

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Spring 3-6-1985

Senate Meeting March 6, 1985

Academic Senate

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 March 6, 1985" (1985). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 477.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/477>

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

March 6, 1985

Volume XVI, No. 12

CONTENTS

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of February 20, 1985

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

ACTION ITEMS

Proposed changes in calendar guidelines and Calendars for fall, '86 and '87 (2.12.85.1)

Appointments to committees

Certification of student vacancies on University Studies Council (2.18.85.1) and of vacancies on Academic Senate (2.25.85.1)

INFORMATION ITEMS:

Proposal for Master's Degree in Applied Computer Science (2.26.85.1)

Academic Freedom Committee Policy changes/(Ritt Report) (4.17.84.4)

Report of Ad Hoc Resolution Committee (3.6.85.7)

Committee Reports:

Administrative Affairs on Evaluation of Administrators

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)

March 6, 1985

Volume XVI, No. 12

Call to Order

Chairperson Gowdy called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m. in the Circus Room of Bone Student Center.

Roll Call

Secretary Sessions called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Approval of the minutes of February 20, 1985

Secretary Sessions noted that minutes of February 20 were lacking a record of attendance and motions. These will be appended to the minutes of March 6.

Mr. Zeidenstein questioned why the Agenda for March 6, 1985 do not show his resolution (2.6.85.1) on the report of the Faculty Affairs Committee. Chairperson Gowdy reported the decision of the Executive Committee that the creation of the ad hoc "resolution" committee subsumed his resolution. Zeidenstein cited Senate By-laws procedures. Chairperson Gowdy repeated the decision of the Executive Committee not to Action his resolutions. Mr. Zeidenstein may move for addition to Action when the ad hoc committee reports.

Mr. Mohr cited minutes of February 20 to clarify that Mr. Eimmermann's motion subsumed the Zeidenstein motion.

Mr. Charnagorsky corrected the minutes in that remarks of the Senate Vice-Chairperson should be attributed to the Student Body President.

Mr. Spence noted on p. 12 that remarks should be attributed to Mr. Spence, not Mr. Spencer.

XVI-117 Motion by Mr. Stokes (second, Taylor) to approve the minutes as corrected. Motion carried voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

The Senate will hold a retreat at Ewing Manor, April 3, 1985.

It is important that the Senate Office be given enough time for duplication of committee material for distribution in the packets or at Senate meetings.

Vice-Chairperson's Remarks

No remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Charnagorsky reported on student elections March 5.

Student Body Board of Directors President, Charles Neff; Vice-President, Marlon Talley

The charity basketball game with Normal town officials realized \$250 for SOAR

Administrators' Remarks

Mr. Watkins reported on the meeting of the BHE on Tuesday, March 5. Governor Thompson addressed the meeting on his budget support for higher education and on the relationship of primary and secondary education to higher education. He cited the "symbiotic" relationship of education and the economy. The BHE unanimously approved the ISU budget.

Questions were raised by Margaret Schmid of the UPI. U of I President Ickenberry supported the strengths of the budget. There may be questions as to the ability of the state to sustain the implications of the new state budget. It is in our favor and should be supported.

Dr. Strand indicated that since legislation enabling public university faculty members to bargain collectively was signed by the governor in 1983 the environment for certain problems has changed. In some instances, different interpretations can be drawn from reports circulated to the university community. One such circumstance was a recent newsletter in which an organization claimed it was responsible for a change being made in the wording of the faculty handbook. Dr. Strand indicated that the wording in the handbook was under review before the organization expressed interest in the passage.

Mr. Harden. No remarks.

Mr. Gamsky noted an adjustment in the announced room and board fee increase: \$12 per semester, about 1%.

Action Items

XVI-118 Mr. Zeidenstein moved (second, Schmaltz) to add his resolutions (2.6.85.1) to Action Items on the Agenda.

Mr. Eimermann observed that his motion (XVI-114) to appoint an ad hoc committee did not intend to preclude the Zeidenstein resolution. He suggested a procedure that the ad hoc report be heard prior to consideration of the Zeidenstein motion.

Parliamentarian Boaz ruled that the Zeidenstein motion requires a simple majority and that Action may be taken at any place in the agenda.

Mr. Zeidenstein explained his intent to postpone decision on his Action item until the Eimermann report is acted on. He does not intend his resolution to exclude the ad hoc report.

The motion carried on a roll call vote.

Proposed changes in calendar guidelines and calendars for Fall '86 and '87. (2.12.85.1)

Mr. McCracken reported. He desired to withdraw the proposals. He explained there is likelihood of a decision by the BOR to adopt Martin Luther King's birthday as a holiday. This would necessitate change in the Spring calendar, and the guidelines may need further review and changes. Mr. Rosenbaum pressed for consideration of guidelines that apply to Fall only, specifically, consideration of guideline 3 to include time for grading papers. Mr. Spence noted the specified intent of Senate to vote on calendars and guidelines in this term. He questioned why Mr. McCracken was withdrawing the proposals. Mr. McCracken noted that guidelines action would precede calendar actions. Senate assented to a delay of consideration of the proposals until the end of Action.

Appointments to Committees

XVI-119 Motion by Mr. Pontius (second, Spence) to approve appointments to the Honors Council (3.5.85.3):

Carol Thomas Neely, English '86 term

Steve Gates, Chemistry, '86 term

Motion carried voice vote.

XVI-120 Mr. Spence moved (second, Pontius) to declare vacancies on the University Studies Council for the seats occupied by Jeffrey P. Baasch, Virginia R. Baird, James Kleinkopf.

Motion carried voice vote.

- XVI-121 Motion by Mr. Spence (second, Balbach) to declare vacant the Senate seats occupied by Marlon Talley, Angela Ford. Motion carried voice vote.

Mr. Zeidenstein spoke to his resolution (2.6.85.1). It is intended as a final alternative. He is preparing a procedure for dealing with minima and equity by a system of ratios. He sees it also as solving the problem of "creeping egalitarianism." He will propose that increases be awarded in proportion to base salary.

- XVI-122 Motion by Mr. Zeidenstein (second, Eimermann) to defer action on his proposal to the next meeting under Action Items. Motion carried by voice vote.

Information Items

Proposal for Master's Degree in Applied Computer Science (2.26.85.1).

Dr. Charles A. White, Dean of Graduate School; Dr. Elizabeth Chapman, Dean of CAST; Dr. Lawrence Eggan, Chair of ACS; Dr. Dean Sanders were at the Senate table to respond to questions.

Ms. Balbach yielded to Dean White, who spoke for the Graduate School and the Graduate Council. The Graduate Council has approved the Master's in ACS proposal. He offered background remarks. For several years he has awaited a graduate proposal in ACS. The proposal arrived at the Graduate School in the Fall of 1984. It has experienced three revisions. It was approved 14-2 with stipulation for revisions prior to submitting to Academic Senate. This unusual procedure is explained by recognizing that the need for the proposal is great. It can be revised while in the approval process. He noted opposition to the proposal and strongly urged discussion and eventual approval.

Dr. Chapman spoke. CAST is committed to an ISU graduate program that will maintain the CAST applied mission and meet societal needs. She represents the College's support for the proposal.

Dr. Lawrence Eggan spoke. He and Dr. Dean Sanders are present to answer questions.

Senator Harden found inconsistencies in the statistical data showing projected numbers of majors on p. 168.

Resource Requirements, p. 29, row 4, 2nd year: The addition to arrive at the figure is not valid. This creates error through the entire table.

On p. 30, the addition and multiplication calculations for staff are incorrect.

The document should be made correct before leaving campus.

Ms. Balbach noted that Academic Affairs Committee deliberations were without knowledge of the earlier history of the proposal.

Some aspects of the proposal do not conform to expectations and procedures of the Academic Plan:

1. A new program is to have existing faculty qualified to support it.
2. A new program should involve faculty with students at all levels; the proposal suggests a faculty for graduate students only.
3. Graduate programs should lead out from strong undergraduate programs.

Other concerns:

The proposal needs general correcting and re-doing. For example, show that the Teaching Sequence is coordinated with Council on Teacher Education.

The proposal is similar to programs at U of I; proposal should not claim otherwise.

The argument that quality faculty are attracted by such a program should note the needs of the undergraduate program.

Mr. Parr noted the specifications of the Graduate Council and responses of ACS. Dean White noted Council has not deliberated the ACS responses but ACS has made responses. He is satisfied with the reservation about awaited letters of support inside and outside.

Mr. Parr observed that two of the proposed sequences do not satisfy the criteria for development of new programs. Dean White declared the proposal is not contradictory to the criteria for new programs in the Academic Plan. He accepted that the proposal addressed the criteria in varying degrees, e.g., qualifications of faculty. He discussed the proposal with regard to the several criteria.

Mr. Mohr questioned p. 18, sec. 20, par 2 on the distinctiveness of the proposal from other programs in the state. To specify business application is narrow. He suggested great broadening of the applications' possibilities. Dr. Eggen responded that the term, applied, is perceived clearly in ACS department, differently outside. A rewrite for clarification of this is being prepared.

Mr. Schmaltz had questions:

1. To Dean White. Can the stipulations and responses be returned to Graduate Council? Dean White agreed to agenda them for March 20 and requested that the chair of the Senate require Academic Affairs to review the proposal at the same time.
2. To Ms. Balbach. She replied to Schmaltz that Academic Affairs hoped for revisions reflecting the committee's concerns.
3. To Dr. Eggan. About concern no. 16 of the Graduate Council concerning qualified faculty to offer a master's program. Dr. Eggan replied that profiles of other institutions comparable to ISU are being assembled. These show, preliminarily, that ISU faculty are comparable: 6 doctorates; all engaged in research; 3 of 4 without doctorates are associate members of the Graduate Faculty. He feels the faculty is competent to support the Masters even without the proposed new faculty.

Mr. Zeidenstein had questions for Dr. Eggan:

1. It is proposed that graduate assistants will teach 100-level courses to free faculty for the graduate program. How much and what kind of teaching will graduate assistants do?

Dr. Eggan responded that they will be assisting in large-enrollment courses that break out into laboratory and discussion sections. They will be working in these one-on-one settings.

Dean White noted that Master's candidates are not allowed to teach without graduate faculty supervision.

Mr. Zeidenstein questioned if upper-level undergraduates are successful in these labs.

Eggan: Yes

2. He noted that Academic Affairs had questioned about meeting undergraduate enrollment.

Mr. Eggan's response was that enrollment is declining.

Is the decline a function of decline of interest or of increased standards?

Eggan replied that both factors are at work. The pressure is lessening and standards are tightened. They are working to solve their enrollment needs, such as servicing their own majors. They are growing in faculty and credit hour/FTE generated. They have increased seats available to students outside the major.

Mr. Zeidenstein and Dr. Eggan discussed the question.

Mr. Parr spoke to his notes on the Academic Affairs deliberations.

Dean Sanders spoke to the problem of enrollments. Enrollment pressure three years ago could not be met with university resources. The decision was then made to plan admission/retention requirements and stabilize majors at 650. With stabilization has come better ability to meet service demands and the needs of minors as well as majors.

Dean Chapman noted that faculty-to-student ratio was about 60:1. Through capping and stabilization has come down to about 20:1. Meanwhile credit hour generation has risen.

Mr. Zeidenstein questioned the guided project rather than an internship in the 39-hr sequence. Why not an internship? Why is a project superior? Dean White noted the graduate requirement for a culminating synthesizing experience. Present practice does not encompass an internship specifically.

Dr. Eggan and Dr. Sanders described the guided project and did not exclude or preclude an internship.

Mr. Spence questioned Dean White. He reviewed Academic Plan criteria for new programs where there is specified existing faculty. Can the existing faculty support the proposal?

Mr. Spence had questions about responses to the Graduate Council criticisms being held to be adequate with three reservations. Item 17 is countered by Dr. Eggan but not responded. Dean White spoke to the procedure desired to put a program in place via internal reallocation. ISU is not able to do this and has to seek new funding for a new program in order to respond to evident societal need. Mr. Spence noted the proposal calls for new, needed faculty and specifies the present ability to support only one of three sequences. This is a contradiction on which he sought clarification.

Mr. Spence noted that Items 18 and 19 question the unevenness and elementary level of parts of proposal. Dean White replied that this was not responded because, without examples, the item cannot be understood, as the reply says. Spence requested clarification.

Mr. Bowen questioned Dr. Eggan regarding the teacher training provisions of the proposal.

Is there state certification in ACS? Eggan replied there is no certification required; he noted proposal would retrain already-certified teachers. He looks forward to certification.

Mr. Bowen questioned p. 29, sec. 6, line 08 and suggested the amount is low for what is expected. Eggan noted other equipment funds inputs, reasonableness of the proposal, and space limitations.

Ms. Balbach questioned minicomputer acquisition in FY84-85. Is this done? Eggan replied that at present the funds are encumbered and the proposal to authorize is before the BHE. Specifications have been written by ACS, are state-of-the-art current, and suitable for the proposed program and the present undergraduate program.

Ms. Getsi questioned the qualifications of faculty. There is no PhD or EdD in the field; other faculty are not terminal. Faculty are not members of the Graduate Faculty in the field. Eggan responded noting extensive experience of faculty as graduate faculty in other universities. ISU has no ACS graduate program. Getsi discussed the difficulty securing of qualified faculty in an emerging field. Nonetheless, an adequate existing faculty is in question.

Dr. Eggan addressed issues and questions: the criteria of Academic Plan, faculty mobility among areas, transfer of graduate-level faculty qualification among areas. He spoke to the popularity of enrollments in, and demand for graduates from ACS; recruitment success has enhanced ISU and has brought recruiting interest to other departments. ISU has a high reputation among recruiting businesses. He noted the quality of ACS graduates, including successful graduate school placements. This all speaks to the quality of ACS faculty.

Mr. Piland asked why the Master's program was not sought 8-10 years ago and why it is so necessary now? Dr. Eggan reviewed the origins of ACS at ISU. Enrollment pressures from the outset focused attention at the undergraduate level. The proposal was started three years ago; the decision was made in 1984 to press for approval and funding at the same time.

Mr. Rosenbaum questioned the projected demand for Master's graduates. Dr. Eggan's response noted assurances from major employers that Masters' are and will be employed.

Dr. Strand responded to a question raised about resources. The Academic Plan does specify resources to initiate a program. He noted that during the last two years internal reallocations had strengthened ACS to a level sufficient to approve the request for the Master's program. Additional funding from the BOR is being requested. There is need to distinguish between resources to approve and new resources to offer the program.

Mr. Spence asked Ms. Balbach about an earlier Master's proposal. Dr. Eggan: Yes, four years ago. It did not mature.

Ms. Shane noted error in departmental designation of course BUS 416; should be BEA 416, on p. 14. Eggan requested understanding for errors. They will be rectified.

Mr. Nelson questioned the calendar for advancing the proposal. Dean White explained the need to be at the BHE in November-December. Mr. Strand noted an April 12, 1985 deadline in BOR. Ms. Balbach noted the proposal was in the Graduate Council in September; Academic Affairs did not receive it until February. It is still subject to errors and questions; it still needs to show support, that is, societal needs. She suggested the proposal needs further attention and revision.

Mr. Luther suggested that ISU may not successfully compete for faculty nationwide; majors in Physics would like ACS but are losing interest. Dr. Eggan noted that ACS curriculum is not oriented to any specific discipline.

Recess at 9:39 p.m. Reconvened at 9:48 p.m.

Academic Freedom Committee policy changes (4.17.84.4)

Mr. Rosenbaum presented the Academic Freedom Committee policy changes (4.17.84.4). He noted at the outset of discussion that he understood the document had the okay of the university lawyer and administration. The University lawyer on March 5, 1985, requested to review the proposal for some possible stylistic and substantive change needs.

Mr. Rosenbaum requested withdrawal from consideration at this time. He hopes for an exchange with the lawyer in March. The document will be ready for a new Senate in April.

Mr. Luther and Mr. Rosenbaum lamented preventing this Senate from action. Mr. Rosenbaum noted a March 20 open hearing; he does not want a hearing on an unfinished document.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked what reservations there were. Mr. Rosenbaum referred to a technical objection about treatment of ASPT procedures, for example. Others may be substantive.

Mr. Zeidenstein and Mr. Rosenbaum discussed technicalities of the form of commentaries of lawyer, et al.

Report of the Ad Hoc Resolution Committee (3.6.85.7).

Mr. Eimmermann represented the report.

Mr. Spence noted the document does not meet Senate regulations for bringing items to attention of Senate. He called for its withdrawal.

A recess was called. Reconvened at 10:07 p.m.

Chairperson Gowdy explained events in the production of the committee report.

XVI-123 Motion by Mr. Piland (second, McCracken) to suspend the rules and consider the proposal at this meeting.

Mr. Eimermann spoke in support of the motion. The issue is complicated and needs careful study. His expectation for tonight is to explain the conceptualization and outline of the proposal. A public hearing is scheduled for Tuesday evening, March 19, 1985. Defeat of the motion will effectively preclude consideration of the proposal by this Senate, which well understands the issue and originated the committee. He noted also the need for time for chairs and deans to implement the proposal for the next ASPT cycle. Failure to implement could lead to another administrative action with funds outside the system.

Mr. Spence spoke against the motion. It is a disservice to the faculty to act so swiftly on such substantive and far-reaching changes. Any implementation could begin only with the 1986 ASPT process. The Provost has promised to seek and accept input from the whole campus in this year's ASPT process. Spring break reduces even more the time to study the proposal.

Mr. Pontius sought clarification that receiving the proposals would constitute Information.

Mr. Mohr opposed the motion. He noted contradictions in attitudes toward Senate Rules. He objected to the haste. He objected that the ad hoc committee has not fulfilled its charge in the motion creating it; the committee has arrogated a role not given it.

Ms. Hanlon sought clarification on the proposed public hearing. If the motion is defeated, would the hearing still take place? In Mr. Eimermann's opinion it would. It is to be announced in the forthcoming ISU Report and copies of the committee report are to be available widely.

Mr. Eimermann said the objective tonight is to initiate discussion. The Senate is not obligated to take action at the March 27 meeting. The motion creating the committee had specific charges; the committee easily fulfilled the first two charges. The committee identified itself as appropriate and competent to recommend specific wording of changes. He accepts that the committee went beyond its charge concerning timetable.

Mr. Zeidenstein appreciated earlier objections to the motion. He specifically objected to the argument of urgency to move on the ad hoc committee report. Mr. Eimermann replied that the committee was created in a situation of urgency. He yielded

to Mr. Watkins, who spoke to the effort of the ad hoc committee to address the problem of equity. The committee sought to create an atmosphere of broad give and take. He interpreted Mr. Mohr's statement at the Senate meeting February 20, 1985. He reiterated his position that the ASPT document, section X.A.1, does allow equity adjustment.

Mr. Zeidenstein claimed personal privilege. His interpretation is that the Provost's use of X.A.1 is not justified. He has some strong concerns about the proposal and time is needed for study. He prefers a repetition of last year's equity actions over a hasty adoption of such vast changes.

Mr. Mohr claimed personal privilege. He expressed an interpretation of the working of the ASPT system regarding merit.

Mr. Watkins yielded to Mr. Strand. He senses a growing attitude that the proposal is perceived to be an administration proposal. It is a good-faith proposal borne out of shared governance from a committee composed of four faculty members and two administrators. He projected considerable delay if the proposals are held over to the new Senate, such that implementation may take another year.

Chairperson Gowdy explicated Senate Rules on bringing items to Senate to show the Executive Committee scheduling the Agenda and the assignment of a document number. She ruled that the item is in order on the Agenda.

XVI-124 Mr. Spence moved (second, Balbach) to challenge the ruling of the Chairperson.

Mr. Mohr noted he received the committee report just today. Ms. Balbach supported her second. Spence argued that Senate cannot Action the report, if it is not Information tonight. He pressed for distribution of the report to the whole faculty.

Mr. Spence called the question. Carried voice vote.

Vote on motion. Passed voice vote. Roll call vote called for.

Motion to overturn the Chairperson's ruling carried. The ad hoc committee report is not on the agenda.

McCracken reported further on proposed changes in calendars and guidelines. The committee still requests to withdraw.

XVI-125 Mr. Spence moved (second, Zeidenstein) a Sense of Senate resolution that the ad hoc committee report be distributed to all faculty, and that a public hearing be held on March 26, 1985.

Nelson suggested a cover letter explaining the proposal and identifying the committee members by name and office. Agreed.

The motion carried voice vote.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs. A brief meeting after Senate.

Administrative Affairs. Request that the policy on review of administrators be distributed. Discussion.

Budget. Will meet after Senate.

Faculty Affairs. No report.

Student Affairs. No report.

Rules. Meet Thursday, March 7 at 2:30.

Adjournment

XVI-126 Motion by Mr. Spence (second, Getsi) to adjourn. Senate adjourned at 11:06 p.m.

NAME	ATTEN- DANCE	VOTE						VOICE VOTE	
		MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	Y N
BALBACH	P							XVI-118	X
BEDINGFIELD	ABSENT							XVI-124	X
BELKNAP	P								
BOWEN	P								
CHARNOGORSKY	P								
CHRISTIAN	P								
CLARK	P								
DORE	ABSENT								
EIMERMANN	P								
FORD	ABSENT								
GAMSKY	P								
GETSI	P								
GLEN, R.	ABSENT								
GORDON, G.	ABSENT								
GOWDY	P								
GRAFF	EXCUSED								
HANLON	P								
HARDEN	P								
JAHRIKE	P								
LANDFAIR	ABSENT								
LORBER	EXCUSED								
LUTHER	P								
MARCHIO	ABSENT								
MASON	EXCUSED								
MAYHORN	EXCUSED								
CRACKEN	P								
MOHR	P								
MULCAHY	EXCUSED								
NELSEN	P								
PARR	P								
PETROSSIAN	P								
PILAND	P								
PONTIUS	P								
PRITNER	EXCUSED								
ROSENBAUM	P								
SCHMALTZ	P								
SESSIONS	P								
SHANE	P								
SPENCE	P								
SPENCER	P								
STOKES	P								
STRAND, D	P								
STRAND, K	P								
TALLEY	ABSENT								
TARULIS	EXCUSED								
TAYLOR	P								
TOWNSEND	ABSENT								
WATKINS	P								
WHITCOMB	P								
ZEIDENSTEIN	P								

NAME	ATTEN- DANCE	VOTE						VOICE VOTE		
		MOTION #XVI-118	MOTION #	MOTION # XVI-120	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	Y	N
E BACH	P	YES		YES				XVI-117	X	
BEDINGFIELD	ABSENT	-		-				XVI-118	X	
BELKNAP	P	YES		YES				XVI-119	X	
BOWEN	P	YES		YES				XVI-120	X	
CHARNOGORSKY	P	-		-				XVI-121	X	
CHRISTIAN	P	-		-				XVI-122	X	
CLARK	P	YES		-				XVI-123		
DORE	ABSENT	-		-				XVI-124	X	
EIMERMANN	P	YES		NO				XVI-125	X	
FORD	ABSENT	-		-				XVI-126	X	
GAMSKY	P	YES		NO						
GETSI	P	YES		YES						
GLEN, R.	ABSENT	-		-						
GORDON, G.	ABSENT	-		-						
GOWDY	P	NO		NO						
GRAFF	EXCUSED	-		-						
HANLON	P	YES		YES						
HARDEN	P	YES		NO						
JAHRKE	P	YES		YES						
LANDFAIR	ABSENT	-		-						
LORBER	EXCUSED	-		-						
LUTHER	P	YES		NO						
MARCHIO	ABSENT	-		-						
MASON	EXCUSED	-		-						
MC HORN	EXCUSED	-		-						
MC CRACKEN	P	YES		NO						
MOHR	P	YES		YES						
MULCAHY	EXCUSED	-		-						
NELSEN	P	YES		YES						
PARR	P	PRESENT		YES						
PETROSSIAN	P	PRESENT		-						
PILAND	P	NO		NO						
PONTIUS	P	YES		YES						
PRITNER	EXCUSED	-		-						
ROSENBAUM	P	yES		NO						
SCHMALTZ	P	YES		YES						
SESSIONS	P	NO		NO						
SHANE	P	YES		YES						
SPENCE	P	YES		YES						
SPENCER	P	ABSTAIN		YES						
STOKES	P	YES		YES						
STRAND, D	P	NO		NO						
STRAND, K	P	YES		YES						
TALLEY	ABSENT	-		-						
TARULIS	EXCUSED	-		-						
TAYLOR	P	YES		YES						
TOWNSEND	ABSENT	-		-						
WATKINS	P	NO		NO						
WHITCOMB	P	YES		-						
WIDENSTEIN	P	YES		YES						
		24 YES		18 YES						
		5 NO		11 NO						

VOTING PROCEDURES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Adopted by the Academic Senate, April 21, 1970

1. Nominations shall be made by ballot, by voice, or by other specified procedures.
2. Anyone receiving a majority (i. e. , nominated by at least 50%, plus one, of all persons participating in the nomination) of votes on a nomination ballot is declared elected.

If an election is not complete after step #2, the election will proceed as follows:

3. All persons nominated shall have their names appear on the first ballot unless they decline the nomination.
4. Anyone receiving a majority of votes on the first ballot is declared elected.

Further balloting, if necessary, continues according to the following steps:

On each ballot, the number of candidates will always be double the number of remaining people to be elected; these candidates will be those receiving the highest number of votes cast on the previous ballot. If there is a tie for last place, a larger number of candidates may appear on the ballot.

ELECTION PROCEDURES FOR EXTERNAL COMMITTEES

1. A list of nominees for elections to committees requiring a written ballot (e.g. Academic Freedom, Ethics & Grievance, Panel of Ten, Search Committees, etc.) shall be presented to the Senate one meeting prior to the election session. In cases where members of the Senate are permitted to add nominees, such additions should be made no later than one week prior to election. The Senate Office will mail any such additions to all members of the Senate four days prior to election. The Senate may waive this requirement by a two-thirds vote.
2. Standard Senate balloting procedures shall be followed except that a maximum of three ballots shall be conducted. If vacancies exist after three ballots, the vacancies shall be filled by the nominees receiving the largest number of votes on the third ballot with ties being broken by a coin toss.
3. Administrative appointments to committees requiring Senate ratification should be referred to the Rules Committee prior to being presented to the Academic Senate.

Approved by the Academic Senate on April 1, 1981.

pch



Intra-University Communication

12

March 5, 1985

TO: Academic Senate
FROM: David Pontius, Chairperson
Rules Committee
RE: Recommendations for Appointments to
Honors Council

The following persons are recommended for appointment to the Honors Council:

Carol Thomas Neely, English
Steve Gates, Chemistry

mla

3.5.85.3

12/4

CALENDAR

1986 First Semester

August 18-20	MTW	Registration and program change
August 20	W	Wednesday classes meeting at 4 p.m. or later begin
August 21	R	All other classes begin
September 1	M	Labor Day Holiday
October 18	Sat	First half of semester ends
November 26	W	Thanksgiving vacation begins at 5:30 p.m.
December 1	M	Classes resume
December 8	M	Last day of classes
December 9	T	Reading day
December 10-13&15	WRFSM	Examination period
December 17	W	Grades due at noon

1987 First Semester

August 17-19	MTW	Registration and program change
August 19	W	Wednesday classes meeting at 4 p.m. or later begin
August 20	R	All other classes begin
September 7	M	Labor Day Holiday
October 17	Sat	First half of semester ends
November 25	W	Thanksgiving vacation begins at 5:30 p.m.
November 30	M	Classes resume
December 7	M	Last day of classes
December 8	T	Reading day
December 9-12&14	WRFSM	Examination period
December 16	W	Grades due at noon

Calendar Guidelines



2. A minimum of 750 minutes shall be required for each semester hour of lecture credit and 1500 minutes for each semester hour of laboratory credit excluding the final examination period. Fall and spring classes will be scheduled to allow classes to meet a minimum of 15 times on each day of the week.
3. The fall semester shall begin in August and conclude in December before Christmas. Grades will be due not less than 4 working days before the winter shutdown begins.

Breaks during the fall semester shall be scheduled for Labor Day, Thanksgiving, and a reading day.

3. 5. 85. 4
(Corrections for
2. 27. 85. 3; 2. 27. 85. 4)

Illinois State University

Academic Senate

February 11, 1985

TO: Senate Executive Committee
FROM: David R. Pontius, Chairperson, Rules Committee
RE: Senate Membership Qualifications for Students (1.19.83.2)

The Rules Committee requests that the above business be moved to action at the February 20, 1985 meeting. As a result of comments at the information session, the proposed changes have been modified to answer some of the concerns. The revised qualifications would read:

Section 3.3(c) second sentence

Undergraduate student representatives must be full-time students, have and maintain a 2.3 GPA and not be on disciplinary probation to be eligible for membership on the Academic Senate. Graduate student representatives are required to be full-time students, to have and maintain a 3.2 GPA and not be on disciplinary probation to be eligible for membership on the Academic Senate.

In addition, the Rules Committee recommends that the change become effective before the Spring 1985 elections. The "Petition For Candidacy Information And Instructions" sheets contain the proposed changes so this should not cause undue hardship.

Normal-Bloomington, Illinois
Phone: 309/438-8627

2. 11. 85. 1 (1. 19. 83. 2)

301 Hovey
Normal, Illinois 61761

Illinois State University

Academic Senate

February 11, 1985

TO: Executive Committee

FROM: David R. Pontius, Chairperson, Rules Committee

RE: Voting Procedures of the Academic Senate and Election
Procedures for External Committees (Business Item 10.19.84.2)

The Rules Committee requests that the above business item be moved to action at the February 20, 1985 meeting. The committee recommends that Voting Procedures...become Article 3.5(a) and Election Procedures...become Article 3.5(b).

Normal-Bloomington, Illinois
Phone: 309/438-8627

2. 11. 85. 2 (10.19.84.2)

301 Hovey
Normal, Illinois 61761

JAN 21 1985



Intra-University Communication

January 17, 1985

TO: Senate Executive Committee

FROM: David R. Pontius DR
Chairperson
Rules Committee

RE: Voting Procedures of the Academic Senate
and Election Procedures for External Committees
(Business Item 10.19.84.2)

It has been brought to the attention of the Rules Committee that the Voting Procedures of the Academic Senate, adopted April 20, 1970, and the Elections Procedures for External Committees, approved April 1, 1981, should be part of the Bylaws. Therefore, the Rules Committee requests that the two procedures mentioned above be placed on the Agenda of the February 6th Meeting as information items. If appropriate, the same items should be action items for adoption into the Bylaws of the Academic Senate on February 20, 1985.

1.21.85.1

October 19, 1984

TO: Laura E. Gowdy
Chairperson
Academic Senate

FROM: John K. Boaz
Associate Vice President
Administrative Services



RE: Voting Procedures of the Academic Senate
and Election Procedures for External Committees

In reviewing the University Policy Manual I have decided to remove the "Voting Procedures of the Academic Senate" adopted by the Academic Senate, April 21, 1970. I have done so, because this is a Senate rather than a University procedure.

As I reviewed this procedure and thought about the "Election Procedures for External Committees" approved by the Academic Senate on April 1, 1981, it occurred to me that these two procedures probably should be incorporated into the Bylaws of the Academic Senate. If you agree, then perhaps you would refer this matter to the appropriate committee.

I have enclosed the two procedure statements to which I have referred.

JKB/me

Enclosures