

Illinois State University

## ISU ReD: Research and eData

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

Winter 11-20-1968

### University Council Meeting, November 20, 1968

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, November 20, 1968" (1968). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1005.

<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1005>

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](mailto:ISUReD@ilstu.edu).

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

November 20, 1968

Meetings of the University Council are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussions with the consent of the Council.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Council may do so by contacting any member of the Council.

MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

1. Samuel Braden	8-2241	12. Jeannie James	8-2682
2. Richard Bond	8-2261	13. Eric Johnson	8-2143
3. George Drew	8-2168	14. Frederick Kagy	8-2612
4. Scott Eatherly	8-2279	15. Walter Kohn	8-8063
5. Elwood Egelston	8-2549	16. Thomas Martin	8-7559
6. John Ferrell	8-2194	17. Charles Morris	8-7674
7. Frederick Fuess	8-5328	18. Warren Perry	8-2377
8. Charles Gray, Jr.	8-8437	19. Mary Rozum	8-2468
9. Dean Hage	8-2274	20. William Zeller	6-7250
10. Charles Hicklin	8-2445	Sandra Stevenson	8-7274
11. Richard Hulet	8-2545	Clerical Secretary	

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

NOVEMBER 20, 1968

#14

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
1. Philosophy, Proposal for Major . . . . .	1
2. Policy and Criteria Guidelines for FSC & APT . . . . .	2&8
3. Operating Budget, President's Report . . . . .	3
4. College of Fine Arts Representative to Council . . . . .	4
5. Department of Political Science, Selection Committee . . . . .	4
6. Communications:	
Professional Travel . . . . .	4
Center for Higher Education . . . . .	5
President's House . . . . .	6
Recreational Space . . . . .	6
Computer Registration . . . . .	6

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL  
(Not approved by the Council)

#14

DATE: November 20, 1968

MEMBERS PRESENT

- |                    |                      |                    |                    |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Samuel Braden   | 6. John Ferrell      | 11. Richard Hulet  | 16. Thomas Martin  |
| 2. Richard Bond    | 7. Frederick Fuess   | 12. Jeannie James  | 17. Charles Morris |
| 3. George Drew     | 8. Charles Gray, Jr. | 13. Eric Johnson   | 18. Warren Perry   |
| 4. Scott Eatherly  | 9. Dean Hage         | 14. Frederick Kagy | 19. Mary Rozum     |
| 5. Elwood Egelston | 10. Charles Hicklin  | 15. Walter Kohn    | 20. William Zeller |

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 November 6 meeting be approved as distributed.  
Mr. Zeller seconded the motion.

The use of the term "voting privilege" was discussed but the minutes were not amended. There was a strong feeling that faculty voting was a right rather than a privilege. It was made clear that the term privilege was not used to indicate anything other than the right of the faculty member to vote in matters of university governance.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT ON PROPOSED MAJOR IN PHILOSOPHY

Miss James explained the action of the University Curriculum Committee regarding the proposal for a major in Philosophy.

Mr. Kennard, Head of the Department of Philosophy stated that most of the courses in Philosophy could be taken by non-majors and it was his hope that students would elect many of the courses.

It was suggested by the Council that there are a few Philosophy courses offered in other departments which might be included as part of the major requirement. Mr. Kennard replied that these courses would be investigated with the hopes that they could be cross-listed in the future.

11/20/68

Miss James moved that the Council accept the proposal of the Department of Philosophy as handed out with slight revisions as indicated in the University Curriculum Committee minutes. Mr. Eatherly seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

Full description of the Major in Philosophy:

Courses in philosophy must total at least 27 hours. Included in this total must be at least one logic course (110, 210, or 310), two courses in the history or philosophy (254 and 255), one course in contemporary philosophy (302 or 303), one area course (261 or 262), and at least two philosophy electives at the 200 or 300 level.

A coherent program of supporting courses, based on the student's needs, worked out in consultation with a departmental adviser, and approved by the department head, is also required of each major.

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

Miss Stein, Chairman of the Faculty Status Committee, opened the discussion by indicating the revisions in the "Policy and Criteria Guidelines for Salary Increments and Promotion of Teaching Faculty". She indicated that the changes were a result of Council discussion at a previous meeting and suggestions from the Council and other faculty members. A question was raised regarding the last sentence in paragraph three with special reference to the word "elsewhere". It seemed to at least one member of the Council that this sentence was very vague and added little to the document.

Members of the Council complemented the Committee on their work.

Mr. Kohn moved the adoption of the "Policy and Criteria Guidelines for Evaluation of Faculty" submitted by Miss Stein with the changes that she has pointed out. Mr. Ferrell seconded the motion. (see page 8 for final report)

The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

Mr. Drew moved that the Chairman of the FSC report annually to the University Council concerning the relationship between the average teaching load of all departments and their scholarly productivity with particular emphasis given to those departments where the average teaching load is below twelve hours. Mr. Fuess seconded the motion.

The general discussion concerning this motion centered around how this evaluation could be accomplished. Mr. Drew stated that his motion was worded in such a manner as to allow the Chairman of FSC to determine the method of study.

Voting was as follows:

<u>Voting "No"</u>	<u>Voting "Yes"</u>		<u>Voting "Present"</u>
Elwood Egelston	Richard Bond	Charles Hicklin	Richard Hulet
Dean Hage	Samuel Braden	Jeannie James	
Charles Morris	George Drew	Eric Johnson	
Warren Perry	Scott Eatherly	Frederick Kagy	
Mary Rozum	John Ferrell	Walter Kohn	
	Frederick Fuess	Thomas Martin	
	Charles Gray	William Zeller	

PRESIDENT'S REPORT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET

President Braden presented a progress report on the Operating Budget request for 1969-71. The initial request was for 68.5 million dollars of which 61.4 million represented formula or statutory requests. 7.1 million dollars was requested for new programs. This budget of 68.5 million dollars has been approved by the Board of Regents.

The staff of the Board of Higher Education has indicated that they will recommend 93% of our budget to the Board of Higher Education. This means a reduction of 4.8 million dollars in the money allotted to new programs. At the present time the President does not know the programs which will be supported by the Board of Higher Education.

It was pointed out that the budget still needed the approval of the Board of Higher Education, the Governor, and the Legislature.

REPORT OF ELECTION COMMITTEE

Mr. Hicklin read a report from Mr. Cashen, Chairman of the Election Committee. The report was as follows:

1. College of Fine Arts representative to the University Council - Joseph M. Wilson.
2. Faculty Advisory and Hearing Panel - As of late yesterday afternoon (11/19/68) the last of the departmental nominees was reported. Six departments have no nominee due to the listed requirements for eligibility to serve on this panel. I doubt if this election can take place before Thanksgiving vacation.
3. Joint Faculty Salary Committee - This morning (11/20/68) a list of the eligible faculty members holding the rank of Instructor was recieved from Dean Belshe's office. I doubt if this election, either, can take place before Thanksgiving vacation.

Mr. Hicklin indicated that some departments did not send nominations for the Faculty Advisory and Hearing Panel. It seems that some departments are not aware of the function and importance of this panel nor are they aware of the procedures for the selection of said panel.

Mr. Zeller moved to accept the report of the Election Committee to seat Mr. Wilson as an observer. Mr. Drew seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a voice vote.

Mr. Bond informed the Council of the membership of the Committee for the selection of a Head of the Department of Political Science. The following constitute the Committee:

- Paul Mattingly, Chairman
- Kenneth Kennard, Administrative Representative
- Waldo Mead
- Joel Verner
- Hibbert Roberts

### PRELIMINARY REPORT ON FACULTY RETREAT

Mr. Kagy reported that a summary of the discussions at the Council Retreat would be circulated to the faculty in the near future. The Retreat Committee had decided to distribute a summary rather than the position papers. Those faculty who desire copies of the position paper will have the opportunity to request copies after the summary has been distributed.

The Council, through its Chairman, thanked the Committee for all that work which was required to make the retreat a success.

The Executive Committee will present nominations for the Retreat Committee in the near future.

### COMMUNICATIONS

#### Request for a study of Faculty Professional Travel Funds

Mr. Hicklin read a letter from Mr. Pohlman, Head of the Department of Sociology-Anthropology. Mr. Pohlman reported that the Department of Sociology-Anthropology had recommended the following:

- (1) "The University through its financial allowances provide much greater encouragement for faculty participation in professional meetings. We especially urge that the University provide adequate funds to persons who are reading papers at professional meetings, and/or who are acting in an official capacity at such a meeting.
- (2) Considerably more money be made available to departments for the purpose of recruiting new faculty, especially in departments where the faculty must be recruited in more than one discipline.
- (3) The University Council conduct an analysis of the distribution of all travel funds for all purposes and report the findings to the faculty. "

Mr. Kohn moved to suspend the rules in order that action could be taken on this matter. Mr. Hulet seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

There was general agreement among the Council that professional travel allowances were inadequate. However, at least one member of the Council felt that the policies at ISU allowed for more travel money than at many of the land grant universities. It was pointed out that there are different policies in different departments and Colleges in the University.

The Council did feel that a study of this problem was warranted but felt that it could better be conducted by a group other than the Council.

Mr. Gray moved that we refer communication from the Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology to the Office of Institutional Research with the understanding that the latter will report back to the Council after the first of January.

Mr. Eatherly seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

#### Policy Regarding the Handling of Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Matters

Mr. Hicklin reported that the "Policy Regarding the Handling of Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Matters at Illinois State University" had been circulated to the Council only two days before the meeting and that the item did not appear on the agenda. Mr. Hicklin explained that action could be taken if the Council voted to suspend the rules.

Several members of the Council requested that more time be allowed for study of the policy.

Mr. Hicklin stated that consideration of the Policy would appear on the agenda of the December 4 meeting. He suggested that Council members submit proposed changes in the policy to Dean Bond's office prior to the next meeting.

#### Sabbatical Leave Policy and Procedures

Mr. Bond circulated the revised policy and procedures. He suggested that the Council study the proposal and be prepared to react to it at the next meeting. Mr. Bond stated that the policy and procedures had the approval of the FSC and the Council of Deans.

#### Center for Higher Education

Chairman Hicklin reported that he had received letters from the University Curriculum Committee and the Coordinator of Academic Planning. Both voiced approval and support for the establishment of a Center for Higher Education.



### Joint Faculty Policy Committee

Mr. Hicklin requested that the Council authorize expenditure of from \$24 to \$36 to cover expences of a meeting of the Joint Faculty Policy Committee in LaSalle.

There were no objections from the Council members.

### President Braden's Report on the President's House

President Braden briefly described both the reason for building a house for the President and the design of the house. Mr. Braden stated that he felt that a President's house was a good idea for our campus and that the house will be useful for the University Community.

Mr. Braden explained that much study has gone into the planning. The house should accommodate a President's family of any size. The design of the house is such that large groups can be accommodated without unduly invading the privacy of the President's family.

### Recreational Space

President Braden asked Mr. Johnson to explain the proposal which would provide additional recreational space on campus.

Mr. Johnson explained that the University budget included several "kinds of dollars". One of the kinds of dollars was explained as Bond Revenue and the use of these dollars is restricted to certain functions. Mr. Johnson stated that the Bond Revenue dollars earned from the Horton-Hancock complex could be used to up-date those facilities.

Mr. Johnson explained that if Hancock field were covered with a synthetic turf, the field could be used by physical education classes and intramural teams during all of the daylight hours and even after dark if necessary. At the present time the utilization of Hancock field is very low. Despite the limited use of the field, the annual cost of maintenance is now between \$10,000 and \$25,000 per year.

Mr. Johnson pointed out that the synthetic turf would not be installed primarily for intercollegiate athletic competition, but rather to provide both better utilization of the two-acre field and increased facilities for recreational activities.

### Computer Registration

Mr. Eatherly requested that further consideration be given the problem of pre-registration. He pointed out that the module system now used in the computer program makes it impossible for students to pre-register for classes meeting back to back on one period and a half schedule and that the University is apparently making no serious effort to change the module system, nor does it warn the student that the computer will treat this as a conflict. He also said that, based on his information, a student who registers for a nine o'clock section of a multi-sectioned course is not placed in another

nine o'clock section if his assigned choice is filled; rather he may be placed in a section at another time. Finally, Mr. Eatherly voiced concern over the problem of enrollment in courses which are scheduled for special areas.

It was suggested that Mr. Eatherly contact Mr. Denny with respect to these problems. President Braden stated that he would also investigate the problem.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Eatherly moved to adjourn. Mr. Kohn seconded the motion.

Motion carried by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Hicklin, Chairman  
Frederick Fuess, Secretary

CH/FF:ss

11/20/68

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON NOVEMBER 20, 1968

POLICY AND CRITERIA GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION  
OF FACULTY  
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

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 twelve-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, but do not negate the necessity for excellence in the teaching portion of the assignment.

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. 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. Relative weights of these categories may vary with departments and with individual assignments but should be stated as explicitly as possible by the departments, which are encouraged to give the greatest weight to excellence in teaching and scholarship. In the case of promotion the faculty member should be evaluated in terms of the promise shown in comparison with others in the department at the next higher rank and in the profession elsewhere of those who hold the proposed rank.

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. Recommendations for special consideration should be evaluated carefully by all APT committees, but should include merit.

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 to Establish Evaluative 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

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 systematic review of the faculty member's teaching assignment and his success in carrying it out. Quality teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level is expected. It is important that the teaching of general education and service courses be adequately recognized along with the teaching of advanced departmental courses. It is expected that quality teaching will be the primary concern of all faculty members.

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.

For example, among the former are demonstration of resourcefulness and creativity in course organization or presentation, subject mastery, and the immediate and long-range 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 and advisement of students is considered to be a 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 sizable (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. Evaluation of scholarly activity should recognize time spent in research (with differential recognition of individual contributions in team research), preparation of formal proposals submitted for outside funding, 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 scholarly activity 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 of those who have teaching loads below twelve 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. Excessive committee activity should be discouraged; salary rewards should reflect the type and quality of committee 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, 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.