Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Spring 3-25-1992

Senate Meeting, March 25, 1992

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Recommended Citation

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

March 25, 1992   Volume XXIII, No. 11

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of February 26, 1992

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

ACTION ITEMS: 1. Academic Affairs Committee
                          Proposal for Bachelor of Fine Arts
                       2. Academic Affairs Committee Proposal
                          for Philosophy: Minor in Religious
                          Studies
                       3. Academic Affairs Committee Presenta-
                          tion of University Studies Review
                          Committee Document
                       4. Faculty Affairs Committee Changes
                          in ASPT Document
                       5. Rules Committee Recommendations
                          for Faculty Appointments to
                          External Committees

INFORMATION ITEMS: 1. Academic Affairs Committee
                          Proposal for Communication Department
                          Professional Public Relations Sequence
                       2. Rules Committee Report on Administra-
                          tive Efficiency Committee Report
                       3. Rules Committee: CAST Bylaws Changes
                      *4. Rules Committee: Bluebook Changes
                      *5. Academic Affairs Committee Presentation
                          of Vision Statement for Strategic Plan

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

*Items on Agenda, but not considered because of a lack of a
Quorum.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(Not Approved by the Academic Senate)

March 25, 1992   Volume XXIII, No. 11

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate
to order at 7:13 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student
Center.

ROLL CALL

Chairperson Schmaltz called the roll and declared a quorum
present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 26, 1992

Senator Walker: I have two corrections. On page 16, the next to
last paragraph should read: Faculty Affairs Committee. On page
42, the next to last paragraph should be attributed to me. I was
the last speaker.

XIII-52 Motion to approve Academic Senate Minutes of February 26, 1992,
by Senator Ogren (Second, Manns) carried on a voice vote.

CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Chairperson Schmaltz: This is the final meeting of the current
Academic Senate. I would like to thank the members of the
Executive Committee and the Chairs of the Committees for all
of their efforts throughout the year.

VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Vice Chairperson Engelhardt: Since this is the last Senate
meeting, I would like to thank all the student senators for
a good past year.   Yesterday, Representatives Ropp and Weaver
were here for an open forum, and I thank everyone who came out
to speak at that.

STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Student Body President Randy Fox had an excused absence.

ADMINISTRATORS' REMARKS

President Wallace presented Certificates
Vice Chairperson Rob Engelhardt and Chai
Academic Senate held a short Executive S
of the Provost, President Wallace conduc
Distinguished Professor.

Provost Strand had an excused absence.

Vice President for Student Affairs had no

Vice President Alexander had no remarks.

ACTION ITEMS

1. **Academic Affairs Committee Proposal f
   Fine Arts**

XIII-53 Senator Ritt moved approval of the Academic Affairs Committee
Proposal for a Bachelor of Fine Arts (Second, Ogren). Motion
carried on a voice vote.

2. **Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for Philosophy:
   Minor in Religious Studies**

XIII-54 Senator Ritt moved approval of the proposal for Philosophy:
Minor in Religious Studies (Second, Collier). Motion carried
on a voice vote.

3. **University Studies Review Committee Document**

XIII-55 Senator Ritt moved approval of the University Studies Review
Committee Objectives Statement (Second, Hesse).

Senator Ritt: This document has gone through a lot of study
by a large number of committees. Professor Borg made a
presentation at the last Senate meeting and questions were
asked and answered. To the best of my knowledge, the statement
as presented at the last meeting is the one that the University
Studies Review Committee wants to go forward with, and the one
that Academic Affairs Committee has approved.

Senator White: I would like to note my confusion with the
phrasing on number 10. e. "discuss the events, values and ideals
that contribute to an emerging world civilization." My suspi-
cion is that no one really quite knows what this language means.
It sounds like students are being encouraged to acquaint them-
selves by studying the homoginazation of the world.

I don't think that is necessarily a good thing. If part of what the common civilization of the contemporary world means is Mac-Donalds in Bangkok, I know that there are a lot of Thai scholars who have a lot of problems with that notion of common world civilization. I would say that this phrasing is ambiguous and loaded with all kinds of political contradictions that have not been adequately dealt with. It is my intention to vote yes for this document, but I would suggest that the committee either re-think this language or take it out.

Dr. Paul Borg, Chair of University Studies Review Committee introduced the other members of the committee present: Dr. Macon Williams, Psychology; Dr. Ollie Pocs, Sociology; Dr. Derek McCracken, Biology; Dr. Wayne Lockwood, Industrial Technology; Dr. Ron Fortune, English; and Senator Paul Walker, Agriculture.

Dr. Macon Williams: The language is not an approbation. It suggests that it is currently happening, not necessarily that it is good.   In teaching the history of the Second World War, you can't leave out Adolph Hitler.   There is probably just as much bad in world civilization as there is good.

Senator White: There is a problem with ambiguous language.

Dr. Macon Williams: There is a porosity that exists between cultures. The process is just more rapid now.

Dr. Ron Fortune: We tried to use language that was homogenous and monolithic.

Senator White: Why do you say "common"?

Dr. Macon Williams: Because it is shared.

Senator White: It may be that I am one of the only people who is confused by this.   I would ask that you think about the language more.

Senator Cook: We did discuss this and raise the question at the previous meeting. Dr. Borg explained his concept of what the common civilization (emerging) consisted of. Nonetheless, each person that I have spoken with about this paper has raised the question anew. I have a faint suspicion that your conversations among yourselves have managed to sort out your mutual understanding of this, but it is far from transparent to other people who have not had the benefit of your discussions. In fact, it seems to be highly confusing and divisive to people who come to it cold without the background material. I also feel that perhaps other phrasing would clarify your point.

4

Dr. Macon Williams: We did not invent this language.
The independent concept comes from other people. The lead
article in the March issue of "Atlantic" points out two
world friends, one is Ghad and the other MacWorld. Nobody
necessarily regards this as offensive.

Senator Cook: But it is a confusing thing as stated in so
few words. Without the "Atlantic" article or some other
supplementary material, this seems to be too terse to be
easily understood.

Senator Walker: I fail to see what is so confusing about it.

Senator Cook: You have been part of an on-going conversation
that has made you acquainted with the terminology. An emerging
common civilization as phrased does seem to be phrased in the
singular as though civilization is a single threaded entity.
I don't perceive that as being your understanding. You are
considering it to be more of a group term.

Senator Walker: Are you using culture and civilization in the
same context?

Senator Cook: No. I am saying that this word is given in the
singular.

Senator White: The word civilization is modified by "common."

Senator Tuttle: I thought I had things sorted out. Now I am
not sure. I raised this question on 10. e. last time because
I was having trouble with that. I had conversations with two
members of the committee, Professors Borg and Fortune, which
were helpful to me at the time. In something like recognizing
that there are a number of threads running through the world
that have some things that are components of those threads
and we ought to be aware of those. I think that is kind of
what I understood out of my conversations. I felt more com-
fortable with that than the last time we met. At least comfor-
table enough that I would vote for the document, even with this
in it. Although I still have some reservations about 10. e.,
I might feel more comfortable if it weren't there, I still would
support this even if it is there. I was challenged to come up
with an alternative wording. I tried. Sometimes I am able to
come up with effective words to express an idea, and sometimes
I am not. This turns out to be a time that I am not able to do
that. Perhaps someone can come up with an alternative they wish
to share with the committee. I don't have anything clarifying
for 10. e. any more so than before, other than an expression of
what I thought I heard two members of the committee tell me.
Perhaps that was a reflection of something that has run through

the committee that has not yet been shared with us. I still
don't have a better wording. I am still troubled somewhat with
10. e. and maybe I would be satisfied with the record showing
that there is some confusion about 10. e. so that as new univer-
sity studies proposals are drafted and implemented and even after
they are implemented and in place, there is some record to show
that there is some confusion about that. I am going to vote
for this even if it is there. I would feel more comfortable
voting for it if 10. e. were withdrawn or modified in wording.
My understanding from two members of the committee is the notion
that some common threads run through the world and have some
elements that we ought to know about. I can understand that
and feel comfortable with that if it is what we mean.

Senator Ritt: I have resolved some of these issues myself.
It seems to me that what this says without any preconceptions
about it is: "discuss the events, values and ideals that con-
tribute to an emerging world civilization." There can very
well be events, values and ideals that don't contribute to an
emerging world civilization. There is no implication that a
world civilization is in fact emerging. In my own paraphrase
of it, it says that there are certain courses, social, cultural,
and economic courses which do contribute to an emerging world
civilization, and that those courses should be studied by our
students. That is my personal resolution of the issue which has
been raised.

Senator Zeidenstein: I would like to note that subparagraphs
a., b., c., and d., are all in the plural. It isn't until
we get to e. that there is a singular. The main boldface
item, number ten at the top, the phrase that nobody has mentioned
so far, "contemporary world community" is singular and is at
least as empirically questionable as the words, "emerging world
civilization." That is pretty clear language even in layman's
terms, especially among sociologists and anthropologists. There
is a notion that whether it is Atlantic, Pacific, or Mediterra-
nean, that there is a literal world community. That suggests
commonality that I just don't see. At this moment, I would
not vote for a document that I consider empirically contains
a non-demonstrable statement.

Senator Razaki: I think it is the combination of these words.
There has been progress in the world. We have seen the fall
of the Soviet Empire. There are very vast differences in
peoples. This may mean a different thing on an American
campus. There is no common Civilization. You mentioned Ghad
vs. MacWorld. It could be the Caucasian world is closer
together rather than the entire world.

Senator Sadeghian: In speaking of the contemporary world community and commonality, I perceive the community to mean people living in a community, to mean not everyone is common. There are different people in a community, but they live together accepting each other's differences. That is what community means to me. When I look at a community of neighborhoods, that is what I see -- different people accepting each other's differences. I don't see commonality. That would mean everyone was alike. When you say community, you see people living together in this global world peacefully and accepting other's differences, and not getting upset or having wars. When I say community, I don't want to force everybody to be like me.

Senator Zeidenstein: The word community connotes common values and myths of a people, common religion, common beliefs, common traditions. It would also include diversity. I don't see that on a worldwide basis. I would hope that the world would some day be that way, but short of Coca Cola commercials, I don't see us getting there.

Senator Sadeghian: I think this is above Coca Cola ads. It is much more a spiritual type of thing here. We are not talking about the common values being that we all wear red or we all like MTV. The common values are that we are willing to accept other's differences. Community is higher than everyone wearing red.

Senator Cook: We have all dramatically demonstrated the fact that these terms are not widely understood in the same fashion by intelligent and educated people.

Senator Touhy: We seem to be confused on some wording.

Senator Zeidenstein: I could not vote for a document that has this in it.

Senator Ken Strand: I would like to hear from Senator White why he would vote for this and yet object to the wording.

Senator White: After listening to what people are saying, I am being tempted in the other direction. It makes as much sense to me to say something like, "discuss the events, values and ideals that contribute to an emerging world revolutionary struggle." It seems as empirically demonstrable at this point to say that as to say what is in the document. There is a certain amount of wishful thinking here.

Senator Ken Strand: I would also like to hear from Senator Zeidenstein as to why he would vote against the document because

of this wording.

Senator Zeidenstein: Because it could be improved beyond where
it is now.   I don't see why I should vote for something that
is not required to be in there as it is presently worded.
Furthermore, I think number ten has two themes.   The first half
talks about values of an American culture, and then you almost
reverse it (using plural and singular nouns) and talk about the
emerging world civilization.   I would feel happier if you would
either delete or revise   last phrase in number ten and
say something about prospects for peace.

Senator Strand: Can this document be fairly easily patched up?

Senator Walker: We had considerable debate on this whole set
of objectives and outcomes this fall.   We had forums and
visited with all the colleges and invited participation from
everyone in the university community.   This was discussed,
substantially in the forum down in the Fine Arts Building.
I think the wording that we have drafted now is probably the
best wording.   I think what is happening here is that we
are looking at it very narrowly from one time to another,
and not looking at the larger version, and trying to read into
it our single minded concepts.   I think the committee had a
much larger issue there.   There are many commonalities and
threads which pull together cultures which we can think of
as an entire world community or civilization.   Trying to
rewrite this on the floor of the Senate would be a big mistake.
We are not subject to all the paraphernalia and literature that
has been out there, and the committee that has been put together
representing the faculty constituents across the campus has
had the literature available.   The proper thing to do tonight
is to vote it up or down.   I certainly would encourage you to
vote it up.   I think it is the best wording.   I would encourage
you not to look at it very narrow mindedly, but to look at it
from the broader perspective of the student outcomes for the
total objectives of the university studies programs.

Senator Wallace: Given the debate tonight regarding what a
general education is supposed to be, we could design an
outstanding course around this document.

Senator Collier: Most people have been speaking about the
cultural differences, political differences, or business
differences in their particular areas of training. I am a
biologist, so I have to speak from my area. As the number
of humans become the dominant species on the planet, and the
earth becomes ecologically smaller, there will be a necessity
for the common cause of survival.

8

Senator Sadeghian: If we vote positive for this, what is the status? Does this mean that this is the way it stays? Will another committee look at it, or what? Will it go as it is from now on?

Chairperson Schmaltz: The Academic Affairs Committee could always recommend changes.

Senator Ritt: I think if the Senate votes on it, this statement becomes the objectives. Of course, as suggested by President Wallace, these objectives have to be translated into a general education program. At that point, assuming no one makes an amendment to this tonight, the final point in this whole process will be the presentation to the Senate of a general education program. I think at that point if the recommended courses have curricula attached to them or something of that sort, at that point we can critically examine whether we approve of these courses being part of a general education program. Again, this is a guideline for the development of a general education program.

XIII-56 Senator Zeidenstein: I would like to offer a friendly amendment to Item 10: right after the words "emerging common" -- change the word common to commonalities in the contemporary world. (strike civilization of and community). The new item would read: 10. develop an acquaintance with the civilizations of the world, the many ethnic traditions that create American culture, and the emerging commonalities in the contemporary world.

Senator Ritt: It would be my own tendency to accept that as a friendly amendment, but I don't feel that I have the authority to do so. The committee has been working on this document for a year and a half, and I cannot offhand accept an amendment. I would accept their guidance if they care to do so.

Dr. Borg: As a response to the open forums and discussions on campus, this phrase was discussed. It is a concept that we thought about very much. The suggested amendment would restrict and narrow that concept.

Senator Zeidenstein: It would read: "emerging commonalities in the contemporary world."

Dr. Borg: We were speaking of a world community. It is very difficult to eliminate these words. I would not accept this as a friendly amendment.

Senator Ritt: I will not accept the motion as friendly.

XIII-57 Senator White: I second the motion.

9

Senator White: I am very much in agreement with Senator
Collier's earlier comments, but I think they are by and large
already covered in item eleven.

XXIII-57)Roll call vote on Zeidenstein amendment failed 15 no, 11 yes,
and 10 abstentions.

Senator Zeidenstein: In item 1. d., "explain the relevance of
science and technology to problems connected with the quality of
individual and societal life." I suggested at the last meeting
that problems might be changed to questions.

Dr. Derek McCracken: Problems we don't see as being negative.
We looked at it more positively, like opportunities in medical
advances, etc.

Senator Zeidenstein: I would disagree. The word problems could
be replaced with the word questions.   In item d. would you have
any objections to substituting the word questions for problems.

Dr. McCracken: What are you gaining by that?

Senator Zeidenstein: In exchanging questions for problems --
someone said -- in general education, everything starts out as
a question.

Dr. McCracken: It seems a matter of what is ambiguous and what
isn't.   Are we putting a different spin on it with new wording?
We need to ask if the new wording would lead to ambiguity.

Senator Zeidenstein: You told me a couple of minutes ago, that
you ask questions to find out what the problems are. Mathematics
is a deductive science.

Senator Hesse: I generally think that this document as a whole
is an improvement over the existing set of objectives. I worry
about picking apart words. I would encourage senators to vote
for this.

XXIII-55)Vote on Ojectives Statement for University Studies passed on a
voice vote.   (one abstention)

4. Faculty Affairs Committee Changes in ASPT Document

Senator Walker: The Faculty Affairs Committee proposed Changes
in the ASPT Document.   We reviewed those last time under infor-
mation stage.   We went back to the committee and discussed
some of the concerns expressed last time. We made one change
and I believe in your packets you have received the letter with

the accompanying change on Item 3 of the document.   We omitted
the word "or" in the last sentence.   We would like to vote on
items one through twelve one at a time.

XXIII-58 Senator Walker moved approval of Item 1.   (Second, Razaki).

Dr. Chris Eisele, Chair of University Review Committee, explained
Item 1:   (Rationale: The current ASPT Handbook description of
different kinds of appeals needs to be clarified.)
There is no substantive change in item 1.   It is merely to split
the two kinds of appeals -- performance and tenure -- out, so it
is easier to read and follow and index.

Vote on Item 1 carried on a voice vote.

XXIII-59 Senator Walker moved approval of Item 2.   (Second, DeRousse)

Dr. Chris Eisele: (Rationale: (1) the nature of an "insuffi-
cient performance" rating warrants an automatic written explana-
tion;   (2) a written record on which to base faculty development
or faculty dismissal should exist.)

Change two is being proposed by the URC and FAC, because we
believe an insufficient performance rating is a serious rating
and we should have a written record as to why it was given for
two reasons: the faculty member needs a written record of such
a serious rating; and the institution deserves to have a written
record for their protection as well. Our experience from talking
to faculty is that it is hard for DFSC's to change a performance
rating.

Vote on Item 2 carried on a voice vote.

XXIII-60 Senator Walker moved approval of Item 3.   (Second, Zeidenstein)

Dr. Chris Eisele: (Rationale: Specific yearly performance
ratings should not be part of the criteria for promotion and
tenure. A faculty member's complete record should be compared to
a set of criteria.)

Change three is a substantive change.   It is the result of our
listening and talking to people across the campus. We think it
is not in the best interest of the faculty or the university for
colleges to be moving situations in which they say, promotions
from associate professor to full professor aren't possible,
unless the faculty member had exceptional merit for at least two
years of a faculty assignment.   We believe that the entire
record should be compared to a set of criteria rather than just
a rating.

Senator Ken Strand: Are you saying the vote of the DFSC does not constitute criteria?

Dr. Chris Eisele: A record is a list of performances. Colleges have criteria that performances are compared to. We don't think that performance over a year can be reduced to a rating such as rate custom merit level each two years. We believe that the rating is a method of telling a faculty member one piece of information.   But, to use a rating as criteria is not sufficient.   Rating is a number. CFSCs should look at the entire performance of a faculty member.

Item 3 carried on a voice vote.

XIII-61 Senator Walker moved approval of Item 4 (Second, Collier)

Dr. Chris Eisele: (Rationale: (1) Changing Board of Regents Policy; (2) problems with formative evaluation process.

This is a substantive change.   There are two changes made in number four.   The first is to delete the notion of formative. i.e., verbal appraisals.   In place of verbal appraisals are interim or written appraisals. We do that for the obvious reason.   Procedurally, we think it is safer, better, more productive to faculty to have a written appraisal so that they have a clear idea of what they are doing or have not done. We also came across more than one comment that the formative, verbal, non-reported appraisal sometimes comes across as a real appraisal. We believe that written evaluations are necessary.

The second change in Item 4 was proposed because of BOR policy changes over the last few years.   A couple of years ago, a policy was made that we have to do four year evaluations of tenured faculty.   At this point there are no procedures for doing that four-year appraisal.   We believe the procedures that we have proposed meet the BOR's request.   The Provost can find out information about the evaluations by asking departments for information.   This would keep all of the information in the departments.   This says an appraisal or evaluation must be done.   There must be some way for the Provost Office to find out what the results were in general and what the procedures were.   The Regents changed some regulations last summer that changed the number of years that a faculty member can bring in with them.   If the calendar works wrong, a faculty member could come up for promotion with one interim appraisal, two formative verbals, and we find that to be wrong.

Senator Schmaltz: In number three, it states "Four-year performance evaluations of all tenured faculty members with the rank of Professor," -- shouldn't this say all tenured faculty?

Dr. Eisele: BOR policy states rank of Professor.

Motion carried on a voice vote.

XXIII-62 Senator Walker moved approval of Item 5 (Second Razaki).

Dr. Chris Eisele: (Rationale: all faculty should have an opportunity to take part in the development of CFSC and DFSC policies.)

The current ASPT document does not specify that faculty should have input into college criteria for CFSC and DFSC policies. We added this to guarantee that it is there.

Motion carried on a voice vote.

XXIII-63 Senator Walker moved approval of Item 6. (Second, DeRousse)

Dr. Chris Eisele: (Rationale: faculty should have copies of all ASPT guidelines.)

Change six is the result of an accidental conversation. I had always assumed that faculty had copies of ASPT guidelines. An administrator convinced me that there was nothing in writing to require making available guidelines. Growing out of that conversation, we thought that the documents should be provided to each faculty member.

Motion carried on a voice vote.

XIII-64 Senator Walker moved approval of Item 7 (Second, Zeidenstein).

Dr. Chris Eisele: (Rationale: The current ASPT document is unclear.)

What we have done in Change Seven is strike some language that is unclear. We lost track of what we were intending to do. The addition in number two says that the DFSC develops departmental procedures and policies and provides them to each department faculty member. For some reason, the previous copy read: each Department Chairperson will announce guidelines. What we have done is to write into policy what is already in practice.

Motion carried on a voice vote.

XXIII-65 Senator Walker moved approval of Item 8 (Second, Razaki).

    Dr. Chris Eisele: (Rationale: to remove the ambiguity in the use of the word "merit.")

    Change number eight is not substantive. We have over the last several years found that the word "merit" has taken on a great deal of ambiguity.   We have a merit system, merit category, merit evaluation, merit rating.   We have attempted to eliminate that ambiguity by using the word performance evaluation consistently throughout the document.

    Motion carried on a voice vote.

XXIII-66 Senator Walker moved approval of Item 9 (Second, Razaki).
(WITHDRAWN)
    Dr. Chris Eisele: (Rationale: to provide departments with more flexibility in rating faculty performance.)

    Change nine is not substantive, because we do permit the current system to remain in place.   What we have provided through this change are options which the departments may exercise.   These changes came out of the hearings, and comments we received.   The options the departments may exercise at their discretion are: two categories. One includes four categories: (EXCEPTIONAL MERIT, HIGH MERIT, MERIT, AND INSUFFICIENT PERFORMANCE).   We chose those words after finding that almost no words provided the peace and tranquility that we were looking for.   The other option is to have three categories: MERIT, HIGH MERIT, AND INSUFFICIENT PERFORMANCE. The other option is to take the current exceptional merit category and divide it so that there are groups of faculty receiving different amounts of money within exceptional merit category, or they may say every faculty member within exceptional merit receives different amounts of money, or they may use the current system which has one amount of money for every faculty member within the exceptional merit category. We think this will give the departments flexibility. We know it maintains status quo, if departments choose.

    Senator Schmaltz: In X.B.10.d., at the top of page 9.2, it says "Salary Allocation in option 1 (MERIT) or option 2 (MERIT/HIGH MERIT) systems:"   Then you talk about salary allocation models for individual faculty receiving MERIT/or HIGH MERIT. You would not have the HIGH MERIT rating in Option 1.

    Dr. Chris Eisele: One and two are based upon the kind of salary allocation criteria.   Across the board would be one. The across the board goes to either MERIT or HIGH MERIT, depending on which system we are using.

Senator Walker: If you were using the MERIT system, then the HIGH MERIT phrases don't apply. If you chose the MERIT-HIGH MERIT system, then the MERIT and the HIGH MERIT phrases apply.

Dr. Chris Eisele: Under X.B.10.d., you expect to see 1, 2, 3, and 4 which deal with each of the different categories. We chose to break it out in one and two. That is, in one case it is across the board; and in the other case it is 1/2 percentage. I don't see a question about the content, I see a question about the way we have broken out one and two.

Senator Schmaltz: Let's say my department uses Option 2, MERIT/HIGH MERIT. Say I got a merit rating, and I am under Option 2. Why couldn't I argue that I should be getting a percentage of my base salary that is the same applied to all faculty in the same category in my department (MERIT/HIGH MERIT). I should get the same percentage rate that the faculty in HIGH MERIT get.

Senator Zeidenstein: I think paragraph two tells you why you can't: "faculty rated MERIT will receive one-half (1/2) the percentage increase of those rated HIGH MERIT."

Dr. Chris Eisele: Let me suggest one small change of wording: (1) Salary allocations to individual faculty receiving MERIT (option 1) or HIGH MERIT (option 2). We are in fact saying that the options are different in their intended effect. If you stay with the current three category system, there is in effect no disincentive built in in that large range between insufficient and exceptional. In the option 2 category, there is in fact, a disincentive built in -- that is, the range is seen as being too broad by a number of faculty, and we have said that if they want to have a system in their department that breaks out two categories between insufficient and exceptional and makes one of those a disincentive, this is how you can do it. We are not intending to say here that option 1 and option 2 address differences in the money. There is a difference in the function between option 1 and option 2.

XIII-67 Senator Wallace: I would like to offer an amendment to X.B.10.d., to replace both sections d. and e.: "Salary allocations to individual faculty will be distributed as a percentage of the faculty member's base salary. The percentage will be determined by a method approved by a majority vote of the departmental faculty." (Second, Cook)

Senator Wallace: The reason I propose this is that no department should have superimposed on it a method for determining its faculty salaries. Different departments have

different needs. The method would be approved by the departmental faculty.

Senator Cook: I like this version better than one that I would have proposed which would be the deletion of section two to allow more individual options within the department structure.   It is a far better solution to that issue.

Senator Nelsen: I strongly support departments choosing their own methods.

Senator Ken Strand: This takes some power away from DFSCs and CFSCs. Could you explain how this would be put into practice.

Senator Wallace: Different models could be developed in departments. Faculty would talk about how this was to be distributed. A model could be discussed in a department and after the faculty talked about it, they would vote on it and put it into place. Another method would be to take it to an elected committee of the department. The department should determine what the method should be.   There are a lot of different models and methods.

Senator Ken Strand: You don't think this would require a lot of extra work.

Senator Wallace: I don't think so. I would think if I were a faculty member that I would appreciate the opportunity of getting together as a department and deciding the method. At least the department would not have superimposed on them what method they had to use.

Senator Zeidenstein: Under this proposal, it is at least theoretically possible that in one or more departments, the faculty might not have exceptional merit. It is possible that the method they choose might not include exceptional merit.

Senator Wallace: The departmental faculty would make that decision.   A second amendment to replace X.B.10.c. would be: "Departments shall have the option of using a performance category system containing three or more categories as determined by a majority vote of the departmental faculty."

Senator Zeidenstein: This would preclude the CFSC's from reviewing the Department's salary allocation method?

Senator Ritt: I don't believe that the President was quite accurate in his description.   It does foreclose or fix

16

some allocations. The statement that it is going to be a percentage allocation forecloses what certain departments do and that certain members of the department receive not a percentage of their salary, but a fixed amount of dollars.

Senator Wallace: But, they could choose a percentage.

Senator Ritt: Oh, different percentages for different people?

Senator Wallace: Yes.

The Academic Senate recessed for fifteen minutes.

Academic Senate reconvened at 9:05 p.m.

(XXIII-66 WD) Senator Walker: Due to the nature of the amendment, we would like to withdraw our motion on Item 9 at this time. (Second, Razaki)

Senator Wallace: I am not opposed to the departments using a performance system.

Senator Walker: The Faculty Affairs Committee notes that.

Senator Nelsen: Where do we direct questions on this matter?

Chairperson Schmaltz: It would probably be best to write a letter to the Faculty Affairs Committee and carbon copy the University Review Committee.

XXIII-69 Senator Walker moved approval of Item 10 (Second, Razaki)

Dr. Chris Eisele: (Rationale: the relationship among DFSC, CFSC and University policy is unclear; University policy reflects procedures and minimum standards that must be conformed to; CFSC policy sets parameters for DFSC policy.) This is a substantive change.

Motion carried on a voice vote.

XXIII-70 Senator Walker moved approval of Item 11 (Second, Sadeghian).

Dr. Chris Eisele: (Rationale: the role of the URC in reviewing CFSC guidelines is unclear.) This gives the URC more authority on paper.

Motion carried on a voice vote.

XXIII-71 Senator Walker moved approval of Item 12 (Second, Touhy).

Dr. Chris Eisele: (Rationale: the role of the URC in reviewing CFSC guidelines is unclear.) This change would ensure consistency of purpose.

Senator Cook: If all five colleges selected different criteria to use in recommending faculty for tenure, would the URC be expected to reconcile these standards?

Dr. Eisele: You would cop out. We need to know that the purposes of faculty and senate are in agreement.

Senator Cook: Will this ensure consistency of purpose?

Dr. Eisele: The power to change CFSC guidelines lies within the colleges.

Senator Cook: But the CFSC documents are approved by the URC, aren't they?

Dr. Eisele: This is to clarify URC's purpose. Some CFSC guidelines have a staffing plan attached to them. This is not the appropriate place for it. It could be a problem.

Senator Walker: Isn't it correct that the appeals process is the ultimate authority of the system?

Dr. Eisele: If the procedures are clear and clean, appeals will probably not be necessary.

Motion carried on a voice vote.

5. **Rules Committee Recommendations for Faculty Appointments to External Committees   3.6.92.4**

XIII-72 Motion by Engelhardt (Second, Newgren) to approval Rules Committee Recommendations for Faculty Appointments to External Committees carried on a voice vote. Appointments as follows:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE
            Patricia O'Connell, EAF   1995
            Bonnie Pomfret, Music   1995

ATHLETIC COUNCIL
            Deborah Shelton, Music   1995
            Beth Verner, HPERD   1995
            Lauren Brown, Biology   1995
            Jim Grimm, Marketing   1995
            Jim Johnson, Psych.   1993

ECONOMIC WELL BEING COMMITTEE

David Kephart, ACS	1995
Margaret Ann Hayden, HEC	1995
Steve McCaw, HPERD	1995

ENTERTAINMENT COMMITTEE

Aaron Moore, Agric.	1995
Sherry Holladay, Comm.	1995

FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE

Lee Graf, MQM	1995

FACULTY ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Wendy Duffy, Acctg.	1995

HONORS COUNCIL

Patricia Jarvis, PSY	1995
Robert Preston, Biology	1995
Anne Wortham, SASW	1993

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Ed Schapsmeier, History	1995
Myrna Garner, HEC	1995

REINSTATEMENT COMMITTEE

Marya Roland, Art	1995
Gurramkonda Naidu, FAL	1995

STUDENT CENTER PROGRAMMING BOARD

Amy Gilreath, Music	1994

STUDENT CODE ENFORCEMENT & REVIEW BOARD

Nancy Chapman, HPERD	1995

SCERB GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

Martha Bauman-Power, HEC	1995
Karen Pfost, Psych.	1995

SCERB HEARING COMMITTEE

David Draper, HPERD	1995
Paul Holsinger, History	1995
K. J. Jinadasa, Math	1995
Suraj Kapoor, Communic.	1995
B. Muthuswamy, ACS	1995
Catherine Peaden, Eng.	1995
Ron Rosati, Agriculture	1995
Myrna Stephens, HPERD	1995
Sue Strohkirch, Comm.	1995

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Susan Appel, Art	1995
Robert Arnold, EAF	1995
Gerlof Homan, History	1995
Kerry Tudor, Agric.	1995

UNIVERSITY FORUM COMMITTEE

Bob Hathaway, Math   1995

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. **Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for Communication
   Department - Professional Public Relations Sequence**

Senator Ritt: Dr. Vince Hazleton, Chair of the Department
of Communication is here tonight to explain the program and
answer questions.

Dr. Vince Hazleton: The new Professional Public Relations
Sequence is designed as a terminal degree for practicing
public relations professionals. Admissions will be limited to
individuals with a minimum of two years of professional experi-
ence related to public relations and appropriate undergraduate
degree. It would consist of 39 hours of coursework. It has a
structured curriculum designed for public relations. The program
would be based in Chicago. The Public Relations Society of
America will sponsor the program. There is only one single
new course which will need to be added to the department curri-
culum, which will not cause any new expenditures of resources.
We will continue to direct and meet our current budget. No
new faculty are needed to deliver this sequence. Courses will
be taught by ISU graduate faculty members. We feel the program
will benefit undergraduate teaching faculty and they will learn
as much as they teach. In the proposed sequence all faculty will
be available to advise students about specific courses.

Senator Hesse: I have five questions.   Is it true that this
degree will not serve any students on campus.

Dr. Hazleton: No.

Senator Hesse: Is there a precedent in the University for this
type of program?   Would the department offer this degree if the
Public Relations Society did not pay it to do so?

Dr. Hazleton: No, it would be foolish to do so.

Senator Hesse: Will faculty be teaching graduate courses off-campus on an overload basis? Will this cause friction in the department?

Dr. Hazleton: Yes. I don't think this will cause friction in the department. The research projects with the PRSSA would in fact benefit the department.

Senator Hesse: Can you give us any assurance that this is not a conflict of interest for faculty to be regularly teaching in a contractual arrangement.

Dr. Hazleton: No more than the merit system deserves. We don't picture this as being problematic. A "yes or no answer" would lead to whoever is in charge not being in charge very long.

Senator Hesse: The Chicago Chapter will collect revenue for the sequence. Does that mean that the Chair of the Communication Department will not approve?

Dr. Hazleton: It will be unilateral.

Senator White: Aren't there IBHE guidelines about courses being offered first and only off campus?

Dr. Batsche: Yes. I need to make clear what the Senate is approving. The Senate does not have to approve off campus programs. This program is going to be offered off campus. The Senate however has to approve the sequence in order for it to be offered as a subdivision of the M.S. in Communications. The only other off campus program that ISU offers that is not offered on campus is at the Dwight Correctional Facility.

Senator White: Then this program has to be approved in order for it to be offered in the Chicago area?

Dr. Catherine Batsche: The sequence has to be approved to be on our inventory.

Senator White: Why does the proposal cover sheet say it is in the communication major?

Dr. Hazleton: That is the model we were given to follow. This is our only degree in Public Relations.

Senator White: On page five of the proposal, about the middle of the page, it mentions a capstone course, Case Studies in Public Relations.

Senator Sadeghian: Capstone experiences are not offered in every discipline. In History and Theatre, students just keep taking courses and eventually they graduate.

Dr. Hazleton: The Department felt that a research experience was necessary to the program.

Senator White: You mention nationally known faculty. Why is this program Public Relations rather than Communication?

Dr. Hazleton: The program review for Public Relations indicated that there were 9.5 FTE, with 7 tenure line faculty. Faculty have a publishing record of 7 book chapters and 90 conference papers.

Senator Sadeghian: On the first page, paragraph four states that the sequence would consist of 39 hours of coursework, unlike the existing 32 hour program -- is this a new sequence?

Dr. Hazleton: We are seeking to structure courses already available to build in the research requirement.

Senator Sadeghian: On the last page, it mentions "The Chicago Chapter of the Public Relations Society of America will collect revenues for the sequence and will contract with individual faculty members for specific courses."

Dr. Hazleton: That structure is there because it will benefit that type of group. Chicago is 120 miles away, and three members of the department will be teaching classes there. There is no mechanism at ISU to administer this. We were trying to reduce the amount of administration.

Senator Sadeghian: How would that differ?

Dr. Hazleton: Students will take the 39 hours, pass the capstone course, and be administered a graduate degree. There are course options to choose from. Students may benefit from the different options.

Senator Sadeghian: That is what other advisors do.

Dr. Hazleton: We need to guarantee advisement. What works on campus will not work at that distance.

Senator Sadeghian: There are no ISU students interested right now? It says they must have two years experience in the field.

Dr. Hazleton: This program is not being offered on campus. We are proposing it because there is a need in this area.

The program is designed as a terminal degree for practicing public relations professionals. The 32 hour program that we presently offer for a Master's degree in Communication includes all communication majors. The new sequence is designed for practicing public relations professionals.

Senator Sadeghian: How does the student body at ISU benefit from this?

Dr. Hazleton: The courses currently exist and are offered on campus. It might not be available to them otherwise. Faculty are already available.

Senator Zeidenstein: I am concerned about the mechanics and logistics of this. Won't the faculty be spreading their time rather thin, teaching at ISU in the daytime, and driving up to Chicago for an evening class. Not to mention the expense of renting classroom space in Chicago.

Dr. Hazleton: Faculty would drive up and back in one day. No one would be teaching more than one course per semester. We would be using the AMA building in Chicago.

Senator Zeidenstein: One graduate course, taught by one person, one evening per week -- and you call this an overload? Does that mean the faculty member has a total of 12 to 16 hours? What is the AMA building?

Dr. Hazleton: American Medical Association.

Senator Razaki: I say if you can do this, more power to you. I think it is a wonderful program.

Dr. Catherine Batsche: I want to remind the Senate that we are approving only the sequence. The department could seek approval from the IBHE to take their existing Masters in Communication off campus. A sequence is noted on the student's transcript now, but "public relations" could not be listed on the student's transcript unless we obtain approval for the sequence. To respond to an earlier comment, we offer many programs off-campus now. But, we cannot put general revenue dollars into these programs when they are offered on a contract basis.

Senator Zeidenstein: Do you need to receive approval from someone for overload coursework?

Dr. Hazleton: There is a Board of Regents requirement for faculty members to report outside consulting.

Senator Zeidenstein: What about the salary a person gets?

Dr. Hazleton: A committee of our faculty members is working
with the PRSSA. We would offer a salary high enough to
attract the faculty members. $4,000 per course per semester
would be budgeted, plus $500 for advisement.

Dr. Catherine Batsche: Typically, the fee is $3,500, but
alternative fees can be negotiated depending on the cost of
the program.

Senator Stenger: Are there courses currently being taught in
Chicago?

Dr. Hazleton: Yes.

Senator Stenger: Then this is already being done, because
the classes are already being taught.

Dr. Hazleton: It is not already being done. It cannot be done
as a program, until it is approved. We can deliver classes
on a contract basis, we cannot deliver a degree program unless
it is approved. At some point people would have to come to
campus to complete a degree.

Dr. Catherine Batsche: We have to have approval from the
Board of Regents and the IBHE before we can offer more than 50%
of the courses leading to a degree off campus. All the courses
are now being offered on-campus, except one class, so the depart-
ment can offer these courses off-campus. However, the
department cannot offer more than 50% of the coursework leading
to the degree without BOR and IBHE approval.

Senator Syrotinski: The rationale seems to quote conflicting
statistics for 1984-1995 and 1982-1995, regarding the jobs
generated in this field. Given the fact of the recession,
is that likely to change?

Dr. Hazleton: The choice of the range of material was merely
to reflect the consistent patterns of estimates of growth in
the field. Most recently the IBHE distributed a document having
to do with productivity within higher education. One of the
most rapidly growing occupational specialities with high demand
that was identified in that study was public relations. I think
the current data indicate a need for this. From my own stand-
point as a professor who teaches public relations, as society
grows increasingly complex, the need for professional communica-
tors to help bridge gaps of understanding caused by differences
in location, occupation, culture, is increasing. I think there
is a long term societal trend to need more people who have a
better understanding of the fundamental communication process.

Whereas, the traditional journalist in residence which would be the historical route in public relations.

Senator Syrotinski: There is a section where you mention equal employment opportunity. How much is that going to be a central concern of your program?

Dr. Hazleton: Role theory approach is special to public relations. It currently focuses on gender issues, either related to choice of public relations roles, effects of the glass ceiling within business organizations, and a number of other areas. There is a strong feminist movement within public relations theory and research. That literature is well represented in our courses.

Senator Syrotinski: What do you mean by feminist?

Dr. Hazleton: Feminist perspectives on organizational theory. Sometimes we need cultural interpretations of what something means, such as the glass ceiling effect. There is some concern in the profession about what's called the feminization of public relations. It appears to be becoming a female dominated profession. The number of women who study public relations currently exceeds the number of men. Historically, that was not the case. There are feminist viewpoints in articulating what that means. One of the articles that I had my students read dealt with the whole area of public relations roles. There has been a distinction between technical roles and managerial roles. The traditional research has indicated that women have a tendency to seek and prefer technical as opposed to managerial roles. One feminist author very articulately and cogently makes the point that there are some cultural values that we bring to using the term managerial role vs. technical role that devalue the work itself.

Senator Engelhardt: I would request that information item number three be brought before information item number two because we have a guest waiting patiently to answer questions on this.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Since there is no objection to this, you may do so.

2. **Rules Committee: CAST Bylaws Changes**

Senator Rob Engelhardt, Chairperson of Rules Committee: I would like to invite Dr. Ken Stier of the Industrial Technology Dept. to come to the table to answer questions.

Senator Zeidenstein: On Page 3, Article 4, Membership, Section I, near the bottom, "(4) each department or academic unit has

the right to have a student as an additional member, with the
exception of Military Science." Why did you exclude Military
Science?

Dr. Stier: Military Science is an academic unit, not a depart-
ment.

Senator Zeidenstein: At the top of the last page, Article IV,
Section 3, staggered terms. How do the department representa-
tives fall into the staggered term representation, or at large
members?

Dr. Stier: People are elected for three-year terms.

Senator Cook: Having been both the at-large representative
and departmental representative, both are elected for three
year terms. There are three at-large representatives and
they are each elected on alternating terms. The department
representatives also are elected, as best we can divide the
odd number, over a consecutive three year period -- 1/3 each
year.

Senator Zeidenstein: In Article V, Section 3, "student members
shall be elected....." Somewhere below, it indicates that
student members are elected by students of the department.
If that was intended, it is not shown here. Conceivably,
faculty members could elect a student. It should read "student
members should be elected by other student members."

Dr. Stier: We'll look into that.

Senator Zeidenstein: In Article VI, Section 2, "Officers of
the College Council.....shall constitute the Executive Commi-
tee of the Council." ".....shall prepare the agenda for each
Council meeting and shall perform such other functions as the
Council assigns to it." In Article VII, Section 6, it reads:
"There shall be no limits on the subjects open to discussion by
the Council. Faculty and students desiring to bring specific
matters to the attention of the Council shall communicate them to
the Secretary. Such requests shall be presented to the Council
for its consideration." Is this an inconsistency?

Dr. Stier: No.

Senator Zeidenstein: In Article XIII, Section 4, E., Academic
Programs: "The Dean, with the advisement of the College Council,
shall be responsible for the formulation and periodic review of
the academic plan for the College."

Finally, Article IX, Amendments and Bylaws, about the bottom half you provide for a referendum to be generated by 10% of the students and faculty. "All students and faculty are entitled to vote in a referendum. An amendment approved by a majority of both the student and faculty members voting, and by the Academic Senate shall become part of this document." Does this have the possibility for a very small number of students or faculty to kill an amendment that was passed by the College Council? There is no quorum required?

Senator Engelhardt: The Rules Committee requested that they put this particular wording in the Bylaws to agree with the ISU Constitution.

Senator Engelhardt: I would move that we move the CAST Bylaws from Information Stage to Action Stage at this time. (Second, Sadeghian).

Senator White: Why?

Senator Engelhardt: This is the last meeting of this particular Senate. The Rules Committee has reviewed this, and it is in agreement with the Constitution. Dr. Stier is here tonight, and we would like to get it taken care of.

Senator Tuttle: As a matter of principle, I don't think we should do this, without any warning, or opportunity to review the proposed changes that clearly ahead of time. I don't see any emergency here. Why do we need to do this?

Senator Engelhardt: This is consistent with the Constitution and Bylaws of the Academic Senate.

Senator Tuttle: You are technically correct. I am arguing that this is contrary to the principle or philosophy of what we are trying to do, particularly with the idea of looking at it thoroughly.

Senator Walker: I am from the College of Applied Science and Technology, and I don't see any urgency in this. I would rather the College have time to make wording changes.

Motion to move the item to action status failed on a voice vote.

3. **Rules Committee Report on the Administrative Efficiency Committee Report**

Senator Engelhardt: Last fall the Rules Committee was charged with looking at the Administrative Efficiency Committee Report. What we did was separate it into different sections and send

them out to different internal Senate committees for research. After they researched and did their own investigations of the recommendations, they sent their final recommendations back to us. The Rules Committee got together and formed this final report. Item 1, "Abolish the Academic Computer Advisory Committee as recommended by the Administrative Efficiency Committee," which appears on Page 2 of the report. Item 2, "Agree with the Administrative Efficiency Committee's recommendation under Academic Planning," is on Page 4 of the report. Item 3, "The Academic Affairs Committee should make any changes they feel necessary regarding the curriculum process. However, not necessarily as recommended by the Administrative Efficiency Committee," which appears on page 5, 6 and 7 of the report. Item 4, "The Enrollment Management Committee should be abolished as recommended by the Administrative Efficiency Committee," which appears on page 8 of the report. Item 5, "The University Review Committee serves a very important function and should remain, contradictory to what the Administrative Efficiency Committee recommended," which appears on page 9. Item 6, "The Facilities Planning Committee should be abolished as the Administrative Efficiency Committee recommends, transferring all responsibilities to the Administrative Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate as outlined in the Administrative Efficiency Committee Report," which appears on page 15. Item 7, "Agree with the Administrative Efficiency Committee's recommendations on paperwork and data collection," which appear on page one of the paperchase subcommittee final report. We noted at the bottom: "Conclusions 1, 2, 4, and 7 are not directly related to the Academic Senate, but were covered in the report so we chose to respond." We received feedback from internal committees on this, so chose to include that in our report.

Senator Razaki: I don't have a page 16.

Chairperson Schmaltz: We will get that to senators before the action item stage.

Senator Walker: This will be information stage under this Senate, but action stage under the next Senate.

Senator Engelhardt: I don't believe it will be action. Most of the recommendations in the report are not under Senate jurisdiction.

Chairperson Schmaltz: The Senate would not have the power to abolish the Academic Computer Advisory Committee. That is not one of our external committees. We could recommend to the President that he do this. The only committee under our juristiction is the Facilities Planning Committee.

Senator Walker: Will this come to the Senate for action?

Senator Engelhardt: The only change that our committee relayed to the Senate, is abolishing the Facilities Planning Committee, and that does not have to be an action item next time.

Senator Young: The only action this report calls for is the abolishing of the Facilities Planning Committee. I would like to make a motion that all of our committees should continue to exist.   Maybe that is not a formal motion.   (No second)

Senator White: The President formed the Administrative Efficiency Committee in order to advise him. He was sharing this information with us. There was never any assumption that anything here would be acted upon.

Senator Engelhardt: That is correct.

Senator Young: The Facilities Planning Committee comes under the Administrative Affairs Committee, so if they want to abolish it, they can.

Dr. Catherine Batsche: The Facilities Planning Committee voted last fall to discontinue.   This recommendation was forwarded to the Administrative Affairs.

Senator Young: That would have to go to Administrative Affairs Committee.

Senator White: As Chair of the Administrative Affairs Committee, we did not take any action to do this.

Senator Engelhardt: The Rules Committee was under the impression that we were to take the response that we got back from the various internal committees and base our recommendations on their reports.   We used their report back to us that the Facilities Planning Committee should be abolished, and went ahead on the efficiency report and the Administrative Affairs Committee's recommendations.   I quote from their report: "The Administrative Affairs Committee supports five of six recommendations in the Efficiency Committee report relevant to committees. We do not support the elimination of the University Review Committee."
We interpreted this to mean that the recommendation for abolishing Facilities Planning Committee was supported.

Senator White: In the process of reviewing the Administrative Efficiency Committees Report, that means that we were concurring with the recommendations of their report.

Chairperson Schmaltz: The basic question is, where do we go from here? We are at the end of one Senate, and will have a whole new Senate. The Rules Committee has done their job and brought back their recommendations.

Senator Ritt: There will be a new Senate and a new Executive Committee. It might be wise to place a request on the record to ask the Executive Committee to direct these issues to the appropriate Senate Committee and ask for a recommendation on the Facilities Planning Committee.

Senator Sadeghian: The Rules Committee already did that.

Senator Ritt: For example, the report states in number 3: "The Academic Affairs COmmittee should make any changes they feel necessary regarding the curriculum process." If the composition of the Academic Affairs Committee changes, then it might be wise for the new Academic Affairs Committee have this fact called to them by the new Executive Committee and ask them to consider the suggested action.

Senator Alexander: I would suggest that probably the appropriate action for the Facilities Planning Committee has already taken place. We have a copy of a memorandum from the chair of that committee dated October 28, 1991, where they voted to discontinue the committee. From that committee recommendation and the Administrative Efficiency Recommendation, I don't know that there is anything else to do. The Facilities Planning Committee has not been meeting for the last six months. This is entirely consistent with everybody's understanding of the dissolution of a committee. I think the Administrative Affairs advice is not necessary. There does not appear to be any further action that needs to be taken here. A committee that was a subcommittee has been dissolved.

Senator Nelsen: Can a Senate Committee vote to do away with themselves?

Senator Walker: It takes Senate action to dissolve the committee. Whether they are meeting or not is unimportant.

Chairperson Schmaltz: This is exactly correct. There has been more emotion generated over the Facilities Planning Committee. The Chair has said repeatedly that an external committee of the Senate cannot rule themselves out of existence. If they choose to not be on the committee, they may resign and we will find a replacement. The Administrative Affairs Committee can recommend to the Senate that one of its external committees be eliminated. If it goes through the Information and Action stages, and the

Senate votes to eliminate it, it shall be done.   It shall not be done by a committee who votes that they don't want to have the committee anymore or that its function is useless.

Senator Walker: My original question was whether there would be action on this item -- as a result of this report?

Chairperson Schmaltz: It is on tonight's Agenda as an jurisdiction Item.   The Senate can do whatever it wants with this. If they wish to carry it on to the next meeting as Action, they may do so.

Senator Engelhardt: The Rules Committee was charged with looking at the Administrative Efficiency Report.   We got a recommendation from the Administrative Affairs Committee to abolish the Facilities Planning Committee as part of their report. Are we out of order by bringing that to the Senate?

Chairperson Schmaltz: No.   Senator White seems to think that his committee has not recommended this for Senate action.

Senator White: We have not looked formally at a proposal for us to come to the Senate and say let's abolish the Facilities Planning Committee.   We reported that we "support the Administrative Efficiency Committee's suggestions in the report."   It would take a different action from our committee in order to bring this to the Senate floor -- in order to abolish the Facilities Planning Committee.   We are merely in this document agreeing with the Administrative Efficiency Committee Report as directed by the Executive Committee.

Senator Cook: Would it be acceptable to the Administrative Affairs Committee to have the Rules Committee propose the amendment of the Blue Book on this regard?   The Facilities Planning Committee is in the Blue Book List of Committees reporting to the Senate.   Rules Committee usually deals with Blue Book Changes.

Senator White: I couldn't make that decision.

Senator Zeidenstein: If the committee is not meeting, whether it is legal or illegal to do so, there is no immediate rush for action.   There is no reason that it cannot be repopulated.

Senator Young: We officially repopulated it a few minutes ago when we appointed someone to serve a new three year term on the Facilities Planning Committee.

Senator Sadeghian: Where are the members of the Executive Committee who sent this report to the Rules Committee, and why did

they do so?   What did they expect us to do with this?

Chairperson Schmaltz: It was to keep you busy.

Senator White: I am not sure Senator Engelhardt was finished
with his report.

Senator Engelhardt: I wasn't finished, but I don't know that it
matters anymore.   I have a feeling the Rules Committee wasted the
last three months reviewing this and no one wants our opinion.

Senator White: I think at some point it will be useful for the
Senate to form an opinion about the report of the Efficiency
Committee.   That would be a form of secondary advice for the
President and the Executive Committee to take into consideration
for future action.   Saying what our thinking is regarding the
Administrative Efficiency Committee Report on the floor of the
Senate is important.

Senator Engelhardt: Then the Rules Committee research through
the internal committees is presented as information to you
tonight, and we will wash our hands of the Administrative Effi-
ciency Committee Report.

In the letter from the Administrative Affairs Committee, they
voiced some concerns: "We would like to comment that there is an
important implication within the idea that 'all areas function in
support of the academic area'.   That is, administrative and
service units should avoid any tendency to confuse their function
with the function of academic units.   There should, therefore,
be no appointment and housing of faculty separate from the facul-
ty assigned to academic departments.   For example, following
these assumptions, it would be questionable to set up, as the
Provost's Office has already done, a Center for Mathematics,
Science and Technology which buys out professors from academic
units in order to put them to work in an administrative (i.e.
support) unit."

In their final comments, the Administrative Affairs Committee
stated: "The Administrative Affairs Committee is impressed with
the work of the Efficiency Committee.   Our only reservation about
their work is that there was very little in it about specifically
administrative lines of authority and communication.   This
strikes us as puzzling.   Is there no more need for considering
what has been termed 'administrative bloat' in our university?
If the excised portions of the Efficiency Committee Report dealt
more directly with administrative reporting lines, does the
President plan on providing the community with an opportunity to
consider that efficiency (or lack thereof) in another context?"

Senator White: I would like to say for the record, that the attached document is not the Administrative Efficiency Committee Report.

Senator Engelhardt: The attachment to our Rules Committee Report includes the three subcommittee reports that Dr. Wallace sent to the Senate: "Committees;" "Paper Chase," and "Data Collection." This is all the Senate received.

Senator Walker: I have a point of clarification. Your Item 2 says: "Agree with the Administrative Efficiency Committee's recommendation under Academic Planning." I want to ask if that means the Academic Planning Committee keeps its current status and operation?

Senator Engelhardt: Certainly.

Senator Walker: Under Recommendation on Page 4, it states: "With respect to the proposed Operational Planning Process, as long as the faculty both participates and is kept informed.... there is no need to establish additional structure." Does this refer to the current Academic Planning Committee process?

Senator Ritt: We were referring to the Operational Planning Process which is part of the Vision Statement.

Senator Alexander: A statement about the Operational Planning Process is contained in the academic planning part of our normal budgeting process. The Academic Plan for a five year period is included in this.

Senator Walker: Why is it referred to as the operational planning process?

Senator Ritt: Because it was never called the operational planning process before it was put into this particular document. A lot of the early work of the Administrative Efficiency Committee was spent on the implementation of the diagram at the end of the Strategic Planning Vision Statement. That was what we had in mind.

Senator Walker: I assume that Item number 5, "The University Review Committee serves as a very important function and should remain, contradictory to what the Administrative Efficiency Committee recommended," also refers to the other recommendations that Faculty Affairs Committee gave you. That contained three recommendations: (1) FAC recommended that the University Review Committee be retained in its present form; (2) FAC recommended that the requirement for CFSC policies to be reviewed annually should be maintained; and (3) FAC recommended that the

requirement for DFSC policies to be reviewed annually should be maintained. I assume that is all included in Number 5.

Senator Engelhardt: Yes.

Senator Walker: Under the Appendix, it talked about the elimination of the withdrawal form. I think that is a worthwhile form and should not be eliminated.

Senator Alexander: We were looking at the Civil Service form to withdraw from classes. We thought that the paperwork involved in withdrawing from classes added nothing to the process. For those people not involved in a degree program, there were a lot of papers being generated, and elimination of that form would streamline the process.

Senator Walker: So, that is just for Civil Service?

Senator Alexander: Yes.

Senator White: Many of the proposals in the paper chase committee did not make it to the final report. I doubt that this is a copy of the final report.

Senator Alexander: As chair of the subcommittee on Paper Chase, this was our final report.

Senator White: Maybe these changes did not make it into the final report. This is too much of a grab-bag of ideas to deal with. We don't have all of the reports before us. This suggestion was probably never a final suggestion of that committee.

Senator Ritt: If you look at the last page, the chart, on the Vision Statement, you will find that the only place where the committees are mentioned in the Planning and Budgeting Process is that part of the Strategic Planning Process which is the annual University priority study. The Operational Planning Process takes place before that in this sequence. I guess it is after the one year resource allocation plan. The Operational Plan is part of that. What the Administrative Efficiency Committee was concerned with was that in that particular stage of planning that the appropriate Senate Committee be consulted before decisions were made.

Senator Walker: Then it had nothing to do with Academic Planning by itself.

Senator Ritt: Yes, that's right. It includes part of Academic Planning: Annual Reviews, Evaluations, Program Reviews, Support

Function Reviews, and Productivity Adjustments, which are all now part of Academic Planning. It was really to make sure that there was reference to Senate Committees having a part of the planning process.

Senator Young: What is the Senate's possible action for this report?

Chairperson Schmaltz: If a Senate Committee, say the Administrative Affairs Committee, wants to bring forth a recommendation to abolish the Facilities Planning Committee -- that could happen. They have already looked at it, and may take that action.

Senator Young: I am talking about this particular report. This is a report from the Rules Committee to the Academic Senate. It carries no more weight than a report. We were asked to report on the Administrative Efficiency Report, and that is what we did. You need to clarify what we are to do with this report. Do we file it, or what. This is our report back to you.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I would think that the appropriate motion from the Chair of the Rules Committee be: "I move that the Senate accept this report from the Rules Committee." That would be the end of this report.

Quorum call: 24 members present -- not a quorum.

Adjournment

Academic Senate adjourned at 11:05 p.m. due to a lack of a quorum.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE
JAN COOK, SECRETARY

NAME	ATTEN-DANCE	MOTION # XXIII57	MOTION #	MOTION # QUORUM	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	VOICE VOTE MOTION #	Y	N
ADAMS	P	ABSTAIN		P				XXIII-52	X	
ALEXANDER	P	NO		P				XXIII-53	X	
BAER	P	NO		X				XXIII-54	X	
BUCEY	P	--------		X				XXIII-55	X	
CAMP	ABSENT	--------		X				XXIII-56		X
COLLIER	P	NO		P				XXIII-57	RC	X
COOK	P	YES		P				XXIII-58	X	
DEROUSSE	P	NO		X				XXIII-59	X	
ENGELHARDT	P	ABSTAIN		P				XXIII-60	X	
FRYDA	(EXCUSED)	--------		X				XXIII-61	X	
GUROWITZ	P	ABSTAIN		X				XXIII-62	X	
HALL	ABSENT	--------		X				XXIII-63	X	
HESSE	P	--------		X				XXIII-64	X	
HOPKINS	P	ABSTAIN		X				XXIII-65	X	
HULIT	P	NO		X				XXIII-66	WTHD	
LOWERY	P	ABSTAIN		X				XXIII-67	WD	
MANNS	P	ABSTAIN		X				XXIII 68	WD	
MAZARELLO	P	--------		X				XXIII-69	X	
MECKSTROTH	P	YES		P				XXIII-70	X	
NELSEN	P	YES		P				XXIII-71	X	
NEWBY	P	NO		P				XXIII-72	X	
NICHOLAS	P	NO		X						
OGREN	P	NO		X						
PARR	P	YES		P						
PITOCCO	EXCUSED	--------		X						
POMERENKE	P	NO		P						
RAZAKI	P	YES		P						
RITT	P	NO		P						
FOX	EXCUSED	--------		X						
RUMERY	P	NO		P						
SADEGHIAN	P	YES		P						
SCHMALTZ	P	NO		P						
SHIMKUS	P	YES		X						
STEARNS	(EXCUSED)	--------		X						
STENGER		YES		P						
STEVENS		NO		X						
STRAND, D.	(EXCUSED)	--------		X						
STRAND, K.	P	YES		X						
SYROTINSKI	P	YES		X						
TOUHY	P	NO		P						
TUTTLE	P	ABSTAIN		P						
WALKER	P	ABSTAIN		P						
WALLACE	P	ABSTAIN		X						
WHITACRE	EXCUSED	--------		P						
WHITE	P	YES		P						
YOUNG	P	--------		P						
ZEIDENSTEIN	P	YES		P						
ZIELINSKI	P	NO								
TIMMONS	ABSENT	--------								
		NO	15							
		YES	11							
		ABSTAIN	10	24						

February 18, 1992

TO: Academic Senate

FROM: Paul Walker
          Chairperson
          Faculty Affairs Committee

RE: ASPT Handbook Changes

Attached are 12 separate proposed changes in the ASPT Handbook. The Faculty Affairs Committee and the University Review Comm. are proposing them as separate changes because they differ significantly in the nature of change they propose. For example, changes one and six are clarifications; changes five and seven are procedural; changes two and twelve are substantive changes to current policy; changes four and nine are substantive additions to current policy. We hope separating the changes into twelve distinctive pieces will make it easier for the Senate to focus on specific issues related to the current ASPT system.

However, one disadvantage of this approach needs to be noted. A specific section of the current ASPT Document may figure in more than one separate change. Proposed changes eight and eleven each involve different changes to Section II. C. To keep potential confusion to a minimum, each of the twelve proposed changes shows only the original ASPT language and a specific proposed change to that section (or subsection). Changes to Section II. C. proposed in change eight are not reflected in proposed change eleven, nor is proposed change eleven reflected in proposed change eight.

2.20.92.1

TO: Academic Senate   (1)

FR: Paul Walker, Chair
         Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 19, 1992

RE: ASPT Handbook Changes (strike-through = delete;
         underline = add)

Rationale: The current ASPT Handbook description of
different kinds of appeals needs to be clarified.

XI.C.   (pp. 23, 24) Appeals in Denial of Tenure Cases:
        1.   If a faculty member is appealing a
              negative decision with respect to tenure
              he/she must direct that appeal to the
              UAC only. In making the appeal, the
              appellant must refer any allegation of a
              violation within the jurisdiction of the
              Academic Freedom Committee (AFC)
              (violations of procedures in non-
              reappointment and denial of tenure cases
              or violations of academic freedom cases)
              to the AFC.

        2.   However, the UAC may, on its own
              recognizance, decide that an academic
              freedom question is involved in the
              appeal and refer that question to the
              AFC for review and findings. In cases
              of appeals where an academic freedom
              violation question is being reviewed by
              the AFC, the UAC may suspend its
              proceedings until it receives an AFC
              report or it may address itself to other
              issues raised in the appeal and issue an
              interim report.

        3.   Upon completion of the AFC hearing, if
              any, the report of the AFC, in addition
              to being processed as outlined in the
              procedures of the AFC, will also
              immediately be forwarded to the UAC and
              must become a permanent part of the UAC
              report. If, in the judgment of the AFC
              a violation of academic freedom
              occurred, the UAC must decide whether
              the violation significantly contributed
              to the decision to deny tenure. The UAC

will then complete its deliberations and forward its complete report and recommendations as indicated in XI.F.3.

XI.D.-G.(pp. 24-26) Initiation of an Appeal: Promotion, Tenure, Performance Evaluation

1. In the case of promotion or tenure recommendations, the appellant shall notify the Chairperson of the UAC in writing of his/her intention to appeal. This notification must be given within ten (10) working days (days when the University offices are open to the general public) of the date on which the appellant received official notification of the College action relating to the matter giving rise to the appeal.

2. In the case of appeals of performance evaluations, the appellant shall notify the appropriate CFSC Chairperson in writing of his/her intention to appeal within ten (10) working days (days when University offices are open to the public) of the date on which the appellant received official notification of the Department action giving rise to the appeal.

2.

E. Informal Resolution:

1. Before a promotion or tenure appeal is accepted by the UAC, there must be an informal effort to resolve the grievance by the Department and/or College involved. The Chairperson or the Vice-Chairperson of the UAC shall undertake this informal effort to bring the parties together.

2. Before filing a written intent to appeal a performance evaluation with the appropriate CFSC, a faculty member who believes that relevant factors or materials have been ignored or misinterpreted by his/her DFSC shall be entitled to an informal meeting with that committee to present arguments for reconsideration of its decision if he or

she so desires. If the attempt at informal resolution is unsuccessful, the appeals process shall proceed if the appellant so desires.

3.

F. Formal Resolution:

1. The Chairperson of the UAC, in the case of a promotion or tenure appeal, or the Chairperson of the appropriate CFSC, in the case of a performance evaluation appeal, shall respond to the appellant within five (5) working days (as defined in XI.D.1.) following the receipt of a written intent to appeal. The Chairperson or the Vice Chairperson of the UAC shall first attempt the resolution of a promotion or tenure grievance , as described above. If the attempt at resolution is unsuccessful, the appeals process shall proceed, if the appellant so desires.

2. The Chairperson of the appropriate CFSC, in the case of a performance appeal, shall respond to the appellant with five (5) working days (as defined in X.I.D.2) following the receipt of a written intent to appeal.

4.

G. Notification
1. The Chairperson of the UAC shall notify the appropriate College and Department Faculty Status Committee and the Provost of an appellant's promotion or tenure appeal. The UAC shall initiate consideration of a promotion or tenure appeal as expeditiously as possible.

2. The Chairperson of the appropriate CFSC shall inform the Chairperson of the DFSC and the Provost of an appellant's performance evaluation appeal. The appropriate CFSC shall initiate consideration of a performance evaluation appeal in like manner as expeditiously as possible.

5.   The UAC shall initiate consideration of
     a promotion or tenure appeal as
     expeditiously as possible. The
     appropriate CFSC shall initiate
     consideration of a performance
     evaluation in like matter.

TO: Academic Senate

FR: Paul Walker, Chair
           Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 19, 1992

RE: <u>ASPT Handbook</u> Changes (strike-through = delete;
           underline = add)

Rationale: (1) the nature of an "insufficient performance"
rating warrants an automatic written explanation; (2) a
written record on which to base faculty development or
faculty dismissal should exist.

X.B.7.(p. 22)   Persons receiving "insufficient performance"
                ratings will, ~~at their written request,~~ be
                informed in writing of the reasons for these
                decisions.

TO: Academic Senate   (3)

FR: Paul Walker, Chair
           Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 19, 1992

RE: ASPT Handbook Changes (strike-through = delete;
           underline = add)

Rationale: specific yearly performance ratings should not be
part of the criteria for promotion and tenure (a faculty
member's complete record should be compared to a set of
criteria).

VII.A. (p.12) The attainment of successively higher academic
               ranks at Illinois State University reflects
               professional growth and achievement of status
               within the discipline. Further, such status
               is generally expected to be demonstrated by a
               sustained record of professional competence.
               Hence, promotions are neither automatic nor
               the product of any set formula based on yearly
               performance evaluation ratings.

VIII.C.(p.17) Criteria for Tenure: The granting of tenure
               status is a major decision and should not be
               considered as automatic once ~~one~~ a faculty
               member enters the probationary period. The
               tenure decision should not be the product of
               any set formula or based on yearly performance
               evaluation ratings....

                                                                    3

TO: Academic Senate   (4)

FR: Paul Walker, Chair
         Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 19, 1992

RE: ASPT Handbook Changes (strike-through = delete;
         underline = add)

Rationale: (1) changing BOR policy; (2) problems with
formative evaluation process.

V.C.1-3 (p.9) ...The DFSC shall conduct annual merit
               evaluations for each faculty member subject to
               the ASPT system in the Department and shall,
               as required, provide for (1) formative, (2)
               interim, and (2) (3) summative appraisals with
               regard to promotion and tenure.

               1.   [Delete entirely]

               2. 1. "Interim appraisal" is defined as a
                     written evaluation of a faculty member's
                     professional activities and performance
                     related to promotion and/or tenure. This
                     evaluation shall be completed by the
                     Chairperson of the DFSC at least
                     every other year until such time as the
                     faculty member is promoted to Professor
                     and has tenure.

               3. 2. "Summative appraisal" is defined as a
                     written summary and evaluation of a
                     faculty member's professional activities
                     at ISU up to the time when a Department
                     decision regarding tenure or promotion is
                     made. This appraisal explains a
                     departmental promotion or tenure
                     recommendation and is to be completed by
                     the Chairperson with the approval of the
                     DFSC only at the time an individual is
                     recommended for promotion and/or tenure.

               3.   In addition f"Four-year performance
                     evaluations" of all tenured faculty
                     members with the rank of Professor shall
                     be made in compliance with Board of
                     Regents Policies. (III.A.p.12, 1988)

                                                           4.1

     a. <u>Four-year performance evaluation policies, procedures, and criteria shall be part of DFSC guidelines.</u>

     b. <u>The Provost's Office may have access to four-year evaluation policies, procedures, and criteria.</u>

     c. <u>The Provost's Office may have access to the results of four-year evaluations on a yearly basis.</u>

VIII.D.1.(p.18)   Evaluation of the performance of a faculty member during the probationary period is a continuing process. ~~The judgment made which results in the~~ <u>The decision to</u> award~~ing~~ or deny~~ing~~ tenure ~~will~~ <u>shall</u> take into account the <u>faculty member's</u> performance ~~appraisals made each year~~ during the entirety of the probationary period. Inherent in the tenure evaluation process is the responsibility at the departmental level to communicate to the probationary faculty member areas of both strength and weakness in his/her performance.

VIII.D.2.(p.18)   To this end, a written interim appraisal of performance, including a statement of the faculty member's potential contribution to the long range goals of the department will be provided by the DFSC (see V.C.) to each non-tenured full-time faculty member <u>every year</u>. ~~at-least every two years.~~

VIII.D.3.(p.18)   [Delete entirely.]

VIII.D.4.(p.18)~~4.~~ <u>3.</u> A summative appraisal of ~~an individual's~~ <u>a faculty member's</u> professional activities (see V.C.) will be completed at the time a tenure recommendation is made.

TO: Academic Senate

FR: Paul Walker, Chair
           Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 19, 1992

RE: <u>ASPT Handbook</u> Changes (strike-through = delete;
           underline = add)

Rationale: all faculty should have an opportunity to take
part in the development of CFSC and DFSC policies.

IV.F.   (p.8) <u>Following appropriate faculty input,</u> each CFSC
                shall develop college criteria or Milner
                Library criteria for merit ratings, promotion
                and tenure and make these criteria available
                to faculty members in the college or in Milner
                Library.

V.C.   (p.9) ~~Responsibilities-of-the-DFSC,~~ <u>Following</u>
                <u>appropriate faculty input,</u> <u>each DFSC will</u>
                <u>develop</u> ~~encompass-developing-department~~
                faculty status procedures and policies in
                conformity with college and University ASPT
                guidelines (see IV.B. and V.F.), collecting
                information from each....

TO: Academic Senate   (6)

FR: Paul Walker, Chair
           Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 19, 1992

RE: ASPT Handbook Changes (strike-through = delete;
           underline = add)

Rationale: faculty should have copies of all ASPT
guidelines.

IV.F.   (p.8) Each CFSC shall develop college criteria or
               Milner Library criteria for merit ratings,
               promotion and tenure, and ~~make~~ provide these
               criteria ~~available~~ to each faculty members in
               the college or Milner Library.

V.C.   (p.9) Responsibilities of the DFSC encompass
               developing department faculty status
               procedures and policies in conformity with
               college, Milner Library and University ASPT
               guidelines (see IV. B.C. and V.F.), providing
               them to each department faculty member,
               collecting information from each . . . .

TO: Academic Senate   (7)

FR: Paul Walker, Chair
          Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 19, 1992

RE: ASPT Handbook Changes (strike-through = delete;
          underline = add)

Rationale: The current ASPT document is unclear.

X.B. (p. 20,21) Departmental Procedure:

      1.   ~~Each-Department-Chairperson-will-announce
              annually,-following-appropriate-discussion
              within-the-Department-faculty-and-the-DFSC,-the
              standards-and-activities-suitable-for
              exceptional-merit-increases,-after-these-have
              been-reviewed-and-approved-by-CFSC.~~ Departments
              are encouraged to recognize the variety of
              activities of individual faculty members, such
              as classroom teaching, research, external grant
              awards, advising, faculty services,
              administration, performing and visual arts,
              professional services, publications, public
              service, student services.

      2.   <u>At the beginning of the evaluation year, after
              each DFSC has developed department faculty
              status procedures and policies (following
              appropriate faculty input) and the CFSC has
              reviewed and approved them, the Department
              Chairperson will distribute the DFSC procedures
              and policies to each faculty member in the
              department.</u>

[renumber X.B.2 through X.B.10. to X.B.3 through
X.B.11]

TO: Academic Senate (8)

FR: Paul Walker, Chair
Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 19, 1992

RE: <u>ASPT Handbook</u> Changes (strike-through = delete;
underline = add)

Rationale: to remove the ambiguity in the use of the word
"merit."

II.C. (p.5) The URC shall receive statements annually from
each College Faculty Status Committee
indicating current college criteria for ~~merit~~
<u>performance</u> evaluation, promotion, equity and
tenure....

III.C. (p.6) The UAC as a whole shall consider appeals of
promotion and tenure decisions only. UAC
members from an appellant's department will
not take part in his/her appeal. An appeal of
a ~~merit~~ <u>performance evaluation</u> decision must
be made to the CFSC (see IV.C. and XI.).

IV.F. (p.8) Each CFSC shall develop college criteria or
Milner Library criteria for ~~merit ratings~~
<u>performance evaluation</u>, promotion and tenure
and make these criteria available to faculty
members in the college or in Milner Library.

IV.H. (p.8) Each CFSC shall submit an annual report to its
College Council (not applicable to Milner
Library) and to the URC, including data for
Departments and for the entire College, which
includes (1) numbers of faculty within each
of the ~~three salary merit~~ <u>performance</u>
<u>evaluation</u> categories, (2) numbers of
eligible faculty recommended and not
recommended for tenure, and (3) numbers of
eligible faculty recommended for promotion
shown by rank....

V.C. (p.9) Responsibilities of the DFSC encompass
developing department faculty status
procedures and policies in conformity with
college and University ASPT guidelines (see
IV.C. and V.F.), collecting information from
each faculty member (see X.B.2.), including
systematically gathered student reaction to

teaching performance (which must protect the anonymity of students as far as possible), and making recommendations regarding faculty appointments, reappointment and non-reappointment, dismissal, contracts, ~~merit ratings~~ performance evaluation, salary equity adjustments (see V.F.), promotion and tenure. The DFSC shall conduct annual ~~merit~~ performance evaluations for each....

V.E.   (p.10)   The DFSC shall inform departmental faculty members in writing of its recommendations pertaining to their status according to the annual faculty status calendar issued by the Provost. The DFSC shall also report its recommendations regarding ~~merit categories~~ performance evaluations, promotions, and tenure to the CFSC. Any Committee member may submit a minority report. A "minority report" is defined as a written statement indicating reasons for dissenting from a majority position.

X.   (p.19)   University Performance Evaluation Policies and Salary Increment Procedures.

X.A.3. (p.20)   Following completion of the ~~merit~~ performance evaluation process and all appeals resulting therefrom, each CFSC shall deliver to the Provost its recommendations for ~~merit~~ performance evaluations....

X.B.4. (p.21)   Each DFSC will conduct annual ~~merit~~ performance evaluations of each faculty member subject to the ASPT system assigned to that department, exclusive of members of the DFSC. Each faculty member will be given a rating of either "exceptional merit," "merit," or "insufficient performance." On a yearly basis and as part of the decisions made regarding the conduct of DFSC matters, each department will determine, by secret ballot, how DFSC members are to be evaluated on ~~merit~~ their performance and, where relevant, promotion and tenure:....

X.B.5. (p.21)   In cases where a faculty member has formal assignments in two or more Departments or areas, each Department or area shall assume responsibility for ~~merit~~ performance evaluations and salary recommendations reflecting the extent of participation in the

8.2

Department or area. The Department in which a faculty member holds rank shall be responsible for the final evaluation....

X.B.6.(p.22) Each DFSC will notify each faculty member annually of his/her merit performance evaluation classification and of any recommended change in rank or tenure status.

X.B.9.(p.22) Following completion of appeal hearings held by the CFSC, each DFSC shall submit to the College Dean a final list of faculty in each merit performance category.

XI.B. (p.23) An "appeal" is defined as a written statement by a faculty member citing reasons why the faculty member believes there has been a misinterpretation, misjudgment or procedural error relating to a promotion, tenure or performance evaluation recommendation concerning that individual faculty member.

FR: Paul Walker, Chair
           Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 19, 1992

RE: ASPT Handbook Changes (strike-through = delete;
           underline = add)

Rationale: to provide departments with more flexibility in
rating faculty performance

X.A.3. (p.20) Following completion of the ~~merit~~ performance
                 evaluation process, and all appeals resulting
                 therefrom, each CFSC shall deliver to the
                 Provost ~~its~~ recommendations for ~~merit~~
                 performance evaluation of faculty classified
                 by department according to merit category
                 (EXCEPTIONAL MERIT, <u>including the salary</u>
                 <u>allocation model; HIGH MERIT, if applicable;</u>
                 MERIT and INSUFFICIENT PERFORMANCE). The CFSC
                 shall include a copy of each DFSC's original
                 recommendations.

X.B.4. (p.21) Each DFSC will conduct annual merit evaluations
                of each faculty member subject to the ASPT
                system assigned to that department, exclusive
                of members of the DFSC. Each faculty member
                will be given a rating of either "exceptional
                merit," <u>"high merit" (if applicable),</u> "merit,"
                or "insufficient performance."...

X.B.10.a.(p.22) Salary increases shall be allocated on ~~an~~ <u>the</u>
                <u>basis of performance ratings.</u> ~~INSUFFICIENT~~
                ~~PERFORMANCE, MERIT, and EXCEPTIONAL MERIT~~
                ~~bases.~~

                [Delete X.B.10.c. (p.22) as written and
                replace with the following.]

X.B.10.c.(p.22) <u>Departments shall have the option of using a</u>
                <u>three performance categories system or a four</u>
                <u>performance categories system as determined by</u>
                <u>a majority vote of the department faculty:</u>
                <u>(1)   INSUFFICIENT PERFORMANCE, MERIT,</u>
                      <u>EXCEPTIONAL MERIT, or</u>
                <u>(2)   INSUFFICIENT PERFORMANCE, MERIT, HIGH</u>
                      <u>MERIT, EXCEPTIONAL MERIT.</u>

[Delete X.B.10.d. (pp. 22,23) as written and replace with the following.]

X.B.10.d. Salary Allocation in option 1 (MERIT) or option 2 (MERIT/HIGH MERIT) systems:
(1) Salary allocations to individual faculty receiving MERIT or HIGH MERIT ratings will be distributed as a percentage of the faculty member's base salary. The same percentage must be applied to all faculty in the same category, either MERIT or HIGH MERIT, and will be applied regardless of rank or tenure status.
(2) In departments choosing to use option 2 (MERIT/HIGH MERIT), faculty rated MERIT will receive one-half (1/2) the percentage increase of those rated HIGH MERIT.

X.B.10.e. Departments shall have the option of choosing between two salary allocation models for faculty receiving an EXCEPTIONAL MERIT rating as determined by a majority vote of departmental faculty:
(1) a fixed dollar amount for each faculty member rated EXCEPTIONAL MERIT, or
(2) variable dollar amounts for each faculty member or group of faculty rated EXCEPTIONAL MERIT. EXCEPTIONAL MERIT salary allocations will be applied regardless of rank or tenure status and will be added to the option 1 (MERIT) or option 2 (MERIT/HIGH MERIT) salary allocation.

9.2

MOTION XXIII-66 WITHDRAWN

TO: Academic Senate

FR: Paul Walker, Chair
          Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 19, 1992

RE: ASPT Handbook Changes (strike-through = delete;
          underline = add)

Rationale: the relationship among DFSC, CFSC and University
policy is unclear; University policy reflects procedures and
minimum standards that must be conformed to; CFSC policy
sets parameters for DFSC policy.

IV.C.   (p.7) The CFSC shall review department faculty
status procedures and policies with the
authority to ensure their ~~conformity~~
consistency with College policies and
conformity with University policies. In
situations involving tenure decisions, the
CFSC shall review the cases of the individuals
involved and either endorse the DFSC's
decision or reach an alternate recommendation.
In situations involving a positive DFSC
recommendation for promotion, the CFSC shall
also review the cases of the individuals
recommended and either endorse the DFSC's
decision or reach an alternate recommendation.
The CFSC shall also review DFSC
recommendations regarding the distribution of
its salary allocation money ~~among the merit
categories~~ and DFSC recommendations for
distributing salary equity money if the DFSC
chooses to conduct a department equity review
as described in V.F. The CFSC shall inform
the DFSC in writing of any actions taken....

V.C.   (p.9) Responsibilities of the DFSC encompass
developing department faculty status
procedures and policies ~~in conformity~~
consistent with college and Milner Library
CFSC Guidelines and conforming to University
ASPT guidelines (see IV.C. and V.F.),...

TO: Academic Senate   (11)

FR: Paul Walker, Chair
           Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 19, 1992

RE: <u>ASPT Handbook</u> Changes (strike-through = delete;
           underline = add)

Rationale: the role of the URC in reviewing CFSC guidelines
is unclear.

II.C. (p.5)   The URC shall receive statements annually from
               each College Faculty Status Committee
               indicating current college criteria for merit
               evaluation, promotion, equity and tenure. It
               shall review these criteria <u>with the authority</u>
               to ~~assure consistency~~<u>ensure</u> <u>conformity</u> with
               University policies....

TO: Academic Senate   (12)

FR: Paul Walker, Chair
            Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 19, 1992

RE: ASPT Handbook Changes (strike-through = delete;
            underline = add)

Rationale: the role of the URC in reviewing CFSC guidelines
is unclear.

II.C.   (p.5) ...and to In addition, the URC shall
                        determine the extent to which relative
                        uniformity consistency of purpose exists
                        in criteria utilized used by the
                        colleges, and to assure such relative
                        consistency and shall uniformity make
                        recommendations as are necessary ensuring
                        such consistency of purpose to the
                        Provost and to the College Faculty Status
                        Committees.

CURRICULUM PROPOSAL COVER SHEET

GRADUATE ONLY   Communication
                                                 Department
                        .

Deadlines for receipt by Graduate Curriculum Committee:
    New Programs - September 1, two years prior to anticipated implementation date.
    All other curriculum proposals - September 1 of each year for inclusion in the catalog
                        of the following year.

Number of copies required:
    New Programs - For original submission to the Graduate Curriculum Committee,
                   six (6) copies are required. After approval by the Curriculum
                   Committee, an additional 15 copies will be required, to include the
                   Graduate Council. After approval by the Council, the Academic Senate
                   requires 55 copies.
    All other curriculum proposals — submit six (6) copies.

Proposed Action:

COURSES

_____ 1. New—follow Guidelines of Graduate Curriculum Committee for 400 and 500 level
           courses.
_____ 2. Deletion of course   )   Summarize below and provide rationale
_____ 3. Change in course level   )   on separate sheet.
_____ 4. Change in credit hours.   )
_____ 5. Other changes.   )

PROGRAMS

__X__   1. New—follow NEPR format.   NOTE: Program approval does not
           (a) Number of courses within program __13__) connote course approval. Courses
           (b) What course level?_____   ) must be approved on an individual
                                                          basis.

_____ 2. Change in requirements for degree.) Summarize below and provide rationale
_____ 3. Other program revisions.   on separate sheet.

Summary of proposed action: Include title of course or program; provide exact catalog
copy, including number and semester for new course.

        Professional Public Relations Sequence

Routing of proposal and approval signatures:
Department Chairperson ___Hazleton_____ Date _9/26/90_
College Curriculum Chairperson _____ Date _10/23/90_
College Dean ___Vholmen_____ Date _10/25/90_
Graduate Dean ___D. F. Alora_____ Date _11/21/91_
                                12

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL PUBLIC RELATIONS SEQUENCE
IN THE COMMUNICATION MAJOR

1. Institution: Illinois State University

2. Responsible College: Graduate College

3. Proposed Sequence Title: Professional Public Relations

4. Previous Sequence Title: NA

5. Date of Implementation: Fall, 1992

6. Description of the Proposed Sequence:

The Department of Communication currently offers a 32 hour Master's
degree in Communication. This program provides a broad exposure to
the field of Communication and prepares students for further study
in Communication, careers in Communication Education,
Organizational Communication, and Consulting.   The proposed
sequence differs from the existing program in several important
respects.

First, the proposed sequence is designed as a terminal degree for
practicing public relations professionals. Admissions will be
limited to individuals with a minimum of two years of professional
experience related to public relations and appropriate
undergraduate degree.

Second, the sequence would consist of 39 hours of coursework.
Unlike the existing 32 hour program, thesis and comprehensive
examination options would not be offered.

Third, the proposal reflects a structured curriculum designed for
public relations rather than a broad exposure to the Communication
discipline. Four courses would be required in the new sequence
while only two courses are required in the current curriculum.

Finally, as a professional sequence, the proposal reflects a heavy
reliance on 400 level courses.   The existing Master's program
requires a minimum of 15 hours of 400 level credit. The sequence
includes only 3 300-level courses, effectively doubling the minimum
number of 400-level hours.

Catalog Copy:

Professional Public Relations Sequence

--39 hours in Communication required
--Required Courses: COM 422, 478, 492, 497
--27 hours of electives selected from COM 303, 355, 371, 400, 424,
433, 434, 435, 436, 460, 485, 494, 495. Up to nine hours of
electives in related disciplines may be applied toward this degree.

This is a professional sequence designed for individuals with a minimum of two years of work related experience.

7. Rationale for the Proposal

This rationale will discuss reasons for: A) offering a Master's sequence in Public Relations; B) taking the sequence to Chicago; and, C) using Illinois State University's Department of Communication.

Public Relations is the most rapidly growing field of specialization in Communication. The Occupational Outlook Handbook (1989) states that employment of Public Relations workers is expected to increase much faster than the average for all occupations through the year 2000. John Hill, (founder of Hill and Knowlton, the world's largest Public Relations consulting organization), predicts that the demand for entry-level positions in Public Relations is expected to increase by 7 % a year throughout this century

Citing the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics, 1984 through 1995, New York Times Magazine (October 14, 1984) indicated that there will be an increase of 26,000 new Public Relations positions in the United States. This represents an expansion of approximately 29% within the profession. Another forecast for the nation suggests an increase of 70,000 new Public Relations positions between 1982 and 1995 (Public Relations Society of America).

Relative to trends for women and minorities, Rea W. Smith (a founder of the Public Relations Society of America) indicates that "employment opportunities in Public Relations are excellent and will continue to be favorable for many years to come . . . there is less prejudice against women in Public Relations than in many business fields . . . (there is a) crying need for black talent in Public Relations." Ms. Smith estimates that there are 35,000 qualified Public Relations practitioners, with a need for 10,000 more and says that new entry-level people will need formal and specific higher education in the profession.

Graduate education has been recognized as an important professional development tool within the field of PR. The Public Relations Society of America in 1989 approved a requirement for continuing professional development in order to maintain accreditation. PRSA, with approximately 14,000 members is the largest professional membership organization for PR. About 25% of the members of PRSA are accredited. Securing an advanced degree automatically qualifies an individual for continuing accreditation. Also credit earning courses count toward continuing accreditation.

Further, Public Relations professionals have identified Illinois among the geographic regions possessing the greatest need for new graduates (Public Relations News, 1/25/82). Illinois is the third largest job market in the nation for Public Relations professionals. As one might expect, much of the Public Relations activity in the state is centered in Chicago.

Illinois State University is the only public university in the state that currently offers an undergraduate degree in PR. We have developed the largest concentration of faculty and resources for PR education and research within the state of Illinois. Only one additional course will need to be added to the existing curriculum to facilitate the new program.

The quality of the graduate program and faculty in Communication have been recognized nationally. Articles in Communication Education (1988) and ACA Bulletin (1979) have identified ISU faculty among the top fifty programs nationally in terms of quantity of articles published in selected Communication journals. Another Communication Education (1988) article identified ISU as among the top five Master's programs among approximately fifty programs identified in the Midwest. At least seven faculty have received awards for teaching or research.

For these reasons, the ISU Department of Communication was asked by the Chicago Chapter of the Public Relations Society of America to develop this degree option. In their view, of all the public and private universities in the state, ISU is best qualified to provide this sequence.

The proposed sequence is consistent with both university and college vision statements. Relevant aspects of the University Vision statement include themes to provide superior graduate education in selected areas and to promote cultural and public service programs. Relevant themes from the college vision statement include encouraging technological progress, economic development, and social planning within the region and beyond and developing creative leadership for the administration and management of public and private enterprises for the 21st century.

8. Expected Impact of Proposal on Existing Campus Programs and Administrative Support Services

The major **direct** impact of the proposed sequence will fall on the Department of Communication. Because of the lack of offerings at other universities and the large number of professionals with needs for education it is anticipated that demand for the sequence will be large. Accordingly, the Department of Communication will supply faculty for the courses to meet the demand as long as it persists. Faculty will teach in this sequence in addition to their regular duties.

The major **indirect** impact of the proposed sequence lies in the ramifications of regular, structured contact between ISU Department of Communication faculty and Chicago-area Public Relations professionals. Initially, this should provide additional off-campus student internship opportunities for undergraduate Communication majors. Second, these contacts should assist Department of Communication graduates in finding employment. Finally, we see the potential for in-class speakers, presentations to student organizations (such as the ISU chapter of the Public Relations Student Society of America), and professional participants in student events such as Communication Week.

9. Expected Curricular Changes and Impact of Proposed Curricular Changes:

One new course would need to be added to the department curriculum; a capstone course for the 39 hour option:

COM 478 Case Studies in Public Relations
     30 hrs of COM req.

Application of theory and research to the analysis of Public Relations cases.

The 39 hour option would require more coursework than the traditional 32 hour program. However, the indirect faculty load would be much less than in the traditional program.

In the traditional program 3 faculty are required to participate as a committee in the advisement and evaluation functions associated with the comprehensive exam and thesis options. For many faculty this represents a substantial time commitment that is not directly compensated or reflected in their load report.

In the proposed sequence all faculty will be available to advise students about specific courses. However, one faculty member will be designated as a formal advisor and will be paid by the program to fulfill this function. With no thesis or comprehensive exams, this should not be an unmanageable. Resources for this are built into the overhead costs of the sequence.

10. Anticipate Staffing Arrangements:

No new faculty are needed to deliver this sequence. Courses will be taught by ISU graduate faculty members.

11. Anticipated Funding Needs and Sources

ISU faculty teaching in the sequence will teach on an overload basis and will be paid from the revenues it generates. The Chicago chapter of the Public Relations Society of America will collect revenues for the sequence and will contract with individual faculty members for specific courses.

12. Anticipated Space Needs and Plans to House the New Sequence

Since the sequence is offered in Chicago, no new space is needed.