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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.
Call to Order

Chairperson Quane called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in Stevenson 401.

Roll Call

The Secretary called the roll, and a quorum was declared to be present.

Approval of Minutes

A motion (Morris, Hanrath) to approve the minutes of the October 22 and October 30 minutes was made. A correction on page 24 of the October 22 minutes was noted. The resolution discussed about the tenth line down should be number # 2. A question was also raised about the statement by Provost Horner that he had "no immediate desire to change temporary contracts into permanent contracts." Provost Horner stated that he did not recall what he said, but he did not believe this statement was correct. Mr. Banks stated that he recalled the Provost saying, perhaps in response to a question about automatically re-assigning permanent lines to temporary, that that sort of policy would be discontinued. The suggestion was made that the statement be deleted. Provost Horner suggested deleting the word "no" and changing it to "a". Mr. Madore clarified that this is Provost Horner's desire. Chairperson Quane stated that the record would be checked and the appropriate correction made. The minutes were approved as corrected.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson Quane stated that a number of handouts had been distributed to the senators tonight. He cautioned all senators that for information items the Senate should be dealing with informational questions rather than debate. He said this was not the time to convince people to vote a certain way.

Administrator's Remarks

Provost Horner asked for an executive session.

After the re-convening into open session, Mr. Horner reported on the status of the internal budget for FY 77. The fiscal agents have been asked to have their requests in earlier because the Budget Team wants an opportunity to influence the line distribution of the budget. He said by mid-January the University will have made some commitments regarding totals by line, and within a few weeks we will be getting summaries of the totals.

Mr. Young drew the attention of the Senate to the handout "Appropriations Request and Budgetary Process." He said steps 1 through 5 deal with appropriations requests and steps 6 through 10 deal with the internal budget. He indicated this information was distributed in his role as Budget Team Observer.
Student Association President's Remarks

Ms. Holmberg explained that the materials in the packets for the student senators was their mail from their SA mailboxes. She announced that there would be a workshop on the Student Association Constitution on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of the first week in January. She asked for input on the need for revision.

Action Item:

1. Search Procedures for Dean of Continuing Education and Public Service

Chairperson Quane reminded the senators that they had received two memos from Provost Horner on this item. A motion (Young, Cohen) to accept the procedures as outlined in the memos of October 15 and December 3 was made. Mr. Wilson made the observation that the title read "Dean of Continuing Education and Public Service" but the college is called the "College of Continuing Education" in the Academic Plan. The concern was expressed that in the selection process we would be looking for a person experienced in public service as well as continuing education. Provost Horner stated that he defined "continuing education" broadly. Dr. Rives stated that the elimination of "and Public Service" was simply an oversight. He indicated that the Academic Plan was subject to further editing and this is a possible item for revision. The motion to approve the procedures passed.

Information Items:

1. Academic Plan

Ms. Chesebro reported that the Academic Affairs Committee had no recommendation right now. She asked Dr. Rives to give an overview of the Plan. She said she had also asked the college deans to appear, and Deans Harrison and Moore were present. She stated that the members of the Academic Affairs Committee would hold "open house" or "open telephone" hours next week; if anyone had questions or comments, he or she could call a committee member. The date for this activity will be announced in the University Report.

Dr. Rives reported that this Academic Plan is basically a revision of the 1975-1980 plan. Dr. Rives said that copies of the Plan were available in department offices and college offices, as well as the Student Association Office. Dr. Rives called the Senate's attention to page 6 where Master Plan IV's mission statement is incorporated in the statement of institutional mission; in fact, the first paragraph is now incorporated in Master Plan IV. He said that the subcommittee had paid attention to the institutional goals inventory. He reported that there have been some changes in the Plan, primarily in emphasis. Dr. Rives called attention to a section on page 19 which is new this year. This section offers a complete inventory of all degree programs available within the University at this time. He said since this section was compiled, the Board of Higher Education made its recommendations on additional degree programs. Dr. Rives explained that Section II focused on new degree programs. He called attention to those different from last year: Business Information Systems, Special Education program, and the Cooperative Program in Women's Studies. At the master's level are programs for a MA in Foreign Languages, Special Education Program for Gifted Children and Youth. At the doctoral level are
proposals for a College of Education Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study Program and doctoral programs in Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education, and Psychology. Dr. Rives stated that under Program Improvements, the University identifies areas where it can make reasonable requests for new dollars. Dr. Rives explained that Section III had been reorganized but was basically the same. The Student Affairs section has been coordinated with the Student Affairs Office. Dr. Rives called attention to page 36 concerning the program reviews. Some specific recommendations are made in regard to strengthening the programs. Section V is the same as last year and provides a statistical overview. Dr. Rives pointed out a new item in the Plan - the organizational structure charts. He said this is an attempt to provide definition of how the University is organized. Dr. Rives expressed his appreciation to the Academic Planning Committee for their hard work, especially to Dr. Dale Vetter who once again is handling the editorial revisions.

Dean Harrison, College of Business, reported on the business proposals. He stated that the Business Information Systems proposal had been in the developmental stage for two years. This major would employ classes in all three departments and has the complete support of each department in the college. The program would be housed in the Department of Accounting. He said the college has done a community survey which indicated a strong need for this program. He said this program will prepare the majors to assume entry level positions in data processing. Dean Harrison reported that his College is involved with two program improvements. The division of the Department of Business Administration is proposed because there are now seven different disciplines in this department. It is felt that the faculty is good and the program is good, but could be better if the department could offer a higher degree of specialization. The division would help the college to develop new areas of specialization and improve job opportunities for the graduates. Dean Harrison reported that within the department itself democratic procedures have been followed in regard to the division. The faculty have indicated that they would prefer to divide. Dean Harrison stated that the other request called for additional resources to develop the college. Dean Harrison said the College of Business is the smallest college and has only been in existence since 1967. The enrollments have grown rapidly. Dean Harrison said that the College has put together a package of things that would better improve its provision of educational services. These items would permit the college to be a more effective educational tool.

Dean Moore, College of Education, discussed the program proposals for his college: a Bachelor's Program Major in Severely and Profoundly Handicapped, Master's Program (Special Education) in Gifted Children and Youth, Master's Program in Early Childhood Education, Master's Program in Adult and Continuing Education, Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction, Doctoral Program in Special Education, College of Education Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study Program, Doctoral Program in Psychology.

The Early Childhood Education Master's Program will build on the Bachelor's degree. The Master's Program in Adult and Continuing Education will prepare workers in that field, and goes along with the establishment of the College of Continuing Education. The doctorate in Special Education is a Regency degree and will be operated by ISU and NIU. The Certificate of Advanced Study Program is a blanket program which enables a number of programs to be offered. It is not meant to be a stepping stone towards a doctoral degree. It is meant to help public school teachers gain skills they need to do a better job.
Under program improvements the College of Education has a Special Education Adaptive Education Program. There is a trend towards putting mildly handicapped children in regular classrooms. This program will train teachers to cope with these children. The Secondary Education Emphasis in Special Education Program addresses another special need. At the elementary level we have a large number of handicapped children in classrooms. At the secondary level we haven't had programs for them. The Department of Special Education is attempting to put more emphasis in teaching at the secondary level. This would be broader training than we now provide, which does emphasize elementary. ISU graduates with this emphasis would be prepared to work at both levels more adequately than they now can. Mr. Madore asked a question regarding page 15 about the shift of resources, and a possible ceiling on program enrollments. It was stated that there has been a considerable decrease in secondary enrollments. Therefore, the College would be channeling resources for the preparation of secondary teachers to some of the new programs. Mr. Madore asked if this resource shift would be limited to the choice that students made. Dean Moore responded that students are reacting to the oversupply and are enrolling in smaller numbers. This is a better system of reallocation than having to restrict the student's options.

The discussion of the Academic Plan took place according to the sections of the Plan.

Section I: Institutional and College Missions

Senator Cohen questioned the following statement in the CAST Mission Statement: "In addition the College will provide leadership in designing programs whereby nurses who have not completed a baccalaureate degree may do so within the framework of existing programs, including present majors and the Contract Major" (p. 11). He asked in view of the fact that the American Nursing Association and regional associations have recommended no new programs why has the University proposed this? Dean Rives replied that a number of nurses have expressed a desire to complete a bachelor's degree. This is not an attempt to provide a nursing degree. Dean Rives stated that a proposal is being considered either at the departmental or college level within the College of Applied Science and Technology. He explained that the proposal would come through the University Curriculum Committee and the Senate. He said that the Academic Plan was not proposing anything which would not be acted upon later. This program regarding programs for nurses is not an attempt to deal with certification problems or preparation of instructors. Mr. Cohen suggested that the language be edited so that the program not appear to be a capstone program.

An alternate wording of the affirmative action statement was presented: "To provide impartially for the needs of all students and through affirmative action to assure that the educational needs of women and minority students are met."

Ms. Chesebro made a comment relative to the College of Arts and Sciences Mission Statement. All of the other colleges state a position relative to preparation of professional educators. It seems rather incongruous that the College where the four D.A. programs reside doesn't have the same commitment. A revision was suggested to bring the College of Arts and Sciences into line with the other colleges and with the emphases in the Master Plan.

II. Academic Plans for New Programs and Improvements in Existing Programs

Chairperson Quane read a communication from Howard Hetzel, Chairperson of the Department of Biological Sciences. Mr. Hetzel suggested a change in the wording
of a statement in the description of the Bachelor's Program in Community and Public Health. His suggestion was that the sentence beginning on Line 3, page 26, be altered to read as follows: "The latter program provides opportunities for biologists in addition to careers as teachers and researchers since it provides an interdisciplinary program based on a solid preparation in the natural sciences in order to provide students with the essential administrative skills for coordinating health agency programs." Mr. Hetzel stated that he proposed this change because he considered the present statement to be too negative concerning the career opportunities for biologists.

The question was raised if any market study had been done of the master's in Foreign Languages. Dean Rives stated that the answer was partly yes. The University's experience with the summer program is the primary basis. Dean Rives stated that he would prefer to defer any definitive answer until Dean Uehling can respond. Dean Rives said he thought our summer experience shows that this would be an attractive program to people who are teaching foreign languages.

The Community and Public Health Major was questioned by Mr. Gordon. He noted that the proposal identifies courses and the sorts of agencies in which the graduates would be qualified to serve, but no reference is made to training the graduates in public administration. It was asked if some attention could be given to that.

Mr. Bernardi asked if there was any more data available on job opportunities rather than just the paragraph referring to the Master's in Applied Physics. Dean Rives responded "clearly yes." There is a well-developed proposal which is presently either at the College of Arts and Sciences level or the Graduate Council.

Dean Rives stated that this question gave him the opportunity to make a good point. The Senate is not approving these programs but is only saying that in principle these programs are worthy of exploration. There will be fully detailed proposals in the area when this comes to the Senate, as indeed all these new programs do. The Senate is simply approving these programs in concept. Approval of the Academic Plan does not mean we are going to institute the programs. Some questions about the need for the program and manpower needs are appropriate but they will be spelled out more fully later.

Mr. Young stated that the Master's program in Applied Physics has a very well documented section on manpower studies and statistics, including the results of an extensive survey. Mr. Young stated that the program reflects the preferences of industrial management personnel as determined by the survey. This degree should make ISU graduates very attractive to these industries. These management personnel have indicated that the program is better than any presently available.

Ms. Upton asked how the Applied Physics program would supplement or duplicate what is being done in industrial technology? Mr. Young replied that he didn't think it would duplicate at all, but would be supplemental. He said that the College of Applied Science and Technology is interested in different things. The people in the Master of Applied Physics program will be trained in experimental physics and be able to use sophisticated laboratory and mathematical tools. Mr. Young stated that these questions will be dealt with when the full proposal comes to the Senate.
Ms. Holmberg said that the Student Association Assembly had prepared a statement. She stated a series of questions from the statement. One concerned the large number of new graduate programs. The question was: Would funding these new programs through reallocation be harmful to the undergraduate programs? Dr. Rives stated that he didn't think it was necessary to limit it to graduate versus undergraduate programs. He stated that we have been funding programs through reallocation for some time. Dean Rives stated that he shared the SAA concern.

The second question dealt with the division of Continuing Education. She stated that the SAA could not understand the need to change to a college. She asked what that structure would entail? She asked if faculty members would report through that college? She asked what was the need for it being on the same level as the other colleges? The response was that this change is mainly an attempt to put more emphasis and visibility on a unit than it has had in the past. The change does not have any implications regarding faculty appointments. Mr. Hanrath asked if there was any significance to the dropping of the phrase "Public Service" from the title of the College. Dean Rives explained again that this was an oversight in the writing of the document.

The discussion then moved to page 33 re the Center for Ethnic Studies. The omission of "cultural studies" was questioned. The use of the word "indigenous" was also questioned. The response was that the reference was not to American Indians but it was an attempt to separate this from the foreign student program in order to indicate that the Center was concerned with cultures in this country.

Dr. Reitan asked why was the Public and Community Health Program assigned to Biological Sciences instead of the Allied Health Professions or in Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance? Why are these programs separate? Dr. Rives stated that this separation was not necessarily best. Biology must be central to any health program. The Health Education program located in HPERD has a good deal of biology content. Programs in the Center for Allied Health all have a significant biological science core requirement. This overlapping is an administrative problem. We may need to make a judgment concerning pulling these together. The Department of Biological Sciences has a basic interest in any health program.

Mr. Van de Voort asked about the Integrated Career Exploration and Development Program. He asked what the implications of this program were for the career development center and if this program would be under the Counseling Center? Dr. Gamsky stated that the program was in the area of the Counseling Center. He stated that this program would work with Academic Advisement and Placement. The University should coordinate placement information and career counseling before the student selects courses. This program attempts to coordinate and provide better counseling.

Section III: University-wide Services and Programs

Mr. Banks asked if it would have been appropriate to combine University Events and the University Union/Auditorium divisions. Dr. Gamsky responded that the University Events office had been moved to the Union by necessity because of the
availability of office space. The functions are being sorted out now into where they best fit. From that sorting came realigned job responsibilities. Dr. Gamsky said that there had been a lot of overlapping. The realignment of responsibilities resulted in no additional people and no reduction, just changes in responsibilities. Dr. Gamsky stated that the process of realignment was still going on; the Personnel Office is doing an audit of the civil service staff now. The suggestion was made that perhaps an organizational chart to explain the Student Affairs Areas was needed.

Dr. Reitan asked what the University is doing with HPS and why? Provost Horner responded that basically the University is attempting to give that program a much more academic skills orientation. He said this statement had been developed by the HPS area. Provost Horner said that in regard to the HPS Program they have transferred some activity which have occurred historically in that office to other units of the University and are attempting to make this more of an academic skills program. Provost Horner said that a number of services were being offered which were being provided through Student Affairs for all students. This unnecessary duplication has been eliminated. The major thrust will be the improvement of academic skills.

Mr. Corrigan asked why there was no mention of Intercollegiate Athletics. Dean Rives stated that last year we had the same question regarding Health Services. He said if anyone wanted an item included they should tell the Academic Planning Committee. Mr. Banks stated that this gave a new definition to "academic". Mr. Reitan responded that perhaps this should be a University plan, rather than an Academic Plan. Mr. Rives stated the whole section deals with non-academic plans so Intercollegiate Athletics could fit in here. Mr. Madore asked to what extent the format is specified. The response was that the University has considerable latitude in this section. Mr. Rives pointed out that each university's report is called an "Academic Plan". Mr. Gordon asked if a statement on Intercollegiate Athletics could be available before the January 14 meeting?

There were no questions on Section IV: Selective Review of Academic Programs.

Section V: Statistical Data Regarding Academic Programs

Mr. Rives stated that the format is specified for this statement. Ms. Upton asked about the use of these statistics in budget allocations by the Budget Team. The explanation was made that the information used by the Budget Team is much more extensive. Dean Rives stated that this section is the information which the University is required to submit. This information is far too limited to use in budget planning. It was questioned how the Board of Regents uses the data. Mr. Rives said that the Board of Regents would have to answer that question. Appendices: There were no questions on the appendices.

Mr. Smith asked who provided the information in the headings "University Analysis and Recommendations" under Selective Review of Academic Programs. Dean Rives responded that each of the program reviews are prepared by the college deans and either himself or Dean White. This is not simply the recommendation of the department but does attempt to bring in university and college perspective.
Resignation of Senator

Chairperson Quane stated that a letter of resignation had been received from Senator Jo Workman. A motion (Madore, Smith) to accept the resignation with regret and appreciation for her years of service was approved.

2. Search Procedure for Vice President for Financial Planning and Business Affairs

Ms. McMahan reported that the changes in the procedure were mainly editorial to reflect changes in the organizational structure of the University. Mr. Salome asked about the wording "acceptable to the University community". Ms. McMahan responded that this is the traditional language and is contained in the previous procedure.

The Chairperson declared a five-minute recess. The Senate reconvened at 8:56 p.m.

3. Revised Procedures for the Dean's List

Ms. Chesebro stated that the memo from Provost Horner is self-explanatory. She reported that the Academic Affairs Committee has referred it to the Academic Standards Committee. She asked that questions be directed to Provost Horner.

Dean Rives stated that the intent was to include the revised procedures in the next catalog. He asked if there is an intent to get a recommendation from the Academic Standards Committee by the next meeting?

Mr. Carlile asked why the 10% figure was used? Provost Horner reported that this recommendation was made by the deans after discussion with the college councils.


Ms. Chesebro explained that the memo of November 10 from the Office of Undergraduate Instruction explains this item. The green sheet distributed to the senators this evening is a syllabus for English 101. Ms. Chesebro reported that the Academic Affairs Committee has taken action on this, and at the next meeting will recommend that this be approved. Ms. Chesebro introduced Bill Linneman, Director of Freshman English and former Director of University Studies; and Carmen Richardson, Chairperson, Department of English. Dr. Richardson stated that in recent months concern over the decline of language skills has grown. A study which assessed the writing ability of children reflected this decline. Reports of employer demands for communication skills have also received attention. The American Chemical Society reported that skill in oral and written communication was sought. The need for improved language skills was mentioned by a group analyzing the Agribusiness program. Faced by this increasing pressure from employers, some colleges are re-instituting the English 101 requirement. She reported that Gerald Balls of the ISU English Department had surveyed a number of schools and of those, only five did not have an English 101 requirement. In the State of Illinois he surveyed all of the public universities. ISU is the only one of the state universities not requiring Freshman English. She stated that the department was not assuming that requiring one course will solve the problem but it is a starting point. Emphasis would be given to
language skills in each department. Mr. Parr stated that an option of having an examination to meet the requirement had been discussed. He suggested that a centrally administered examination would be better. He said that one department is now considering such a competency requirement, but does plan to maintain the requirement of a "C" grade. Mr. Van de Voort asked about the quality of instruction in English 101. He asked if the class size would allow individual attention. Mr. Linneman reported that the department had held class size to 25. He said he did not anticipate increasing the enrollment maximum. Mr. Hanrath asked how one can proficiency out of 101? Mr. Linneman responded that anyone can take the proficiency examination now. It is offered three times a year. Ms. Stone asked if, in light of all the statistics given, a study had been made to determine the need for this requirement at ISU. Mr. Linneman stated that no actual survey had been done, but he had heard comments of the freshman English teachers. Comments from academic units interviewed by the University Studies program were favorable to reinstituting the English 101 requirement. Mr. Corrigan asked how many new faculty members will be needed because of the increased enrollment? Mr. Linneman responded that he didn't think the department would have much need for new staff. He said he had tried to review the number of students the department could handle. He said there are about 3,700 possible enrollees. Of these, about 50 will proficiency; 150-200 will be transfer students who have taken English, leaving about 3,500 students. The department offers 123 sections of English 101, 18 sections of 101.3 (HPS), and 2 sections for foreign students. The department could therefore handle 3,575 if every space in every section were filled. Three sections will also be offered in the summer. Mr. Linneman reported that in past years, although 101 was elective, about 80% took it. In 1973-74 the number was 77%; in 1974-75 it was 81%.

Chairperson Quane stated that he had received a letter from Richard Whitcomb, Chairperson, Department of Foreign Languages, expressing his department's support for this proposal.

Dr. Reitan asked what kind of examination was the proficiency examination. Mr. Linneman responded that the proficiency examination consists of an objective test based on usage followed by an essay examination in which the readers look for most common errors. He reported that of the 205 people who took the proficiency examination (this was when an ACT score of 24 was necessary to take the examination), 47 passed (23%). Last year over 300 took the exam and 43 passed (14%). He said this exam was a good measure of proficiency. The question was raised as to why a "C" level was necessary. The student could obviously improve by enrolling in the course. Mr. Linneman responded that the "C" level indicated a level of competency. Mr. Linneman stated that the department had changed its operating procedure which has improved the manner in which students are approaching the course. The instructor is more a facilitator and helper. Mr. Banks stated that he recognized the differences between types of learning and what it takes to measure it -- i.e., Math 107 and English 101 -- but asked that those responsible give additional thought to the beneficial effects of having a competency examination, that is, the benefits of receiving a grade in a course as a certificate versus passing a competency examination.

Mr. Linneman stated that the primary interest is quality. He referred to the green sheet which listed what the department is doing now. The requirements
include a library paper plus a certain number of papers written in class and a
certain number written outside of class for a total of 8 plus the library paper.
Mr. Madore described this as an odd way to get at quality because of the large
number of papers required. Mr. Linneman stated that there is improvement from
the beginning paper to the end paper.

Mr. Cohen wished to comment on Mr. Madore's remark. He said that the more an
individual writes, the better the individual can write. This is an area where
one learns by doing again and again. An English 101 course which required less
would not be very effective. Mr. Linneman remarked that instructors are evaluating
those papers. The student is encouraged to think about different types of writing,
thought processes, organizational skills. Organizational skills are quite important.
If we are talking about a comparison-contrast theme, we are talking about a certain
kind of writing skill. This skill might be used in an essay exam. Skill in writing
application letters also was taught. Mr. Reitan said he thought there was a special
responsibility to justify the requirement of a specific course. He suggested that
the Senate might agree with this for a four-year period. Then a report on the
experiment could be submitted. Ms. Chesebro stated that the Academic Affairs
Committee would make such a recommendation.

5. Amplification Policy

Ms. Lohr and Mr. Boldt presented the proposal. Ms. Lohr noted that the senators
had received two policies, one in the mail and one on the table tonight. Ms. Lohr
clarified that the policy under discussion was the one on the table. Ms. Lohr
outlined the changes in the policy. The hours were changed to 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Also a statement was added: "disturbances will not be allowed in outside areas on
days when class is in session". A section "c" was added regarding where complaints
can be taken. The only other change is in regard to exceptions to the policy.
References to "University Events" will be changed to "University Events and Auditorium
Public Functions Office". "Associate Director of University Union and Auditorium"
is the new title for the position held by Mr. Throckmorton. Mr. Maxwell asked who
decided what constitutes a disturbance. Mr. Throckmorton responded that this would
usually be decided by the Secretary's Office or Public Safety Office. Mr. Corrigan
asked what is the need for an amplification policy in light of the moving of the
library since the potential for disturbance is reduced. The response was that there
will be other classes in the old library. Ms. Stone explained that it is not just
because of the library that this revised policy is proposed. She explained that
this policy doesn't refer only to the amphitheater but also to noise out of dorm
windows. Mr. Danks stated that the policy addresses itself to two things: the use
of the amplification and to the restrictions. Mr. Smith asked if there was any
need for the policy at all? He asked how the need for the policy was determined?
Ms. Stone stated that after the events connected with the Rites of Spring and the
MEG Rally the committee was asked to clarify the policy. Mr. Gordon stated that
the Senate was discussing two things: expediting the request and what is a
disturbance. He asked if this policy was designed to deal with both. Mr. Boldt
stated that the procedure for obtaining permission to use amplification also tells
where to direct complaints or disturbances. Mr. Smith asked if it were possible
to have amplification equipment in the amphitheater only until someone complains?
Mr. Boldt said that as he understood it the old policy was ambiguous. This policy
would clarify what was going on and why. Mr. Wilson provided some background
information. The Senate in 1971 adopted a policy and procedures statement. Apparently there were some troubles and the statement was rewritten. The original statement did deal with both policy and procedures. That was approved by the Academic Senate. Mr. Banks stated that item “c” did not appear to be an appropriate subsection under procedures for securing the amphitheatre. Perhaps this should be an additional paragraph on where to take complaints. It then was asked if the residence halls had been consulted. The response was that the committee had met with Dan Girvan. According to the housing program, complaints are addressed to the residence hall manager. Ms. Stone said that this section just followed the current policy. If there is a disturbance in the residence halls, this policy would be followed. Mr. Salome suggested that the wording be "from intrusion of amplified sound both from within and without" since there are both inside and outside possibilities. Mr. Throckmorton pointed out that the scheduling of the amphitheatre was already in his office. This policy statement will clarify that function. The present policy limits the use of equipment not secured from media services. This policy would allow the individual to bring his own equipment and would expand the use of the facility. Mr. Rhodes stated that he would like to have more information and requested a more full statement of the procedures be provided. Mr. Wilson said the Senate should have the 1971 policy under which we are presently operating. It was stated that under the present policy one can't have amplification at all. Only the President can make exceptions to this policy. Mr. Tarrant suggested that perhaps it might be best to reject this and keep the present policy. Mr. Madore moved the agenda.

6. Revision of Student Elections Code

Ms. Holmberg stated that she would try to explain the problem of Elections Code Revision. She stated that the senators should have a copy of the ISU Student Assembly Elections Code which was used last year by the SA. Association of Residence Halls and the Senate also ran their elections by this code. Amendments had been proposed to the Code by the SA. These proposed amendments were developed by an Election Code Revision Task Force. They were put together by this year and last year's Elections Committees. She said she had intended to move this to the action item status. Because of the re-writing done by the SA Assembly, the ARH decided not to participate in the SA elections. The purpose of the revision had been to develop one Elections Code for all student elections. The SA Assembly preferred to retain control over this and therefore re-wrote the Code. The SA Assembly will allow other organizations to run their elections by this code but final decisions will be made by the SA Assembly. The SA Assembly added a provision which will remove all polling places from the residence halls. What the Senate needs to consider is whether or not they want to hold their election with the SA Assembly. The Assembly did not take action regarding the date of the election. That was tabled. The SA Assembly is talking about a two-day election. Ms. Holmberg stated that she thought that there was a problem. She said the Senate cannot accept the proposed amendments since they assume the three groups will be working together. She stated that the Senate could hold its own election, work with one or the other groups. She recommended that the Elections Code be referred back with the understanding that the Senate will act upon its recommendation at the next Senate meeting.

Mr. Hathway, Chairman of the University Elections Committee, gave a historical perspective. Mr. Hathway reported that the SA Assembly was charged with the establishment of a set of codes for running elections. The Senate elections are codified by the ISU Constitution and the Senate bylaws. The first year the code was approved for use at the next election. Mr. Hathway said that the revision committee had begun its work in the fall. It reviewed the recommendations and drew up the amendments. Mr. Hathway said that his committee was recommending
that the revised code be adopted and had prepared bylaw changes to accommodate the revisions. He said he had not had a chance to review the SA Assembly changes. He said his committee would have to meet and make a recommendation regarding the code's use in the spring elections. He said there would have to be some basic agreement for the election to be run as scheduled. If there is an impasse, then the future is not clear. He stated that there is really nothing ready to be acted upon tonight. Action would have to be taken at the January 14 meeting.

Mr. Gamsky asked to what extent the Rules Committee had been involved. He said that in looking at the revisions, they seem to violate the Senate bylaws and Constitution, especially in view of the decision on polling places. He suggested that Rules look at this as far as it concerns student senators. As stated now, there seems to be a number of difficulties. The question was asked what now constitutes the information item with which the Senate is dealing. Chairperson Quane responded that the Proposed Amendments to the ISU SA Elections Code are under discussion. Mr. Reitan stated that this item really didn't come from the Rules Committee, although they had been in touch with Mr. Hathway. Mr. Reitan stated that he thought the Senate was getting some useful information. The situation right now is confused. Mr. Hathway stated that during his tenure the rules have basically been interim procedures. Ms. Holmberg suggested that it was appropriate for this to go to the Rules or Elections Committee. She said that we as a Senate cannot possibly draft the Code. Mr. Young stated that the Senate needed to get the procedures in motion. A motion (Young, Salome) that the Elections Code Revision be referred to the Senate Elections Committee was made.

Mr. Gordon asked how many different elections are currently governed by one committee. He said the response would make a difference in how he voted. He said he was not sure that the Senate Elections Committee was the place for this to go. Ms. Holmberg responded that the proposed amendments would create a joint committee. If the revisions are accepted, it is very possible that all three groups will be holding their elections at different times. That possibility is part of the whole problem. The possibility of three different elections, sets of criteria, and polling places is real. As of now, there is no coordination. Ms. Holmberg agreed that these questions have to be cleared up. Mr. Young stated that the Elections Committee is the most knowledgeable committee to which the Senate has access. That is the place where the most expertise rests. Mr. Gremaud asked what was the difference between the status of this year and last year. He asked why the Senate election couldn't be held with the SA elections. Mr. Hathway responded that the proposed change in the date was a problem since the date of the Senate election is constitutionally set. Mr. Hathway stated that the goal is to hold a joint election. The Elections Committee would attempt to determine if that can be done or not. If it can't be done, then the committee would recommend that the faculty election be held on schedule and have something else to recommend on the student election. He said there are a number of process questions and some substantive issues. The on campus, off campus issue was cited as an example. He stated that several years ago the Senate debated certain representation issues. He noted that currently 60% of the students were from one academic department, probably 75% from one college. Some colleges were not represented at all. A motion (Cohen, Young) to move the previous question was approved. The motion to send the Election Code Revisions to the Senate Elections Committee was approved.

7. Statement on Surveillance Cameras

Mr. Corrigan introduced the proposal. He stated that several times the issue had come up regarding putting outside surveillance cameras in operation. In every instance there has been a public uproar. The issue came up again in the spring of 1974 regarding putting a camera on TriTowers. Mr. Corrigan stated that this
proposal has been sitting in Student Affairs Committee for the past year and a half. Mr. Morris proposed that a different approach be taken. He said this statement would seem to declare a prohibition in an area where the Senate is only advisory. The administrative officials involved are not under the Senate. Ms. Chesebro stated that she thought this topic had been presented before. She stated that the Senate had prohibited their use. Mr. Salome stated that some surveillance cameras are needed for insurance purposes, i.e., the Galleries. It was pointed out that this statement is directed towards only outside cameras. It was asked if we had other than television cameras. Mr. Corrigan replied that according to the proposal from the spring of 1974 the camera was capable of recording what it saw. The university stated that it wasn't intending to use film, but some cameras do have that capability. That was why the use of film was mentioned. Mr. Corrigan stated that this statement is only advisory. It is not a restriction on what the University can and cannot do. The Chairperson suggested that by the next meeting Student Affairs Committee have available the customary statement of pros and cons of the proposal.

8. Withdrawal Policy

Ms. Dieterle, Chairperson of Academic Standards Committee, introduced the proposal. She stated that the committee had been working on the policy for about a year and a half. She stated that the committee hadn't had much student input because of the long standing student vacancies on the committee.

Ms. Chesebro, Chairperson, Academic Affairs Committee, discussed the handout which she had distributed to the Senate. Ms. Chesebro stated that the primary reason for the change is that the W without qualifiers is being misinterpreted. The policy change is needed for those students wanting to go to graduate schools and professional schools. Ms. Chesebro referred also to the rationale listed in the Academic Standards Committee proposal. Ms. Chesebro stated that the general consensus was for the acceptance of the withdrawal grade with qualifiers, WP and WF. The possibility of shortening the withdrawal period was also discussed. The question of putting the WF on the transcript had been discussed as was the possibility of faculty reprisal through the WF. Ms. Chesebro stated that a member of her committee had proposed some amendments. She turned the floor over to Mr. Gordon.

Mr. Gordon directed the attention of the Senate to a five part proposal, the sum and substance of which are essentially to return the system of withdrawals to the one the university had before the last change. He said he did not offer this as a conflicting proposal. He emphasized that the rationales that are presented do not claim as much as the Academic Standards report. His approach to this subject is one which assumes that the withdrawal policy is but one portion of the overall system of grading procedures. Mr. Gordon stated that he took the position that withdrawals should be used sparingly. He had some real reservations about the present policy because it encourages proliferation of reasons for withdrawing from courses. Mr. Gordon stated that his proposal was in five parts. The time of withdrawal would be up to the sixth week. He said he did not propose only a W in the first six weeks because of the possibility of a more precise definition even up to that early time in the semester. If no basis for a grade exists, then a WX would be given. He suggested not leaving any question as to the status of the student. The WF would also not leave as much question and might do some good. Mr. Gordon suggested moving up the time limit from the 14th week to the 11th week. Mr. Gordon reported that Mr. Carr had informed him that the number of the weeks includes an eighteen week semester. There is one week prior to the beginning of classes. He stated that the numbers were subject to change. During the second
portion of the semester the student may withdraw with WP or WF. Mr. Gordon stated that he was not specifically interested in the necessity for students to confer with their instructors but that the instructors have a sign off place on the form. Mr. Gordon said in reference to the assigning of the WF that he expected both parties to approach the question solely on the merits of the work assigned so far. He said he thought it was important that there were established channels of appeals. Mr. Gordon stated that one of the reasons that the policy was changed was because of problems with the WF. Mr. Gordon said he was aware of the problem but didn't think the withdrawal policy should have to deal with limited number of cases. He said that students don't know the consequences of withdrawal under the present system. He said we need to do a better job of indicating what the possible benefits and dangers are for students who withdraw. He suggested calculating a WF as an F since the student is withdrawing in order to avoid failure. He said he thought the whole question of evaluation was at issue here. In fairness to all other students and in fairness to the student himself, the WF not counting doesn't go far enough. The D or F student is getting the short end of the stick if students are withdrawing because not to do so would be to fail. Students should be encouraged to stay in a course and get as much out of it as possible. Mr. Rhodes asked which proposal should be discussed.

Mr. Carr stated that some of Mr. Gordon's ideas would be acceptable to the Academic Standards Committee. He said he would like to have that proposal as an amendment to the Academic Standards proposal. The problem with the time frame was discussed. If the time was changed, there would be a period of time when a student who really needs to get out, can't do so. He suggested that the fourteen weeks period might be kept. Mr. Carr stated that the members of the Academic Standards Committee had expected changes. He stated that many of the changes Mr. Gordon had suggested had been considered by the committee but the committee didn't think it could get the changes through.

Mr. Carlile stated that there are a few references to passing work. He asked what exactly is passing work. The response was that a D was a passing grade. Mr. Newman noted that as of spring of 1973 there were 600 withdrawals. In 1974-75 there were almost 20,000 withdrawals. What was the change in grade point average between those two periods? The response was that it has gone up but exact figures are not known. Mr. Banks said it would have to go up because we are substituting a number of withdrawals for a number of D and F grades. Mr. Newman said he was interested in finding out how serious the change was.

Mr. Gordon questioned the ruling that questions could not be addressed to anything but the Academic Affairs proposal. He said he intended to offer his proposal as a substitute proposal. Chairperson Quane ruled that if that was Mr. Gordon's intent, then it was appropriate to ask questions on it.

9. Revisions in the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures

Mr. Smith said he was sorry to confront the Senate with this document so late. Mr. Smith stated that the committee had a lengthy and lively session last Thursday night. The committee then met on Sunday and incorporated several changes. Mr. Smith suggested that the senators carefully look over both documents -- one dated November 24 and one dated December 8. Mr. Smith highlighted a couple of the changes in the proposal dated December 8. On page 1 the committee had added a clause "b" to take into account some concern about the appropriate role of advice to the President and the faculty member's right of access to the Board of Regents. On page 2 the committee had divided a composite election group into
two groups -- Milner Library and laboratory schools -- and increased the size of the University Review Committee slightly. On page 4 the committee has indicated that a majority of the College Faculty Status Committee must be tenured. Also on page 4 the committee has added a procedural step indicating that recommendations from the DFSC and CFSC are to be sent to the Provost. Page 6, point "H", spells out more clearly procedures when the faculty member has duties in more than one department. Page 10, point C(1) was changed to indicate that the decision to deny tenure does not necessarily reflect on the competency of the individual. On page 13, item #3, section b, was changed to read "each year". Also the committee has deleted the phrase "suggested percentages". Item #2 in the appendix now reads "at the completion of the assignment". Mr. Horner stated that there are few policy documents which are more crucial to faculty members than this. Any knowledge that the substance of the Roberts Committee Report would be incorporated was not known until very recently. The faculty were given only two days notice of the hearing. Dr. Horner said he was disappointed that no more than 25 persons participated. Dr. Horner said the question he was raising is whether or not real chance is being given if the faculty wanted to read the proposal. Perhaps more time before arriving at the time of action is needed. Mr. Duty asked how large would these two committees be? Mr. Madore replied that the appeals committee originally started with a 25 to 1 ratio. It is a fully tenured committee. The ratio of 15 to 1 would generate 23 committee members; if a ratio of 20 to 1 is used, there would be 18; with a ratio of 25 to 1, there would be 15. Mr. Smith stated that the URC would be increased by two. Mr. Duty asked about the options faculty members have to remove a person from the subcommittee of the UAC hearing an appeal.

Mr. Madore expressed a personal point of view regarding the time frame for implementation. If action could be taken reasonably early, we are at the point where we decide the policies and procedures for next year. Mr. Madore said he had not expected this to be under discussion at 11:25 p.m. He suggested that this could be an information item again at the next meeting. Mr. Cohen asked why the phrase "suggested percentages" was dropped, and the percentages made mandatory. Mr. Smith stated that the committee was not clear in its own mind what the phrase "suggested percentages" meant. Mr. Smith said this formula was suggested by the original Roberts document. The FAC discussed it and decided it was a good formula. He said if "suggested percentages" was left in then every department could decide exactly what proportions it would use. A department could say it would give 95% to exceptional merit and 5% to merit. Mr. Smith said he had discussed this with Mr. Roberts who indicated that his committee wanted to leave it in. Mr. Horner said that, instead of locking percentages in, perhaps the Senate could make that a job of the URC. He said this would be quite a departure from what we will be discussing this year. When the BHE recommendation for salary increments is less than 3/4ths the cost-of-living increase, we must recognize that we are dealing with inadequate resources. It might be better to make this a function for the URC to do every year.

Mr. Reitan asked about the meaning of the phrase "long range goals" on page 11, section "c". Mr. Reitan said that it seemed to him rather likely that the main factor would be need. Mr. Smith said that perhaps the statement should read "long term goals and needs of the department".

Committee Reports

Executive Committee - As noted in the November 19 minutes, the Senate has received a resignation of Elwood Egelston from Faculty Status Committee.
Rules Committee - Mr. Reitan reported that the Rules Committee had been working faithfully on its investigation of budget reporting. He said that a short meeting of the committee was needed tonight.

Administrative Affairs Committee - When the Chairperson Evaluation proposal was passed, it contained a provision that the AAC review the policy and report back. The AAC sent questionnaires to the deans and college councils. The policy seems to have gone well, but some minor changes have been made. It was noted that results were used in making changes in salary and in promotion. Student input was a major area of concern. The Committee is concerned about student input and will be making recommendations re student input.

Student Affairs Committee - No report.

Academic Affairs Committee - Ms. Chesebro asked for a brief meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee tonight.

Faculty Affairs Committee - The Senate will be receiving the FAC proposal on Financial Exigency for information only. The FAC will submit it to the Board of Regents on January 29. The FAC will not be submitting it as any final action item. The document suggests guidelines for the Board's consideration.

Communications

Mr. Van de Voort commented that the APT document is very important. He asked that a student caucus be held to discuss it.

A letter from Mark Plummer, Chairperson, Department of History, regarding the change in University Studies categories was read. Mr. Rives said that he had provided Academic Affairs Committee with the nature of the change in response to the Department of History's concern. That committee will meet after the meeting to discuss the matter.

Adjournment

A motion (Gremaud, Madore) to adjourn was approved. The meeting adjourned at 11:40 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,

Robert D. Young, Secretary
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