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DATE: October 16, 1968

MEMBERS PRESENT


CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Charles Hicklin, Chairman of the University Council, called the meeting to order at 7:15 p.m. in the third floor lounge of the University Union.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Gray moved that the minutes of the October 2 meeting be approved as distributed. Mr. Zeller seconded the motion.

Mr. Kohn questioned the word "expected" used by President Braden in discussing sabbatical leave. President Braden replied that if a sabbatical leave policy is properly stated in the procedures that the expenses could be deductible under the Internal Revenue Code. In order to do this it has got to be clear that the University expects the faculty to keep up.

Mr. Fuess noted that the word "there" in the fifth paragraph of page 2 should be "these".

The motion to approve the minutes as distributed carried unanimously by a voice vote.

REPORT OF UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Mr. McCarney, Chairman of the University Curriculum Committee, explained two proposals which have been approved by the University Curriculum Committee. The first was a proposal for two journalism minors; Teacher-Education, 23 semester hours and Liberal Arts and Sciences, 24 semester hours.

Mr. McCarney noted that the proposal required approval because it is a new minor. There is an existing journalism minor which is open only to English majors. The proposal is designed to allow any student on campus to minor in journalism.
In response to the question concerning where the minor would be housed, Mr. McCarney stated that for the present, students enrolled in a journalism minor would be advised by members of the English Department.

Mr. Kohn moved that we accept the proposal by the Curriculum Committee regarding the two journalism minors. Mr. Eatherly seconded the motion.

The motion was carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

The proposed minor in journalism, Liberal Arts and Science Curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23 semester hours</th>
<th>Prerequisite: typing ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQUIRED COURSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 165: Elementary Reporting</td>
<td>3 semester hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 166: Advanced Reporting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 167: History and Principles of Journalism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 267: Newspaper Laboratory I (proposed)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 360: Mass Communications</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15 semester hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COGNATE ELECTIVES (Choose at least six semester hours from this group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 294: School Newspaper and Community Relations (proposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 295: The Annual and Periodical (formerly The High School Annual, 2 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 247: Creative Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 255: State and Local Gov't.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 252: Municipal Problems and Administrating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 353: Political Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 160: Introduction to Radio-Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 241: Basic Photography</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELECTIVES (Electives necessary to complete minimum hours for a minor in Journalism are to be selected according to the primary interest of each student with the consent of his advisor.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech 262: Radio Programming and Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 263: Television Programming and Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts 153: Typography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 268: Newspaper Laboratory II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business 131: Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business 256: Advertising (with permission from College of Business)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The proposed minor in Journalism, Education Curriculum:

23 semester hours
Prerequisite: typing ability

REQUIRED COURSES
English 165: Elementary Reporting 3 semester hours
English 166: Advanced Reporting 3
English 167: History and Principles of Journalism 3
English 267: Newspaper Laboratory (proposed) 3
Speech 360: Mass Communications 3

SUBTOTAL 15

COGNATE ELECTIVES
English 294: School Newspaper and Community Relations (proposed) 3
English 295: The Annual and Periodical (proposed revision) 3

SUBTOTAL 6

ELECTIVES:
Industrial Arts 153: Typography 2

SUBTOTAL 5

TOTAL 23 semester hours

The second proposal to be presented by the Curriculum Committee included; (1) a change in existing major and (2) two new degree programs in Music.

Mr. McCarney indicated that two of the proposals required more semester hours than the 55 semester hour limit set by the University Curriculum Committee and the University Council. It was explained that these programs are required for a professional degree. Evidence was also presented which indicated that the proposals were in line with the requirements for accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Music.

Dean Belshe pointed out that at the time the limit was placed on the number of semester hours which could be required for a major, the Music Department offered only an Education degree. The two degree programs which do not conform with the regulations are new degrees and the third program is a Liberal Arts Degree in Music which does conform with the regulations. Therefore, Dean Belshe felt that spirit limitation on the number of hours required for a Bachelor of Arts Degree or a Bachelor of Science Degree was not being violated.

Members of the Council inquired concerning the use of proficiency examinations for those students with a background in Music. The members of the Department of Music stated that there had been some advanced placement of students in Theory classes based on proficiency. The idea of giving credit for those courses in which the student is able to pass a proficiency examination did not appear to be acceptable to the Department of Music. It was suggested that it is difficult to have a proficiency in the area of applied music as there is no limit to the
degree of skill which could be developed. It was also pointed out that a skill in the area of applied music could be lost if it is not studied. Some Council members questioned the justification of such a system. To several Council Members it appeared that there was no incentive for the well prepared student as he would take the same courses as the student who was not well prepared.

Mr. Egelston moved the adoption of the proposed music programs. Mr. Hage seconded the motion.

The motion passed by a roll call vote with Mr. Martin and Miss James abstaining.

The exact proposals were as follows:

a) Retention of the 60 semester hour Comprehensive Major in Music Education is an exception to the maximum hour requirement. A change in designation to Bachelor of Music Education.

b) New Program: A 37 semester hour major designated as Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science Degree in Music.

c) New Program: A 68 semester hour Bachelor of Music Degree.

d) Deletion of the existing majors in the Department of Music, contingent upon final approval of the above programs.

e) Retention of existing minors in Music Education and revision of them to provide a Liberal Arts Minor in Music of 24 semester hours.

POLICY AND CRITERIA GUIDELINES FOR SALARY INCREMENTS AND PROMOTION OF TEACHING FACULTY

Miss Ethel Stein, Chairman of the Faculty Status Committee presented the new Policy and Criteria Guidelines for Salary Increments and Promotion of Teaching Faculty. She pointed out that the changes were a result of feedback from the college and department APT committees and information obtained at the retreat which was held. Miss Stein emphasized that the purpose of the document was to furnish guidelines for the departments. The departments would be encouraged to set up their own specific criteria.

Miss Stein stated that there were two major revisions from last year's document; (1) service and teaching were separated and (2) the entire document was restructured to make it more readable.

A copy of the tentative proposal is included in the minutes.

Two general reactions were voiced by the Council.

1 - The new policy and criteria guidelines appear to point forward a change in the direction of the University. Several members felt that there was increased emphasis on scholarly productivity. Some felt that emphasis was placed on functions and duties which were not concerned with students.
2 - The section regarding "Merit for Service" was a major point of comment among the Council. Many felt that such a statement would discourage faculty participation in committee work. Others were concerned that the suggested minimum was somewhat demanding. There was also concern regarding the importance of different committees and the value of holding a national office in a professional organization.

In general, the Council did feel that the new guidelines were an improvement over last year's policy. Special attention was called to the second paragraph on the first page. This statement was generally well accepted by members of the Council.

Mr. Drew moved that we postpone action on the Policy and Criteria Guidelines for Salary Increments and Promotion of Teaching Faculty until the next meeting of the University Council. In the meantime, the Faculty Status Committee is requested to make editorial changes in light of the discussion of this evening. Mr. Gray seconded the motion.

The motion passed by a roll call vote with Mr. Bond abstaining.

DISCUSSION OF REGISTRATION PROCEDURES AND PROBLEMS

Dean Belshe opened the discussion by pointing out that the purpose of registration is to get students into the programs they need for graduation as efficiently, effectively and humanely as possible. He stated that many of the pre-enrolled students were able to complete registration in 15 to 20 minutes. The registration process was slowed the last day by the presence of 1,000 more students than expected. Dean Belshe also reported that Illinois State had moved to a computerized registration with only three months "lead time" when many Universities take up to two years to prepare for this change over.

Several questions were asked of Dean Belshe and Mr. Denny regarding possible changes in the procedure. Some of the questions and answers were as follows:

Q. Can registration be spread over a longer period?
A. This is possible, however, it would require an increase in staff.

Q. Is there a better method to keep advisers informed of sections closed and re-opened?
A. Yes. With the use of "on-line terminals" to the computer such as are used by airlines which are expensive and not available at I.S.U.

Q. Should a section be re-opened when only one seat is available?
A. This is the humane aspect of registration. It would be easier for the Registration Office if sections would not be re-opened until there are a number of seats available.

Q. Does the computer establish priorities for courses listed on the student's schedule?
A. Yes, the first course listed will be considered first.
Mr. Denny suggested that written comments and suggestions regarding registration procedures were always welcome. He emphasized that there are three critical numbers to be considered in the registration procedure, the call number and the corresponding semester hour credit for each class, and the student's ID number.

**DISCUSSION OF PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS**

Mr. Scott Eatherly presented a tentative form which he suggested as a possible means of evaluating administrators. The form asked three specific questions:

1. What particular strengths does this person possess?
2. In what areas could the practices of his office be improved?
   Do you have constructive suggestions?
3. Any other comments.

Mr. Eatherly suggested that the evaluation form be completed by individuals whose areas were influenced by the particular administrator. It was suggested that perhaps all faculty members should have the opportunity to evaluate any and all administrators.

Mr. Eatherly suggested that the completed evaluation sheet be returned to the person who is the subject of the survey. At a later date, perhaps the second year, the evaluation sheets would be returned to the person and to his superior.

Council members pointed out that it is difficult to evaluate an administrator without a job description. Job descriptions do not exist for all positions and thus would complicate the procedure. In the evaluation of teachers the evaluation is based on the goals of the course which are communicated to the students.

There was one suggestion that we should evaluate administrative offices and not administrators. An evaluation of administrators can become a popularity contest and not reveal the effectiveness of the office or even the administrator. It was also suggested that the effectiveness of an administrative office is the responsibility of the administrator's superior and not the University Council.

Several members indicated that it would be difficult to evaluate because of lack of contact with the particular individuals.

Mr. Eatherly asked that his suggestions not be considered an action item and suggested that the administrators set up some procedure for evaluating their own offices. If this action is not taken by the administration, Mr. Eatherly will bring an action item to the University Council.

**ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF FACULTY HEARING PANEL**

It was pointed out that this item should not appear on the agenda. Members of the Faculty Advisory and Hearing Panel are elected by the Faculty and not by the University Council.

The Chairman of the Council directed the secretary to instruct the Election Committee to conduct an election to fill the vacancies on the Faculty Advisory and Hearing Panel.
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COMMUNICATIONS

Letter from the Academic Standard Committee

Mr. Hicklin read a memo from Miss Helen Kelly, Chairman of the Academic Standards Committee. Miss Kelly reminded the Council that it had tabled action on the policy regarding Repetition of Courses in order that student reaction might be obtained. Miss Kelly reported that the Academic Standards Committee now included student membership and that the ASC had requested that this item not be placed on the agenda in the near future.

The secretary of the Council was instructed to inform the Academic Standards Committee that action on this item would be delayed. However, it was pointed out that action should be taken by December if this policy is to become effective in the 1968-69 catalog.

Report from the Committee to Study Student Participation in University Affairs

Mr. Hicklin, Chairman of the above committee, indicated that the final report of the committee will be made at the next meeting of the Council.

Phase III of the Master Plan

Mr. Hicklin read a letter from Lyman Glenny in which he requested that a faculty representative be elected by the Council to serve on an advisory committee for phase III of the Master Plan for Higher Education.

Mr. Drew moved that the rules be suspended and action taken on the item. Mr. Bond seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a voice vote.

The following were nominated by the Council.

George Drew  Charles Gray  Charles Porter
Alice Ebel       Charles Hicklin   David Sweet
Elwood Egelston  Ben Hubbard      Dale Vetter

Mr. Hicklin was elected as Illinois State University’s representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee for phase three of the Master Plan for Higher Education.

Selection Committee for the Head of the Department of Business Administration

Dean Bond reported that the members of the Business Administration Department had elected Earle Reese to fill the vacancy on the Selection Committee for the Head of the Department of Business Administration caused by the transfer of Lee Dohleman to the Business Education Department.
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Constitution Committee Membership

Dr. Braden announced that he had appointed two students, John Freese and Douglas Poag and one staff member, John Wolter to the Constitution Committee.

Mr. Bond moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Hulet seconded the motion.

Mr. Hicklin adjourned the meeting at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Hicklin, Chairman
Frederick Fuess, Secretary

CH/FF:ss
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Introduction - General Policy

The continued growth and development of Illinois State University depends upon the continued growth and development of its individual faculty members. Such growth can be assured only if the reward system is consonant with those factors which contribute to the stature of the University and to the quality of the education of its students. A true merit system is one in which merit is measured in terms of stated University goals by departmental peers and accountable administrative faculty most nearly in positions to make professional judgments.

Teaching, scholarly productivity, and service are the stated functions of the University. The performance of these functions requires a diversity of talents among the faculty; it is not university policy to cast all of its faculty in the same mold. It is also recognized that persons not only differ in abilities but in the kinds of contributions they choose or may be assigned to make to the University. Thus it is the policy of the University that the assignment and expectations of each faculty member be clearly delineated by the department and that he be evaluated in terms of his contribution and on the basis of his assignment. For example, a faculty member who is teaching a normal 12-hour teaching load would be evaluated primarily upon his teaching, with appropriate expectations of keeping himself professionally current and with at least occasional expectations of scholarly productivity. Reduced teaching loads would increase expectations in scholarly productivity.

Salary increments and promotion should be based upon a systematic review of each faculty member's contribution, as follows: (1) base adjustment of salary for minimum satisfactory performance, (2) merit increase for teaching, (3) merit increase for scholarly productivity and (4) merit increase for service. Relative weights of these categories may vary with departments and with individual assignments, but should be stated as explicitly as possible by the departments. Each of the above factors should be evaluated separately and independently so that faculty members can be rewarded for meritorious teaching, scholarly productivity, and service. The greatest rewards will ordinarily accrue to those who distinguish themselves as both teachers and scholars.

In order for these evaluations to be effective and to make appropriate distinctions, department APT committees or department heads will be asked to classify the members of their department into five levels of achievement: unusual merit, considerable merit, some merit, minimum acceptable performance, and inadequate performance. In each case the classifications are to be made without regard to proposed salary increments.
It is recognized that no set of guidelines can provide explicitly for every situation that will arise and that there is a need to allow for special consideration to cover extraordinary contributions and to provide in unusual circumstances for adjustments for salary inequities. These circumstances may include special market situations. Recommendations for special consideration should be evaluated carefully by all APT committees.

Implicit in these statements is the assumption that merit can be judged, based upon appropriate criteria. It is imperative that these criteria be enumerated and that the specific basis for evaluation of departmental members be communicated to all those affected. To these ends, guidelines for the establishment of criteria follow:

Guidelines for the Departments in Establishing Evaluation Criteria for Salary Increments and Promotions

Recognizing that departments differ in objectives and process, the main responsibility for the elucidation of criteria for the evaluation of faculty will rest with the department and the college. In the development and implementation of criteria, highest priority is to be given to those behaviors which contribute to the University goals of excellence for its educational product, the student, and the visibility and stature of the University in the wider academic professional community. The following should be included and must be demonstrated by the individual involved: the evaluations are to be adequately supported and systematically documented by the department.

1. Minimum satisfactory performance. Each department is expected to define explicitly minimum performance with respect to standards of teaching, scholarly productivity, service and other minimum expectations. With these minimum standards in view the contribution of each faculty member will be evaluated. Merit will be considered to be performance beyond these minimums.

2. Merit for teaching. This calls for a specific and systematic review of the faculty member's teaching assignment and his success in carrying it out. It is important that the teaching of general education and service courses be adequately recognized along with the teaching of advanced departmental courses.

The difficulty of evaluating teaching is recognized, but each department should attempt to do so for all who have teaching assignments. Since college APT committees and the FSC will require the department APT committee and the department head to provide specific objective evidence for and support of the merit ratings of its faculty members, the department APT committee should spell out both the criteria for meritorious teaching and the specific measures and procedures which have been used for evaluation.
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For example, among the former are demonstration of resourcefulness and creativity in course organization or presentation, subject mastery, and impact of the faculty member on the student outside the classroom. Among the measures or demonstrations of teaching effectiveness which might be used would be visitation of classes by colleagues, submission of evidence of student performance, course syllabi, student evaluation, and evaluation of graduates. Counseling students is considered to be part of teaching.

3. Merit for scholarly productivity. Recognition of the faculty member in the wider academic community is through his scholarly productivity. It is expected that a sizeable (and variable) portion of a department will be productive scholars. The criteria for the measurement of this productivity should be clear at the departmental level and will be expected by the Faculty Status Committee in any APT recommendations. While evaluation of scholarly activity should recognize time spent in research (with differential recognition of individual contributions in team research), and may take into consideration research or other scholarly activity in progress, the premium should be placed upon the public dissemination of results whether by publication, the delivery of papers or other means appropriate to the field (e.g., exhibits or performances). Criteria and judgments regarding recognition of both the quantity and quality or significance of any publications should be the responsibility of the department. For example, national recognition would normally exceed state or local recognition and a monograph would outweigh occasional papers. In addition to subject research, the dissemination of new ideas or the results of new programs or teaching strategies should be considered in this category.

Due consideration and allowance should be made for the amount of released time which has been available for the scholarly activity. A higher productivity level should be expected to those who have teaching loads below 12-hours.

4. Merit for service. A clear distinction of service is necessary to avoid confusion between the activities of university citizenship and the extension of professional activities beyond the university community. A minimum level of committee activity should be expected and should be stated by each department. Such minimum levels might, for example, include one committee assignment each at the department, college and university level. In order to guard against the "professional committee man," salary rewards for committee activity should be rare and should reflect both the type and quality of service.
While at this stage of our development, very few of our faculty have a significant portion of their assignment in service, departments should be prepared to recognize meritorious service in two areas: (1) non-compensated extramural activity related to one’s professional assignment, such as consultation and (2) non-compensated participation in state or national professional organization such as holding office in the group or active committee work which goes beyond mere attendance at the organization’s meetings. In both cases, criteria for minimum and meritorious levels of performance should be spelled out in departmental criteria.