

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Fall 9-23-1987

Senate Meeting September 23, 1987

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 September 23, 1987" (1987). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 523.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/523>

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

September 23, 1987

Volume XIV, No. 3

CONTENTS

Call to Order

Roll Call

Minutes of September 9, 1987

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Approval of Faculty and Student Representatives to Honorary Degree Selection Committee
2. Approval of Members to Search Committee for Assistant Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Instruction
3. Election of Members to Panel of Ten
4. Approval of Academic Standards Committee Chair
5. Approval of Additional Student Appointments to External Committees
6. Approval of SBBB Nomination to Honorary Degree Committee
7. Election of Academic Planning Committee Members
8. Approval of Rules Committee Recommendations for Committee Replacements

INFORMATION ITEMS:

1. Faculty Affairs Committee Proposed Revisions to Faculty Ethics & Grievance Procedures
2. Revisions to Budget Committee Codification for Blue Book

Communications

Committee Reports

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.)

September 23, 1987

Volume XVIV, No. 3

Call to Order

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

Roll Call

Secretary Roof called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Minutes of the September 9, 1987 Academic Senate Meeting

Mr. Watkins had a correction in the first sentence of his remarks on page 5: "Mr. Watkins was supportive of the change and resolution that was just enunciated. He thought that anyone who thinks clearly can distinguish what are partisan and political issues."

Mr. Zeidenstein had several corrections. On page 4, fourth paragraph, second sentence should read: "Also, specific wording should be contained in such amendments." Page 4, paragraph 7, second sentence: "He pointed out that purportedly there are certain issues on which all people of good will, sound mind and reasonably healthy bodies agree."

On page 5, first paragraph, add after last sentence: "[And it has not.]" Fourth paragraph, first sentence, should read: "Mr. Zeidenstein suggested that any statement by an official or representative body that spoke for the institution might be recalled and a statement made that he was not speaking for the entire University." Second sentence should be corrected to read: "That may not be much of a punishment, but then the policy was meant not as punishment for an official, but as a protection for the University." Paragraph 9 should be replaced with: "Mr. Zeidenstein said that he was not against such statements now, after his amendment had been adopted. He added that partisan is probably too broadly defined in the original document."

XVIV-15 Mr. Hamilton moved to approve the Minutes of September 9, 1987 as corrected (Second, Feaster). Motion carried on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Schmaltz stated announced that the Executive Committee had met prior to the Senate meeting and decided to add Rules Committee Recommendations for committee replacements to the Action Items on the Agenda. Paperwork concerning these items is at the Senator's places this evening.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Williams stated that now that the Board of Regents has approved a \$150 tuition increase, it is time for the faculty, students, and administration to come together as one and exert pressure on Governor Thompson to call a special session of the General Assembly in which a revenue enhancement bill

can be passed. Without these measures, additional tuition increases are sure to be forthcoming. The tuition increase issue was one that students fought on their own because the increase was coming directly out of their pockets. Without future revenue enhancement, the faculty and administration will continually receive a lower class of salary increases or none at all. Higher education in Illinois has been suffering greatly, and there is no time better than the present for those involved to take a stance so that the quality of higher education does not fall. In the next few weeks there will be many ways in which we can all come together and express to the Governor the need to call a special session of the General Assembly. To quote President Watkins in his State of the University Address: "We will position ourselves for better times -- and better times for education had better come." Now is the time for better times for education, and I must believe that with a unified front we can bring about better times.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Meiron stated that efforts to persuade the Governor to call a special session to enact revenue enhancement are in the planning stages. There will be a meeting on Monday, September 28th, at 5:00 p.m. in the Circus Room so that we can move forward with what the Vidette called "a day of action". He encouraged all students, faculty members, and members of the administration to attend.

Administrators' Remarks

President Watkins stated that he had prepared a letter that would be sent out to each of the 177 members of the General Assembly, strongly encouraging them to accept the responsibility for providing adequate funding for education in the State of Illinois. We reminded them that we are ninth in the nation according to the article in our local newspaper. In terms of per capita income, according to Dr. Ed Hines of our Center for Higher Education, we rank 35th. This year it will be less. Also included in the letter is a copy of the State of the University address. A great many people are now excited about this issue, though he stated that he wished they had been as enthusiastic last Spring. He deferred to Provost Strand for an answer to Sen. Klass's letter of 9/10/87.

Provost David Strand replied to Dr. Gary Klass's letter of September 10, 1987. In the memo, Senator Klass had asked three questions; he responded to those. (1) Is the University Administration still committed to reducing enrollments to 20,500 within the next five years? Yes, this objective has been reaffirmed by the President, Provost, and the target committee that met within the last two weeks. (2) Who is responsible for the failure of the University to reach its Fall 1987 target of 3,750 new freshmen enrollments? Response: No one. The number of new freshman students was reduced by 198 from the Fall of 1986 to the Fall of 1987. The 3,750 target was exceeded because of the higher number of special admit students than projected: 800 were projected, 1,100 were admitted. Special admit students include honor students, minority students, talent grant recipients, adult learner re-entry students, and athletes. (3) Can you assure the Senate that there will be no increase in enrollments in the Fall of 1988? Answer: No, but additional steps are being taken to limit new freshmen next year. Pooling will begin December 1st rather than January 1st.

Mr. Klass asked why in the State of the University address President Watkins said we plan to decrease total enrollment by four or five percent over the next five years, when in fact that would leave us 500-600 students above that target.

Mr. Watkins explained that when he wrote the State of the University address he did not have the enrollment data for the fall of 1987. In his verbal statement, he corrected that to say "four or five percent or more". He did not change his comments in the printed copy. The figure of 20,500 is still the target.

Vice President for Student Affairs, Neal Gamsky, had no remarks.

Vice President for Business and Finance, Warren Harden, had no remarks.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Approval of One Faculty and One Student Representative to Honorary Degree Selection Committee

XVIV-16 Mr. Borg nominated Senator Marilyn Newby as the faculty representative to the Honorary Degree Selection Committee (Second, Roof). Motion carried on a voice vote.

XVIV-17 Mr. Williams nominated Senator Ray Zinnen as the student representative to the Honorary Degree Selection Committee (Second, Meiron). Motion carried on a voice vote.

2. Approval of Members to Search Committee for Assistant Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Instruction

XVIV-18 Mr. Borg moved the nominations from the Administrative Affairs Committee: Carson Varner, Finance & Law; Pamela Ritch, Theatre, and Keith Stearns, Special Educational Development. (Second, Newby) Motion carried on a voice vote.

XVIV-19 Mr. Williams nominated Senators Alexandria Johnson and Mark Peters to fill the student openings on the committee. (Second, Meiron) Motion carried on a voice vote.

3. Election of Members to Panel of Ten

The Academic Senate elected the following faculty members to serve on the 1987 Administrative Selection Committee Chairperson Panel (Panel of Ten):

Frederick W. Fuess, Agriculture
Mona J. Gardner, Finance & Law
Myrna Hale Garner, Home Economics
Robert Hathway, Mathematics
T. C. Ichniowski, Chemistry
David J. MacDonald, History
Bernard J. McCarney, Economics
George Tuttle, Communication
Iris I. Varner, Business Ed. & Admin. Serv.
Henry J. Zintambila, Geography/Geology

4. Approval of Academic Standards Committee Chair

XVIV-20 Ms. Mills moved approval of Academic Standards Committee Chairperson, Virginia Crafts. (Second, Taylor) Motion carried on a voice vote.

5. Approval of Student Appointments to External Committees

XVIV-21 Mr. Williams moved approval of Student Appointments to External Committees. (Second, Meiron) Motion carried on a voice vote. The following students were approved:

Library Committee

Andrea Davison
Sarah Dixon
Michael Hettinger
Peter Smudde
Sherry Wahl

Council on University Studies

Michelle Williams

S.C.E.R.B.

Raymond P. Long
John J. Tully, Jr. (alternate)

6. Approval of S.B.B.D. Nomination to Honorary Degree Selection Committee

XVIV-22 Mr. Meiron moved approval of the S.B.B.D. Nomination, Ms. Brownwyn Sears, to the Honorary Degree Selection Committee. (Second, Williams) Motion carried on a voice vote.

7. Election of Academic Planning Committee Members

Ms. Mills explained that the Academic Senate was being asked to elect two new members to the Academic Planning Committee. This committee originally had 24 members, but in December of 1984 the Senate approved a resolution to continue for the development of future academic plans with an Academic Planning Staff consisting of: the current and past chair of the Senate; the current and past chairs of the Academic Affairs Committee, the Student Regent, the Assistant Vice President for Academic Planning, the Dean of Graduate Studies, and a representative from the Provost's Office. This committee has a very heavy workload which involves reviewing two drafts of program reviews from each department of the college that is being reviewed. The committee also reviews the mission statements. The problem is that the Chair of the Senate succeeded himself and the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee succeeded herself. The Blue Book of the Senate says if the composition of the committee drops below eight, the Senate will designate a faculty member or members to bring the membership back up to eight. The Academic Affairs Committee polled Senators to see if anyone would be interested in serving. Three members agreed to run for election: Patrick O'Rourke, Judith Roof, and Carroll Taylor.

Mr. Belknap said the Rules Committee reviewed this, and the only question that had come up was whether Academic Senators could serve on this committee. According to the Blue Book it is appropriate for senators to serve. They thought this was a valid and responsible way of placing two members on this committee.

Mr. Klass asked if the two top vote getters would win the election. Mr. Zeidenstein stated that since there were only three names for two spots, he would advise against this. He suggested a clear majority would be in order.

Mr. Schmaltz said that the traditional Senate procedures would be utilized.

Election results:	*Patrick D. O'Rourke, Agriculture	27
	*Judith A. Roof, English	33
	Carroll Taylor, Accounting	10

8. Approval of Rules Committee Recommendations for External Committee Appointments

XVIV-23 Mr. Belknap moved approval of the Rules Committee Recommendations for External Committee Appointments. (Second, Williams) Motion carried on a voice vote.

Nominations for Athletic Council

Thomas Baer, Curriculum & Instruction
 Carol Chrisman, Applied Computer Science
 Jim Grimm, Marketing
 Sam Mungo, Curriculum & Instruction
 Rod Riegel, Educational Admin. & Foundations
 Beth Verner, Health, Physical Education & Dance
 Douglas X. West, Chemistry

Council on University Studies

Paul Walker, Agriculture (1988 term)

Economic Well Being Committee

Ken Crepas, Finance & Law (1990 term)

S.C.E.R.B. Hearing Panel

Sandy Little, HPERD (1988 term)

Reinstatement Committee

Myrna Garner, Home Economics (1988 term)
 Masoud Hemmasi, MQM (1989 term)

Faculty Ethics & Grievance Committee

(elected alternates)
 Manhar Thakore, Milner Library (1989)
 Sadreddin Hassani, Physics (1990)

Academic Freedom Committee

(elected alternate)
 Robert Townsend, Milner Library (1990)

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Faculty Affairs Committee Proposed Revisions to Faculty Ethics and Grievance Procedures

Mr. O'Rourke, Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee, introduced the revised Faculty Ethics and Grievance Procedures for information. The document had been in committee for quite some time and was being rewritten for clarity and to conform with other university documents. He apologized for not having a copy of the original document included, and this would be distributed to senators later. In terms of substantial changes, a description of and procedures for the appeals committee had been added, and the exclusion of licensed attorneys as advisors for faculty members had been added. Two proposed appendices were included with the document: (1) the flow chart, and (2) the Code of Ethics. Also enclosed is a proposed amendment and rationale by Gary Klass.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked if the inclusion of the Klass amendment meant that it was being recommended by the committee. According to Mr. O'Rourke's opening comments, it was not. Mr. Zeidenstein asked if the committee had come to any decision about the Klass amendment?

Mr. O'Rourke stated that it was fairly clear that Senator Klass would submit his amendment without committee endorsement. The committee was not in agreement about the amendment, so they forwarded it with no recommendation.

Mr. Zeidenstein thought this left the Senate uninformed as how the experts on the subject, the Faculty Affairs Committee, felt about it. He thought that committees should, as a general rule, come to a decision and give the Senate the considered voting judgement of a subject matter committee before it comes to the Senate. The matter should be accepted or rejected by the committee so that the Senate would have a clue about the recommendation for or against it.

XVIV-24 Mr. Zeidenstein moved that the information item on the Proposed Revisions to Faculty Ethics and Grievance Procedures be recommitted back to the Faculty Affairs Committee so that the committee can give the Senate a document showing more clearly what changes have been made from the original version to the new version. This document should be submitted later with appropriate changes clearly outlined. (Second, Insel).

Mr. Mottram suggested an acceptable form that had been used in documents in the past where changes were underlined.

Mr. Schmaltz said that the problem with this document was that portions had been moved around and rewritten: underlining would be hard to follow.

Mr. Strand asked if the motion would preclude the committee from examining other suggested changes in the document. Could senators submit changes to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Mr. Schmaltz said that would be permissible.

Mr. Klass asked if there was a deadline for getting this into the Faculty Handbook. Mr. O'Rourke answered that it would go into the next printing of the Faculty Handbook if it missed the current issue.

Mr. Belknap was opposed to recommitting the proposed revisions. He felt that the committee could elect not to make a recommendation on an item. He asked if the Faculty Affairs Committee had reviewed Senator Klass's amendment. Mr. O'Rourke said, yes, they had reviewed the amendment, but chose not to make a recommendation. He said the committee had not reached agreement on the amendment. If adopted, it would make significant changes in the document.

Mr. Strand stated that if the committee wished to bring this amendment before the Senate without a recommendation again, the Senate should be advised as to how it will reconcile the membership criteria of the FEGC.

Mr. Zeidenstein stated that the purpose of his recommit motion was not the issue of the Klass amendment. The purpose was to clearly understand the changes being made in the document.

Mr. Klass said that the purpose of this session was to present the item for information. Mr. Zeidenstein had this meeting to ask questions and two weeks to read and understand the document and see how he wishes to vote. He saw no reason to recommit the item. He thought the item could be voted on at the next meeting.

Mr. Zeidenstein stated that the practice of the Senate has been on any major document revisions that they have been presented in such a manner as to clearly see what is being changed.

(XVIV-24) Vote on motion to recommit the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Procedure Revisions to the Faculty Affairs Committee carried on a voice vote.

Mr. O'Rourke asked for input from senators as to proposed changes in the document.

2. Revision of Budget Committee Codification for Blue Book

Mr. DeLong, Chair of the Budget Committee, explained the revisions to the Budget Committee Codification of the Blue Book. These changes had primarily been formulated by the previous budget committee. Included in Senators' packets was a copy of the existing budget committee codification. Several changes had been made. To his knowledge, there had been no Budget Team for three or four years. As stated in the explanation sheet, the revision of the committee functions are: to eliminate outdated procedures; to make the Budget Committee responsible for duties that it could reasonably be expected to do, and to make some duties more specific. They have not added new functions, just revised the existing functions. The former chair of the Budget Committee, David Ramsey, said that the Budget Committee would be looking at proposals for budgetary implications. Sometimes everything is passed, and then the Budget Office finds budgetary impacts that were not seen at first.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked if his proposed suggested amendments had been considered by the Budget Committee. Mr. DeLong's answer was no. Had the committee made any decisions on these proposed changes. Mr. DeLong answered no. The draft copy drops 4. c. "the use of funds other than General Revenue relating to all aspects of the university." You removed from your proposed revision any consideration of any source of funds other than General Revenue funds. Why?

Mr. DeLong said that this was excluded for two reasons. The non-general revenue aspect is seldom discussed by the Senate. This includes student fees which go through student fee boards, grants which are handled by departments, etc. There is nothing in the proposed function that precludes the Senate from considering non-general revenue funds. Paragraph three of the explanation sheet states: "...whereas the Budget Committee considers the cost-side; any ranking should be made on the basis of both benefits and costs."

Mr. Harden reinforced what Mr. DeLong had said. The Budget Committee does not get into questions other than General Revenue Funds. Other funds from a myriad of accounts, such as agency, student fees, bond revenue funds, restricted funds, etc. are so numerous that they could not possibly be covered. It is all it can handle for the Budget Committee to consider General Revenue portion of the budget.

Mr. Klass asked if there were other standing committees that report through the Budget Committee. Mr. DeLong answered, No.

Mr. Klass asked about the matter of evaluating NEPR's, was this an important function for this committee to serve, other than seeing that the numbers were in the right format. Does the Budget Committee consider any serious policy matters, or is it just a question of format?

Mr. DeLong said what they examine is basically format. They reviewed the budgetary aspects of new programs. They look at a number of areas closely. enrollment projections, areas that will be affected, possible implications on the college, etc.

Mr. Strand stated that at one time the Senate Budget Committee raised questions about the level of funding requested in the new program request. It is not unusual for a department to pare down a budget request to a minimum level in order that it does not appear that the amount of money needed for a program does not become an obstacle for approval. In one instance, the Budget Committee in making an analysis of the financial request found that it was too conservative, therefore as a result of negotiations, the budget line was raised to a more realistic level. The Budget Committee has recommended to the Senate on NEPRs on being approved by the Senate, not be offered until funding came from the General Assembly. There had been a period of time when programs had been approved and the department tried to offer them while re-allocating resources.

Mr. Taylor said as a member of the Budget Committee, he felt they were more of a communicator to the Senate rather than being in the position of to make decisions.

COMMUNICATIONS

Senator Roof stated that she had a letter to the Parking Committee suggesting several improvements in faculty parking policy. Those who were interested in reviewing the letter or signing it could see her after the meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs Committee - Ms. Mills announced that her committee had been considering several matters: Council for Teacher Education Bylaws; a Proposal for Master of Science in Geo-hydrology; a Review of the Oral English Language Proficiency Report; and a review of the Academic Planning Process. She announced a brief meeting following Senate.

Administrative Affairs Committee - Mr. Borg had no report.

Budget Committee - Mr. DeLong reported that his committee was also considering the M.S. in Geo-hydrology. They would have a meeting following Senate.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Mr. O'Rourke announced a meeting after Senate adjourned.

Rules Committee - Mr. Belknap asked his committee to get together after Senate.

Student Affairs Committee - No report.

XVIV-25

Mr. Williams moved to adjourn (Second, Mottram). Motion carried on a voice vote. The meeting of the Academic Senate adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JUDITH A. ROOF, SECRETARY

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

September 23, 1987

Volume XIV, No. 3

CONTENTS

Call to Order

Roll Call

Minutes of September 9, 1987

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Approval of Faculty and Student Representatives to Honorary Degree Selection Committee
2. Approval of Members to Search Committee for Assistant Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Instruction
3. Election of Members to Panel of Ten
4. Approval of Academic Standards Committee Chair
5. Approval of Additional Student Appointments to External Committees
6. Approval of SBBB Nomination to Honorary Degree Committee
7. Election of Academic Planning Committee Members
8. Approval of Rules Committee Recommendations for Committee Replacements

INFORMATION ITEMS:

1. Faculty Affairs Committee Proposed Revisions to Faculty Ethics & Grievance Procedures
2. Revisions to Budget Committee Codification for Blue Book

Communications

Committee Reports

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.)

September 23, 1987

Volume XVIV, No. 3

Call to Order

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

Roll Call

Secretary Roof called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Minutes of the September 9, 1987 Academic Senate Meeting

Mr. Watkins had a correction in the first sentence of his remarks on page 5: "Mr. Watkins was supportive of the change and resolution that was just enunciated. He thought that anyone who thinks clearly can distinguish what are partisan and political issues."

Mr. Zeidenstein had several corrections. On page 4, fourth paragraph, second sentence should read: "Also, specific wording should be contained in such amendments." Page 4, paragraph 7, second sentence: "He pointed out that purportedly there are certain issues on which all people of good will, sound mind and reasonably healthy bodies agree."

On page 5, first paragraph, add after last sentence: "[And it has not.]" Fourth paragraph, first sentence, should read: "Mr. Zeidenstein suggested that any statement by an official or representative body that spoke for the institution might be recalled and a statement made that he was not speaking for the entire University." Second sentence should be corrected to read: "That may not be much of a punishment, but then the policy was meant not as punishment for an official, but as a protection for the University." Paragraph 9 should be replaced with: "Mr. Zeidenstein said that he was not against such statements now, after his amendment had been adopted. He added that partisan is probably too broadly defined in the original document."

XVIV-15 Mr. Hamilton moved to approve the Minutes of September 9, 1987 as corrected (Second, Feaster). Motion carried on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Schmaltz stated announced that the Executive Committee had met prior to the Senate meeting and decided to add Rules Committee Recommendations for committee replacements to the Action Items on the Agenda. Paperwork concerning these items is at the Senator's places this evening.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Williams stated that now that the Board of Regents has approved a \$150 tuition increase, it is time for the faculty, students, and administration to come together as one and exert pressure on Governor Thompson to call a special session of the General Assembly in which a revenue enhancement bill

can be passed. Without these measures, additional tuition increases are sure to be forthcoming. The tuition increase issue was one that students fought on their own because the increase was coming directly out of their pockets. Without future revenue enhancement, the faculty and administration will continually receive a lower class of salary increases or none at all. Higher education in Illinois has been suffering greatly, and there is no time better than the present for those involved to take a stance so that the quality of higher education does not fall. In the next few weeks there will be many ways in which we can all come together and express to the Governor the need to call a special session of the General Assembly. To quote President Watkins in his State of the University Address: "We will position ourselves for better times -- and better times for education had better come." Now is the time for better times for education, and I must believe that with a unified front we can bring about better times.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Meiron stated that efforts to persuade the Governor to call a special session to enact revenue enhancement are in the planning stages. There will be a meeting on Monday, September 28th, at 5:00 p.m. in the Circus Room so that we can move forward with what the Vidette called "a day of action". He encouraged all students, faculty members, and members of the administration to attend.

Administrators' Remarks

President Watkins stated that he had prepared a letter that would be sent out to each of the 177 members of the General Assembly, strongly encouraging them to accept the responsibility for providing adequate funding for education in the State of Illinois. We reminded them that we are ninth in the nation according to the article in our local newspaper. In terms of per capita income, according to Dr. Ed Hines of our Center for Higher Education, we rank 35th. This year it will be less. Also included in the letter is a copy of the State of the University address. A great many people are now excited about this issue, though he stated that he wished they had been as enthusiastic last Spring. He deferred to Provost Strand for an answer to Sen. Klass's letter of 9/10/87.

Provost David Strand replied to Dr. Gary Klass's letter of September 10, 1987. In the memo, Senator Klass had asked three questions; he responded to those. (1) Is the University Administration still committed to reducing enrollments to 20,500 within the next five years? Yes, this objective has been reaffirmed by the President, Provost, and the target committee that met within the last two weeks. (2) Who is responsible for the failure of the University to reach its Fall 1987 target of 3,750 new freshmen enrollments? Response: No one. The number of new freshman students was reduced by 198 from the Fall of 1986 to the Fall of 1987. The 3,750 target was exceeded because of the higher number of special admit students than projected: 800 were projected, 1,100 were admitted. Special admit students include honor students, minority students, talent grant recipients, adult learner re-entry students, and athletes. (3) Can you assure the Senate that there will be no increase in enrollments in the Fall of 1988? Answer: No, but additional steps are being taken to limit new freshmen next year. Pooling will begin December 1st rather than January 1st.

Mr. Klass asked why in the State of the University address President Watkins said we plan to decrease total enrollment by four or five percent over the next five years, when in fact that would leave us 500-600 students above that target.

Mr. Watkins explained that when he wrote the State of the University address he did not have the enrollment data for the fall of 1987. In his verbal statement, he corrected that to say "four or five percent or more". He did not change his comments in the printed copy. The figure of 20,500 is still the target.

Vice President for Student Affairs, Neal Gamsky, had no remarks.

Vice President for Business and Finance, Warren Harden, had no remarks.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Approval of One Faculty and One Student Representative to Honorary Degree Selection Committee

XVIV-16 Mr. Borg nominated Senator Marilyn Newby as the faculty representative to the Honorary Degree Selection Committee (Second, Roof). Motion carried on a voice vote.

XVIV-17 Mr. Williams nominated Senator Ray Zinnen as the student representative to the Honorary Degree Selection Committee (Second, Meiron). Motion carried on a voice vote.

2. Approval of Members to Search Committee for Assistant Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Instruction

XVIV-18 Mr. Borg moved the nominations from the Administrative Affairs Committee: Carson Varner, Finance & Law; Pamela Ritch, Theatre, and Keith Stearns, Special Educational Development. (Second, Newby) Motion carried on a voice vote.

XVIV-19 Mr. Williams nominated Senators Alexandria Johnson and Mark Peters to fill the student openings on the committee. (Second, Meiron) Motion carried on a voice vote.

3. Election of Members to Panel of Ten

The Academic Senate elected the following faculty members to serve on the 1987 Administrative Selection Committee Chairperson Panel (Panel of Ten):

Frederick W. Fuess, Agriculture
Mona J. Gardner, Finance & Law
Myrna Hale Garner, Home Economics
Robert Hathway, Mathematics
T. C. Ichniowski, Chemistry
David J. MacDonald, History
Bernard J. McCarney, Economics
George Tuttle, Communication
Iris I. Varner, Business Ed. & Admin. Serv.
Henry J. Zintambila, Geography/Geology

4. Approval of Academic Standards Committee Chair

XVIV-20 Ms. Mills moved approval of Academic Standards Committee Chairperson, Virginia Crafts. (Second, Taylor) Motion carried on a voice vote.

5. Approval of Student Appointments to External Committees

XVIV-21 Mr. Williams moved approval of Student Appointments to External Committees. (Second, Meiron) Motion carried on a voice vote. The following students were approved:

Library Committee

Andrea Davison
Sarah Dixon
Michael Hettinger
Peter Smudde
Sherry Wahl

Council on University Studies

Michelle Williams

S.C.E.R.B.

Raymond P. Long
John J. Tully, Jr. (alternate)

6. Approval of S.B.B.D. Nomination to Honorary Degree Selection Committee

XVIV-22 Mr. Meiron moved approval of the S.B.B.D. Nomination, Ms. Brownwyn Sears, to the Honorary Degree Selection Committee. (Second, Williams) Motion carried on a voice vote.

7. Election of Academic Planning Committee Members

Ms. Mills explained that the Academic Senate was being asked to elect two new members to the Academic Planning Committee. This committee originally had 24 members, but in December of 1984 the Senate approved a resolution to continue for the development of future academic plans with an Academic Planning Staff consisting of: the current and past chair of the Senate; the current and past chairs of the Academic Affairs Committee, the Student Regent, the Assistant Vice President for Academic Planning, the Dean of Graduate Studies, and a representative from the Provost's Office. This committee has a very heavy workload which involves reviewing two drafts of program reviews from each department of the college that is being reviewed. The committee also reviews the mission statements. The problem is that the Chair of the Senate succeeded himself and the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee succeeded herself. The Blue Book of the Senate says if the composition of the committee drops below eight, the Senate will designate a faculty member or members to bring the membership back up to eight. The Academic Affairs Committee polled Senators to see if anyone would be interested in serving. Three members agreed to run for election: Patrick O'Rourke, Judith Roof, and Carroll Taylor.

Mr. Belknap said the Rules Committee reviewed this, and the only question that had come up was whether Academic Senators could serve on this committee. According to the Blue Book it is appropriate for senators to serve. They thought this was a valid and responsible way of placing two members on this committee.

Mr. Klass asked if the two top vote getters would win the election. Mr. Zeidenstein stated that since there were only three names for two spots, he would advise against this. He suggested a clear majority would be in order.

Mr. Schmaltz said that the traditional Senate procedures would be utilized.

Election results: *Patrick D. O'Rourke, Agriculture	27
*Judith A. Roof, English	33
Carroll Taylor, Accounting	10

B. Approval of Rules Committee Recommendations for External Committee Appointments

XVIV-23 Mr. Belknap moved approval of the Rules Committee Recommendations for External Committee Appointments. (Second, Williams) Motion carried on a voice vote.

Nominations for Athletic Council

Thomas Baer, Curriculum & Instruction
 Carol Chrisman, Applied Computer Science
 Jim Grimm, Marketing
 Sam Mungo, Curriculum & Instruction
 Rod Riegel, Educational Admin. & Foundations
 Beth Verner, Health, Physical Education & Dance
 Douglas X. West, Chemistry

Council on University Studies

Paul Walker, Agriculture (1988 term)

Economic Well Being Committee

Ken Crepas, Finance & Law (1990 term)

S.C.E.R.B. Hearing Panel

Sandy Little, HPERD (1988 term)

Reinstatement Committee

Myrna Garner, Home Economics (1988 term)
 Masoud Hemmasi, MQM (1989 term)

Faculty Ethics & Grievance Committee

(elected alternates)
 Manhar Thakore, Milner Library (1989)
 Sadreddin Hassani, Physics (1990)

Academic Freedom Committee

(elected alternate)
 Robert Townsend, Milner Library (1990)

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Faculty Affairs Committee Proposed Revisions to Faculty Ethics and Grievance Procedures

Mr. O'Rourke, Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee, introduced the revised Faculty Ethics and Grievance Procedures for information. The document had been in committee for quite some time and was being rewritten for clarity and to conform with other university documents. He apologized for not having a copy of the original document included, and this would be distributed to senators later. In terms of substantial changes, a description of and procedures for the appeals committee had been added, and the exclusion of licensed attorneys as advisors for faculty members had been added. Two proposed appendices were included with the document: (1) the flow chart, and (2) the Code of Ethics. Also enclosed is a proposed amendment and rationale by Gary Klass.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked if the inclusion of the Klass amendment meant that it was being recommended by the committee. According to Mr. O'Rourke's opening comments, it was not. Mr. Zeidenstein asked if the committee had come to any decision about the Klass amendment?

Mr. O'Rourke stated that it was fairly clear that Senator Klass would submit his amendment without committee endorsement. The committee was not in agreement about the amendment, so they forwarded it with no recommendation.

Mr. Zeidenstein thought this left the Senate uninformed as how the experts on the subject, the Faculty Affairs Committee, felt about it. He thought that committees should, as a general rule, come to a decision and give the Senate the considered voting judgement of a subject matter committee before it comes to the Senate. The matter should be accepted or rejected by the committee so that the Senate would have a clue about the recommendation for or against it.

XVIV-24

Mr. Zeidenstein moved that the information item on the Proposed Revisions to Faculty Ethics and Grievance Procedures be recommitted back to the Faculty Affairs Committee so that the committee can give the Senate a document showing more clearly what changes have been made from the original version to the new version. This document should be submitted later with appropriate changes clearly outlined. (Second, Insel).

Mr. Mottram suggested an acceptable form that had been used in documents in the past where changes were underlined.

Mr. Schmaltz said that the problem with this document was that portions had been moved around and rewritten: underlining would be hard to follow.

Mr. Strand asked if the motion would preclude the committee from examining other suggested changes in the document. Could senators submit changes to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Mr. Schmaltz said that would be permissible.

Mr. Klass asked if there was a deadline for getting this into the Faculty Handbook. Mr. O'Rourke answered that it would go into the next printing of the Faculty Handbook if it missed the current issue.

Mr. Belknap was opposed to recommitting the proposed revisions. He felt that the committee could elect not to make a recommendation on an item. He asked if the Faculty Affairs Committee had reviewed Senator Klass's amendment. Mr. O'Rourke said, yes, they had reviewed the amendment, but chose not to make a recommendation. He said the committee had not reached agreement on the amendment. If adopted, it would make significant changes in the document.

Mr. Strand stated that if the committee wished to bring this amendment before the Senate without a recommendation again, the Senate should be advised as to how it will reconcile the membership criteria of the FEGC.

Mr. Zeidenstein stated that the purpose of his recommit motion was not the issue of the Klass amendment. The purpose was to clearly understand the changes being made in the document.

Mr. Klass said that the purpose of this session was to present the item for information. Mr. Zeidenstein had this meeting to ask questions and two weeks to read and understand the document and see how he wishes to vote. He saw no reason to recommit the item. He thought the item could be voted on at the next meeting.

Mr. Zeidenstein stated that the practice of the Senate has been on any major document revisions that they have been presented in such a manner as to clearly see what is being changed.

(XVIV-24) Vote on motion to recommit the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Procedure Revisions to the Faculty Affairs Committee carried on a voice vote.

Mr. O'Rourke asked for input from senators as to proposed changes in the document.

2. Revision of Budget Committee Codification for Blue Book

Mr. DeLong, Chair of the Budget Committee, explained the revisions to the Budget Committee Codification of the Blue Book. These changes had primarily been formulated by the previous budget committee. Included in Senators' packets was a copy of the existing budget committee codification. Several changes had been made. To his knowledge, there had been no Budget Team for three or four years. As stated in the explanation sheet, the revision of the committee functions are: to eliminate outdated procedures; to make the Budget Committee responsible for duties that it could reasonably be expected to do, and to make some duties more specific. They have not added new functions, just revised the existing functions. The former chair of the Budget Committee, David Ramsey, said that the Budget Committee would be looking at proposals for budgetary implications. Sometimes everything is passed, and then the Budget Office finds budgetary impacts that were not seen at first.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked if his proposed suggested amendments had been considered by the Budget Committee. Mr. DeLong's answer was no. Had the committee made any decisions on these proposed changes. Mr. DeLong answered no. The draft copy drops 4. c. "the use of funds other than General Revenue relating to all aspects of the university." You removed from your proposed revision any consideration of any source of funds other than General Revenue funds. Why?

Mr. DeLong said that this was excluded for two reasons. The non-general revenue aspect is seldom discussed by the Senate. This includes student fees which go through student fee boards, grants which are handled by departments, etc. There is nothing in the proposed function that precludes the Senate from considering non-general revenue funds. Paragraph three of the explanation sheet states: "...whereas the Budget Committee considers the cost-side; any ranking should be made on the basis of both benefits and costs."

Mr. Harden reinforced what Mr. DeLong had said. The Budget Committee does not get into questions other than General Revenue Funds. Other funds from a myriad of accounts, such as agency, student fees, bond revenue funds, restricted funds, etc. are so numerous that they could not possibly be covered. It is all it can handle for the Budget Committee to consider General Revenue portion of the budget.

Mr. Klass asked if there were other standing committees that report through the Budget Committee. Mr. DeLong answered, No.

Mr. Klass asked about the matter of evaluating NEPR's, was this an important function for this committee to serve, other than seeing that the numbers were in the right format. Does the Budget Committee consider any serious policy matters, or is it just a question of format?

Mr. DeLong said what they examine is basically format. They reviewed the budgetary aspects of new programs. They look at a number of areas closely. enrollment projections, areas that will be affected, possible implications on the college, etc.

Mr. Strand stated that at one time the Senate Budget Committee raised questions about the level of funding requested in the new program request. It is not unusual for a department to pare down a budget request to a minimum level in order that it does not appear that the amount of money needed for a program does not become an obstacle for approval. In one instance, the Budget Committee in making an analysis of the financial request found that it was too conservative, therefore as a result of negotiations, the budget line was raised to a more realistic level. The Budget Committee has recommended to the Senate on NEPRs on being approved by the Senate, not be offered until funding came from the General Assembly. There had been a period of time when programs had been approved and the department tried to offer them while re-allocating resources.

Mr. Taylor said as a member of the Budget Committee, he felt they were more of a communicator to the Senate rather than being in the position of to make decisions.

COMMUNICATIONS

Senator Roof stated that she had a letter to the Parking Committee suggesting several improvements in faculty parking policy. Those who were interested in reviewing the letter or signing it could see her after the meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs Committee - Ms. Mills announced that her committee had been considering several matters: Council for Teacher Education Bylaws; a Proposal for Master of Science in Geo-hydrology; a Review of the Oral English Language Proficiency Report; and a review of the Academic Planning Process. She announced a brief meeting following Senate.

Administrative Affairs Committee - Mr. Borg had no report.

Budget Committee - Mr. DeLong reported that his committee was also considering the M.S. in Geo-hydrology. They would have a meeting following Senate.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Mr. O'Rourke announced a meeting after Senate adjourned.

Rules Committee - Mr. Belknap asked his committee to get together after Senate.

Student Affairs Committee - No report.

XVIV-25

Mr. Williams moved to adjourn (Second, Mottram). Motion carried on a voice vote. The meeting of the Academic Senate adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JUDITH A. ROOF, SECRETARY

