

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Fall 11-29-1978

Senate Meeting November 29, 1978

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

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



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

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting November 29, 1978" (1978). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 436.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/436>

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(Not approved by the Academic Senate)

November 29, 1978

Volume X, No. 7

Contents

Call to Order
Roll Call
Approval of Minutes of November 15, 1978
Resignation of Senator
Seating of Senator
Chairperson's Remarks
Vice-Chairperson's Remarks
Student Body President's
Dance Education Major 11.6.78.4
Theatre Education Major 11.6.78.5
Art Education Major 11.6.78.2
Social Science Comprehensive Program 11.6.78.3
ASPT Amendment 11.29.78.1
Constitutional Amendment 11.29.78.2
Academic Plan 11.2.78.1
SCERB Reivision 9.19.78.1

Committee Reports
Communications
Adjournment

SHUMAN STANLEY
DFC V P FOR BUSINESS & FINANCE

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.

-2-
ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(Not approved by the Academic Senate)

November 29, 1978

Volume X, No. 7

Call to Order

The meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order by Chairperson Cook at 7:30 p.m.

Roll Call

The Secretary declared a quorum to be present.

Approval of Minutes

X,51 A motion (Schmaltz/Shulman) to approve the minutes of the November 15, 1978 Senate meeting was made. A correction on page 6 under "Rules Committee": it should read "November 17, 1978 at 4:00 p.m." rather than the date and time reported. A correction on page 4 under "Comprehensive Social Sciences 11.6.78.3" it should read: "...we have stated that...". The minutes were approved as corrected.

Resignation of Senator(s)

X,52 Ms. Cook announced that the Senate has received a resignation from Bill Bolen, student senator. A motion (Smith/Gavin) to accept Mr. Bolen's resignation with regret was made and approved.

Seating of Senator(s)

Mr. Erickson reported that Kathy Greathouse is being seated to replace Mr. Bolen. Mr. Erickson introduced Ms. Greathouse who previously served on the Senate.

Chairperson's Remarks

Ms. Cook announced that the Senate office has received the packet from the Board of Regents and invited all senators to come in and read the material at any time. She also announced that the BOR meeting is scheduled for next Thursday, December 7, 1978.

Vice-Chairperson's Remarks

No remarks.

Administrator's Remarks

No remarks.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Donahue reported that a caravan is going again to the Board of Regents' meeting Wednesday evening or Thursday morning. The Student Association Assembly meeting is this coming Sunday at 3:00 p.m. The Director of Residential Life will be there to answer several questions on residential life. Mr. Donahue announced that the Student Association is sponsoring a "Security Night" at the Poison Apple. S. A. is going to attempt to raise money to contribute to a fund to increase security on the campus. Mr. Donahue called upon other groups to help contribute to this fund.

ACTION ITEMS:

Dance Education Major 11.6.78.4

X,53 Mr. Kennedy of Academic Affairs Committee, presented the Hour Increase Proposal on this item. Mr. Kennedy reported that considerable discussion had been held on all of these proposals in the committee. A motion (Kennedy/Miller) to approve this proposal was made, subject to the approval of the Council of Teacher Education. Mr. Kohn asked for the rationale on this.

Carmen Imel reported for the Dance Department. Ms. Imel discussed the history and development of courses in Dance. In order to meet IOE guidelines and in order to meet student teaching requirements in a minor they have gone from the comprehensive dance to a straight major.

Mr. Friedhoff raised a question about the violation of the old guidelines and asked if this would limit the number of hours required to graduate. Mr. Kennedy stated that there had been considerable discussion for these proposals. In answer to a question from Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Friedhoff explained that there had been a previously established limit for majors and minors and comprehensive majors.

Mr. Kennedy stated that Mr. Shulman had appeared before the committee and made a strong case for his point. Mr. Miller reported that some of the guidelines were over ten years old now and the Academic Affairs Committee was recommending a revision of some of those policies governing our majors. Motion passed.

Theatre Education Major 11.6.78.5

Mr. Kennedy presented the proposal on Theatre Education Major from the Academic Affairs Committee. Mr. Ralph Lane joined the Senate for debate on this topic. A motion (Kennedy/Miller) to approve the Theatre proposal was made.

X,54

Mr. Friedhoff asked if a professional accrediting agency certified theatre programs. Mr. Lane stated that two external agencies had developed guidelines and stated that other agencies had accepted those guidelines for accrediting theatre programs. Mr. Lane stated that these guidelines did not require a minimum number of hours, but instead required competencies. Mr. Kohn asked if some adjustment in the present proposal couldn't be made, if it was only a matter of adding additional competencies on the part of the student. Mr. Lane explained the differences between the requirements for competencies and the number of credit hours and the relationship between the accrediting agencies. He also explained that this program was designed to meet the new requirements of the Illinois Office of Education. He explained that this was not only in response to the IOE but, coming at this time through a study is some three to five years. He explained that he thought that it was necessary to have a program for this university to have these additional hours. He stated that he felt that to carry out what Mr. Kohn was suggesting, it would be a more intricate arrangement of courses than what they are asking for.

In answer to a hypothetical question from Mr. Kohn about what would happen if this motion were to fail, Mr. Lane stated that we would be graduating people that were not considered competent.

Mr. Turner, Chairperson of the Budget Committee, reported that there may be some hidden costs in relation to these programs, but that they would be absorbed by the department.

Mr. Kennedy explained what it means to meet the guidelines of IOE. The 100 pre-student teaching clinical experience hours must be spread throughout professional and cannot be lumped into a final experience. Mr. Kennedy stated that this should help explain the necessity for the new courses. Mr. Hirt asked the same questions as Mr. Kohn. Mr. Lane explained that when they were first trying to train competent theatre people and in addition to that to train theatre education majors, and so it becomes more complicated than just putting courses together or putting competencies into the present courses.

Motion passed.

Art Education Major 11.6.78.2

X,55

Ms. Susan Amster, Mr. Fred Mills and Mr. Dick Salome joined the Senate for a discussion of this proposal. A motion (Kennedy/Sanders) to approve the proposal on Art Education Major was made. Mr. Salome explained that there would really be no semester in which there would be no overload hours. Mr. Hicklin explained that Professional Sequence would be offered in 2 hour blocks next semester rather than on a flexible schedule to the majority of students. This is because self pacing may be hazardous to Art Major/s progress. He stated that something which had arisen as a possible misunderstanding in the minutes of the previous meeting needed to be clarified.

Mr. Kohn raised a question of having a comprehensive major hour requirement in Art. Ms. Amster explained that they were trying to train students for a well-rounded person for K through 12 so that the extra hours. The hours added courses is necessary for teachers to be competent at all grade levels to be able to teach art.

Mr. Shulman made a statement that applies to all programs. He stated that it was apparent that there was a problem. Everyone recognizes that there is a problem. Mr. Shulman stated he did not agree that this was a broad program and he thought that, in fact, it was a much more narrow program. Mr. Shulman scolded the program planners for coming out with a patchwork. He recommended that people should go to five years of school if necessary. Mr. Shulman recommended that we should have a maximum number of hours that could be taken in a department toward a bachelor's degree. Mr. Shulman stated that these hours were appropriate for a vocational school or a conservatory, but not for a university. He recommended that we call ourselves a technical institute because we are doing a disservice to students.

Motion passed with one abstention.

Social Science Comprehensive Program 11.6.78.3

X,56

A motion (Kennedy/Wolfe) to approve the proposal on Social Science Comprehensive Program was made. Mr. Homan, Chairperson of the History Department, was present for any discussion on this topic.

Mr. Rosenbaum pointed out some inconsistencies in the rationale and stated that since the rationale says that it would allow the individual to develop a substantial social science area and then adds only five more hours. This seems to contradict itself.

Mr. Homan remarked that he agreed that the additional social science methods course would, in fact, have the effect of reducing the number of possible electives. He stated that this would be raising from 55 to 60 the required number of hours for a comprehensive social science is probably not enough but it would at least add to what the student had in his background to teach the various disciplines. Mr. Homan said this was the only truly comprehensive major on campus.

Ms. Patterson noticed, through some informal research she did this summer, that the social science teaching jobs seem to be tied in with coaching and athletic jobs. She speculated that if students took a double major plus some 15 to 18 hours of physical education, they would seem to be more employable. Perhaps we should change the student requirements instead of changing the tradition of the schools. Ms. Patterson asked how many hours they would expect to take in each of these field. Mr. Homan indicated that students could take as low as 8 hours.

Mr. Turner, Budget Chairperson, stated that there would be more hidden costs associated with this program, more than the other two, but he indicated that they would again be absorbed within the department. Mr. Barton asked Mr. Turner to explain the hidden costs. Mr. Turner explained that these were created by the extra hours of required courses. Mr. Hirt asked why non-teaching majors are required to take these extra hours. Mr. Homan stated that it would simplify the advisement process and would help strengthen all comprehensive social science majors.

Motion passed with 3 abstentions.

ASPT Amendment

X,57

Mr. Smith, Chairperson of Faculty Affairs, requested permission to add as an Information Item the Amendment to the ASPT Document. A motion (Smith/McCarthy) to add the ASPT Amendment to the Agenda for tonight's meeting as an Information Item was made.

Mr. Friedhoff objected to the speed with which this item was entered. Mr. Cohen was requested by Mr. Smith to explain why time is so important an issue for this amendment. Mr. Cohen explained that if this was not acted upon, added as an information item tonight, it could not be acted upon and the problems involved in reappointment dates could not be remedied this year.

Motion passed with 2 abstentions.

Mr. Smith explained the necessity for this. Stan Rives, Ira Cohen and Margaret Jones of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Evaluations were introduced to the Senate.

Mr. Kohn asked for a summary of the results of this. Mr. Cohen explained that they were trying to cover the case where somebody was appealing a denial of tenure to the Appeals Committee and the next year they would go to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, assuming there were grounds, people spent the last year of employment, instead of looking for a job, fighting a hearing. This amendment forces some expeditiousness into the process which is lacking now. The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee will have to revise some of its procedures. Mr. Cohen noted that nothing is changed in the appeals process. This would not drag hearings out into the seventh year waiting for an Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee hearing. The proposal also calls for dropping the word "tenure" out of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee. This is to bring it in line with the other documents that put "tenure" in the title of those committees that grant tenure rather than on the title of those committees which protect tenure.

Mr. Schmaltz asked for a sample case. Mr. Cohen stated some historical cases, and described some past cases, the difference between violations of academic freedom as opposed to denial of tenure. Mr. Cohen stated that this would not preclude members from alleging academic freedom violations during the process. The University Appeals Committee could also initiate procedures for alleging violations of academic freedom.

Mr. Watkins asked Mr. Cohen since this addresses matters of appeal, does his committee expect to take up other matters. Mr. Cohen said yes, this is only a matter of time. This was brought in piece-meal because of the timing, because of the notification dates. Mr. Cohen stated that his committee was going to bring in all sorts of items and this should be the least debatable. Mr. Cohen explained the operation of the Case Advisory Committee in deciding whether to pass on an allegation or not. Mr. Cohen explained to Mr. Watkins that the AFT would not be the final court of appeals under the new proposal. There would be a simultaneous sharing by the University Appeals Committee and the new named Academic Freedom Committee.

Mr. Cohen explained that with timing, the Provost would know the whole picture including the decision by Academic Freedom Committee when he makes a decision upon tenure.

Mr. Smith explained that the President will also get a copy of the Academic Freedom Committee's report on a specific case. Mr. Horner said that now that if the history of the length of hearing holds, that they would not always be simultaneous.

Mr. Cohen stated that he hoped that this proposal would help. He also hoped that this would be wrapped up during the spring. As to the question as to whether or not sometimes the process was not complete in time, Mr. Cohen stated that the negative letters of dismissal would have to be sent on the appropriate dates even though they might be reversed later.

Mr. Cohen explained what the intent of the constitutional amendment was designed to do. Mr. Horner pleaded that Academic Freedom Committee be extended to include Academic Freedom and Due Process Committee. Mr. Cohen said that he thought the courts have, in fact, usually interpreted it that way. Mr. Horner reminded the committee that the Academic Freedom Committee's failure to follow due process and inadequate consideration have been grounds for appeals.

Constitutional Amendment (see appendix)

Mr. Smith corrected a typographical error on the committee report. These are amendments to Article III, Section 5 A, B and 6 C of the ISU Constitution of the University Handbook, p. 83. Mr. Smith said that the Faculty Affairs Committee had signed a petition with five names to fill the legal requirements for Constitutional amendments. A motion (Smith/McCarthy) to approve these amendments was made and approved.

X,58

The Screening Process for Entertainment, Forum and Union/Auditorium Board has been withdrawn by the Student Affairs Committee as an Action Item.

INFORMATION ITEMS:

Academic Plan

Mr. Miller announced the next meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee in which they will be considering the Academic Plan for a vote. Mr. Miller announced that the next meeting of this committee would be Tuesday, Hovey 418, 10:00 a.m. It was announced that the Academic Plan would be an Action Item at the next Senate meeting.

Mr. Donahue raised a question about the deletion of the Student Affairs section from the Academic Plan. Dean Rives explained that there was a new format from the BHE. The Illinois Board of Higher Education this year, for the first time, has decided that each public university ought to be involved with academic planning and they have extended a new format. Mr. Rives stated that the university-wide document for University Planning would be developed on the campus as mentioned by the President in his State of the University Address. This would stimulate planning in other areas.

Mr. Kohn asked if this plan was actually a realistic plan which the university realistically intended to pursue. Dean Rives stated clearly, yes. It does not mean that everything that is in it will come about, but the university will be pursuing them. There are some external constraints such as budgeting approval by the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Mr. Rives stated that he had looked over the 1967 Academic

Plan and was surprised as how much of that plan had been implemented. Dean Rives stated that this is probably one of the most conservative plans which has been presented during the period which we have been making out Academic Plans. Dean Rives stated that in approving the Academic Plan we are not approving new plans since each one of these plans would come in a more complete form for individual approval.

Mr. Hicklin asked if it was true that we had only 3 degrees conferred in Physics last year. Mr. Hicklin remarked that very often the Board of Higher Education looks at the undergraduate program before allowing a school to move to a graduate program, and he remarked that with only 3 people graduating from the undergraduate program in Physics, it would be very difficult to field a graduate program in this area.

Dean Rives stated that this was true. Dean Rives stated that not all double majors were in the data for each department.

Mr. Smith asked about the percentages of transfer students. Dean Rives stated that most of our transfer students used to come from four year institutions, but most of our transfer students now come from community colleges. Mr. Rives stated that there had been a significant increase in part-time students. Dean Rives stated that the bottom projection for 1988 had been revised upward from the previous plan and this was done because the increase in the number of freshmen in the present year. Mr. Rives stated that our request for admissions are running ahead of last year at this time.

Mr. Donahue raised a question as to whether or not we were acquiescing to a defeatist attitude in not pursuing more new programs and hoped that it would not be the sentiment of the university. Mr. Rives stated that we were pursuing different possibilities based upon demand but that we would pursue this sometime through the expansion of existing programs, which we would do without going all the way through the Board of Higher Education. He cited the new sequence in horticulture within the agriculture department as an extension of an existing program.

Mr. Rosenbaum raised a question of statement on page 10. It seemed to indicate that we did not need additional facilities but he raised a question about intermural facilities. The President explained that he was requesting some planning money for this building that he thought was some years off but he said he would not pursue that through bond revenue. With all of our problems with bond revenue, many many priorities are above the intermural type building. The President stated that he has not given up, but it is not on the Academic Plan at this time.

Mr. Smith raised several points, including the possibility of opposition that the School of Nursing might incur from Illinois Wesleyan. Dean Rives said that we are not in competition with Illinois Wesleyan in any way and that representatives from Wesleyan were on the Advisory Committee. The IBHE staff raised certain questions about the money involved in such a School of Nursing. Dean Rives said that we do not have any intention to institute a program this expensive through reallocation.

President Watkins explained the comment by Mr. Smith that remedial programs are unified programs for specialized students and are not under attack by the BHE. There will not be an immediate phase-out of any type of program which we are carrying on. Dean Rives indicated that the Senate would be receiving in the next month a bachelor of science in nursing which will be sent in January. A bachelor

program in legal studies has already been approved by the Senate. The Bachelor of Fine Arts Theatre will be coming in January. The master's program in Applied Physics has already been approved by the Senate; the BHE did not approve it. The Department of Applied Computer Science will be coming shortly. The Center for Accident Prevention in Agriculture is in the Senate office for distribution. The Center for Higher Education which we are reestablishing, and previously existed will be forwarded. These are the items which will be coming to the Senate for Action and Information soon.

SCERB Revision (see appendix)

Ms. Gavin of the Student Affairs Committee introduced Larry Quane, Executive Director of SCERB to answer any debate on this topic. Mr. Quane explained the definition of disciplinary standing in the proposal. Mr. Quane said this does not deal with members of SCERB but just to members of the Hearing Panel, in answer to a question by Mr. McCarthy. Mr. McCarthy asked Mr. Quane if he would be willing to expand this concept of disciplinary and good academic standing to other areas such as membership on the Academic Senate. Mr. Quane stated they are already concerned. Students are concerned that members of the SCERB Panel hearing other student problems should meet these minimum requirements.

Mr. Shulman asked if there was a minimum number of hours involved in being on the Hearing Panel. Mr. Quane stated that he did not believe that there were minimum hours required for registration for a student to be on the Hearing Panel. Mr. Quane said that it does not state that you have to be a full-time student, but it's been the experience that the screening committees consider only full-time students.

Mr. Erickson asked if they considered using the word "probation" rather than "good standing". Mr. Quane stated that one could still be dropped from a college and long as one is in good standing in the University, one can still serve on the Hearing Panel.

Ms. Cook notified the Senate of the distribution of a document entitled "Present Priorities for Use of the Academic Venate Office Facilities" (see appendix) and stated that these guidelines would be followed in the future.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs Committee

Next meeting is Tuesday, Hovey 418, 10:00 a.m., December 5, 1978 and the committee will be discussing the Academic Plan.

Administrative Affairs Committee

Mr. Rosenbaum stated that he expected to report next week for the Ad Hoc Committee on Parking and Traffic. That may be an information item at the next meeting. His committee is working on a revised draft of the Dean's Selection Procedure that is expected to be brought into the next meeting. Next meeting of this committee is 412 Stevenson, 7:00 p.m. December 6, 1978.

Budget Committee

No report.

JUAC

No report. Next meeting is 9:00 p.m. at Northern University in DeKalb, Illinois, on December 6, 1978.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Wednesday, December 6, 1978, 3:00 p.m., Stevenson 214. Mr. Smith said the committee will be discussing a grievance matter. He also said they considered the status of permanent faculty members in the laboratory schools.

Rules Committee

Next meeting of this committee is Friday, December 1, 1978 at 4:00 p.m. in the Physics Conference Room.

Student Affairs Committee

Next meeting of this committee is Wednesday, December 6, 1978 at 6:00 p.m. in DeGarmo 551. It was announced that the sub-committee of the Student Affairs Committee will be working with the final draft of the Screening Process. Mr. Donahue invites any interested party to attend.

Adjournment

X,59 A motion (Shulman/March) to adjourn was made and approved at 9:30 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,

Charles Hicklin, Secretary

JC:CH:c

NAME	ATTEN-DANCE	VOTE							VOICE VOTE		
		Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion No.	Y	N
Amster	P								51	x	
Austensen	ex.								52	x	
Barton	P								53	x	
Belshe	P								54	x	
Boaz	P								55	x	
Bowen	P								56	x	
Bown	ex.								57	x	
Butz	P								58	x	
Carey	P								59	x	
Chambers	P										
Cook, James	P										
Cook, Janet	P										
Crafts	P										
Donahue	P										
Elliott	P										
Erickson	P										
Fizer	P										
Friedhoff	P										
Gamsky	P										
Gavin	P										
Ginnis	P										
Henry	A										
Hermansen	P										
Hicklin	P										
Hirt	P										
Horner	P										
Jesse	P										
Keffales	P										
Kennedy	P										
Koehler	P										
Kohn	P										
Kuhn	P										
March	P										
McCarthy	P										
Miller	P										
Morrison	P										
Patterson	P										
Rosenbaum	P										
Sanders	P										
Scharfenberg	P										
Schmaltz	P										
Schwalm	P										
Shulman	P										
Sims	ex.										
Smith	P										
Turner	P										
Wilson	P										
Watkins	P										
Wolfe	P										

Y=Yes N=No P=Present

TO: Members of the Academic Senate
FROM: Brian Bown, Student Affairs Chairperson
RE: SCERB additions
DATE: November 15, 1978

On September 15, 1978 SCERB recommended the following additions to the University Handbook, 1978-80. The additions would be new sections in Chapter III, Section III, specifically H. 1. e. and H. 2. e.

"If a Hearing Panel member is not in good academic or disciplinary standing, at the University, he/she shall be removed from the Hearing Panel. The notification of such removal will be in writing."

On November 8, 1978, the Student Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate approved the above additions. The Student Affairs Committee recommends this as an Information Item at the November 29, 1978 Academic Senate meeting.

BB:c

Present Priorities for Use of the Academic Senate Office facilities

First Priority -

Senate Meeting

Preparation of letter to President reporting actions of previous night's meeting

Preparation of Minutes of last meeting

Executive Committee Meeting

Preparation of agenda and Ex. Comm. packet by Fri. before Ex. Comm. meeting

Dissemination of referred materials to specified committees

Preparation of Minutes of Ex. Comm.

Next Senate Meeting

Preparation and distribution of packet by Fri. before Senate meeting

Distribution of agenda to department and college offices

Preparation of materials to distribute at meeting

Second Priority - done as time allows between first priority tasks

Internal Committees

Duplication and distribution of announcements and minutes of meetings

Where necessary, typing of minutes.

External and Ad-Hoc Committees

Duplication and distribution of announcements and minutes of meetings

Where absolutely necessary, typing of minutes

Permanent Records

Filing of minutes of all meetings and committee meetings

Maintenance of membership lists, notification of vacancies and appointments

Senate and internal committees

External and ad-hoc committees

Filing of correspondence

Third Priority - done when all else fails

Non-Senate Committees - liason records

Meetings between Senate and other bodies

Committee of Executives (of Senate, SA, Civil Service Council, Prof-Tech Council)
notification of meetings

Correspondence

Letters of congratulation, notification, condolence, appreciation with regard to Senate activities,

Replies to letters received by Senate

Follow-up of previous Senate action

Use of Senate letterhead paper by members of the Senate presently is reserved to correspondence related to official Senate business (part of the Senate's Business Calendar) and to formal letters of congratulation, appreciation, etc. as above. Senators may, of course, write their own letters on their own paper to anyone, representing themselves as individuals or as speaking for their own constituency, but such letters would not involve use of the Senate Office staff or facilities.

Communications to the Senate or any of its committees covering matters which will be added to the Senate Calendar may be prepared utilizing Senate facilities, subject to the availability of the office facilities. Senators who have questions, complaints or suggestions concerning this policy or concerning any grievance concerning the office, will bring such problems to the Chairperson or the Vice-Chairperson of the Senate, who will facilitate solutions on these matters.

Nov. 21, 1978

TO: Members of the Academic Senate

FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee

SUBJ: I) Amendment to the Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies
 II) Committee name change Amendments to ISU Constitution
 (A petition signed by five faculty members is necessary to start this process.)

Background: This past summer, the Executive Committee of the Senate appointed an ad hoc Committee (Ira Cohen (Ch.), Ben Hubbard, Margaret Jones, Stan Rives, Hibbert Roberts) to study the ASPT document particularly with regard to the appeals process and to make recommendations for changes. The first two changes forthcoming have been discussed by the FAC in consultation with the chairpersons of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and the Ethics and Grievance Committee and those changes are submitted for the Senate's information tonight, with FAC recommendation for favorable action at the December 13 meeting.

I Amendment to Sec. IX Policies for Termination of Employment (see ASPT Document pp. 11,12)

Add the following policy statements as a new section D under Section IX:

Note: References in this new statement are made to the "Academic Freedom Committee". This is a name change for the present "Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee".

- D 1. In case a faculty member, during a tenure-decision year, receives a negative recommendation on award of tenure, he/she must state the basis of an appeal in writing within a reasonable time period after notification of the negative recommendation. The following time periods are recommended as "reasonable" for submission of the written appeal: within 30 calendar days of formal notification of a negative recommendation on tenure, within 14 calendar days of a subsequent act which is alleged to be a violation of academic freedom.
2. The faculty member must direct his/her written appeal to the U.A.C. If the faculty member alleges violations of academic freedom, the U.A.C. must immediately ask the Academic Freedom Committee to institute its procedures. The U.A.C. may on its own recognizance decide that an academic freedom question is involved in the appeal and simply ask the Academic Freedom Committee to institute its procedures. In the case of an appeal where an academic freedom violation question is being dealt with by the Academic Freedom Committee, the U.A.C. may choose to suspend its proceedings until it receives an A.F.C. report

or it may address itself to other issues raised in the written appeal and issue an interim report. If at any time during the U.A.C. proceedings the appellant believes that an academic freedom question has surfaced, the appellant may direct a request (within the 14 calendar day provision in D 1 above) for the A.F.C. to institute its procedures. Upon completion of the hearing, the report of the A.F.C., in addition to being processed via the transmission procedures outlined in the Academic Freedom document, will also immediately be forwarded to the U.A.C., and must become a permanent part of the U.A.C. report. If, in the judgment of the A.F.C. a violation of academic freedom has occurred, the U.A.C. must decide whether the violation significantly contributed to the decision to deny tenure. The U.A.C. will then complete its deliberations and forward its complete report and recommendation to the offices designated by the ASPT Document. (see Sec. XI E 3)

Rationale for Amendment I:

The ad-hoc committee's chief area of immediate concern (with which the FAC concurs) was the nature of the appeals process in denial of tenure cases. Several times in the recent past, a faculty member receiving a negative tenure decision has appealed to two different bodies, the University Appeals Committee and the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee - the first for adjudication of substantive matters, the second for allegations of denial of academic freedom and/or due process. Each, by nature a complex and lengthy procedure, was running far into the terminal year. Under the new, suggested procedures a time frame has been developed which would facilitate the appeals process of both committees being concluded within the spring semester. In the event of losing his/her appeal, the faculty member would then have one full academic year to bend his/her energies toward seeking other employment. Also the new procedure will make it possible for the University to be more efficient in its use of these two committees, since differing charges can be heard simultaneously and the decisions of the two committees can be related to each other if necessary.

II Amendments to Art. III Sec. 5, A, B, ⁶C of the ISU Constitution (see University Handbook p

1. Amend the Title of Art. III Sec. 5 to read: Procedural Standards in Faculty Ethics, Grievance, Academic Freedom, Tenure Procedures.
2. Amend Art. III Sec. 5 A sentence 1 to read: ... provide for a "Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee".
3. Amend Art III Sec. 5 A sentence 2 to read: ... which are not related to the "Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee, the University Appeals Committee, or the Academic Freedom Committee".
4. Amend Art. III Sec. 5 B sentence 1 to read: ... provide for an "Academic Freedom Committee" constituted of ...

5. Amend Art. III Sec. 5 B sentence 2 to read: ... for handling faculty "academic freedom, tenure, and dismissal cases" which guarantee ...
6. Amend Art. III Sec. 6 C so that the title reads: "University Review Committee" and so sentence 1 reads: ... provide for a "University Review Committee to recommend detailed policies on the handling of faculty appointment, promotion, salary, and tenure matters with such policies being approved by the Academic Senate". Delete sentence 2.
7. Amend Art. III Sec. 5 C so that the third sentence reads: ... recommendations from the "University Review Committee" shall be ...

Rationale for the Amendments under III:

1. There is no longer a single Faculty Grievance Committee. It is now a faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee.
2. There is no longer a Faculty Status Committee. Its place has been taken by the University Review Committee. Changes in the wording of these sections must be made to conform to the present committee system.
3. The present name of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, because of the inclusion of the word "tenure", results in the committee being perceived as the body dealing with decisions to grant or not grant tenure. This is not its function; the decision on tenure is a substantive judgment made by ASPT Committees through departmental, college, and appeal processes described in the ASPT document. The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee handles allegations of violation of academic freedom and/or due process which occurred in the arrival at the substantive judgment: Since it is not a tenure committee the word should be dropped. Academic freedom standards are defined in "Statement of Principles on Academic freedom and Tenure". (See partial statement in Sec. VIII ASPT document).

Approved:

Robert L. Smith
Brigitte J. Rubin
John J. McCarthy
Virginia R. Smith

Nov 29, 1978