

Illinois State University

## ISU ReD: Research and eData

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

Fall 11-3-1982

### Senate Meeting, November 3, 1982

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

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



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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, November 3, 1982" (1982). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 530.  
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/530>

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)

November 3, 1982

Volume XIV, No. 4

Contents

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of October 13, 1982

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Committee Appointments (10.19.82.2)

Sequence in Industrial Accounting (10.26.82.1)

Scope and Mission Statements - University and College - ISU 1983-1988 Academic Plan (10.28.82.1)

Academic Planning Priorities - ISU 1983-1988 Academic Plan (10.28.82.2)

Changes Proposed by the University Review Committee for Inclusion in the 1983 ASPT Document (3.31.82.1)

Financial Exigency Procedures (10.12.82.1)

Academic Calendar Revision - 1984-1985 (8.30.82.5)

Committee Reports

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)

November 3, 1982

Volume XIV, No. 4

Call to Order

The meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order by Chairperson Tuttle at 7 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

Roll Call

Secretary Varner called the roll and announced that a quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes of October 13, 1982

Mr. Mohr asked that the minutes be corrected, page 6, paragraph 5, to reflect his position that the administration should be given the opportunity to try the four-day week. Also on page 6, Mr. Eggan said his statement that the Senate is a policy setting body (first paragraph) was corrected by the chair who noted the Senate is a policy advising body. In the fourth full paragraph on page 7, Mr. Eggan correct "for-day" to "four-day."

XIV-22

On a motion by Mr. Bedingfield (seconded by Mr. Andrejek) the minutes of the October 13, 1982, meeting were approved as corrected. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Tuttle reported that the Executive Committee had acted tonight to schedule an additional meeting of the Senate on Wednesday, December 1, 1982, at 7 p.m. in the Circus Room. The Executive Committee would meet Tuesday, November 23, at 8 a.m., to set the agenda for the December 1 meeting.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Bruin said screenings for Student Center/Auditorium Board, Entertainment Committee, and Forum Committee would be November 15-17. Student members of the Senate interested in participating in the screenings should contact Mr. Bruin.

Administrators' Remarks

Mr. Strand reported that ISU would have budget hearings before the Illinois Board of Higher Education on Monday, November 8, in Springfield.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Kroner presented the Student Association's nominations for student members of the Dean of the College of Applied Science and Technology Search Committee: Robert Anliker, Industrial Technology; Lisa Carol Bonner, Home Economics; Terald Brue, Agriculture; and Kathy L. McClure, Criminal Justice Sciences. The Senate would elect two members at the November 17 meeting.

The Student Association had made fee increase recommendations to Vice President Gamsky and recommended no increase except for an increase of \$1.50 in the health

service fee.

ACTION ITEMS

- XIV-23 Mr. Brickell, Rules Committee Chairperson, moved approval of the confirmation of Dr. David Tucker, the Provost's appointment, to the Council for Teacher Education to replace Robert Baker who resigned. Dr. Tucker would complete the 1984 term. The motion was seconded by Mr. Eimmermann and passed on a voice vote.
- XIV-24 Mr. Brickell moved approval of the appointment of Mary Charnesky (seconded by Ms. Landre) to a one-year student term on the Library Committee. Ms. Charnesky was in academic good standing and not on disciplinary probation. The motion passed on a voice vote.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Sequence in Industrial Accounting (10.26.82.1)

Mr. Tuttle invited Dr. James Hallam, Department of Accounting Chairperson, and Dr. Everett Israel, Department of Industrial Technology Chairperson, to the table for the discussion.

Dr. Hallam said the sequence would prepare persons for positions in industry. They would gain an understanding of the manufacturing process to better work in the area of costing new products; they would be better prepared to talk with engineers. The sequence would better meet the needs of industry.

Mr. Friedhoff was concerned that the sequence was highly structured. After 104 hours of required courses and 14+ hours to meet University Studies requirements, only two hours were left for electives. Dr. Israel noted that some larger companies could offer a half-year training program with courses that would meet some of the sequence requirements. The program was designed to use courses already available at ISU to serve the needs of business and industry. There are many good courses, but not all the good courses could be fitted into 120 hours. Some compromises were necessary. There are some places where there would be flexibility, depending on which company might be involved.

Mr. Reitan noted that it was a fine program, but he wondered whether it was necessary to keep within 120 hours. One-hundred twenty hours was the minimum at ISU, not the maximum. A sixteen hour load was not unusual. Dr. Hallam responded that the Board of Regents might not accept that. Mr. Tuttle added that he would interpret the 120 hour figure to mean that any program over 120 hours needed strong justification. Mr. Boothe added that one of the definitions of the baccalaureate degree was that it could be finished in four years. Mr. Slan questioned the conclusion that no new anticipated funding was needed for the proposal if students were to come from existing accounting and industrial technology majors. If there were to be 100 new students taking their place it would entail more funding. Mr. Hallam responded that admissions policies could result in cutbacks and could control enrollment of majors.

In response to a question by Mr. Plummer, it was noted that the sequence had been worked out cooperatively between the Accounting and Industrial Technology Departments. Outside industries had been consulted. The proposal had been approved by the Accounting Department Curriculum Committee, the Accounting Department faculty, the College of Business Curriculum Committee, the University Curriculum Committee, and the Academic Affairs Committee. This had been

a two-year process.

Mr. Eggan reported that discussion in the Academic Affairs Committee had centered on the question of tightness of hour requirements and lack of options once a student is in the sequence. The student's choice came in deciding to enter the sequence. Mr. Eggan questioned whether Math 121 could be taken without Math 120, and whether all prerequisite hours were accounted for in the proposed sequence. In response to the concern of how many students could go right into Math 121 without taking Math 120 and also the question of whether students who take 121 can enroll in MAM 100 without taking 120, Dr. Hallam said if students take 121 or 115 they can go directly into MAM 100.

Dr. Israel pointed out, in response to a question regarding the requirement that the last 30 hours had to be taken at ISU, that exceptions to this would be possible if a student was in a program offered by some larger employers. This would allow some flexibility.

Ms. Landre asked if students in this sequence would be prepared to take the CPA exam. Dr. Hallam said they would need to pick up an additional nine hours in such courses as taxes and auditing. Mr. Woodson wondered whether transfer students could take the sequence or whether they would have problems. He also asked about the design of internship programs which might be desirable. Dr. Israel said transfer students would have problems. In answer to Mr. Woodson's second question Dr. Israel said courses such as metalurgy, drafting, could be taken in the "shop" rather than at ISU. Agreement on training and earning credit would be worked out. The program is a variation of the comprehensive major in accounting. One student was currently working in this sequence.

Mr. Ritt thought the College of Business always required the math skills taught in Math 120--finite and linear. Did the College of Business change its policy? Dr. Hallam responded that Math 121 would suffice in place of Math 120.

Mr. Frahm noted that the rationale provided for the sequence was to be sensitive and responsive to the needs of industry. In materials he had recently read, one of the qualifications desired by employers was communication skills. Dr. Hallam responded there was desire on the part of Deere, Caterpillar, and Ford Motors for such a sequence. It had also been recommended by the Advisory Board to the College of Business.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked how much better off students would be if the sequence was approved than the student now going through the program. Mr. Pontius responded that the student going through now was doing it on faith, hoping the sequence would be approved.

Mr. Hallam said the program was laid out so students would know what is going to happen. They would know what they were going to take. The sequence would also be identified on the student's transcript.

Mr. Eimermann asked for clarification on why it was a sequence within a major instead of a major. Mr. Hallam said it was easier to have a sequence approved since a sequence would not have to be approved beyond the Board of Regents.

Mr. Slan commented that based on his experience in advising, few students could take Math 121 without Math 120. He felt a student would have to take Math 120 even though it did not appear on the program.

Scope and Mission Statements - University and College - ISU 1983-1988 Academic Plan (10.28.82.1)

Mr. Tuttle invited Dr. Eugene Jabker, Associate Provost, to the table for the discussion of the next two items.

Dr. Jabker said Section I, Institutional and Collegiate Mission Statements, was developed at the college level and reviewed by the Academic Planning Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee. Section II, Academic Planning Priorities, had been through revisions, many of which the Senate had seen over a seven-month period. Section II had also been reviewed by the Academic Planning Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee. Revised versions, based on the Senate's discussion at this meeting, would be distributed prior to the November 17 meeting. Sections III and IV, Program Reviews and Expanded Program Requests, would come to the Senate as information items on November 17. Work would begin next spring on the 1984-1988 Academic Plan. The College of Arts and Sciences would have a program review.

Mr. Eggen reported that the Academic Affairs Committee had received an earlier draft of Sections I and II two weeks ago, not in time to respond before they were sent to the Senate. The suggestions of the Academic Affairs Committee were, therefore, not included.

Mr. Woodson asked if the wording "best possible undergraduate academic programs complemented by strong graduate programs," was intentional. Dr. Jabker said that the graduate programs were not comparable to the undergraduate programs.

Mr. Friedhoff asked how the university was committed to research. He also asked Dean Nappi, College of Business, to define the word "normally" (page 6). Dean Nappi said that virtually all of the 4,000 students in the college take more than 50% of their courses outside the college. Mr. Friedhoff then asked the Dean what was meant by "traditional" (page 8) in the sentence: "This heightened interest in continuing business education, with its demand for faculty and other resources, appears to be coming at a time when the nation's population dynamics suggest some freeing of resources now being devoted to more traditional forms of undergraduate and graduate education." Dean Nappi asked if he could respond later. Mr. Friedhoff then questioned the statistics on page 11, "In the 1990's, the racial breakdown of students enrolled in K-12 classrooms will be about 28 percent white, 37 percent black, and 42 percent Hispanic." The total came to 107% and no geographic area was specified. The figure did not seem accurate. These figures appeared in the mission statement of the College of Education. Dr. Jabker said they would be checked.

Mr. Reitan felt that while accreditation by a professional association was nice for the College of Business, the important accreditation for the University was the North Central Association accreditation. He felt the wording used gave a false impression (page 6).

Dean Nappi responded to Mr. Friedhoff's earlier question about the meaning of "traditional." He said the college would look at new student populations; a three-two plan for completing the bachelor and master's degrees in five years; and work in areas of continuing education for those now in business.

Mr. Mohr asked how the Needs and Priorities Committee statement fit into this document. Mr. Jabker responded that when work on the statement was completed, it would appear in next year's scope and mission statement. Originally it

was to have been included in this Academic Plan but was not ready. That was the reason for the short Institutional Mission Statement in Section I.

Academic Planning Priorities - ISU 1983-1988 Academic Plan (10.28.82.2)

Under "Curriculum Trends," page 6, Mr. Friedhoff hoped a better word could be found for "productivity." He further asked why the use of temporary faculty was not considered a problem along with financial and enrollment conditions. Temporary contracts are demoralizing. Why is it we do not focus on the systematic reduction of temporary faculty?

Dr. Jabker responded that because it does not appear in the document does not mean there is a lack of concern. It is a complex area. The concentration of problems was limited to the areas of finance and enrollment. Mr. Friedhoff noted that a lot of people do not see it as complicated as the administration does. Dr. Jabker said that in the next five years and beyond, the recruiting of the best faculty is tied to staffing and quality of programs. The absence of a statement on temporary contracts does not mean no concern.

Mr. Schmaltz asked how the reallocation of time from teaching courses to other things would save money. Dr. Jabker responded that it is difficult to have a commitment to research and indirect instruction with a 12-hour teaching load. Reallocation of time was a response to the needs of faculty. The University must have assurances it will not be penalized if internal reallocation is used. Mr. McCracken said if money were moved from direct instruction to research, the graduate program would be even less cost effective. Dr. Jabker said research was charged against departmental research.

In response to a question by Mr. Slan, Dr. Jabker responded that courses taught which might not be essential to the nature of the program for the students could be cut to weed out duplication of course offerings. If the University does not get additional funds from outside sources, this was suggested as a possibility for obtaining funds for research.

Mr. Woodson commented on the reported rigorous academic standards being developed at community colleges. Dr. Jabker said not all junior colleges were improving standards at the same level. It is a statement of general trends.

Mr. Kroner noted that an increase in large enrollment sections might hurt both undergraduate assistants and students.

Mr. Frahm took exception to the statement that many of these financial problems are "beyond the control of anyone." They are under the control of somebody. He felt that faculty do not "recognize" that these problems are beyond the control of anyone. He would like this section rewritten.

Mr. Ritt asked if the University would re-examine the curriculum in the light of what is being done at junior colleges. Would the University rearrange the internal academic plan? Dr. Jabker responded that as we examine some of our programs we could find that some things we do are done at the community college level. If resources for education remain constant over the next few years, some offerings would need to be cut.

Mr. Reitan asked how the trend would affect enrollment? There could be some decrease in the freshman level offerings which could affect the quality and nature of upper level courses.

Mr. Hobbs asked whether fewer students at the lower level would mean a decrease in University Studies offerings. Dr. Jabker said that predicted enrollment declines apparently would not occur. Mr. Brickell wondered if the University should be that concerned about the growth of junior college enrollment when there was not one in our district. Mr. Slan pointed out that in order to increase upper division offerings, the University might need to cut down freshman enrollment. Provost Boothe noted that it was hard to predict how many junior college students would come to ISU.

Mr. Tuttle called for a 5-minutes recess at 9:30 p.m.

Changes Proposed by the University Review Committee for Inclusion in the 1983 ASPT Document (3.31.82.1)

Mr. Tuttle invited Edward S. Meckstroth, University Review Committee Chairperson, and Donald Armstrong, Secretary of the URC, to the table.

Mr. Schmaltz, Faculty Affairs Committee Chairperson, introduced the discussion by yielding to Mr. Meckstroth who read a prepared statement describing the proposed changes and the rationale for the changes. (Appended to these minutes is a summary of the proposed changes prepared by the URC. A copy of the complete text of Mr. Meckstroth's statement is on file in the Senate Office.)

Mr. Schmaltz said the Faculty Affairs Committee conducted open hearings where written and spoken testimony was presented. The Faculty Affairs Committee supported changes 1, 2, 3, and 6 (see appendix), but did not support changes 4 and 5.

Mr. Brickell asked Mr. Schmaltz if the committee based its recommendations on input received at the hearings. What viewpoints were expressed?

Concerning number 5, Mr. Schmaltz responded that faculty in some departments at ISU look at the people in a discipline across the country and feel that all are exceptional. Others asked whether it is fair to have the exceptional merit category when there is no money for merit raises.

Mr. McCracken asked why the CFSC should develop criteria for merit ratings; why should the college have guidelines. Why not use department guidelines? Can faculty members inform the CFSC if they should be considered for an equity review adjustment? There is no appeal procedure if a faculty member is not on the receiving end of equity review funds. How does a faculty member get his/her position reviewed?

Mr. Boothe asked Mr. Schmaltz how many of the 800 faculty who are affected by the ASPT opposed the changes. Mr. Schmaltz said he did not know. Twenty-five came to the hearings; 20 testified. Mr. Slan said one could not conclude that those who came would be the only ones opposed to the changes.

Mr. Frahm said he appreciated the process of establishing what is equitable. It seemed appropriate that somewhere along the line it would be necessary to set guidelines for equity review. He asked for clarification of the change which said CFSC members shall not participate in ASPT deliberations involving their home department. Did it mean they would not be present during any discussion or just for the vote. Mr. Schmaltz said the FAC wanted non involvement to mean they would leave the room.



Mr. Eggan asked if the URC could initiate equity review procedures. Has an equity review ever been successfully completed? Mr. Slan said that equity reviews by the URC in 1977 and 1979 resulted in some people receiving additional money.

Mr. Eimermann asked what the rationale was for DFSC members to leave when faculty from their departments were discussed. Mr. Meckstroth responded that the URC felt this was standard practice. There could be too much input from someone in the same department. The proposed change seemed a cleaner way to handle it.

Mr. McCracken asked how the library was organized for ASPT matters. Mr. Meckstroth said the Director does what the DFSC does in other colleges. Changes would need to be made at the library if the proposed changes were approved.

Mr. Woodson said one alternative considered by the Faculty Affairs Committee was to abolish the merit system until there was money to fund it. It made little sense to operate a merit system if it was separated from money.

Mr. Plummer noted there had also been affirmative action equity reviews. A problem with equity review procedures is that departments could create inequities so money to correct this situation would come in from other sources. The ASPT document should be purposely vague in this regard.

Mr. Eggan asked how many appeals had been handled by the University Appeals Committee. Mr. Meckstroth said the number had been diminishing over the last few years: 1977, 21; 1978, 12; 1979, 9; 1980, 11; 1981, 9. These were tenure and promotion appeals. Mr. Eggan wondered how much time an individual would have to commit to this process. A three-year term might not fit the nature of the UAC. Does it require the same kind of year-to-year carry over as the University Review Committee?

Mr. Mohr felt as long as promotion and tenure were based on merit ratings a faculty member would have to be able to appeal merit ratings. This was provided for in the change.

Mr. Bowen asked how faculty in a department where they think 85% really are exceptional feel about the proposed changes. Mr. Meckstroth said such a situation really was not a merit system.

Mr. Brickell asked if the Faculty Affairs Committee had an alternative to recommend for the proposed change that said "No department shall assign more than 40% of its faculty to the exceptional merit category." Mr. Slan said the proposed changes were amendments to the present document. The committee supported the status quo in this area. It was simply rejecting the proposed amendment to that part of the document.

Ms. Crafts asked if the Faculty Affairs Committee had considered a temporary suspension of merit in times when financial conditions were such that merit raises could not be given. She was also concerned about the possibility that someone who had not received merit increases through the years because of low productivity could suddenly have the salary raised with an equity review.

#### Financial Exigency Procedures (10.12.82.1)

Mr. Tuttle explained that this report was from an ad hoc committee appointed by the Senate and chaired by Mr. Ritt. Mr. Ritt expressed appreciation for

the work of the committee. He particularly wanted to note the contribution of Lucille Holcomb and Bonnie Mohr, Chairpersons of the Administrative-Professional and Civil Service Councils, respectively. All the other members of the committee were members of the Senate.

Mr. Ritt reported that the committee held an open hearing October 11. The materials distributed to the Senate did not address the possibility of the Executive Director requesting the Board to take up the issue of financial exigency. A statement to cover this would be added to section 2.

Concerning Section 3.3.2, Mr. McCracken asked whether temporary women or minorities could be kept over white males. Ms. Varner responded that, according to 3.3.2, no faculty on tenure line may be scheduled for release before any temporary faculty. In response to a question by Mr. Rosenbaum, Mr. Ritt said approved leaves counted toward continuous service.

Mr. Wright asked if a state of financial exigency was anticipated. Mr. Ritt responded that last year the University had to cut \$1.3 million from its asking budget because of conditions similar to exigency. The reductions were made with minimal reduction in teaching personnel. In answer to another question by Mr. Rosenbaum, Mr. Ritt said the DFSC had not been excluded from the groups who would identify key personnel. Departments would have to make the decisions, not just the chairperson. Mr. Rosenbaum felt it would be good to have a statement that would call for departments to have defensible criteria for identifying key personnel. He realized that it was difficult to put such criteria in the document but he felt some were needed.

Mr. Ritt said the committee would welcome advice on developing such criteria. The process called for in the procedures was open and appealable.

Mr. Rosenbaum's last question concerned the proposed composition of the committee, and he wondered if the chair of Academic Affairs Committee could not replace one of the members of the Senate Budget Committee. Mr. Ritt said the 1977 Financial Exigency Committee had the entire Budget Committee of the Senate plus some additional people. This was based on the feeling that it was very important to have as many people on the committee as possible with budget background.

Mr. Slan felt key "position" would be a better word than key "personnel." Mr. Strand responded that this might not work in non-academic areas. Ms. Varner clarified the intent of the ad hoc committee language as the best person available. "Key personnel" was the term used by the Board. Defensible criteria had to be used in identifying the best person. Certain activities have to be maintained.

XIV-25 Mr. Weegar moved to carry the information stage of this item to the next meeting and adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frahm. Mr. Tuttle said the motion was not debatable. As a point of order, it was noted that this item had to be submitted to the Board of Regents and it was important to have the procedures in place as soon as possible.

The motion was defeated on a voice vote.

Mr. Eimermann noted that the University could be faced with a mid-year recision. He asked if the ad hoc committee had considered adding "completion of courses underway" to the reduction criteria. Mr. Ritt said the committee had not. Mr. Schmaltz noted that two-months notification time was called for and the Board did not want the language suggested by Mr. Eimermann in its policy.

Academic Calendar - 1984-1985 (8.30.82.5)

Ms. Crafts, Administrative Affairs Committee Chairperson, introduced this item. She said the Executive Committee had called for the discussion of this item to be limited to the fall of 1984 only and to the technical aspect of changing the date of fall break from October 12 to October 19. The Administrative Affairs Committee had consulted with Gary Davis and Scott Massin and had seen no problem with changing the date to the middle of the fall semester. This would take care of the problem of the conflict with fall break and a home football game. Ms. Crafts said the committee would present a motion to rescind the action of the Senate taken February 25, 1982, and would submit a revised calendar for Senate approval. In response to a question by Ms. Romani, it was pointed out that the change was proposed to eliminate a conflict with fall break and a home football game. Consideration of the elimination of fall break and alternate times for fall break would be separate issues, and would not be considered at this time.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs. Mr. Eggan said the committee would continue to meet at 3 p.m. on Mondays in Hovey 418.

Budget Committee. No report.

Faculty Affairs. Mr. Schmaltz said the next meeting would be November 12 at 3 p.m. in DeGarmo 551. The ASPT document revisions would be on the agenda and the committee would bring it in for action at the November 17 meeting of the Senate.

Executive Committee. Mr. Bruin said the next meeting was November 10 at 8 a.m. in Hovey 308.

Joint University Advisory Committee. Ms. Crafts said the State University Retirement System document prepared by JUAC had been distributed to faculty and staff. She urged a careful reading of the document. She expressed appreciation to the Board staff for covering the cost of printing. Members of university communities would need to take responsibility for getting action groups going.

Rules Committee. Mr. Brickell, Chairperson, said the next meeting would be November 11 at 10 a.m. in DeGarmo 304.

Student Affairs. Ms. Pager, Chairperson, said the committee had approved the proposal to separate the policy and programming functions of the Student Center/Auditorium Board into two separate entities and a proposal would be forwarded to the Executive Committee for approval by the Senate.

Adjournment

XIV-26 On a motion by Mr. Wright (seconded by Mr. Brickell) the meeting adjourned at 11:30 p.m. The motion carried.

For the Academic Senate,

Iris Varner, Secretary



S U M M A R Y  
PROPOSED CHANGES IN ASPT POLICIES

1. ELECTION DEADLINES:

URC/UAC/CFSC--April 15 (I-C)

DFSC--May 1 (I-C)

2. TERM OF OFFICE:

URC--3 years (II-A)

UAC--3 years (III-A)

3. EQUITY REVIEWS:

CFSC/DFSC: Equity reviews will normally be conducted by the CFSC in cooperation with the DFSC. These reviews shall take place when the CFSC determines that such a review would be appropriate. (II-D/IV-E/V-F)

Each CFSC may allow a department to use up to 10% of regular line raise money for equity adjustments if the department shows justification for this need. (IV-E-5/X-A-3)

URC: The URC reserves the right to conduct a University wide equity review whenever it determines that such a review would be appropriate. (II-D)

Reserves may be held back in years in which a University faculty salary equity review is conducted by the URC. (X-A-3)

4. APPEALS:

CFSC: An appeal of a merit decision must be made to the CFSC. (III-C/IV-C/XI)

The CFSC will no longer be required to review department decisions on merit ratings. The CFSC will serve as the appellate body for an appeal of a merit decision.

UAC: The UAC will consider appeals of promotion and tenure decisions only. The entire committee, excluding members from an appellant's department, will hear the appeal. (III-C)

Membership: Each college shall have a minimum of one member on the UAC. Any College with more than one hundred faculty members shall have one additional member for every one hundred faculty members (or major fraction thereof). This is the same procedure used to determine URC membership. (III-A)

5. EVALUATION POLICIES AND SALARY INCREMENT PROCEDURES:

No department shall assign more than 40% of its faculty to the exceptional merit category. (X-B-4)

Each DFSC shall assign not less than 10% nor more than 40% of its salary allocation to the exceptional merit category. (X-B-11)

6. OTHER:

CFSC members shall not participate in ASPT deliberations involving their home departments. (IV-A)