

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

Fall 12-13-1978

## Senate Meeting December 13, 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 December 13, 1978" (1978). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 435.  
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/435>

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES  
(Not approved by the Academic Senate)

December 13, 1978

Volume X, No. 8

Contents

SHUMAN STANLEY  
DFC V P FOR BUSINESS & FINANCE

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of November 29, 1978

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice-Chairperson's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Appointment of Faculty Member to Screening Committee for Director  
of Intercollegiate Athletics for Men 12.5.78.3

\*Amendment to ASPT Appeals Policy 11.29.78.1

\*Amendment to University Constitution 11.29.78.2

Amendment to SCERB codification 9.19.78.1

Academic Plan for 1979-84 11.2.78.1

\*Revised Procedure for Selection of College Dean 9.14.78.1

Screening Process for External Committees 11.14.78.1

Reestablishment of Center for Higher Education 11.30.78.2

\*appendices

Committee Reports

Communications

Adjournment

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

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES  
(Not approved by the Academic Senate)

December 13, 1978

Volume X, No. 8

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,60 A motion (Carey/Schmaltz) to approve the minutes of November 29, 1978 Senate Meeting was made. Mr. Smith made the following corrections to the minutes:

Page 5, 7th paragraph should read:

"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, and assuming there were grounds, people spent the last year of employment, instead of looking for a job, involved in 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 clarify the fact that the committee does not grant tenure but rather protects it."

Page 3, last paragraph, second line:

insert the word "the" before the word "professional" and the word "experience" after the word "professional".

Mr. Rosenbaum suggested the following corrections:

Page 4, paragraph 2, under Social Science Comprehensive Program should read:

"Mr. Rosenbaum argued that in light of the Senate's 55 hour guideline for comprehensive majors, the Senate should have good reasons for approving the increase but that the proposal offered very weak reasons for the increase. He believed that the putative justification for the increase was inadequate because it claimed that the increase would allow students to develop depth in a single social science area, yet students could develop such depth without the increase. He further noted that if the purpose of the increase were to require students to develop such depth, the proposal does not do that, requiring, as it does only 5 more hours."

Also Page 8, under Administrative Affairs Committee:

Mr. Rosenbaum stated that he expected to receive the report from the Ad Hoc Committee next week, not that he expected to report for the committee.

The minutes were approved as corrected above with some additional typographical corrections.

Mr. Hicklin explained that due to his absence from campus to attend the Board of Regents meeting that he was unable to see the final draft of the minutes which went to the printer. He announced that in the future, the minutes may be delayed in order that he see a final draft.

Chairperson's Remarks

None given.

Vice-Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Erickson announced that all the student senators should bring their addresses up to date for the second semester. Notification should be given to the Senate secretary as soon as possible. Mr. Erickson also requested that candidates file petitions to run for the Senate during the spring elections.

Administrators' Remarks

Mr. Watkins reported on some of the activities of the Board of Higher Education including the approval of the Masters Degree in Corrections and the Certificate of Advance Study in Educational Administration. Mr. Watkins noted that the BHE did not approve the Advanced Certificate in Counseling and Guidance. He stated that most of the time at the BHE meeting was spent listening to the various systems presenting their budget pleas. The Board spent some time discussing the wage guidelines issued by President Carter. Mr. Watkins reported that the Board of Regents had taken action on nepotism changes. The Board revision made nepotism the same for everyone, faculty, students, administrators and civil service alike. He stated that there is nothing wrong with the members of the same family working at a university but no member of a family should be in a position to affect the initial appointment or working conditions of any member of the same family. The Board postponed action on the revision of the probationary tenure period. Two programs in environmental health were passed by the Board without comment. The Department of Health Sciences was approved. Mr. Watkins stated that with the help of a four-wheeled vehicle and an expert driver he was able to get to the Board of Higher Education for a budget hearing. He stated that the Board staff seemed to show some real understanding of the underfunding of ISU's budget.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Donahue stated that he hoped that we would promote the bus service to Amtrak and reiterated a plea for candidates for the upcoming Senate election. Mr. Donahue expressed appreciation to Mr. Tom Wilson who had helped with the research department of the Student Association and the coordination of interns.

Ms. Cook introduced Mr. Craig Dudczak, Information Science as the acting parliamentarian for this evening's meeting.

ACTION ITEMS:

Appointment of Faculty Member to Screening Committee for Director of Inter-Collegiate Athletics for Men 12.5.78.3

Mr. Jesse, Chairperson of Rules Committee, introduced this item. The nominations from Rules Committee are: William Easton, Library Science; Ed Livingston, Music and Robert D. Young, Physics. Mr. Jesse introduced Mr. Livingston and Mr. Easton who were present at the meeting. Voting proceeded on these candidates.

Amendment to ASPT Appeals Policy 11.29.78.2 (see appendix)

Mr. Smith explained the amendment, this was also included as an appendix in the Senate Minutes of November 29, 1978. Mr. Smith gave some minor changes that had

X,61 been added after the last Information session on this item. These changes consist of adding "and or due process" after the words "academic freedom" where ever they appear in the text. A motion (Smith/Kuhn) to adopt this proposal as amended on December 13, 1978 was made.

Mr. Cohen, Chairperson of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Evaluations & Appeals was present for any discussion on this topic. The Provost raised a question on Paragraph D, 1 about the use of the word "reasonable". Mr. Cohen gave the rationale for the use of the word "reasonable".

Motion passed with 3 abstentions.

Appointment of Faculty Member to Screening Committee for Director of Intercollegiate Athletics for Men 12.5.78.3

Ms. Cook announced that Ed Livingston, Music, had been elected to the screening committee for Director Intercollegiate Athletics for Men.

Amendment to the ISU Constitution 11.29.78.2

X,62 Mr. Chambers pointed out some inconsistencies in the language of this document and this was corrected by some editorial changes by Mr. Smith. A motion (Smith/Kuhn) to accept this proposal with the amendments was made and approved.

Motion passed on a roll call vote of 39 yes with 1 abstention.

Amendment to SCERB codification 9.19.78.1

X,63 Ms. Gavin reported on the amendment to SCERB codification. A motion (Gavin/Donahue) to approve the modification of the SCERB codification and amendment to the University Handbook was made.

Mr. Kohn expressed concern that students could serve on any committee who were not on good academic standing. He stated that he had recommended this to Student Affairs that they consider requiring good academic standing for all committees.

Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Quane how they were going to ascertain who was in good academic standing and who was not. Mr. Quane answered that members of the committee would have to release that information voluntarily.

Mr. Morrison asked what if a student did not want to release the information. Mr. Quane stated that, in that case then, they would not have the information.

Mr. Belshe stated he believed the academic information on a student is available to those faculty members that need it for such things as advisement, otherwise it is not available. He stated that for instance, the criteria for membership in a group could be specified and Admissions and Records could be asked to specify whether members met this criteria. This could be distinguished between releasing specific Grade Point Averages.

Ms. Kuhn remarked that persons that are sponsors to honorary societies are allowed to receive this information.

Mr. Gamsky listed several situations in which academic information could be released.

X,64 Mr. Hicklin moved the previous question. Mr. Barton seconded. The motion passed to close debate.

The main motion passed on a voice vote.

Academic Plan for 1979-84 11.2.78.1

X,65

Mr. Miller spoke for the Academic Plan. He stated that the Academic Affairs Committee had approved the Academic Plan. A motion (Miller/Carey) to approve the Academic Plan for 1979-84 was made.

The motion passed.

X,66

A motion (Shulman/Chambers) to reconsider the wording on the SCERB motion. Mr. Chambers raised the question as to whether or not being removed from the Hearing Panel would mean that they could serve originally. Mr. Donahue explained that such persons served for a year, screened and served for a year, that they could be dropped below good academic standing during that year. The motion to reconsider failed 14-24 on a show of hands with 1 abstention.

INFORMATION ITEMS:

Revised Procedure for Selection of College Dean 9.14.78.1 (see appendix)

Mr. Rosenbaum included some editorial revisions of the procedure which were incorporated into the corrected copy which appears in the appendix. Mr. Horner stated that there seems to be an inconsistency when the President is asked to consult the Provost sometimes and to consult with appropriate college councils in selecting an acting Dean. At other times the Provost is required to consult on this matter. The Provost also stated that while it says that the Provost may add members to the committee, there are no procedures for adding these persons.

Mr. Martin asked whether or not the students had to be from the college and it was pointed out that later in the document it was specified, that the students would be from relevant colleges.

Mr. Carey asked whether or not the present selection process for Dean would remain the same or would it be altered by these changes. Mr. Rosenbaum said it was the intent that present procedures would continue without being affected by this document at this time. Mr. Rosenbaum said it was the committee's clear intent that Chairpersons would not be eligible to serve on this selection committee.

Mr. Shulman asked Mr. Rosenbaum for the rationale for exclusion of administrative personnel. Mr. Schwalm explained that the rationale was that the administrators already had the input through various other members on the committee.

The President asked for a clarification on Paragraph 2 on naming the acting Dean. Mr. Watkins stated that he thought it would be more appropriate that the Provost would consult with the appropriate members of the college council and possibly make a recommendation to the President. The President suggested that it might be a clearer procedure if the Provost consulted with the appropriate college council.

Mr. Fizer suggested that it appeared that Affirmative Action Officers could be excluded from the committee. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that he had had a communication from Dorothy Carrington of the Affirmative Action Office. She wants all Dean candidates to be interviewed by the Affirmative Action Office. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that the Affirmative Action office had some misgivings about monitoring the process in which they are involved as committee members.

Ms. Kuhn mentioned some of the problems that have arisen in the selection of Arts and Science Deans in terms of representation from various departments. In some search committees they had more than one person from a single department.

Mr. Hicklin asked Mr. Rosenbaum to explain the concerns of the Affirmative Action office, "Was it to interview all the candidates? Was it the desire for a veto over the candidates or the desire to meet affirmative action guidelines or to ascertain the candidates attitudes towards affirmative action?" Mr. Rosenbaum was not sure of the intent of the Affirmative Action Office's concern.

Screening Process for External Committees 11.14.78.1 (see appendix)

Mike Donahue explained the Screening Process for external committees. Mr. Donahue deleted several parts of the proposal. Mr. Donahue explained the problems of coming to a consensus on this issue, he also explained the background for these changes which came up because of complaints of these committees being sensitive to minority representation in the screening process. Mr. Donahue went through the document and explained the various sections and their purposes.

Mr. Hicklin asked how these guidelines prevented the mistakes of the past and Mr. Donahue attempted to explain how the mistakes of the past would be avoided.

Mr. Sims raised some doubts about the screening, remarking that the pre-screening meeting is expected to solve all the problems that have been encountered in the past.

Ms. Butz asked who would decide on what questions would be asked of all the persons interviewed. Mr. Donahue stated that there should be some flexibility and questions should vary from year to year and committee to committee based upon programmatic differences. Ms. Butz raised several questions about the consistency of the committee and whether or not what the minimum number would be to allow the the screening to proceed.

Mr. Schmaltz raised a question of how many or how much influence non-returning members would be allowed on the screening committee. He stated that there would be only one non-returning person allowed on the screening committee.

Mr. Erickson asked what the state of this selection code would be, would it be added to the Blue Book? He pointed out that this has an ambiguity in the term "student" as it does not appear in the document.

Mr. March made some suggestions for improvement in the document. Mr. Donahue took Mr. March's recommendations under advisement. Mr. Fizer suggested that other groups be added to the list who would be notified of vacancies.

Mr. Erickson raised a question about any safeguards that would be used to make sure these processes were enforced.

In answer to a question about why various groups were to be notified of vacancies and where the list came from, Mr. Donahue explained that these were drawn up in an attempt to cover a wide range of constituencies on the campus.

Reestablishment of Center for Higher Education 11.30.78.2

Mr. Carey introduced this item. Mr. Carey introduced Dean Burnham, College of Education to answer questions. Mr. Carey raised various questions which were brought to the committee about this proposal. Dean Burnham and Dean Rives were

invited to the table to discuss this proposal.

Mr. Carey explained that this was not degree granting nor course-offering center. It would be designed to study research questions pertinent to higher education including all aspects of post-secondary education. He stated that this would not overlap with the present Office of Institutional Research. Mr. Carey said that the cost for the first year would be born by internal reallocation in the College of Education including some grant money. The first fiscal year would take \$110,000. This cost would stabilize at \$150,000 during subsequent fiscal years.

Mr. Wilson raised a question of Dean Burnham, "where would we come up with \$150,000?" Dean Burnham explained that the proposal is to reactivate the center. Dean Burnham stated that a NEPR (New Expanded Program Request) had been sent to the Board of Higher Education for new funds. He said that we were seeking external funds from government and from foundations. He stated that before the year is over we will have money available from external grants. He stated that the majority of activities formed would be based upon soft money. Dean Burnham stated that the same questions that Mr. Carey was raising now would be the kind of questions that would be researched. Dean Burnham stated that this would be a focal point to solicit external funds. If no funds are forthcoming, then no activities will be forthcoming.

Mr. Schmaltz asked whether the difference between these and the Kellogg Foundation and Dean Burnham explained that this center was for in-depth study to develop new models in Higher Education, not the professional development of faculty which is the in-house function served by the Kellogg Foundation.

Mr. March asked why the original center was disestablished. Dean Rives explained the history and background for the Senate members. He said that the Center was not affiliated with any college at that time and that it operated out of the Dean of Faculties Office. It did offer courses and one of the reasons for its disestablishment was, it had little direct relationship to ongoing academic programs. He said that these activities are more appropriately placed in the College of Education. Dean Rives stated that the previous center was a victim of a dictum from the BHE to achieve certain cost savings.

In answer to a question, Dean Burnham explained that the research positions in this center would be drawn from across the University and possibly from external sources also.

Mr. Hirt asked if there was a possibility of fellowships in the center and Dean Burnham stated that this would be possible.

Mr. Smith asked if they expected concern by the Board of Higher Education about duplication. Dean Burnham stated that there was another center at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. He said that at both the Board of Regents staff and the Board of Higher Education Staff, no one is raising the question of duplication. We are rather receiving strong encouragement from both groups to establish this center. Dean Burnham explained that we have other projects in the College of Education which we will declare under this higher education center. Some of the present projects have generated some funds which could be used as seed money in this center. Dean Burnham stated that we were trying to get a broad enough charter that we could bring many types of post-secondary projects under it.



In response to a question from Mr. March, Dean Rives explained that there is never any guarantee that one would get funding. Mr. Rives stated that the Board of Higher Education uses as a basis for permission to establish a center, the center's potential in attracting outside funds. He pointed out that the Center for Schools Finance had been successful in this regard.

In response to a question by Mr. Hicklin, Dean Burnham explained the relationship between this proposal and the mission statement which the Board of Higher Education has written for ISU. He explained the relationship between this mission statement and the approval of doctoral programs in the College of Education. He stated that the Board of Regents and the Board of Higher Education staff seem to feel that the Center is entirely appropriate and within the mission statement. These groups are urging us to reestablish this center.

#### Committee Reports

##### Academic Affairs Committee

The next meeting of this committee will be Tuesday, December 19, 1978, 10:00 a.m. in Hovey 418. We will be discussing the proposal on the Center for Higher Education, questions on the Basic Skills document and the Agricultural Accident Prevention proposal.

##### Administrative Affairs Committee

The next meeting of this committee will be Wednesday, January 17, 1979 in FSA 129 at 7:00 p.m. We will be discussing the Dean Selection Procedure.

##### Budget Committee

Mr. Erickson announced that the Budget Committee will meet next semester.

##### Faculty Affairs Committee

The next meeting of this committee will be January 17, 1979, Stevenson 216 at 4:00 p.m. We will be discussing the ASPT document.

##### JUAC

Mr. Hicklin announced JUAC meeting on this campus just before the next Board meeting at 9:00 p.m. in DeGarmo 551 on January 24, 1979. JUAC is still discussing the length of probationary period for granting tenure. There is this staff document on this topic. JUAC will also consider the advisement reports coming from the various campus including ISU.

Mr. Hicklin stated that for Mr. Rosenbaum this meeting would be his last and expressed appreciation for his hard work on a difficult committee.

##### Rules Committee

Mr. Jesse reported that the next meeting of this committee will be December 15, 1978 at 3:00 p.m. in 311C Moulton and they will be discussing affirmative action and academic standards in the Blue Book.

##### Student Affairs Committee

Mr. Donahue stated that the next meeting will deal with cleaning up of the Screening Process discussed tonight. Date of the meeting has not been set as yet.

Adjournment

X,67 A motion (March/Gavin) to adjourn was made and approved at 10:04 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,

Charles Hicklin, Secretary

JC:CH:c

NAME	ATTEN-DANCE	VOTE							VOICE VOTE		
		Motion # 62	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion No.	Y	N
Amster	A								60	x	
Austensen	P	yes							61	x	
Barton	P	yes							62	roll	call
Belshe	P	yes							63	x	
Boaz	P	yes							64	x	
Bowen	A								65	x	
Bown	A								66		x
Butz	P	yes							67	x	
Carey	P	yes									
Chambers	P	yes									
Cook, James	P	yes									
Cook, Janet	P	yes									
Crafts	P	yes									
Donahue	P	yes									
Elliott	ex.										
Erickson	P	yes									
Fizer	P	yes									
Friedhoff	P	yes									
Gamsky	P	yes									
Gavin	P	yes									
Ginnis	P	yes									
Greathouse	ex.										
Henry	P	yes									
Hermansen	P	yes									
Hicklin	P	yes									
Hirt	P	yes									
Horner	P	present									
Jesse	P	yes									
Keffales	ex.										
Kennedy	P	yes									
Koehler	ex.										
Kohn	P	yes									
Kuhn	P	yes									
March	P	yes									
McCarthy	P	yes									
Miller	P	yes									
Morrison	P	yes									
Patterson	A										
Rosenbaum	P	yes									
Sanders	P	yes									
Scharfenberg	P	yes									
Schmaltz	P	yes									
Schwalb	P	yes									
Shulman	P	yes									
Sims	P	yes									
Smith	P	yes									
Turner	ex.										
Wilson	P	yes									
Watkins	P	yes									
Wolfe	ex.										

Y=Yes N=No P=Present

39 yes 1 ab.

(as amended on  
December 13, 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 and or due process.
2. The faculty member must direct his/her written appeal to the U.A.C. If the faculty member alleges violations of academic freedom and or due process, 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 and or due process 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 and or due process 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 and/or due process 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 and/or due process 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.

and Sec. 6 C

II Amendments to Art. III Sec. 5, A, B, <sup>^</sup> of the ISU Constitution (see University Handbook p 83) <sup>^</sup>

1. Amend the Title of Art. III Sec. 5 to read: Procedural Standards in Faculty Ethics, Grievance, Academic Freedom, and/or due process, 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. 6 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).

TO: Members of Academic Senate  
FROM: Administrative Affairs Committee  
RE: College Dean Selection Procedures Revision  
DATE: December 6, 1978

The following is the proposal of the Administrative Affairs Committee. It is basically the current procedure with changes and modifications incorporated. Changes are underlined, and significant new sections are accompanied by their counterparts in the current procedures.

1. A new college dean shall be selected when the President officially announces to the Academic Senate that:
  - a. There is a vacancy or will be a vacancy at a specified date in the future.
  - b. A new college has been or will be created.
  - c. An existing college has been or will be divided into two or more new colleges, in which case the dean of the old college does not automatically become dean of one of the new colleges unless one of them retains the name and a principal portion of the functions of the already existing college.
  - d. Two or more existing colleges have been or will be combined into one college, in which case none of the deans of the old colleges automatically becomes dean of the new college.
  - e. A unit within a college has been or will be made into a college, in which case the head of that unit does not automatically become dean of the new college.
2. Selection of an Acting Dean

When necessary, the President shall name an acting dean of a college. Before naming an acting dean, the President shall consult the Provost and the members of the appropriate College Council. If necessary, an acting dean may be named from among faculty who hold rank in another college.

(In the current document, the selection of an acting dean is treated in the section entitled "Organization of the Committee on Selection." The recommendation is that it be placed in a separate section. The current procedures provide that "When necessary, the President shall name an acting dean of a college. Before an acting dean is named, the President shall consult with the Provost and the members of the Committee on Selection. If necessary, an acting dean may be named from among the faculty who hold rank in another college.")

### 3. Organization of the Committee on Selection

- a. A Committee on Selection shall consist basically of five persons holding rank on the faculty of the University and two students.
- b. The Academic Senate shall annually elect ten faculty members to serve as an Administrative Selection Committee Chairperson's Panel. From this panel the Provost, after consulting the President, shall select the Chairperson of a Committee on Selection of a college dean. No faculty member shall be elected to this panel for more than three consecutive one-year terms and no faculty member shall serve as chairperson of more than one Committee on Selection during a year. Panel members shall not be members of the Academic Senate.
- c. After the Chairperson has been appointed and after consultation with the President, the Provost shall appoint from among the faculty holding an administrative appointment and academic rank one person to serve on the committee. This person shall serve as Secretary to the Committee.
- d. After the Chairperson and Secretary of the committee have been appointed, the University Elections Committee shall conduct an election among the members of the faculty holding a major assignment in the college for purposes of selecting three members of the committee. To be eligible to vote in this election, a faculty member must hold a regular appointment at the University for the full regular semester (excluding all summer sessions) immediately preceding the semester or summer session in which the election occurs. To be eligible to be elected to the committee, a person must be eligible to vote and hold no administrative appointment. Before the election, the Provost shall provide the University Elections Committee with a list of the names of those within the college who are eligible to vote. The University Elections Committee shall first conduct a primary election for purposes of nominating six candidates. No more than one candidate may come from a single department unless the college has fewer than six departments. In no case may more than two candidates come from a single department. The nominees shall be those candidates receiving the most votes except insofar as adjustments are necessary to insure that the preceding provisions are met. Following the primary election, the University Elections Committee shall conduct a final election for selecting the three members of the Committee. No more than one member may come from a single department unless the college has fewer than three departments.
- e. Two students will be elected by the Academic Senate from four nominated by the Student Association. These students should be selected from academic majors within the College for which the Dean is being sought.
- f. The Provost may determine that up to two additional members may be added to the Committee on Selection in order to achieve better representation of the disciplines in the college or to meet affirmative action objectives. These members shall be faculty who do not hold administrative appointment, and the majority of the faculty on the committee shall be within the college for which a dean is being chosen.

(Current procedures read, "The Provost may determine that up to two members may be added. The methods of selection of such members shall be determined by the Academic Senate upon the recommendation of the Provost, with the stipulation that the majority of the committee will be within the college involved.")



- g. If meetings of the faculty of the college are necessary for purposes relating to the selection of a dean, the Chairperson of the Committee on Selection shall call and preside over all such meetings. The Provost shall be informed in advance of and may attend, but not vote at, all meetings of the Committee on Selection.
  - h. If a member of the Committee on Selection becomes a candidate for dean, that member of the Committee shall resign and the person who received the next highest number of votes in the final election shall be named to the committee.
4. Responsibilities of the Committee on Selection
- a. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Selection to work closely with and to advise the Provost as to whom he/she should recommend as dean of the college. To this end, the committee shall actively seek qualified candidates for the deanship both from among the faculty and from those not presently serving on the University faculty in a manner designed to insure candidates of the highest qualify. The committee shall ordinarily recommend to the Provost at least three candidates for the deanship, including at least one who does not presently serve on the University faculty. The committee members shall rank these candidates in order of preference.
  - b. Prior to making its recommendations to the Provost, the Committee shall arrange for each individual candidate to be interviewed by the following: the College Council, the chairpersons of the departments in the college, the DFSC of the department in which the candidate would, if appointed, hold rank, the members of the Committee on Selection, the Provost, the President, and anyone else whom the Provost specifies. The Committee on Selection shall arrange an interview for any candidate designated by the Provost.

(Current Procedures state that "Prior to making its recommendations to the Provost, the committee shall arrange for each individual candidate to be interviewed by the following: members of the college advisory or other faculty representative committee, the chairperson of the department in the college, the members of the Committee on Selection, the Provost, the President, and anyone else whom the Provost specifies. The Committee on Selection shall arrange an interview for any candidate designated by the Provost.")

- c. Prior to scheduling any interviews, the committee shall inform each of the persons or groups listed in "b" above, in writing, of the names of all persons whom the committee is actively considering for the deanship. The correspondence with the credentials of such dandidates shall be open to inspection by any of these persons other than those who are active candidates.
- d. When the Provost and the Committee on Selection have agreed that there are no additional candidates whom they desire to interview, the committee shall begin the process of selecting the candidates which it will recommend to the Provost. Prior to making its recommendation, the committee shall solici the views of the chairpersons of the departments in the college and of the College Council. The committee shall provide these persons with a form prepared by the committee for evaluating each of the candidates who was interviewed. The committee shall set a reasonable deadline when the forms and

comments must be received prior to the time the committee meets for purposes of ranking the candidates. In making its recommendations to the Provost, the committee shall communicate fully to him/her the reactions of those persons to each of the candidates which it recommends.

5. The Final Appointment

The Provost may reject all candidates recommended to him/her by the Committee on Selection, in which case the Provost shall either instruct the committee to resume its search for satisfactory candidates or may dissolve the committee and provide for the creation of a new committee in accordance with these procedures. After receiving a satisfactory report from the committee, the Provost shall indicate to the President his/her preference for dean. The President shall make the final selection. Before presenting the name of the person selected to the Board of Regents for approval, the President shall inform the Academic Senate and the Selection Committee and shall solicit written reactions from individual Senate members. Only after the Board has approved the appointment shall it be publicly announced.

6. Modifications or interpretations of these procedures must be approved by the Academic Senate upon recommendation of the President or the Provost. Once the procedures have been initiated in an instance, they should not be modified.

PERSONNEL SELECTION CODE FOR:

Entertainment Committee  
University Union/Auditorium Board  
Forum Committee

- I. TITLE
- II. RELEVANCE OF PRIOR STATUTES
- III. DEFINITIONS
- IV. METHODS AND TIMEING REQUIREMENTS OF SCREENINGS
- V. SCREENING COMMITTEE
- VI. SCREENING COMMITTEE MAKE UP

TITLE

- I. This Code shall be known and may be cited as the Personnel Selection Code of the Entertainment Committee, the University Union/Auditorium Board and the Forum Committee.

RELEVANCE OF PRIOR STATUTES

- II. Upon its approval by the Academic Senate this Code shall supercede all previous rules and regulations concerning the subject matter contained herein, however nothing within this Code shall be interpreted as being in violation of the University Constitution.

DEFINITIONS

- III. As used in this Code, unless specifically altered:
  - a. "Personnel" shall mean any individual screened and approved under the auspices of this Code.
  - b. "Screening Committee" shall mean any committee established by the Student Organizations, Activities & Programs Office and/or by the Academic Senate with the power to solicit, interview and select applicants for positions on the Entertainment Committee, the University Union/Auditorium Board and Forum Committee.
  - c. "Screening" shall mean the process of soliciting, interviewing and selecting from two or more applicants for any given position on Entertainment Committee, University Union/Auditorium Board and Forum Committee.

METHODS AND TIMING REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL SCREENINGS

- IV. a. All vacant personnel positions must be announced in the VIDETTE, at no later than nine working days prior to the time when applications will no longer be accepted.

Notification of committee applications shall also be made to the University College Councils, the Student Association, the Association of Residence Halls, Black Student Union and Greek Council.

- b. A standardized form requesting name, ISU identification number, address, phone, age, accumulated hours, major, minor, past and current activities at ISU, past and current work experiences, courses related to position and any other relevant questions must be used for all candidates for any one position.

- c. The Rules Committee of the Academic Senate shall be responsible for insuring that all sections of this Code are appropriately followed before recommendations are made to the Senate.
- d. Recommendations for appointments are due in the Senate office no later than March 31 of the spring semester.

#### SCREENING COMMITTEE

#### V. Screening Committee and duties shall conform to the following:

- a. Individuals placed on screening committee shall be required to attend a meeting called by the Student Organizations, Activities & Programs' Office prior to the actual screenings. There will be a minimum of two (2) meetings and screeners must attend one (1) of those two meetings. Failure to do so will result in the removal from the screening committee. Such removal option shall be up to the Student Organizations, Activities & Programs' Office.
- b. Any vacancy occurring on the screening committee shall be filled in the same manner used to select the original members of the committee.
- c. Prior to the first interview a series of questions shall be determined, to be uniformly asked, of all persons interviewed. ~~-(Suggested questions to be handout at Senate meeting.)-~~ It is preferred that screeners stay for an entire evening session. New screeners coming in late or replacing screeners must review the series of questions before screenings continue.
- d. All individuals screening shall objectively rate the personnel interviewed and submit those recommendations in writing to the Student Organizations, Activities & Programs' Office.
- e. All Entertainment Committee, University Union/Auditorium Board and Forum Committee positions will be filled following appropriate approval by the Academic Senate.
- ~~f. Screeners will screen for minimum 2-hour blocks of time.~~

#### SCREENING COMMITTEE MAKE-UP

- VI a. Entertainment Committee, University Union/Auditorium<sup>Board</sup> and Forum Committee positions are to be screened by a ~~four~~<sup>three</sup> person committee, consisting of one student from the Student Association Assembly, one student (who shall be a senator) appointed by the Vice-Chairperson (if a student) of the Academic Senate in conjunction with the Student Affairs Committee and ~~two~~<sup>one</sup> students who shall be non-returning members of the Committee in which he/she shall screen for. ~~-(one of which will be non-voting.)-~~
- b. A member of the screening committee (Assembly member, Senator) must have been elected or appointed in the term prior to the screenings.