

Winter 2-9-1965

University Council Meeting, February 09, 1965

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

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



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

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "University Council Meeting, February 09, 1965" (1965). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1070.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1070>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISURED@ilstu.edu.

Joint Faculty Policy Committee

Minutes of the Meeting

February 9, 1965

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 10:20 A.M.

<u>Present</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Max B. Ferguson Glenn A. McConky Alan R. Aulabaugh	Eastern Illinois University Charleston, Illinois
Claude Dillinger Eunice H. Speer Charles White	Illinois State University Normal, Illinois
Ralph Novak James W. Beach Eugene B. Grant Roderick Kohler	Northern Illinois University DeKalb, Illinois
Arthur L. Fritschel Merle E. Lundvall Donald W. Marshall	Western Illinois University Macomb, Illinois
F. H. McKelvey	Teachers College Board Executive Officer

1. Before approval of the minutes of the October 20 meeting, the Chairman read a letter from Leo Eastman in which he protested the action of the JFPC in approving recommendations of the Council of Presidents with reference to tenure. The ensuing discussion brought out the fact that none of the group interpreted the recommendations of the Council of Presidents as being retroactive but accepted it in good faith. Fritschel then moved, seconded by Dillinger, that the October 20, 1964 minutes be approved as written.

Further discussion centered around the meaning of the proposed addition to the By-Laws, and Governing Policies with reference to the nepotism policy.

Dr. McKelvey reported that the Council of Presidents had concurred with the recommendation of the JFPC on page 2, Item 1 (C) of the JFPC minutes of October 20, 1964, but had rejected the JFPC recommendation P2, October 20 minutes, Item 1, with reference to letter of September 14, 1964.

2. Role of graduate assistants and faculty assistants.

Dr. McKelvey reported that the STCB did not favor allowing graduate assistants to "take charge" of college classes. Only persons with the Master's degree are permitted to do this.

In passing it was stated that a general practice among universities is to afford about one graduate assistant to three graduate students.

3. Qualifications of Assistant Professors.

In discussing this topic it was stated that according to the By-Laws, and Governing Policies, page 25, middle paragraph, it would not be possible for a graduate student nearing the completion of a doctorate to teach unless he were first awarded the master's degree. It was pointed out, however, that some excellent advanced students do not receive a Master's degree

Marshall made a motion, seconded by McConky, that, beginning with the last word in line 20, page 25, the sentence should be changed to read: The instructors, or group IV, must have the master's degree (or its equivalent and must have been admitted to candidacy for the doctorate) and must not exceed one-fifth of the total faculty. The motion to make this change carried but the intent was to take this proposal back to our respective groups for discussion and other opinions.

4. Again interest was expressed in continued efforts to effect reciprocity in retirement systems. The JFPC has expressed interest in reciprocity of retirement systems at each of its meetings since the inception of the JFPC.
5. There was considerable interest expressed in what might be described as "fringe benefits" such as a subsidized uniform health insurance for faculty as is common for workers in some industries. The discussion seemed to be partially centered around the benefits of such a plan as far as tax considerations are concerned.

There seemed to be no concrete suggestion for action on this topic but we were to investigate the attitudes toward the matter on our own campuses. The secretary was asked to write to Mr. Edward S. Gibala, Sec. to find out if he has any knowledge of plans falling in this category.

6. Tenure was discussed but there seemed to be a wide variation in opinions toward tenure requirements. No action was taken.
7. Dr. McKelvey reported that the Council of Presidents was not in favor of reduced tuition for faculty dependents at the State universities.
8. Time was spent in a discussion of the various considerations in attracting good faculty members to our various institutions. Desirable features of employment in our institutions that were mentioned included:
 1. A salary schedule with no ceiling for certain groups;
 2. A retirement system better than many others.
9. Concern was expressed for values that are sometimes expressed in recruitment and selection of staff members. It seems that it is coming to be quite common for a bright young candidate to seek a position where he will be required to do only a minimum amount of teaching with the remainder of his time devoted to a research project supported by foundation funds. Many of these candidates, it was said, seem to loathe teaching, believing that to receive a research grant is the sine qua non of success.

It was agreed that our next meeting would be held Tuesday, May 11, 1965, at which time we would consider the following topics:

1. Efficient functioning of the staff.
2. The aims of our programs.
3. Other academic problems.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

EXPANSION OF PURPOSE

Since ancient times, societies have been concerned with the nature and character of the education of their youth. Reflections on this matter have generated many questions and many answers. One of the more fundamental and important questions that has been broached for a number of years concerns the education of teachers. That is: what is the best way to prepare a teacher? To date, mankind has found no absolute and unequivocal answers to this question. Yet, there is considerable opinion and a great deal of experiential evidence that a single-purpose institution (such as ISU) is not necessarily the best way to educate teachers. Considerable support may be mustered for the proposition that the experiences afforded by a single-purpose institution are not as conducive to the development of a broadly-educated person as those available at universities with pre-professional and other academic programs. The national tendency from the single-purpose college is a manifestation of this view. In fact, there were one hundred and fifty of these institutions fifteen years ago; today, there are about twenty.

This national trend has not been in and of itself, however, the overriding reason why the staff of ISU desires an expansion of programs. The Committee on Future Planning of the University has discussed the appropriateness of such a proposal since 1958. Our singleness of purpose has been questioned by such groups as the ISU Advisory Committee of lay members, the visitation committees of the North Central Association (April 1964) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (November 1964), visitation committees from the Illinois State Legislature, and the ISU Student Senate. The faculty of the University, as a community of scholars dedicated to the search for truth, have not been immune to the ideas of such groups, nor have they been insensitive to the national trends.

As a consequence of the rapid growth of the University, intra-faculty and faculty-administrative communications have become increasingly difficult. The President, therefore, asked the University (faculty) Council in 1963 to study ways of improving the efficiency of the communication system. To obtain this goal, the Council polled the faculty to determine what problems or issues were foremost in the minds of that group. A large number of responses indicated that the faculty was concerned more with "expanding purpose" or "multi-purpose," as well as "the best method for preparing teachers," than with any other issues. After a panel discussion of these questions at the December 1963 faculty meeting, the Council proceeded to divide the faculty into representative groups of 24 to 30 members for subsequent discussion. As a result of these sessions, the University Council approved unanimously, in June 1964, a resolution which requested the President of the University to establish a committee with the explicit task of recommending ways to broaden the programs of the University in harmony with its fundamental goal of educating teachers.

This committee consists of six full professors, one associate professor, two assistant professors, and two administrators. The following areas are represented: Art, Science, Elementary Education, Languages, Health and Physical Education, Practical Arts, School Administration, Social Sciences, Speech.

The members of this committee are:

Francis Belshe, Professor of Education, Dean of the Undergraduate School,
Chairman (elected by his committee)
Arley Gillett, Professor of Health and Physical Education
Warren Harden, Assistant Professor of Economics, Secretary (elected by his
committee)
F. Louis Hoover, Professor of Art, Head of the Department of Art
Eric H. Johnson, Professor of Education, Vice President for Administrative
Affairs
Brigitta J. Kuhn, Associate Professor of French
Charles Porter, Professor of Industrial Arts, Head of the Department of
Industrial Arts
Donald Prince, Professor of Education, Director, School Administration
Program (also immediate past President of the Illinois Secondary School
Principals' Association)
Omar Rilett, Professor of Biological Sciences, Head of the Department of
Biological Sciences
Elizabeth Russell, Assistant Professor of Education
Charles A. White, Professor of Speech, Head of the Department of Speech

The committee began meeting in July, 1964, and has met regularly each week since that time with the exception of semester breaks and vacations.

The committee, with the general approval of a majority of the faculty, and the President, believe that ISU must expand its purpose. Some of the significant reasons for program expansion are :

- (1) It would bring a more representative student body to the campus with varying interests and goals. As a consequence, a cross-fertilization process would occur which would contribute to a more realistic educational experience for all students. Furthermore, it would attract more men to the University which would help to balance the sex ratio. At the present time, approximately 60 percent of the students are women.
- (2) It would attract students to the campus who might not have planned a teaching career when in high school. The exposure of these persons to the advantages and excitement of teaching may draw many individuals

of high quality into the teaching profession. There are many examples of this at other universities.

- (3) It would be considerably easier to screen teacher candidates when alternative degrees are available at the same institution. There are many students who should not for a number of reasons become teachers. The University should be able to counsel students out of teacher education without being placed in the embarrassing position of asking them to leave the University.
- (4) It could improve the position of the University in competing for new faculty members because our curricula would be more in harmony with less specialized institutions.
- (5) It should enhance the ability of the University in acquiring financial support from private and public agencies (grants and research funds).
- (6) It would enable the University to more fully enrich the curricula available to those who are teacher education candidates. Certain disciplines are not taught in the secondary and elementary school systems of the State and are therefore not apt to be as important in the curricula development of a single-purpose institution as those which are. Psychology affords an example of such a case. Yet, there is no area of learning where research and investigation are more directly related to teaching.
- (7) It will facilitate the efforts of the University in the education of college teachers. There is considerable evidence that the supply of secondary teachers is meeting the demand for them in many fields. Extreme shortages of teachers now occur at the college level. The preparation of these teachers requires a university of broad dimensions and resources at all levels. The expansion of purpose would enable ISU to continue to fulfill the basic purpose of any university -- to seek and interpret the truth.
- (8) It recognizes a national trend based upon the individual studies of many institutions.

After considerable discussion, conferences with staff members, and responses from questionnaires, the committee feels that a movement towards expansion of purpose involves three steps. (At the present time, the University offers the B.A. and B.S. in addition to the B.S. in Education; and the M.A. and M.S. in addition to the M.S. in Education.)

1. The first step would be to initiate programs, less hours in professional education, in those departments that could offer such programs without adding new courses and staff.
 - a. A student could elect to meet the B. A. or B.S. degree requirements without completing any courses in Professional Education.
 - b. Professional Education requirements would be replaced by electives outside major and minor fields in the case of the B.S.; whereas, in the case of the B.A., the professional education hours would be divided between electives and foreign language.
 - c. The number of hours required for currently existing department majors would not be increased. Specific requirements for new majors would need to be listed but elective and foreign language hours would have to be provided for.
 - d. This change would in no way affect the courses as listed in the 1965-1966 catalog and in and of itself would not increase the staff needed.
2. The second step would involve an increase in major fields and in inter-disciplinary programs (such as has been done in Educational Administration) that might require new courses and staff.
 - a. The specific requirements would need to be listed.
 - b. The probable list of courses and staff would need to be shown for the next five years.
3. The third step would involve an administrative reorganization and the continuing increase in department and in inter-departmental programs.
 - a. The reorganization will probably be affected by the second step and it in turn will probably affect the further development of the second step.
 - b. The Bonham report (1963) pointed out the need for administrative reorganization whether ISU remained single purpose or not.

- (1) There are too many academic departments and offices reporting to the Dean of the Faculty.
- (2) There should be certain academic divisions, colleges or schools.

March 19, 1965