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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

The meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order by Chairperson Cohen at 7:00 p.m. in Stevenson 401.

Roll Call

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

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the Senate meeting on February 8, 1978 will be approved at the next Senate meeting as they were delivered late to the Senate members.

Seating of New Senator(s)

Edith Popp and Jean Scharfenberg were welcome as the new Senate members.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Cohen announced that the annual Retreat for the Senate will be next Wednesday, March 1, 1978 at Ewing Castle at 6:00 p.m. with dinner being served at 6:30 p.m. This is held each year for the continuing senators and the newly elected senators for the coming year.

Mr. Cohen read into the minutes an explanation of the President's role in the decision-making process of the Academic Senate. He also noted that this system that has been followed, and seems to function well, works in the following way:

"The President attends regular meetings of the Senate as a member, however, at the same time he is a member of the Senate, he is more than just that. He also has the right, the obligation, under the Constitution to review the workings of the Senate. The system by which this is done is that the office of the Senate sends to the President for his approval, any action of the Senate that needs any form of formal promulgation or forwarding to bodies external to the University. There are a limited number of Senate items; procedures of the Senate committees, etc., which do not fall into this category."

Administrator's Remarks

President Watkins declared an Executive Session of the Senate and all non-members of the Senate were excused.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Rutherford announced that he was, as of this time, a 'lame duck' President and will be leaving office on March 30, 1978 at 7:00 p.m.
Committee Appointments

Ms. Upton of the Rules Committee announced the following appointments to the Parking Appeals Board: Jerome Cain, Alan Katz and N.E. Neville. Ms Upton also announced that Michael Powers was replacing Harry Wray on the UCC with term expiring in 1979. A motion (March/Hayes) to approve these committee appointments as stated was approved.

Resolutions on Computer Center (see appendix 1)

Mr. Hicklin reiterated the two resolutions on the Computer Center as Ms. Cook was out of the city. Mr. Hicklin said that the first resolution is the request of the services of an external consultant in university Computer Centers capable of examining all aspects of computer operations, who will help us develop long range planning for equipment and services, and will assist us on the design of a procedure with which we can perform a yearly analysis of our computer uses and expenses and design a charging formula for the subsequent fiscal year. This would be based upon the principle that charges would reflect closely the actual costs of services received. Mr. Hicklin stated that the second recommendation is that the university consider the establishment of a committee of computer service managers and users, pending the report of the consultant, which will facilitate communication about projected new and changed computer facilities and uses. Mr. March and Mr. Fizer asked where the money was coming from for this consultant, and Mr. Hicklin remarked that they did not consider that to be a matter for the committee and that the appropriate administration would select the consultant. A motion (Hicklin/Jesse) to accept both resolutions on the Computer Center was approved.

College of Education Reorganization

Mr. Moonan explained that Dean Burnham was present at this meeting if there were any questions regarding the College of Education Reorganization. Mr. Moonan indicated that the Academic Affairs Committee had unanimously recommended the Senate approve the change. A motion (Moonan/Carey) to approve the College of Education Reorganization was made. Mr. Erickson, reporting for the Budget Committee, advised that the reorganization would cost the university no additional money. Mr. Moonan asked Dean Burnham where the material centers would be located and Dean Burnham explained that the charts presented in the proposal simplified to focus simply on the key aspects of reorganization. Mr. Young said that he was asked to request discussion concerning the roles and duties of the program directors in relation to functions now carried out in Departments. Dean Burnham replied that the duties and responsibilities are spelled out in the document. These are half time positions. Responsibilities need to be worked out in implementing the plan. The positions come from C & I. Dean Burnham didn't perceive any overlap of responsibility between Departments and the College. Department chairs were invited to add their perceptions. Ms. Upton asked how the lab schools fit into this. Dr. Burnham explained that this was really a separate matter and that they are not now under the College. We anticipate stronger links with the lab schools, but that is a future matter. Dr. Quane asked how any future decline in FTE in the College would be handled and was told by Dr. Burnham that we would obviously have to adjust; it would be an administrative matter, and certain people would be involved in that decision. Mr. Hicklin added relative to Mr. Young's question, that two new doctoral programs have come online. That fact decreases problems of coordination. We have to cooperate on those. Also that we are trying to get a new enterprise off the ground that has not always been a college in recent years. The motion was approved.
Ms. Upton announced that the Rules Committee had come up with two models for this representation and that there was not unanimous support for either model. The Committee voted for the "At-Large" model on a vote of 5-3. Ms. Upton explained that her committee would support the "At-Large" proposal and that if this model was voted down they would present the second model, the "Collegiate". Ms. Upton read the "At-Large" model to the senate members. A motion (Wilson/Rice) to approve the "At-Large" model was introduced. Mr. March explained that he had never had to vote as an off-campus senator or as a Physics major, but that he thought the "At-Large" proposal allowed for a little more diversification and the opportunity for anyone from any college to run. Mr. Hicklin remarked that he thought the on-campus students had an extra edge for the simple reason that the students felt a more togetherness plus the availability of the voting booths in the dorms and buildings. Mr. Erickson indicated ARH support for the "At-Large" model. Senator Rutherford said that at the Student Association's last meeting they voted overwhelmingly to support the "At-Large" model.

Ms. Upton said she would like to urge the members to vote this model down. She argued there are many students in colleges other than Arts and Sciences who are not politically minded but who are honest, sincere, and would make a good contribution and represent their colleges. A couple of years ago, she added, there were only two student senators not from Arts & Sciences. She explained that she had 270 names on petitions supporting the "Collegiate" model. Ms. Upton invited Tim Hinsdale, a student in Fine Arts, to speak. Hinsdale said he wished to express the continuing interest of the Fine Arts students in the Senate elections from as far back as 1976. Ms. Upton said she felt very strongly about the need for interested people on the Senate, and she thought that the broader the base, the more rational the thinking would be.

Mr. March replied that he did not think that any college had been misrepresented. He also said that he worked for several hours in the Fine Arts buildings attempting to get the students to vote on election day and that he was told to stop bothering them. He also stated that by 4:00 p.m. on election day that only 41 people had voted from the Fine Arts buildings. Ms. Gawel remarked that being politically minded had nothing to do with it, that she hadn't learned much about the politics of it until she had to go out and get information so she could gain a broader background on becoming involved with the Senate herself. Ms. Gawel also said that she knew of at least one student that was presented with only the "Collegiate" model and was not told about the "At-Large" model when asked to sign a petition. Mr. Fizer said that he supported the "At-Large" model, that the Black Student Union also supported the "At-Large" model, and that he hoped the Senate would do the same. Mr. Carey stated that he supported the "Collegiate" model as does the College of Business Council. Ms. Patterson said that she supported the "At-Large" model more than she did the "Collegiate" model, especially since the "At-Large" model provides that a student's major be included on the ballot. Ms. Wilson said that he was in favor of the "At-Large" model proposal. He observed that Fine Arts recently had two representatives and that he would hate to see them limited to one.

Mr. Quane argued it is important to have Students involved. Students should represent student views. But students as presently elected do not necessarily reflect all student views. We should have a diversity of opinion. He also noted that the petitions were started by students, not college Deans. There has been no coercion by administrators or others in this. Mr. Gamsky said that for the last five years, the vast majority of the on-campus students felt that they were
influenced by what they see as a political process. There are students who feel left out. Every survey on Institutional Research, my office, and the Vidette indicates this. I can't support either the present system or the "At-Large" model to get at this problem. Maybe the "Collegiate" model won't help either. A listing of majors in the "At-Large" model will help. Peggy Guichard explained that when she took her petitions around that she explained both models to the students and had them read them individually; otherwise, she said, they wouldn't sign something that they hadn't read.

Ms. Croxville said that the Greek Council had also endorsed the "At-Large" model, but that some of the students didn't like either one of the two models. Mr. Cooper suggested that the Senate send both models back to the committee for further study. Mr. Cooper also said that anyone that really wanted to become involved would become involved. Mr. Rice wanted to know why these Fine Arts students didn't keep their ear to the ground and become involved at this time? Dr. Rhodes said the question of how to run elections should not be raised; it's a question tonight of categories or no categories, not parties or election processes. Mr. Rutherford remarked that he had checked with Dr. Eastman's office and that out of the commencement material returned to his office last year, 2.5% of the seniors didn't even know which college they were from. Mary Debeck, a student in Special Education, remarked that 86% of the 500 students of the Council for Exceptional Children voted for the "Collegiate" model. Mr. Etickson felt there had not been voting along College lines in the Senate. Mr. Cooper suggested that students must simply try; they won't become involved in the political process unless they do try. A motion (Natale/Hicklin) to move to an immediate vote carried. A roll call vote yielded a result of 25 yes, 18 no, and 3 abstentions. The chair declared that the necessary 43 vote for changing the By Laws was not reached and the motion fails. A motion (Upton/Natale) to approve the "Collegiate" model for student representation on the Senate was made. A motion (Patterson/Watkins) to move to an immediate vote carried by a vote of 38 to 4. The "Collegiate" model proposal was then defeated by a vote of 14 yes, 25 no, and 6 abstaining.

Later in the meeting, however, Chairperson Cohen raised a question about his own ruling that this question requires a 2/3 vote. The Parliamentarian, Monte Law, stated the By Laws themselves do not speak to the question. Mr. Hicklin noted that with full notice the Constitution itself requires a 2/3 vote. Mr. Cohen said he could recind his earlier ruling and take a challenge to the chair or simply take a challenge to the earlier ruling. A motion (Wilson/Moonan) to challenge the chair's requiring a 2/3 vote on the "At-Large" proposal was made. Mr. Quane asked if a successful challenge requires a majority of the group or those present and voting. Mr. Hicklin replied a majority of those present and voting. Mr. Rhodes and Mr. Rutherford protested that a vote on this question late in the meeting, after people had left was not fair, but Mr. Cohen responded that a challenge to the chair can be taken at any time. Mr. Law observed that we have made other By Law changes by a majority vote. Mr. Christiansen observed it is only common sense that it should take fewer votes to change By Laws than the Constitution. If the Constitution can be changed with a 2/3 vote after advance notice, then the By Laws should be able to be changed with a simple majority vote after advance notice. The chair was overruled by a vote of 27 sustaining the challenge, 16 supporting the chair, and 1 abstaining. Thus, the "At-Large" proposal was passed.

Certificate in University Honors (see appendix 3)

Mr. Rhodes presented this proposal from the Academic Affairs Committee, and he introduced Kyle Sessions, Director of Honors, to answer questions concerning the proposal. Mr. Christiansen asked for an explanation of the Honors Seminar. Mr. Sessions explained that the Seminar was campus oriented and that it entailed tours
of the library, the Computer Center and the labs. Students are then required to
return to one of these learning centers for some experiential learning activity.
Mr. Christiansen then asked why the time restriction in #3, requiring students
to be certified prior to the beginning of the student's sixth semester at ISU?
Fred Roberts, Chairperson of the Academic Standards Committee, replied that they
did not want the Certificate to compete with Departments and their major degree
programs. Mr. Christiansen then asked if it would be possible for a transfer
student to qualify for the Certificate? Mr. Sessions responded by saying he was
comfortable with the proposal as modified. The Honors program is essentially
aimed at underclass students and less at transfer students. If a transfer student
really wanted this, however, he felt it would be possible because of the flexibility
in the language of the proposal.

President Watkins invited William Semlak, Honors Director designator, to speak to
the proposal. Mr. Semlak supported the Certificate, saying it would help as in re-
cruiting students and in getting them actively involved. The Certificate is sound,
said, and he would seek additional resources that would strengthen it in the
future. Mr. Smith asked about what additional money would be required, and Mr.
Sessions replied that it would not be very costly. Mr. Sessions added that he
runs the Colloquium now, and there would be staffing implication only if additional
sections were added.

Mr. Morrison asked about the present number of Honors sections, and Mr. Sessions
replied there are seven. Mr. Quane asked, what is the objective in qualifying
for the Certificate -- 6 hours of A, completion of hours, what? Mr. Sessions
replied that by and large Honors programs across the country agree that the
objective of Honors is a special experience and not the grade; obviously the grade
is important and a student would not remain in Honors without making good grades,
but that is not the central aim. The Honors program does have minimum standards.
Mr. Quane then asked about in-course Honors. Mr. Sessions explained that any
Honors student can approach any instructor in any course for an Honors experience
above and beyond or in lieu of ordinary course requirements. It is essentially
an Honors independent study. Mr. Quane, finally, asked why the Honors Director
rather than the Honors Council should make the award? Mr. Sessions said he had
not thought about that; probably it should be the Honors Council.

Certificate of Advanced Study in Educational Administration

Mr. Carey presented this certificate for the Academic Affairs Committee for
questions, but there were none.

Certificate of Advanced Study in Counselor Education

Mr. Koehler presented this certificate for the Academic Affairs Committee for
questions, but there were none.

Final Examination Policy  (see appendix 4)

Mr. Ritt introduced the proposal for questions, explaining that the Academic
Affairs Committee has received input from Departments, Colleges, and individuals
with varying reactions. One concern he noted is with consistency between College
and University policy on final examinations. He pointed out that it is possible
for individual colleges to pass individual policies so long as these policies are
consistent with University policy.
Richard Dammers, Chairperson of the College of Arts and Sciences Council, informed the Senate that the College of Arts and Sciences Council had passed a final examination policy which he hoped the Senate would consider in revising University policy. He read the Arts & Sciences policy (see appendix 5). Mr. Rutherford asked if Academic Affairs had taken the Arts and Sciences policy into consideration, and Mr. Ritt replied that the Committee wanted to get a sense of the feelings of the Senate as well as other groups. Mr. Rutherford asked if Academic Standards had considered the Arts and Sciences policy, and Mr. Roberts replied that Academic Standards had considered a revised final exam policy prior to the passage of the Arts and Sciences policy.

Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Dammers under the Arts and Sciences policy if multi-section courses could vary in respect to having finals, if variation could exist from semester to semester. Mr. Dammers responded that that would be a Departmental decision.

Mr. Quane asked about the process to be followed when a student has more than two finals on one day, and Mr. Roberts replied that under the Academic Affairs proposal it would be up to the instructor's discretion to set an acceptable alternative. Mr. Watkins suggested there might be a better way of handling this situation since it just might put the instructor behind the eight ball. Mr. Rosenbaum suggested no statement on this or a mandatory statement might be more desirable.

Mr. Quane questioned if the spirit of the Academic Affairs proposal was to preclude finals during the last week of classes. Mr. Roberts said, yes, but it does not preclude section or unit exams. Mr. Rosenbaum asked if the Committee considered requiring no exams of any kind during the last week of classes? Mr. Roberts said, no, because section or unit exams might be desirable. Mr. Rice raised the question of what constitutes an excused absence? Would it have to be presented before the exam or could it be presented after? Mr. Smith observed if the aim of the revised policy is to prevent shortening the semester for faculty and students, couldn't the Committee simply reword existing policy.

**College of Arts and Sciences By-Laws**

Ms. Kuhn introduced these By-Laws with the observation that a great many suggestions have been incorporated, especially in Sections V, B, 3 and VI, 1. Mr. Christiansen queried section V, B, 1, and Mr. Dammers replied that section is the same as the old By-Laws. Mr. Rutherford asked if the Vice Chairperson of the Council is a student and Mr. Dammers said that has always been the case. Mr. Christiansen asked if anything precluded a student from chairing the Council, and Mr. Dammers said, no.

**University Appeals Committee**

Mr. Quane explained that after last meeting's approval of a change in the UAC procedure a discrepancy was discovered between what was passed and what was intended by Derek McCracken and others. We approved the following:

1. The UAC shall elect its own chairperson and vice-chairperson.

2. When a discrepancy in the evaluation of a faculty member exists between a DFSC and a CFSC, these committees shall attempt to reconcile the differences. The chairperson or vice-chairperson of the UAC shall preside at the informal meeting of the committees and the faculty member shall not be present.
The original intent of the authors of the ASPT document was the same as #2 above regarding the presence of the appellant. However, it came to light at the meeting on February 9th, that approximately 40% of the initial appeals were concluded at the informal meetings and that the appellant was present at these meetings. Derek McCracken, chairperson of UAC, would like very much to continue the practice of having the appellant participate in order to keep the number of appeals needing to be heard by subcommittees as small as possible.

Therefore, the Faculty Affairs Committee would like the following to be approved when it is brought for reconsideration at this meeting:

"When a discrepancy in the evaluation of a faculty member exists between a DFSC and a CFSC, these committees shall attempt to reconcile the differences. The chairperson or vice-chairperson of the UAC shall preside at the informal meeting of the committees and the faculty member shall have the option of being present".

IX,90 A motion (Hicklin/Kuhn) to reconsider the action of last meeting in respect to #2 above was approved. A motion (Quane/Koehler) to approve the revised wording of #2 above carried.

Committee Reports

Committees announced their next meeting times and Mr. Rhodes noted in particular that Academic Affairs would be considering a revised withdrawal policy.

Adjournment

IX,92 A motion (March/Butz) to adjourn was approved at 10:30 p.m.

NOTE: Newly elected Senators are listed in appendix 5.

Respectfully submitted,

Ira Cohen, Chairperson
John K. Boaz, Secretary
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>Motion # 86</th>
<th>Motion # 87</th>
<th>Motion # 89</th>
<th>Motion # 87</th>
<th>Motion # 89</th>
<th>Motion # 89</th>
<th>Motion No.</th>
<th>VOICE VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belshe</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boll</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowker</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buzz</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christiansen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Exc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croxville</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLong</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egelston</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiser</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamsky</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavel</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hefflin</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicklin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kehoe</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosley</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natale</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popp</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quane</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritt</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenbaum</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scharfenberg</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwabe</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sims</td>
<td>Exc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROBLEM: In the Fall semester, 1977, three departments from two colleges separately approached the Budget Committee for help, stating that, under the current system of allocating funds, the money they had available for computer operations would not come close to meeting their minimal academic needs. Interviews with 8 department heads and 5 college deans indicated that many departments and all colleges but CAST had the same problem, and that the problem was significantly more acute than seemed necessary, since as several maintained, "The computer is not used around the clock 7 days a week, yet our legitimate projects are denied while the machine sits idle!"

The Senate Budget Committee is not concerned in any way with actual assignment of dollars to any on-going university activities; that is the province of the President's Budget Team. The Budget Committee is concerned with policies, procedures and priorities. Our interest, then, was in determining what aspects of the budgeting process had made this problem seem suddenly so acute, and whether, by adjusting that process, the problem could be alleviated.

IMPROVEMENTS PRESENTLY IN PROGRESS:

A: For future fiscal years, the Budget Team plans to use data from a full fiscal year in determining the university's current pattern of use.

For this year, fiscal 1978, the Team experimented with using the 10-month data available at the end of April and adding on 20% to represent use of funds anticipated for the remaining two months. It turned out that many activities, computer jobs among them, have peak demands at the end of the semester or the academic year which are not allowed for in the 10-month+20% formula. This is one reason why this year's projected computer expenses were unduly low, and received a proportionately small part of the over-all budget, in most colleges.

B: The Budget Team has written and distributed a description of their operating procedures used in drawing up an annual budget of General Revenue funds.

Many people had been unaware that Computer Services staff have nothing to do with allocation of computer budgets to departments nor with the total amount budgeted by the university as a whole. The new document explains how academic (and administrative) budgets are determined: The pattern of the previous and current year's use of money is studied, adjusted for known changes in costs and gross changes in university activity, then available funds for the coming year are partitioned among colleges and administrative units in a pattern similar to that of their current use. Each unit then plans to subdivide its dollar allotment in the ways it considers best. Thus increases in proportionate funds for computer services in a college require corresponding decreases in budgets for travel, commodities or other budgets in that college.

C: All informal, behind-the-scenes transfers of funds between computer accounts have been stopped this year.

Accurate projections for future years are based on accurate data this year. Previously, when one account ran low, a staff member could transfer some of its work to an inactive account from another area without consulting either party. This is no longer done. As a result, many areas will find themselves using noticeably more or less money than they had expected. It is the responsibility of the colleges to monitor their accounts and arrange official transfers of funds from one departmental computer budget to another. Where with-
in-college (or within-administrative unit) transfers are inadequate, colleges (or administrative units) may agree to transfer funds among themselves. So far, by this method, needs of all but one department and one administrative unit have been met for the Spring 1978 semester.

D: All announcements of planned rate increases by university agencies must be disseminated by March 15 in order to take effect on July 1, the start of the fiscal year.

This year computer users were informed on August 4 that the billing rates would be changed on August 20. On August 17 they were told that rates for off-campus services from NICC at Edwardsville were being changed September 1. College and departmental budgets were being set up in mid July.

For this year, it is averred that all legitimate needs will be met. If a point comes at which some such needs are unsupportable, then a policy must be developed to determine how cuts should be made. That would be a matter for Senate consideration at that time.

FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

A: It is the duty of the university to see that the money available actually is paying for the costs of the services we receive. As the research demands of our graduate programs increase, and as the upper division enrollments in the Applied Computer Science program and Business Information Systems sequences expand, we will be facing demands for computer services of a type and magnitude new to us. At the same time, equipment, paper and maintenance costs will be changing. Balancing all of these factors is an intricate problem.

The Budget Committee has moved unanimously to recommend:

RECOMMENDATION I: That the university request the services of an external consultant in university computer centers capable of examining all aspects of our computer operations. This person will help us develop long range planning for equipment and services, and will assist us on the design of a procedure with which we can perform a yearly analysis of our computer uses and expenses and design a charging formula for the subsequent fiscal year, based upon the principle that charges would reflect closely the actual costs of services received.

B: At present there is no formal or informal structure which informs Computer Services of new or changed uses being planned by departments or administrative units, nor informs those users whether the equipment available can support all of their proposed activities. This makes it difficult for Computer Services to anticipate needs for more keypunches, display terminals, disk storage space, or week-end staff in time to respond to the increased load. Nor can Computer Services suggest ways of spacing out tasks that will need to use the same equipment so as to minimize conflict. This lack of advance communication hinders both the computer managerial staff and the campus users.

To alleviate the problem, the Budget Committee has moved unanimously to recommend:

RECOMMENDATION II: That the university, pending the report of the consultant referred to in Recommendation I, consider seriously the establishment of a committee of Computer Service managers and users, which will facilitate communication about projected new and changed computer facilities and uses.
PROPOSAL FOR "COLLEGIATE" STUDENT REPRESENTATION
ON ACADEMIC SENATE

"The undergraduate student representatives shall be elected from the following 6 categories:
1. Students pursuing majors in the College of Applied Science and Technology
2. Students pursuing majors in the College of Business
3. Students pursuing majors in the College of Fine Arts
4. Students pursuing majors in the College of Education
5. Students pursuing majors in the College of Arts and Science
6. General, Contract and unclassified undergraduate students

The number of representatives from each of these categories will be determined annually by the Rules Committee based on the Fall Semester enrollment. To be eligible to run as a representative of a college, an individual must have declared a major in that particular college before Feb. 1 of the election year. All eligible students, as defined by the Senate Constitution, may vote for these representatives.

HOW THE MODEL WOULD WORK BASED ON FALL '77 ENROLLMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Undergraduate enrollment</th>
<th>% of total enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Senators</th>
<th>Rounded to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3648</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>4196</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified nurses</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>17,002</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal for 'At Large' Student Representation on the Academic Senate

The undergraduate student representatives shall be elected at large by undergraduate students.

The graduate student representatives shall be elected at large by graduate students.

Each student candidate for the Senate shall have his/her major designated on the ballot beside his/her name.

Rationale:

1.a. For purposes of necessary and desirable representation, sub-categories of students lack significant meaning for the vast majority of students. Students fall into only one neatly identifiable group as student concerns, with very few exceptions, do not differ because of declared major, college affiliation, residency, year in school, etc., particularly in terms of questions considered by the Senate. Therefore, it does not seem desirable to identify arbitrary categories or to guarantee seats for those categories for representational purposes when in reality no meaningful categories actually apply.

b. As support for the above, the Committee learned that an increasing number of students fit in the "general/unclassified" category, students change majors several times throughout their academic career—often across Colleges, and 23% of students registering for commencement in 1977 could not accurately identify the College with which their major was affiliated. In addition, coursework for the average student is distributed across several departments and colleges because of University Studies, related major requirements, minor requirements, and electives meaning that major coursework in a given department and/or college often makes up less than 50% of the average student's program. The latter point is noted specifically in contrast to the situation whereby most faculty teach courses in only one department.

2. Student members of the Senate elected at large would seem to be substantially released from possible pressures of arbitrary sections of the University, i.e. Colleges, leaving the students free to consider issues in light of the best interests of students and of the University. It seems desirable for students to serve in a trustee role of acting in those best interests rather than in a delegate role of reflecting the views of a particular component of the University. At large student members would seem to complement the vast majority of questions before the Senate in any given year, questions of a general policy nature not significantly differing in their impact upon specific components of the University. Specialized knowledge, as at present, can best be provided by those making and/or effected by proposals.
3.a. At large student member selection would seem to provide for the highest level of student interest in the Senate, both in numbers of candidate and in likely voter involvement. Past experience has consistently reinforced the difficulty of attracting interested candidates for the Senate and committees from those students pursuing majors in certain Colleges, regardless of the effort made to recruit the same. It seems best to allow the electoral process to run its natural course by offering all interested students the opportunity to petition and an equal chance of election in an at large system rather than risking less, and perhaps no, competition in certain artificial and arbitrary classifications.

b. It is further likely that voter involvement would be significantly higher under an at large system as by necessity campaigning would be broad-based, places of voting would be centralized, coordination with other student elections would be possible, etc.

c. Student members of the Senate selected in an at large process would also be more likely to come to the Senate with a broader knowledge of and appreciation for the University as a whole making for more effective Senators overall.

4. The designation of candidates' majors on the ballot would provide an adequate safeguard against over-selection of students majoring in certain departments and/or colleges. Such a ballot designation would also encourage campaign organizations to recruit students with diversified majors, but would place the burden of selection upon the voters.

February 1978
I PROPOSAL

The Certificate in University Honors would be awarded by the Director of the Honors Program to those students fulfilling the requirements in the original proposal by the Honors Council on April 28, 1977. (Two additional policy statements have been added by the Academic Standards Committee.)

Honors Seminar—1 hr. credit IDS 187: Independent Study.

1. The following requirements must be met in order to gain the distinction, Certificate in University Honors. Participation in the certificate program is voluntary, however, and is limited to members of the Honors Program.

a) This activity was initiated during the summer of 1977. It consists of introduction to six major learning facilities at ISU (e.g., computer, library) and a short individual research project utilizing one of them. The seminar uses faculty/staff of the learning facilities and is coordinated by the Director of Honors. It has no faculty/staff implications.

b) Honors Colloquium. IDS 102. 3 hrs. credit.

c) Presentation to Honors Colloquium. Optional 1 hr. credit IDS 287 Independent Study.

d) Other Honors study. 6 hrs. May be accomplished through Honors sections, In-Course Honors, Honors Independent Study, Undergraduate Research Participation, and departmental Honors course or courses.

*2. The Director of the Honors Program and/or the Honors Council shall establish performance standards in the required program which must be achieved to qualify for the Certificate.

*3. The Certificate will be awarded upon completion of the above requirements but in any case such requirements must be completed prior to the beginning of the student's sixth semester at Illinois State University. The Director of the University Honors Program could, at his discretion, extend the time limit for those students currently enrolled in the Honors Program at the time the proposal is accepted.

* added by Academic Standards Committee
FINAL EXAMINATIONS

Faculty members have the responsibility to administer final examinations at the close of each semester, term, or summer session in all courses except those in which a final examination is unnecessary or impracticable. Each department will file a complete list of course offerings with the appropriate College Dean, identifying those which require a final examination and those which do not.

The schedule of final examinations is prepared and published by the Office of Scheduling and Space Analysis. This schedule will allow 40 minutes of examination time for each credit hour; for example, a three hour course will have 120 minutes of examination time. Requests for change of room or time should be made through the department chairperson to the appropriate college dean. No examination should be given during the last week of classes except a laboratory practical examination.

Any unexcused absence from a final examination will be considered as failure of the examination.

Grades will be due in the Office of Records no sooner than three working days after the end of the last examination.
FACULTY MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

College of Arts and Sciences

Group A:

Fritz Schwalm (Biology) 1981
Janet Cook (Mathematics) 1979
Kenneth Jesse (Physics) 1979
Robert Ritt (Mathematics) 1980

Group B:

Roy Austensen (History) 1980
Willard Moanan (Milner Library) 1979
Thomas Wilson (Poli Science) 1979
Walter Friedhoff (Psychology) 1981
Walter Kohn (Poli Science) 1981

Group C:

Steve Rosenbaum (Philosophy) 1981
John K. Boaz (Information Science) 1981
Ralph Smith (Information Science) 1979
Brigitta Kuhn (Foreign Languages) 1980

College of Applied Science and Technology

Larry Miller (Ind. Tech) 1981
Reginald Henry (Gariculture) 1979
Robert Koehler (HPERD) 1980
Larry Quane (HEIT) 1980

College of Business

Laura Patterson (Management & Marketing) 1980
Roger Potter (Business Adm) 1979
Eugene Carey (Accounting) 1980

College of Education

Larry Kennedy (Education) 1981
Charles Hicklin (Curriculum & Instruction) 1979
Mack Bowen (Special Education) 1980
John McCarthy (Educational Administration) 1980

College of Fine Arts

Stephanie Amster (Art) 1981
Jean Scharfenberg (Theatre) 1979
Herbert Sanders (Music) 1980
Student Election Results

Student Association President/Vice President:

Mike Donahue/Paul R. Eber 1766
Dave Rice/Rob Halladay 328

On-Campus Senate:

Kent Erickson 1014
Chuck Olson 837
Marjorie Butz 804
Karen Elliott 791
Kevin Conlon 782
Darlene Gavin 779
Brian Barton 745
Paris C. Brown 601

--Runners-up--

Andy Morrison 596
Mark Hermanson 430

Off-Campus Senate:

Diane Tillhof 411
John Sims 377
Rockie Zeigler 348
Dorothy Wolfe 346
Craig Turner 331
Edwin Fizer 320
Dirk Chitwood 309
Russ March 264

--Runners-up--

Bill Bolen 206
Joseph W. Lechner 180

Graduate Student Senate:

Brian Bown 18