

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Fall 11-28-1990

Senate Meeting, November 28, 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, November 28, 1990" (1990). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 567.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/567>

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

November 28, 1990

Volume XXII, No. 7

Call to Order

Roll Call

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Action Items:

1. Faculty Affairs Committee
Proposal for Change in ASPT
2. Faculty Affairs Committee
Proposal for Change in ASPT
3. Rules Committee Proposal for
Changes in Council for Teacher
Education Bylaws
4. Rules Committee Recommendation
for Appointments to Enrollment
Management Committee

Information Items:

Administrative Affairs Committee
Proposal for Academic Calendars
for 1993--1995

Communications

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 28, 1990

Volume XXII, No. 7

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:04 p.m. in the Ballroom of the Bone Student Center.

ROLL CALL

Chairperson Schmaltz called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Approval of Minutes of November 7, 1990

XXII-38 Motion to approve the Academic Senate Minutes of November 7, 1990 by Arnold (Second, Stearns) carried on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson Len Schmaltz thanked Vice Chair Eric Raucci for filling in during his absence at the November 7th meeting. He also thanked senators for their cards and remembrances while he was hospitalized.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson Eric Raucci apologized for appearing to be biased at the last meeting. He lacked the expertise of our Chair.

Student Body President's Remarks

Student Body President Terrence Sykes had an excused absence.

Administrators' Remarks

President Wallace: I would like to inform the senators that a draft document outlining the possible assumptions for the five-year program of enrollment reduction by three thousand students will be available for campus discussion in January. The presentation will be scheduled in January for the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. The Executive Committee can then decide the appropriate Senate process. The presentation to the Board of Regents would occur in early Spring. Related to this matter, ISU has received its FY92 discussion budget from the IBHE. We had our budget meeting this week with Dr. Wagner. This is a

first step in the FY92 budget process. It is a long way from the final budget that will emanate from the legislature. I was very pleased with Dr. Wagner's recommendation for ISU. His financial recommendations make it clear that he fully supports not only the enrollment reduction program, but also the linkage of the strategic planning outcome to our budget process.

Provost Strand had no remarks.

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

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

Action Items

1. Faculty Affairs Committee Proposal for Change in ASPT Item 10.23.90.2

Senator Ritt: The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends the URC's proposed change in the ASPT Handbook to add the following clarification to the description of how the CFSC functions:

Page 4, Add to IV. A.

Each College shall have a CFSC composed of three to six faculty members (as defined in the Introduction above, but not excluding those categories of faculty listed in I. D.) and the College Dean who is an ex-officio voting member and Chairperson of the Committee. The majority of the committee must have tenure. Members shall be elected at large by the faculty (as defined above) of the College for staggered two-year terms. In those Colleges having six or more departments, no Department shall have more than two representatives. Except for the Chairperson, CFSC members shall not participate in or be present at ASPT deliberations (including Appeals) involving individuals from their home departments.

XXII-39 Motion to approve the change by Senator Ritt (Second, Arnold).

Senator Zeidenstein: I would suggest that (including Appeals) is a parenthetical phrase and that you take out the parentheses and put commas before and after the phrase.

Senator Ritt accepted that as a friendly amendment.

Vote on change in ASPT Handbook carried on a voice vote.

2. Faculty Affairs Committee Proposal for Change in ASPT
Item 10.23.90.3

Senator Ritt: This came to us from the University Review Committee. What it does in the ASPT Handbook is to clarify the procedure for replacing vacancies of the URC, UAC, CFSC, and DFSC when they leave office prior to the end of their term. Since all of these committees function as faculty elected committees, a replacement on them should be elected by faculty and not appointed by administrators which is now possible.

ASPT Handbook, Add to I. D. (on Page 2)

Elected members of the Academic Senate shall not be eligible for election to the University Review Committee or the University Appeals Committee. Faculty members shall be eligible to serve on only one of the following elected bodies at a time: the University Review Committee, the University Appeals Committee, a College Faculty Status Committee or a Department Faculty Status Committee. College Council members shall not be eligible to serve on their College Faculty Status Committee. Those faculty members holding administrative appointments may not be elected to serve on ASPT committees (URC, CFSC, DFSC, UAC). Vacancies on the University Appeals Committee, the University Review Committee, a College Faculty Status Committee or a Department Faculty Status Committee shall be filled by established election procedures.

XXII-40 Motion by Ritt (Second, Arnold) to approve the change in the ASPT document carried on a voice vote.

3. Rules Committee Proposal for Changes in Council for Teacher Education

XXII-41 Senator Raucci: We discussed these changes in the Council for Teacher Education Bylaws as an information item at the last meeting. I move approval of these changes. (Second, Whitacre). Motion carried on a voice vote.

4. Rules Committee Recommendation for Appointments to the Enrollment Management Committee

XXII-42 Senator Raucci: I move approval of the Rules Committee recommendations for appointments to the Enrollment Management Committee a faculty senator: Thomas Baer, Curriculum and Instruction; and student: Kyle McCoy, a Junior Business Major. (Second, Stearns) Motion carried on a voice vote.

Information Items

1. Administrative Affairs Committee Proposal for Academic Calendars for 1993-1995

Senator Nelsen: The Administrative Affairs Committee at the beginning of the year received several drafts of calendars for 1993 to 1995 from Dr. Austensen's Office. The committee proceeded to review those calendars and as a result of their review you have in front of you calendars for 1993-94 and 1994-95. There were several changes in the calendars as presented by Dr. Austensen. The primary changes were removal of the fall break day, shifting that day to the day before Thanksgiving and closing the University on Tuesday evening at 10:00 p.m. during the week of Thanksgiving. For the increase in the exam by one day so that the exam week would have a Saturday in it where it previously did not so that fall semester classes that meet on Saturday will have a full semester of instructional time plus an exam day rather than just an exam period in place of the last day of instruction. You have in front of you a copy of the calendars developed by the committee as well as calendars for 1992 through 1995 calendars, to determine the accuracy of our dates. There were two other communications that came our way. One was early in the semester by a faculty member who had some difficulty with the way Spring break fell this year and we assured him that we could not move Spring break this year, it was already set. It usually falls at the end of the seventh or eighth week during the Spring semester. It does fall within that category here. The other question was from the athletic group about the scheduling of fall break. This year a football game fell during the weekend of fall break. They asked that we consider scheduling fall break around the athletic schedule which has been in place longer than the calendar. Some Saturday classes do meet after fall break day, and if we had canceled them there would have only been thirteen class meetings for some Saturday classes. Canceling the Wednesday before Thanksgiving on these calendars will eliminate that problem.

Senator Smith: Have you considered having a study day on the Friday before final examinations?

Senator Nelsen: Sunday has been considered the reading day. The biggest single problem with that has been just scheduling enough class areas to meet particularly when we have classes that meet on Saturday. We also have to consider the winter shutdown in December. If we scheduled a reading day on Friday, we would be extending the Fall Semester by at least another day. That would mean another weekend the students would have to be on campus. We don't go directly from the classes to the exams. We have a weekend in between.

Senator Ritt: I have observed and it seems that exams are scheduled at two hour intervals. This creates considerable inconvenience to those of us who teach four hour courses and try to figure out some way to give an examination that lasts two hours and forty minutes. That is one complication that arises with two hour intervals. The other complication which arises is that sometimes students take courses consecutively and it seems to require some sort of quantum leap to get from the examination that ended at 3:00 p.m. in one building and another one that starts at 3:00 in another building. It seems some effort could be made to alleviate these problems.

Senator Nelsen: The Administrative Affairs Committee does not deal with the exam schedule. There is a ten minute break between exams. Being on the West side of campus, we are well aware of what it is like to have such a short time between classes. The best I can say is that we will forward these concerns to Dr. Austensen's Office.

Senator Ritt: I can appreciate the necessity as far as the University is concerned for getting grades in at a reasonable time. I can also appreciate that sometimes it is very difficult to accomplish this, especially at the end of the summer session, when the last class is on Friday and you have to have the exams graded by Monday. It seems to me that we have a fairly good faculty who try to meet their responsibilities as conscientiously as they can. I was just wondering if it is really necessary to have codified some sort of humiliating punishment if grades are not in on time. I find that relatively offensive.

Senator Nelsen: I am a little thrown here from the point of view that when grades are due and not turned in that there is a punishment. I know they will be on the phone and calling and requesting grades. In the case of the Spring semester, to show our great faith in the faculty members, we have grades due two days after contracts have ended. I don't know what penalties there are.

Senator Ritt: The penalty is that if you turn your grades in late, you have to fill in a separate grade form for each student in your class. Some classes have forty or fifty students.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Senator, I don't know what this has to do with the calendar.

Senator Ritt: It has to do with the time that grades are due.

Chairperson Schmaltz: That would be a matter for the Faculty Affairs Committee to consider.

Senator Nelsen: There have been times when I had difficulty getting grades in on the due date, and I have called them and they have taken the grades two days late without filling out individual cards.

Senator Ritt: The Faculty Affairs Committee will look into this.

Communications

None.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs Committee - Senator Walker reported that his committee has just finished reviewing the Academic Plan for 1991-1996. We have requested the Executive Committee to put this on the Agenda for the December 4th Academic Senate Meeting as an Information Item. You should have received this in the mail by this time. It is a blue notebook.

Also, we have been taking responses from various committees and units on campus regarding the mission statement of the strategic plan. We have not received any responses from any of the Senate committees which we asked for. I would encourage you to get those in, if you want to have a say in any of the questions regarding the mission statement of the strategic plan. We hope to bring forward the Academic Affairs Committee recommendations regarding that at an early February meeting.

The Committee has been reviewing revisions in the Bylaws of the University Curriculum Committee. On our agenda next week we will be looking at Senator White's concerns regarding sexist language.

Administrative Affairs Committee - Senator Nelsen reported that in addition to bringing forward the academic calendars, there are two other topics that the Administrative Affairs Committee is currently looking at. One is some general questions and information on Physical Plant, and as finalized materials are available to the committee, we will review that in the Spring. Another item is a report that was submitted to the committee on staffing and employment trends at ISU. We will be sending to Dr. Webb-Lupo and considering her responses, and getting back to the Senate on that.

Budget Committee - Senator Mohr stated that in the packets was a memorandum to the Executive Committee from the Senate Budget Committee regarding a Status Report on Senate Resolution XXI-99 dated March 7, 1990. The Executive Committee decided to pass this report along without comment to the members of the

Senate for their review and whatever action they might wish to take. We would be quite willing to receive comments on this. As you will notice, the Administration did not come up with a complete plan for "phasing out the use of income fund <tuition dollars> for inter-collegiate athletics." We did feel, however, that there is an important historical background to this that all senators ought to be aware of, so we did include an historical note as to how we got into this situation. I would recommend to you that you read that very carefully. It does give you better insight on why we are where we are and probably how we got into it without any nefarious manipulation on the part of anybody. We are where we are because of things that have happened in the past and not because there was an intent to divert funds from the academic areas. We look forward to your reactions.

The Executive Committee received a report on Faculty Load from the Provost, and I wondered if he would like to comment on this.

Provost Strand: The report is a number of pages with hundreds of pieces of data in it. It was submitted to the Academic Senate in response to an earlier request from the Senate. After it is reviewed by the appropriate committees of the Senate, or Senate members, I will be happy to respond to questions. As far as making a presentation at this point, I think the data are self-evident. I would be happy to discuss the data in response to questions rather than make a detailed presentation to the Senate.

Senator Mohr: This report was made available and it is fairly lengthy, so the Executive Committee decided that it would be available in the Senate Office and it would not be distributed to individual members of the Senate. So, for any of you who wish to follow up on the data, should go to the Senate Office and look at the Faculty Load Report. I would commend this report to the attention of the University Studies Review Committee since this information could be very helpful to them. Their philosophical statement for example says that, "The University Studies program consists of courses which are of the highest caliber, which are taught by the most qualified faculty, and which develop both general and specific knowledge." In this report, there is concrete evidence of the veracity of that statement, and the possibility of cheating that if we reallocate some of our resources.

Provost Strand: Are you talking about the statement of philosophy of the University Studies Review Committee?

Senator Mohr: Yes. I thought it might be of interest to them to see this report.

Provost Strand: There were no data associated with the University Studies Review Committee statement on philosophy. There were numerous data accompanying the report that I sent under the date of November 12, 1990 regarding the "Use of Non-Tenure Track Faculty." I am unclear as to which of these reports you are making reference.

Senator Mohr: What I am saying is that when one looks at the data of who are teaching 100 level courses, 200 level courses, 300 level courses, etc. and you look at the University Studies offerings, and then have a statement of philosophy that says that we want only the most qualified faculty in the University to teach the introductory program, which most of those courses are, I think you are asking for a change in which we allocate our positions. It may be a very significant change. We shouldn't say that we want something that is unachievable. For if you want something, you want to know what it will cost to achieve. Otherwise our statements lack veracity.

Chairperson Schmaltz: The report on the "Use of Non-Tenure Track Faculty," is available in the Academic Senate Office.

Senator Walker: Since I am the senate's representative on the University Study Review Committee, when the appropriate time comes for introduction of this information, I will see that the committee is aware of it.

Senator White: What prompted this report on the use of non-tenure track faculty?

Provost Strand: Several years ago, as a result of discussions in a number of quarters, the University modified its policy regarding non-tenure track faculty. This new statement on non-tenure track faculty was brought to the Academic Senate. The statement was endorsed by the Senate as being the appropriate way to proceed. I believe it was Senator Mohr who requested that as a monitoring aspect of the process, the Office of the Provost would provide for the Academic Senate annually during the month of November, a report that consisted of certain numerical data regarding the distribution of the instructional resources of the University. That report was submitted the first year utilizing the format that the Office of the Provost had been requested to place it in, and then it was suggested that the format be revised the second year. You have the revised format before you. The report is being presented to you simply as a matter of response to the discussion about non-tenure track faculty and the policy affecting non-tenure track faculty.

Senator White: May I ask why this report was not distributed?

Chairperson Schmaltz: That was an Executive Committee decision. The report was quite lengthy, and we were concerned

about printing costs. It was more a matter of economics, not one of suppressing information.

Senator White: I would like to know what the report indicates? I suppose I can go to the Senate Office to read it. I would assume that the purpose of the requirement of the report was to see if there is any change or improvement in the numbers of non-tenure track faculty employed. Wouldn't this document indicate any improvement in those numbers?

Provost Strand: Unfortunately, it is impossible to ascertain the answer to that question. The format was changed at the request of the Senate. You can't compare these data with last year's data.

Senator White: Does that mean that next year you will be able to?

Provost Strand: Assuming that the data report format remains the same, yes you could make a comparison. We would also presume that the Faculty Affairs Committee from which this topic originated a couple of years ago wished to make some sort of assessment of the data comparing them from one year to another. The memo to the Senate Chair also concludes with the fact that Dr. Webb-Lupo and I would be pleased to work with the Faculty Affairs Committee in discussing this. We have not heard from any Senate committee.

Senator White: Might I ask if the Faculty Affairs Committee intends to discuss this?

Senator Ritt: The report has been distributed to us. We have not had time to discuss it yet. Nobody on the committee has raised the question. I can look at that data and not have the slightest idea of what sort of conclusions one comes to as a result of looking at it. I think this is not atypical of data that is circulated not only in the University, but also in other places. I would be happy as Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee to receive any comments from any Senator in which some sort of a rational procedure or conclusion from the data. We are willing to look at it, but there are too many factors that are not in it such as the quality of our programs, the quality of our teachers, or the question of whether our resources are being wisely allocated. We would be happy to look at it, but we need some direction as to what we are looking for. If what you are looking for is a change in numbers, that would be easy. One could analyze the old data, and analyze the new data and come up with the answer that department A is using fewer temporary faculty members than they were last year.

Chairperson Schmaltz: What we could do at this point is give

the Senators an opportunity to read the report and react to it. Perhaps the Executive Committee should have made the report available to all senators. We were trying to save money.

Senator Zeidenstein: Rather than run off fifty copies, it might be more efficient to make it available to those who request it.

Senator Mohr: The report is ten pages long.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Senator Ritt reported that his committee's present agenda had one more item from the University Review Committee. We are still waiting for the University Review Committee's analysis of the faculty survey taken last year about possible changes in the ASPT process. There are no urgent matters.

Senator Collier: As members of the Faculty Affairs Committee, Senator Stearns and I met this evening with the University Review Committee. I would like to report that the URC survey results will be distributed early next semester.

Senator Stearns: The URC is in the final stages of preparing the report.

Senator Collier: There are five key issues that will be discussed at faculty hearings next semester, sometime in January. Those hearings are to be the basis of possible major changes in the ASPT process, which subsequently will be reported to the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Senate.

Rules Committee - Senator Raucci had no report.

Student Affairs Committee - No report.

Adjournment

XXII-43 Senator Schurman moved to adjourn (Second, Andrew). Motion carried on a voice vote. Meeting of the Academic Senate adjourned at 7:47 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JAN JOHNSON, SECRETARY

