

Summer 7-2-1969

University Council Meeting, July 02, 1969

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, July 02, 1969" (1969). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 989.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/989>

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.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES

#7

DATE: July 2, 1969MEMBERS PRESENT

- | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Richard Bond | 5. John Ferrell | 9. Richard Hulet | 13. Warren Perry |
| 2. Samuel Braden | 6. Frederick Fuess | 10. Eric Johnson | 14. Milton Weisbecker |
| 3. Scott Eatherly | 7. Charles Gray | 11. Thomas Martin | |
| 4. Elwood Egelston | 8. Charles Hicklin | 12. Charles Morris | |

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Charles Hicklin, Chairman of the University Council, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p. m. in the fourth floor lounge of Stevenson Hall.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Egelston moved that the minutes of June 18, 1969 be approved as distributed. Mr. Gray seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

REPORT ON INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

President Braden distributed copies of two documents which outlined an interinstitutional alignment that will include a long-range academic as well as athletic relationship. The documents were presented to the Council for its information and will be presented to the Board of Regents on July 13, 1969.

President Braden stated that this proposal had been mentioned at a previous Council meeting and had been discussed with the Athletic Board.

PRESENTATION OF FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE CRITERIA GUIDELINES

Mr. Ferrell moved to accept the proposed Revision of Policy and Criteria Guidelines for Evaluation of Faculty, Illinois State University. Mr. Morris seconded the motion.

Mr. Perry noted that "~~heads~~ chairmen" (page 2) should read "heads or chairmen".

The motion carried unanimously.

A copy of the policy is attached.

REPORT OF ELECTION COMMITTEE ON FACULTY ADVISORY AND HEARING COMMITTEE

Chairman Hicklin read a report from the Election Committee. The following were elected to the Faculty Advisory and Hearing Committee by a campus-wide election last May:

Vernon Pohlmann	Robert Duncan
Mark Plummer	Paul Brand
Harold Moore	Thomas Wilson

It was announced that Mr. Earl Reitan has been elected Chairman of this committee for the 1969-70 year.

ELECTION OF MEMBER OF ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Chairman Hicklin announced that Mr. Edwards will be on leave next semester and a replacement is needed on the Elections Committee.

The Executive Committee on the Council submitted the names of Mrs. Audrey Francis and Mrs. Martha Bickley as nominees. The floor was opened to additional nominations. No further nominations were presented.

Mrs. Francis was elected to the Elections Committee to serve until June of 1970.

COMMUNICATIONS

Legislative Liason

President Braden announced that Mr. Fisher had been our liason with the Legislature in Springfield and that Mr. Eric Johnson will assume this position. He will work with our local representatives so they understand the interests of the University.

Letter from Eastern Illinois University

Mr. Hicklin noted that he had received a letter from a representative of the Faculty Senate of Eastern Illinois University asking him to respond to a proposal of a Student Faculty Advisory Board.

Calendar Committee

Mr. Bond presented the name of Mr. C. Edward Streeter as a replacement for Mr. Hicklin on the Calendar Committee and asked for Council ratification of this nomination.

Mr. Egelston moved to consider an item not on the agenda. Mr. Braden seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Gray moved that the Council ratify the nomination of Mr. Streeter to the Calendar Committee. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

General Education Council

Mr. Bond announced that he had designated Mr. Rives as his representative on the General Education Council. Mr. Rives will be serving as an American Council on Education intern during the school year.

Selection Committee for Department Head for Elementary Education

Mr. Bond announced that a new Selection Committee had been formed to search for a Department Head for the Department of Elementary Education. The following will serve on the committee:

Mr. D. Wheeler, Chairman
Mr. J. Durham, Administrative Representative
Mr. A. Slan, Department Representative
Mr. G. Drew, Department Representative
Mr. R. Layman, Department Representative

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Johnson moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Weisbecker seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:18 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Hicklin, Chairman
Frederick Fuess, Secretary

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON JULY 2, 1969

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 quality of the learning experienced by its students and the continued growth in scholarship of its faculty. Such growth and development can be assured only if the reward system is consonant with these goals.

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 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 his performance and promise in teaching and scholarly productivity (in accord with departmental weightings) in comparison with others in the department at the next higher rate and in comparison with those who hold the proposed rank at other comparable institutions.

In order for these evaluations to be effective and to make appropriate distinctions, department APT committees or department heads or chairmen 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

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 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 the quality of the educational experience for all students will be the primary focus of each department.

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 or chairman 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 of 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 are 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 term 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. Service is defined primarily as the extension of the university beyond the usual boundaries of the campus through the professional involvement of its faculty. In addition, with the increasing emphasis on faculty involvement in university governance, new demands are continually being made upon the teacher to participate in the internal affairs of the department, the college, and the university.

Therefore, meritorious service should be recognized in two areas: (1) non-compensated extramural activity related to one's professional assignment, such as professional consulting or participating in one's professional organization and (2) non-compensated service to the department, college or university in administrative, committee or other functions. Although a minimum level of service should be expected of each faculty member, excessive participation or activities which may interfere with his major assignment should be discouraged.

In all cases, criteria for minimum and meritorious levels of service should be spelled out in departmental criteria and may vary according to the faculty member's professional assignment.