for the selection and evaluation of presidents but that, as in the current by-laws, there is no provision for input from campus vice-presidents, other administrators/staff, or faculty. We have always urged that such provisions be added.

Summary

While a title change from "Executive Director" to "Chancellor" may be advisable, we believe that the approval of these revisions of bylaws and governing policies would inevitably threaten the autonomy and diversity of the universities, severely weaken the abilities of presidents to act for the good of their universities, seriously diminish the functions and value of the governing board, and jeopardize the system.

We offer as a concluding thought this passage from the Involvement in Learning study:

The integrity and autonomy of colleges are critical to the establishment of an environment conducive to student learning and growth. When bureaucratic practices distort institutional values and drain energy away from teaching and learning, not only does the learning environment suffer, but costs to the taxpayer increase. We believe that it is the responsibility of legislators and other state officials to minimize practices that breed distrust and cynicism in public colleges and universities. [p. 68.]