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Executive Committee

Meeting No. 4
4:00 - 5:20 p.m. October 16, 1974
President's Conference Room

Members Present: Mr. Arnold, President Budig, Ms. Frankland, Mr. Henry, Mr. Hicklin, Mr. Kolasa, Mr. Liberta, Mr. Madore, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Tarrant, Mr. Young

Guests: Dean Helgeson, Mr. McBee

The Chairperson called the meeting to order.

Mr. Madore asked about the status of the report from the APT Review Committee. Mr. Liberta reported that the first draft is finished and will be in the hands of the faculty next week. He stated that there will be a questionnaire attached to the mailing to the faculty. He stated that by the third week in November the committee would reach a recommendation to either scrap the proposal or to adopt it.

Mr. Madore asked about the status of the Human Resources Management Task Force. Mr. Tarrant suggested that the Chairperson do something about seeing that this committee is completed and begins its work.

Chairperson Sutherland asked if the Committee wished a formal communication from the APT Review Committee about the status of its work. Mr. Madore said that his concern was over the time element involved, but that Mr. Liberta's report was sufficient for his purposes. The Chairperson stated that he would investigate the situation with regard to the Human Resources Management Task Force.

Action items for the agenda of the October 23 meeting were discussed. The proposal for filling the vacancy created by the resignation of Mr. Koehl was explained by its co-sponsor, Mr. Kolasa. He stated that Joe and he had met with the Student Association Assembly and had received input from Mr. Gamsky, Mr. Hathway, Mr. Morris, Mr. Roderick, Mr. Walter and Mr. Elliott. He stated that the present election code called for thirty days public notice before an election could be held. He stated that this system proposes the creation of a four-member committee which would screen candidates and rank order them before submitting the names to the Senate for election. A question was raised if this would become a change in the Senate bylaws and always be the procedure used in filling vacancies. Mr. Kolasa stated that we were not setting a precedent. Mr. Hicklin stated that the Constitution states that students will be elected. He stated that we cannot follow the suggested procedure without first amending the Constitution. He stated that he could see the time when the Student Association would be in fact appointing all of the people. He stated that we had better check with someone to see if this was not a violation of Board policy since our Constitution is a part of Board policy. Mr. Kolasa stated that he was not suggesting that there not be an election but rather that it be an election by the Senate as opposed to an election at large. A discussion of whether the procedure was an appointment or an election ensued. Mr. Kolasa stated that under the existing code ballot boxes, poll judges, etc. would be required. Mr. Tarrant stated that the election would not be completed before the end of the year.
It was suggested that Mr. Kolasa see Mr. Goleash and see what system would be in conformity with legal matters. Mr. Madore suggested that the item be placed on the action item agenda pending discussion with Goleash. Mr. Kolasa discussed the relationship between the Student Association and the Senate. He stated that he didn't feel that we were fair to ask the Association for a recommendation if we had no intention of abiding by it. Mr. Madore stated that nothing precludes this unless Goleash says it is against Board of Regents policy. Mr. Hicklin reiterated his concern that this was in violation to the Constitution. Mr. Arnold also suggested that the item be checked with Mr. Goleash and be put on the agenda. A motion (Mr. Madore, Mr. Arnold) to place this item on the action agenda was approved.

The Chairperson announced that other action items were the University Curriculum Committee codification proposal, student appointments to Senate external standing committees, and Athletic Council appointments. An information item was the SCERB Annual Report. A motion (Mr. Madore, President Budig) to approve the agenda was approved.

An election was held to determine the two names to be submitted to the President as the nominees for the position on the Athletic Council. Ron Cook and James Collie were submitted from the list submitted by the Athletic Council through the Rules Committee.

Mr. Hicklin asked if there was any assurance that minority groups were represented in the student appointments. Mr. Arnold replied that he didn't see the significance of this question. He stated that attempts were made to make these committees as representative as possible. He stated that the students had discussed this many times and didn't see the need for an even ratio on every committee.

A letter from Charles Pendleton regarding student vacancies on the Parking Committee was noted.

A request from Dr. Dieterle for two student members to fill vacancies on the Academic Standards Committee was received. A letter from Scott Eatherle re a person being on two committees was received. It was stated that the Senate was more concerned about appointments since the Senate did not want to interfere with departments presenting their choices for elected committees. It was felt that a person's being on an elected committee and an appointed committee was not especially worrisome. A letter of resignation from the General Revenue Budget Advisory Committee was received from James Koch. A motion (President Budig, Mr. Arnold) to send the Dieterle, Eatherly and Koch letters to the Rules Committee was accepted.

The Chairperson discussed the agreement between the Unit #5 School District and the lab schools, to enroll the lab school students in Unit #5 to bring more state money into the district. The Chairperson stated that he was disturbed about how the decision had been made without prior consultation and review. He stated his concern that this could in time lead to encroachments against faculty welfare and against academic programs in the lab schools. He stated that there would be a joint meeting of Faculty Affairs Committee and Academic Affairs Committee with Dean Helgeson and Dr. Gnagey on Monday, October 21 at 4:00 p.m. in Hovey 418 to discuss the way in which the decision was made. Mr. Hicklin stated that NIU had done this earlier. Dean Helgeson stated that NIU went public three years ago; they lost their lab schools. Dr. Budig stated that the Board
had directed the University to find alternate means of financing the lab schools. The Chairperson said there was some indication that the lab school faculties were not consulted with before this agreement was announced. The Chairperson asserted that we had better find out about how the decision was made and what assurances we have that programs will not be violated. He stated that it is the way the decision was made that offends him; the decision itself may be very meritorious. President Budig stated that this is a good decision; it is a way to have continuance of the lab schools. He stated that we probably have another year to prove that we have funding options that are viable. He stated that this agreement is a very simply stated document that has no implications in terms of programs and staffing. He stated that if there are better ideas they are welcome. He stated that the one difference is that the schools will obey the state requirements on attendance. He stated that he thought an error had been made in communication. He stated his belief that this judgment was the only judgment that could have been made. He stated that some members of the administration had been preoccupied with keeping the schools open and had thought that everyone knew that we needed to find additional ways of funding. He stated that the record is clear on this and shows good faith. He said he would have no reservations to bringing this to the committee. He stated that his error was in not bringing this to the Senate. He stated that presently the University is trying to negotiate a second agreement with Bloomington. Dr. Budig stated that we need a program thought to be innovative and a funding base. He reiterated that if there was any breakdown in communication it was his mistake. He stated again that he was optimistic that he would be able to show good faith. He stated that there was no attempt to slip anything by anyone. The Chairperson stated that he was concerned that external bodies not have control over the programs of the laboratory schools. Mr. Tarrant stated that he had read of the agreement in the newspaper and was frankly delighted.

A letter from Joe Arnold re an alternative to the CCGR proposal was discussed. He stated that a group of faculty and students had worked up an alternative proposal and was concerned about what route to take to get it considered by the Senate. It was suggested that the plan be submitted to CCGR who would advance it to the Senate. Committee members stressed the importance of the work of the CCGR and the need for adequate time for presentation and discussion of the proposals on the Senate floor.

A motion (Mr. Henry, Mr. Madore) to adjourn was approved. The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.