

Summer 7-24-1974

## Senate Meeting July 24, 1974

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting July 24, 1974" (1974). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 223.  
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/223>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact [ISURed@ilstu.edu](mailto:ISURed@ilstu.edu).

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

July 24, 1974

Volume V, No. 17

Contents

Call to Order

Roll Call

Seating of Senator

Administrator's Remarks

Remarks of Student Association President

SCERB Policy Revisions

Administrator's Remarks

Approval of Minutes

Optional Retirement Payments for Non-Employment  
Periods during the Calendar Year

Proposal for Enlargement of Entertainment Com-  
mittee Membership

Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendation on  
Establishment of Referee Body

Committee Reports

Communications

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

Academic Senate Minutes

July 24, 1974

Volume V, No. 16

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Sutherland called the meeting to order at 7:20 p.m. in Stevenson 401.

ROLL CALL

The Secretary called the roll, and it was determined that a quorum was not present. A motion (Mr. Hicklin, Mr. Baska) that the Senate act as a committee of the whole and consider the information items until such time as a quorum was achieved and action could be taken on action items was made. The Chairperson ruled that a two-thirds majority was needed for approval. The motion was approved with the needed majority.

V, 144

SEATING OF SENATOR

The Chairperson stated that a special election had been held in the College of Fine Arts, and Harold Boyd had been elected to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Max Rennels. The Chairperson invited Mr. Boyd to the table to be seated.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REMARKS

President Budig offered a brief statement that he requested be read into the record. The President stated:

"When compared to other public institutions of higher learning in the State, one must conclude that Illinois State University fared reasonably well in the budget process. Our percentage increase is adequate to meet limited educational objectives.

The appropriations provided will permit the University to make those salary adjustments previously planned or announced. The University is, however, deeply disappointed that funds were not provided for salary increases more reflective of the present rate of inflation. Also disappointing is the deletion of funds intended to more fully and adequately fund the State Universities Retirement System.

Students will share our disappointment to learn that there will be no relief from the present level of fees which they must pay to support the University Auditorium. The Amendment which would have provided an appropriation for this purpose was deleted by amendatory veto. The University plans to include within its FY76 Capital Budget request a specific request for partial funding of the Union/Auditorium facility."

REMARKS OF THE STUDENT ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

There were no remarks from the Student Association President, Mr. Arnold.

INFORMATION ITEMS1. Student Code Enforcement and Review Board Policy Revisions.

Mr. Chamberlain, speaking for the Student Affairs Committee, introduced the proposal and then turned the floor over to Mr. Steinbach, who spoke on the revision in the alcohol policy. Mr. Steinbach stated that since sending the original proposals to the Executive Committee the Committee had talked with Mr. Schwelle, Executive Director of SCERB. He stated that there had been a revision in the wording to reflect the jurisdiction of the University Housing Office in the residence halls rather than the previous statement which says "by the University office responsible for that area." This revision is intended to make the policy clearly applicable only to University housing, rather than to any student lounge. Mr. Steinbach stated that they wished to keep the alcohol policy limited to the residence halls. He stated that this proposal puts the responsibility for designating other areas that may use alcohol in the hands of the Housing area. Mr. Steinbach stated that the other areas would be designated by the managerial personnel and the residence hall governments. Mr. Baska asked what other areas were being considered. Mr. Steinbach stated that other areas would be up to the managerial staff and the governments of the residence halls. Other areas that have been proposed include floor lounges, the Pit, other lounges. Mr. Sutherland raised a question about the different proposals in front of the Senate on the alcohol policy. He asked which one was the one supported by the Student Affairs Committee. Mr. Steinbach stated that the "Proposed" statement was considered by the Student Affairs Committee and rejected. He stated that the committee had chosen to go with the alternate with the change as specified in the handout distributed tonight. The SCERB Revisions will be an action item at the next Senate meeting.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REMARKS

President Budig stated that during Administrator's Remarks he should have asked Secretary of the University Charles Morris for comments. Secretary Morris stated that he felt called upon to explain a committee that doesn't exist. He referred to the discussion of the "committee" in the Executive Committee Minutes, number 18. He stated that early in the summer he initiated regular meetings between several administrators and staff who were involved in projects that interacted with one another. Those involved in these discussions were George Duncan, Coordinator of Parking and Traffic; John Newbold, Director, Public Safety; Keith Fred, Director, Campus Recreation; Robert Dietsch, Superintendent of Grounds; Preston Ensign, Coordinator of Campus Planning; Robert Ward, Superintendent, Architectural and Engineering Services; Jack Beno, Project Coordinator, Bicycle Study; and Lewis Legg, Coordinator, Environmental Health and Safety. Another reason for the initiation of the meetings was that Preston Ensign was beginning to review these projects and take a look at long-range planning. It has been suggested, Dr. Morris stated, that this was a "committee"; it was only a meeting of staff who are involved in different projects such as parking lots, tennis courts, demolition of Central School, etc. Dr. Morris stated that it seemed to him that it would be a good idea to invite a student to sit in on these meetings and act as a communication person to the Senate and the Student Assembly. With that in mind he asked Mr. Arnold to designate a student to meet with the group; Mr. Arnold designated Jenny Sneed. The group considered the development of bicycle paths and drafted a set of bicycle regulations. "It has been inferred or implied that this is a final set of regulations without opportunity

for input. Input was sought at the earliest moment," Dr. Morris stated. Dr. Morris stated that when Mr. Duncan goes to the Parking Committee, he would have an improved set of regulations to propose. He stated that there was never any intention of doing anything other than what Mr. Duncan has always done. The Parking Committee has always approved regulations and policies.

Mr. Morris stated that as far as the use of the Union parking lot goes, the subject will have to be taken up with someone else. Mr. Morris stated that it does not fall into the jurisdiction of his office. Mr. Morris also stated that parking had been provided for Preview parents.

Mr. Sutherland stated that the Administrative Affairs Committee will pursue these matters and has been asked to establish a liaison with Dr. Morris's office. The account in the Vidette doesn't quite accurately reflect what went on at the Executive Committee meeting, reported Chairperson Sutherland. There were no questions raised on the points covered by Mr. Morris.

At 7:40 p.m. a quorum was declared and the Senate moved into regular session.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- V, 145 A motion (Mr. Rogers, Mr. Steinbach) to approve the minutes of May 1, 1974 was approved.
- V, 146 A motion (Mr. Rogers, Mr. Steinbach) to approve the minutes of July 10, 1974 was made. Mr. Ficek stated that on page 104, third paragraph, sentences six, seven, eight and nine were not his remarks and should be attributed to someone else. Secretary Hicklin indicated that the statements should have been credited to Mr. Laymon. The motion to approve the minutes as corrected was approved.
- V, 147 A motion (Mr. Rogers, Mr. Steinbach) to change the date on the June 24 minutes from June 24 to June 26 was approved.

#### ACTION ITEM

##### I. Optional Retirement Payments for Non-Employment Periods during the Calendar Year.

- V, 148 (See Appendix for resolution) A motion (Mr. Helgeson, Mr. Arnold) to adopt the resolution was made. Mr. Duty asked if there were any schools in Illinois or nationwide which have this provision. Mr. Smith stated that he could not answer this question at this time. He did state, however, that New York State paid all of the retirement contribution. In answer to a question, it was pointed out that this would be a uniform policy for all state universities if adopted. Mr. Woods pointed out that there was a tacit agreement at Southern that if you will post-date your retirement letter they will give you twelve months employment. Mr. Woods took exception with item 4 since the state does not match the funds at the present time anyway. Mr. Woods called for a much more dramatic statement of the problem than found in item 4. Mr. Smith pointed out that the intent was to show that the state eventually does pick up a portion even though they do not match annual contributions. The Chairperson stated that perhaps Mr. Woods' concerns about the difference between nine-month and twelve-month appointments could be expressed in the cover letter or some other communication when this item is forwarded. Mr. Hicklin stated that of course nothing at this point could be dramatic enough to fully emphasize all the problems with the State Universities Retirement System in terms of its lack of funding and its lack of



prudent investment in the past. Mr. Hicklin asked that we forward this proposal intact to our sister institutions and try to get the idea considered at a higher level. The motion to approve the resolution passed unanimously.

#### INFORMATION ITEMS

##### 2. Proposal for Enlargement of Entertainment Committee Membership.

Mr. Chamberlain, speaking for the Student Affairs Committee, stated that the Executive Committee had previously been notified of the need for the expansion of the Entertainment Committee. Mr. Steinbach explained that the present committee had seven members and four alternates and had asked to be increased to fifteen members and five alternates. Mr. Steinbach stated that at present the additional people were working with the Entertainment Committee and were ready to assume the seats on the committee as soon as it was approved by the Senate. Mr. Quane raised a question on the composition in terms of faculty-student ratio on the committee after the change. Mr. Steinbach replied that the committee would be increased to twenty students - fifteen members and five alternates - but the number of faculty - four - would remain the same. Mr. Steinbach stated that in the past the faculty on the committee had done very little. He explained that the members of the committee actually work on the concerts, and faculty members usually have only acted in an advisory capacity. He stated that at present only one of the faculty members, Ms. Doris Richards, was actively involved in the work of the committee. Mr. Hicklin brought up the point that while the Rules Committee was considering the revision as a ByLaws change they might perhaps consider removing faculty from the committee entirely since this has been suggested by students and faculty in the past. Mr. Roderick ascertained that the Student Affairs Committee did not propose to increase the number of faculty members. Mr. Woods asked for a clarification about the work load. Mr. Steinbach explained that the Entertainment Committee actually worked at the concerts, made all arrangements for the concerts, for ticket distribution, publicity, box office, etc. Mr. Smith clarified that this revision was for the purpose of spreading the workload. He expressed his hope that this revision was for the purpose of getting more widespread input about different kinds of entertainment. Mr. Steinbach stated that this could be a possible outcome of the expansion.

##### 3. Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendation on Establishment of Referee Body.

The Chairperson explained the background for this proposal. He stated that jurisdictional disputes sometimes arose between the Ethics Committee, the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and the Faculty Grievance Committee, and a need was felt for a referee body to settle these disputes. The Chairperson referred to the letter from Mr. Goleash, included in the Appendix of the June 26, 1974 Minutes. This recommendation was the result of a letter from Mr. Hickrod, Chairman of the current Ethics Committee. The Chairperson asked Mr. Smith, Chairperson of the Faculty Affairs Committee, to explain the proposal. Mr. Smith stated that while the committee had been exhorted to include a statement of policy which would mandate an assignment to a definite committee by some referee, the committee had changed the word "designate" to the word "suggest" which would still leave some freedom or latitude in assigning situations to a specific committee. He stated that the committee was not ready yet to hire a mediator whose recommendation would be mandatory. Mr. Smith

said that they hoped to discuss that further. He stated that the committee wants to work on the entire problem of assisting faculty members who have problems which might come before any or all of these committees, including consideration of the option of combining all three committees and reconstituting only one committee to handle all of these problems which now go to the various committees. Mr. Smith stated that he wanted to investigate much more thoroughly the legal implications of giving advice in this area. The Chairperson asked for clarification as to the process of a faculty member's coming to the referee body and being referred to the appropriate committee. The Chairperson read from the letter from Mr. Goleash which had recommended a committee of members of the three groups which would meet when needed. The Chairperson asked Mr. Smith to clarify the difference between the Goleash recommendation and the FAC recommendation. Mr. Baska, speaking for the Faculty Affairs Committee, stated that they had considered the "when needed" provision and had decided that they preferred a standing committee rather than a "when needed" one. Mr. Smith again explained the reasons for the committee's rejection of Mr. Goleash's recommendation. He stated that they felt that they should not cut off a faculty member's right to go to a specific committee where he felt that he could be heard. A suggestion was made that the word "each" be inserted after "member" so that it is clear that only one member from each committee would be on the standing committee. Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Helgeson had suggested that the Faculty Affairs Committee recommend that one member from the Ethics, Grievance, and Academic Freedom and Tenure Committees be appointed to a preliminary review board. In answer to a question from Mr. Duty as to how the faculty member initiates either a grievance or an ethics case, Chairperson Sutherland stated that the Senate chairperson usually receives the communication. Mr. Duty stated that at the present time if a faculty member may bump his way through three committees he would now have four committees to bump himself through if he does not agree with the jurisdiction decision. Mr. Smith stated that the faculty member should have that right. Mr. Gordon discussed various points about how the present structure operates and what happens to persons who keep going from committee to committee. Mr. Smith attempted to clarify the questions raised by Mr. Gordon. Chairperson Sutherland stated that while a person having a grievance had certain rights, the members of the committee that have to handle repeated complaints and the persons who are charged in the situations also have rights. Many complications are raised by overlapping jurisdictions or allowing a person to go from committee to committee with his complaints. Mr. Smith pleaded that we go into a one-year situation in which we try the referral committee while we work on restructuring the procedures. Mr. Morris asked Mr. Smith if it were possible to have two different committees hear and act on the same case and come up with two different recommendations. Mr. Helgeson stated that it is possible at the present time for a faculty member to appeal to two different committees. He pointed out one committee could be studying the larger implications of the case and one could be considering the same facts from a different angle. Mr. Helgeson pointed out that no one at the present time is in a position to give faculty member advice as to where a specific complaint should go. Dean Helgeson stated that he has in the past advised faculty members but they sometimes regard his advice to be "suspect" and therefore there have been delays in some cases where faculty members did not accept his advice. Dean Helgeson pointed out the necessity for some kind of referee committee to aid the faculty member in determining which committee his problem should be referred to. He said that this would be a service to faculty members. He stated also that at some point a faculty member should

be precluded from running all over the campus to three or four committees. Some committee should have the final say as to where the charge belongs. Dean Helgeson stated that while it might not be mandatory, the administration would insist that the decision of the referee body be a matter of record and the burden of proof would be on the complaining faculty member to prove why his case shouldn't be taken to the committee recommended by the referee body. Mr. Duty asked how many cases had been before more than one committee. Mr. Sutherland stated that he knew of at least two but there might be some others before his tenure as chairperson. The Chairperson stated that this is of course an attempt to police our profession internally and that sometimes these cases had led to external litigation. Mr. Helgeson stated that the delay comes from going to what he called "barracks room lawyers" who offer advice as to which committee the faculty member should approach. Mr. Helgeson deplored the loss of valuable time. He stated that it would expedite things a great deal if the complaint would go to a single committee which was familiar with the jurisdiction of all the committees. Mr. Ficek raised a question of whether or not the same set of facts might not be legitimate jurisdiction for all three committees. He stated that in some cases this proposal would not solve the problem or even minimize it. Mr. Ficek stated that it would not be serving the faculty well to give them an erroneous decision that this belonged in a single committee rather than in several committees. Mr. Ficek stated that if the committees were set up with due process that followed constitutional requirements there would be less likelihood of external litigation arising after such due process. Mr. Gordon suggested a possible solution would be a single committee with subcommittees to handle specialties. Mr. Smith stated that this was a very interesting suggestion. Mr. Woods entered a plea for a single committee. Mr. Quane suggested that Mr. Gordon's recommendation of a single committee with subcommittees was de facto implementation of the Goleash memo in the sense that the committee would have double jurisdiction in giving the complaint to a subcommittee and then reviewing the subcommittee's recommendation. Mr. Ficek reiterated his point that laymen should not be establishing procedures by which these committees operate, even though the committees are composed of laymen. If this is what happens, that is, if the committees' procedures were established in the light of the requirements of due process, then there would be less opportunity for litigation external to the University. Mr. Hicklin made a plea for a year of muddling through with the proposed committee. He suggested that many problems might be arising in the next year and that the single committee would be overloaded. He stated that we would be disturbing certain traditions in electing or appointing these various committees if we try to move now to a single committee. Mr. Helgeson stated that he and Mr. Goleash had approached Mr. Eatherly, Chairman of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee about removing some of the vagueness and asking the AFT Committee to restudy some of the vague aspects of their procedures. He stated that Mr. Eatherly is very receptive to cleaning up these points. Mr. Gamsky asked if this was still an information item since we are treating it as an action item and are debating its merits. The Chairperson asked Mr. Smith to inform the Executive Committee by July 31 if they wanted the proposal to become an action item for the August 28 meeting. Mr. Smith stated that the committee would now state that they should like to have it as an action item, if the Executive Committee concurs.



## COMMITTEE REPORTS

Administrative Affairs Committee - Mr. Duty reported that the evaluation of department heads proposal is a continuing information item on the committee's agenda.

Ms. Chesebro stated that the Academic Affairs Committee had no report.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Mr. Smith stated that the Faculty Affairs Committee would be sending to Mr. Young for the Joint University Advisory Committee a package of proposed fringe benefits for faculty. He stated that there would be several items on the list, but they had not yet come up with the final phrasing of the proposals. He stated that the committee is also looking at the cost of the tuition waiver proposal for survivors of deceased faculty and civil service personnel.

Mr. Roderick reported for the Rules Committee. He drew the attention of the Senate to three items reported in the Executive Committee Minutes of July 17, 1974 from the Rules Committee.

Mr. Chamberlain reported for the Student Affairs Committee. He stated that at their meeting yesterday they discussed the alcohol revision to the SCERB regulations which had previously been discussed as an information item. He reported that there had been some need for haste in the consideration of the disciplinary sanctions in that it was desired to include them in the Handbook. Mr. Chamberlain stated that the Student Affairs Committee did not approve any of the proposed changes in the disciplinary sanctions which have already been entered in the Handbook. The parental notification policy will go back to the committee for a study of its legal implications.

## COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Hicklin reported as a member of the Faculty Advisory Council to the Board of Higher Education elected from the Senate that Dr. Cameron West, Executive Director of the Board of Higher Education, would be announcing his resignation on July 29 and Mr. Hicklin stated that Dr. West had been a friend of ISU in terms of his policy determination and he hoped that future executive directors would continue the commitments that Dr. West had made to the institution.

Mr. Steinbach cited a warning ticket that had been given to a student parked in a metered lot, which stated that the student could not park in a metered lot without a registration sticker. Mr. Kolasa expressed his hope that parking meters would be set up to run for more than an hour so a person could use the meters on Tuesday and Thursday during the hour and fifteen minute classes without having to leave class and put more money in.

Mr. Morris stated that it was unfortunate that these problems had not been raised at the time when the Coordinator of Parking was here since he might have been able to respond to the complaints. Mr. Morris stated that unless the Senate intends to take up this situation he would request that these remarks be directed to the Parking Committee.

A motion (Mr. Sims, Mr. Chamberlain) to adjourn was approved. The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,  
Charles R. Hicklin, Secretary

