

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Summer 8-29-1990

Senate Meeting, August 29, 1990

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, August 29, 1990" (1990). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 573.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/573>

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

August 29, 1990

Volume XXII, No. 1

Call to Order

Seating of New Senators

Roll Call

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Approval of January-June Academic Senate Meeting Calendar
2. Ratification of Civil Service Representative to JUAC
3. Election of Students to Athletic Council
4. Election of Student and Faculty Senators to Honorary Degree Committee
5. Ratification of SBBB Nominee to Honorary Degree Committee
6. Approval of Council for Teacher Education Appointments

INFORMATION ITEM:

Faculty Affairs Committee Proposal for Change in ASPT Document

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussions 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)

August 29, 1990

Volume XXII, No. 1

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:06 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

SEATING OF NEW SENATORS

Chairperson Schmaltz introduced two new senators: Timothy Schurman, the new Student Regent, who is a Social Science/Teacher Education major; and Dr. Lloyd Hulit of the Speech Pathology and Audiology Department, who is replacing Mel Goldstein.

ROLL CALL

Secretary Jan Johnson called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Approval of Minutes of April 25, May 2, June 12, and July 11 Academic Senate Meetings

Dr. Schmaltz explained that there had been no quorum for the past three meetings, so approval of the Minutes back to April would be necessary.

XXII-1 Motion to approve the Minutes of April 25, May 2, June 12, and July 11 Academic Senate Meetings by Senator Zeidenstein (Second, Tuttle) carried on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson Schmaltz welcomed senators back for the Fall Semester.

He announced that the Parliamentarian for the Senate for the past six years, Ira Cohen, resigned because of commitments he will have on Wednesday evenings this year. We have tried, desperately, to find a replacement without success. As a result, we have no Parliamentarian this evening. Hopefully, there will be no controversial issues on the Agenda. If any Senators, particularly members of the faculty, know anyone skilled in parliamentary procedure, who might volunteer to serve as our Parliamentarian, please contact the Senate Office.

I realize that we have experts on parliamentary procedure on the Senate, but I have been told by the former Parliamentarian that you cannot be a senator and Parliamentarian at the same time because of the conflict of interest. If you have possible names, please let us know.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson Eric Raucci asked student senators to hand in their Fall Schedules as soon as possible.

Student Body President's Remarks

Student Body President Terrence Sykes stated that awhile back we had Karen Arnold the Student Rights Director of the SBBB speak at a Senate meeting regarding a survey of faculty members regarding student evaluations. I just wanted to let you know that we sent out over one thousand surveys to faculty and staff and had very poor response. The word "apathy" is used regarding students -- I didn't know whether to say that about faculty or not. I didn't care whether the responses were yes or no, what we wanted to do was get a feeling for what kind of participation we would get. We took the surveys and envelopes to the department offices and even said we would come to pick them up, and still received a poor response. Out of the one thousand surveys, we received close to 150 responses. The faculty on the Senate represent the entire ISU faculty, so I wanted to let you know that we at the SBBB are pretty disappointed in the ISU faculty, for failure to respond to our survey.

Administrators' Remarks

President Wallace, and Provost Strand are entertaining the Ambassador from Thailand because we have an educational exchange with Thailand. It is an important academic affair, so they have excused absences.

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

Vice President for Business and Finance, James Alexander, had no remarks.

Action Items

1. January-June 1991 Academic Senate Meeting Calendar

Senator Zeidenstein: Do any of these meetings fall on Tuesday?
Answer: No.

Chairperson Schmaltz: There is a typographical error for the January Meeting -- it should read January 30, 1991.

XXII-2 Senator Taylor moved to approve the January-June 1991 Academic Senate Meeting Calendar (Second, Ritch). Motion carried on a voice vote.

2. Ratification of Civil Service Representative to JUAC

Chairperson Schmaltz: We have a letter from the Chairperson of the Civil Service Council nominating Leon Toepke for a three year term as Civil Service Representative to the Joint University Advisory Committee of the Board of Regents. Leon has served a previous term on JUAC.

XXII-3 Senator Walker moved approval of this nomination (Second, Johnson). Motion carried on a voice vote.

3. Election of Students to the Athletic Council

Chairperson Schmaltz: The third action item is the election of students to the Athletic Council. A ballot is included in your packet. In the past the Academic Senate nominated people for the Athletic Council, including students, and the President appointed them. According to previous bylaws, the Senate had to send the President at least two names for each person elected. If two members of the Council were to be elected, the Senate forwarded four names, and the President appointed two members. With the change in the Athletic Council Bylaws, we asserted our independence, and said that the Senate would directly elect members to the Athletic Council. The Bylaws say that we will "elect" members to the Athletic Council. We are to elect two student athletes, one male and one female. For this, the Athletic Department provided us with four names with some biographical information on each of those students. We are also to elect two non-athletes to the Athletic Council. The SBBB has provided us with two names. Some biographical information is included in their letter of nomination. We discussed this at the Executive Committee meeting. One could argue that this is like an Iraqi election, with only two candidates from which to elect two members. The Constitution says nothing about the number of candidates, so the SBBB was well within its prerogatives in their nominating procedures. For either of these positions (athletes or non-athletes) the Chair will allow for nominations from the floor.

Senator Smith: I would like the biographical information.

Chairperson Schmaltz: You received that in your packet.

Senator Moonan: The information on Greg Gardner is illegible.

Senator Raucci read the biographical information.

Senator Mohr: Since one of these biographies was read aloud, I feel we should read the other three biographies.

Senator Raucci read the other three biographies.

Students elected to the Athletic Council:

Kersten Annegers, athlete
Allen Adams, athlete
Tim Moore, non-athlete
Eileen Hogan, non-athlete

4. Election of One Student Senator and One Faculty Senator to the Honorary Degree Committee

Paul Walker, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, stated that his committee had met prior to the Senate meeting and had nominated Senator Pam Ritch to represent the faculty senators on this committee.

XXII-4 Motion by Alstrum (Second, Amster) to elect Pam Ritch for the faculty senator position on the Honorary Degree Committee carried on a voice vote.

Terrence Sykes stated that the student caucus agreed on Senator Monica Szwedo as their nomination.

XXII-5 Motion by Hall (Second, Miller) to elect Senator Monica Szwedo as the student senator representative on the Honorary Degree Committee carried on a voice vote.

5. Ratification of SBBB Nominee to the Honorary Degree Committee

Chairperson Schmaltz: You have a letter in your packets nominating student, Mona Hansra, as the student representative.

XXII-6 Motion by Sykes (Second, Schurman) to approve the SBBB Nomination of student, Mona Hansra, as student representative to the Honorary Degree Selection Committee, carried on a voice vote.

6. Approval of Council for Teacher Education Appointments

Chairperson Schmaltz: You have a letter in your packets from David Strand, Provost, appointing three members to the Council for Teacher Education:

Dr. Robert Fisher, CECP, ex officio
Dr. Jerry Jinks, C&I, Education Rep.
Dr. Bonnie Nastasi, Psychology

XXII-7 Dr. Strand asks that the Academic Senate confirm these appointments. Motion by Taylor (Second, Ritch) to confirm these appointments carried on a voice vote.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Faculty Affairs Committee Proposal for Change in the ASPT Document

Senator Ritt: I would like to introduce Dr. Chris Eisele, of the University Review Committee, to answer questions.

Dr. Eisele: To explain why we are making these suggestions, I would like to read from the proposal sent to the Faculty Affairs Committee:

"It has come to our attention that cases exist of various faculty not submitting ASPT materials and receiving any of three different evaluations: Merit, Insufficient Performance, or No Rating with concomitant variations in salary. To correct this situation, we suggest the Faculty Affairs Committee recommend to the Senate the following change in the ASPT document:"

X. University Evaluation Policies and Salary Increment Procedures

B. Departmental Procedure:

2. Faculty members will submit to their DFSC reports on their activities and accomplishments for the purpose of evaluation. Failure to submit these reports by the faculty member (may) shall result in an "insufficient performance" evaluation unless different procedures are agreed to in writing by the DFSC and the Faculty member prior to the submission deadline.

I. F. add (see X. B. 2.) at the end of the paragraph.

V. C. add (see X. B. 2.) at the end of the paragraph.

Dr. Eisele stated that the URC was trying to clarify the existing language in the ASPT document as to what happens when faculty do not submit DFSC reports on time.

SENATOR MOHR: There seems to be a logical inconsistency here. Item B. 2. allows for late submission of materials "unless different procedures are agreed to in writing by the DFSC and the Faculty member prior to the submission deadline."

Item I. F. states: "Late submission of materials: No materials upon which faculty members are evaluated for ASPT purposes shall be received after the appropriate deadline as stated in the ASPT calendar unless it can be

reasonably established that such materials were not available prior to the deadline. (see X. B. 2.)"

One says the faculty member has a reprieve after the fact, whereas the other says that "no materials shall be received after the appropriate deadline" -- unless prior arrangements are made.

Dr. Eisele: (Inaudible)

SENATOR MOHR: For example, if a faculty member is in an automobile accident in Indiana, will he receive insufficient merit for not making prior arrangements for submitting his ASPT data?

Dr. Eisele: (Inaudible)

SENATOR MOHR: A person does not make prior arrangements to have an accident.

SENATOR MOHR: Is it true that currently the DFSC doesn't have the right to consider only the material that was submitted by the faculty member by the deadline. And if the faculty member did not submit all of his materials, is it possible that other materials could be submitted after the due date if for example, it was something overwhelming like the faculty member receiving the Nobel Prize or something.

Dr. Eisele: The DFSC's should base their evaluations on materials that they have.

SENATOR MOHR: They don't need to punish someone for winning the Nobel Prize.

Dr. Eisele: Our proposal is not intended to be punitive. It is intended to clarify that the ASPT document requires that you submit a report.

SENATOR MOHR: Say a faculty member got insufficient merit for years and years and years, and then wins the Nobel Prize. Shouldn't we at least congratulate him?

Dr. Eisele: Right now the DFSC does the evaluation. It is their responsibility to evaluate the information submitted to them by the faculty member. They make a judgment on information that they have.

SENATOR NELSEN: B. 2. reads "Faculty members will submit to their DFSC reports on their activities and accomplishments for the purpose of evaluation. Failure to submit these reports by the faculty member shall result in an 'insufficient performance' evaluation" unless the DFSC agrees to an extended dead-

line for submission of these materials?

Also, say a faculty member is retiring, does he/she need to submit these materials? Why? It doesn't make sense.

Dr. Eisele: Retiring people who do not submit materials force a difficulty choice on the DFSC because of future salary considerations.

SENATOR NELSEN: Basing judgment only on what is submitted, say a faculty member chooses to submit a book, should he just include good stuff, and leave out the bad stuff? Is hearsay considered?

Dr. Eisele: This is a question raised by a number of Chairs. At this time the ASPT document is silent on this.

SENATOR RITT: The Faculty Affairs Committee needs to receive written materials from Departmental Chairs and faculty to support this.

SENATOR WALTERS: We need to give the DFSC the authority to decide if it will accept late submissions.

Dr. Eisele: The change recommended in B. 2. does this: "Failure to submit these reports by the faculty member shall result in an "insufficient performance" evaluation -- unless different procedures are agreed to in writing by the DFSC and the Faculty member prior to the submission deadline." The ASPT document gives the faculty member specific rights and responsibilities. The DFSC has not lost any authority.

SENATOR WALTERS: I read this as a mandate for the DFSC to require documents of the faculty member.

Dr. Eisele: The next paragraph takes care of that.

SENATOR RITCH: What is the rationale for the Department Salary Bases being determined by retiring faculty members?

Dr. Eisele: (Inaudible)

SENATOR RITCH: Is there a rationale for people who are retiring to submit documents?

Dr. Eisele: Yes, for example, if they retire in January, or in cases where additional employment opportunities develop.

SENATOR RITCH: Under this, they would have to arrange in writing to not submit documents?

Dr. Eisele: (Inaudible)

SENATOR COMADENA: Under Paragraph F; would materials that are submitted late be an addendum to the report; or the report?

Dr. Eisele: The way it is written, it could mean exactly what we talked about: an accident, illness, or being stuck in Kuwait.

SENATOR ZEIDENSTEIN: I think we have been having 2/3 questions and 1/3 debate. I thought I had a distinction between B. 2. and I. F.; but now I am not sure. B. 2. refers to reports on faculty members activities (articles) whereas I. F. refers to submission of materials.

Dr. Eisele: I agree with your first interpretation. Failure to submit ASPT documents at all will result in insufficient merit. F. could solve the problem of an accident on the way to school.

SENATOR ZEIDENSTEIN: I suggest we revise I. F. to include late submission of reports, books, articles or whatever. We need to clarify the language to avoid loopholes.

SENATOR TUTTLE: What is the primary problem we are trying to solve? A bunch of near retirees abusing the system, or inequity in departments in salaries, or what? What is the real problem?

Dr. Eisele: Inequity in departments and between departments, and other problems caused by not submitting reports. The ASPT document needs to provide a mechanism where DFSC's can deal with late submission of materials. This would force a DFSC to make a decision.

SENATOR TUTTLE: Are these inequities great, small, moderate?

Dr. Eisele: I don't know how much policy has to break down before it needs to be fixed. Different departments have different kinds of ratings. We were trying to give other options for deadlines for not submitting reports which DFSC's have to deal with and give faculty members adequate consideration.

SENATOR VANDEN EYNDEN: I have served on four or five different DFSC's under four or five different chairs. We never paid any attention to rules other than the Department's rules, or College guidelines.

Dr. Eisele: The ASPT Document is the University-wide document governing these matters. Ignoring it could have serious consequences.

SENATOR COLLIER: Since the ASPT document is silent on this,

wouldn't college and department guidelines supersede it.

Dr. Eisele: We are only privy to College guidelines, the Colleges impart information in their CFSC document. The DFSC's should follow the University ASPT Document as a minimum standard.

SENATOR COLLIER: That doesn't preclude them from enacting new ones.

SENATOR STEARNS: Professor Eisele commented on hearsay. The members of the DFSC may be given information that a faculty member is not aware of or not consulted about. This issue is something that needs to be addressed.

Dr. Eisele: This seems to be under the rule of the Chair in the current process. The chair says "bad things" without documentary evidence that seems permissible, especially without some departmental guidelines.

SENATOR ZEIDENSTEIN: Under Paragraph I. F., am I correct in assuming that the change is only in the underlined part (see X. B. 2).

Dr. Eisele: Yes

SENATOR ZEIDENSTEIN: Have DFSC's been having problems that were documents, reports, materials, etc. have been submitted late or not at all? At what date is it too late?

Dr. Eisele: I cannot recount specific problems. From what I'm told, one possible example of complication was the Bill Frinsko Incident, where a professor refused to submit materials and then a serious problem involving law suits arose later. There is a calendar date that must be followed -- deadline based on the appeals process.

SENATOR MOHR: Departments don't want to use hearsay evidence. Do they also not want to use student evaluations?

SENATOR WALKER: I would encourage the Faculty Affairs Committee to work on the wording and verbiage in this recommendation before we deal with it as an action item.

SENATOR RITT: Are you asking for the committee to make wording changes before it comes up for action?

SENATOR WALKER: Yes.

SENATOR ZEIDENSTEIN: The wording should be clearly distinctive. Unless the committee reads this very carefully, you say there is a difference.

SENATOR NELSEN: I would request that the committee consider equity within departments. Each department conducts the process differently.

Dr. Eisele: (Inaudible)

SENATOR TUTTLE: Equity in treatment leaves the decision with the departments. My department would differ from others. These changes would not solve problems of equity.

Dr. Eisele: (Inaudible)

The URC is charged with providing a document that gives guidelines. I hope that a couple of comments tonight do not mean that this document is ignored.

CHAIRPERSON SCHMALTZ: I hope the Faculty Affairs Committee will take into account some of the questions asked tonight. What prompts this change. Perhaps you could bring in some documentation to support this.

SENATOR RITT: The problem is that some faculty are not submitting ASPT materials. These wording changes were proposed by the URC to try to correct this. There is no necessary chain of argument that says because this situation exists, then it should be rectified. That is one reason we, the Faculty Affairs Committee would like more documentation from Chairs and Faculty to support these changes.

SENATOR AMSTER: I interpreted these changes in respect to the process in terms of those people who do not turn anything in for political reasons or disinterest. In the case of retirees, we could build in an exception that their previous experience speaks for them. It would be taken as part of the process to balance that out, and not in a negative way.

SENATOR MOONAN: One of the things necessary for the appeal process is the need for a written record of events. Certain DFSC's are not familiar with the rules. The ASPT Document should provide the rules to go by.

Communications

Paul Walker announced a communication from the University Studies Review Committee which has been meeting this summer and has been charged with undertaking a study of the University Studies Program. They will be presenting a philosophy statement to the Senate shortly. They will be interacting with various university forums, for reactions and discussion. After the philosophy statement, they will be working on criteria and a plan.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs Committee - Chairperson Paul Walker reported that the Academic Affairs Committee would meet following Senate.

Administrative Affairs Committee - Senator Nelsen announced a short meeting following Senate. He asked committee members to turn in their schedules as soon as possible because the President wished a meeting regarding administrative reorganization and there were two academic calendars that would need work.

Budget Committee - Senator Mohr announced a meeting after Academic Senate. His committee will be trying to resolve the Sense of the Senate Resolution of March 22, 1989 by October. They will be meeting with the administration on this matter.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Senator Ritt set a meeting after Senate adjournment.

Rules Committee - Senator Raucci announced a brief committee meeting following Senate.

Student Affairs Committee - Senator Sykes announced a meeting following Senate.

Motion to Adjourn

II-8 Senator Ritch moved to adjourn (Second, Sweeney) Motion carried on a voice vote. Meeting of the Academic Senate adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JAN JOHNSON, SECRETARY

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING CALENDAR

JANUARY - JUNE, 1991

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

HOVEY 419
4:00 P.M.

January 21, 1991

February 4, 1991

February 18, 1991

March 1, 1991

April 1, 1991

April 15, 1991

April 24, 1991
*After Senate

June 3, 1991

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETINGS

CIRCUS ROOM - 7:00 P.M.
BONE STUDENT CENTER

January 30, 1991

February 13, 1991

February 27, 1991

March 13, 1991

*March 27, 1991
Orientation of
New Senators
(Founder's Suite)

April 10, 1991

April 24, 1991

May 1, 1991

June 12, 1991