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Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.
May 10, 1978

Call to Order

The meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order by Chairperson Cook at 7:00 p.m. in Stevenson Hall 401.

Roll Call

The Secretary called the roll and declared a quorum to be present.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of April 26, 1978 were deferred. Secretary Hicklin stated that with all the elections of the External Committees, Internal Committees, etc., to prepare for and the length of the last Senate meeting, it was impossible for the secretary to complete. The minutes were deferred.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson Cook shared her planning on the Senate Sign with the members of the Senate and stated that the senate members could be made more visible in their departments with this sign. Ms. Cook asked that they be posted outside their offices, preferably in a high-traffic area, in order to increase communications.

Vice-Chairperson's Remarks

There were no remarks from Mr. Erickson.

Administrator's Remarks

President Watkins reported on the Senate Appropriation Committee. He said there was no harsh questioning and he considered it a very friendly session. He stated that the budget seemed to be going along very well and there were a few questions about unit cost and he said ISU does only too well on low unit costs. The Senate Budget staff says that our per student costs for administration were the lowest in the state. Dr. Watkins invited questions from the members of the Senate. Mr. March asked a question of Mr. Horner about the College of Business. Senator March said that the chairpersons of some departments did not know about the block in the computer and some advisors did not advise the students accurately on this and there was some confusion during registration. Mr. March repeated the rumor that he had heard about the College of Business planned for registration next year. He said that we needed to improve communications and that students would be seriously affected by the College of Business proposal to block students from the 200 level courses until they have taken 100 level courses, would be held out of graduation. Mr. Horner replied that he had no idea about the rumor, this was the first time he had heard this. Ms. Butz asked a question about the student classification and wage scale plan. Ms. Butz stated that she had been trying to find out who made the decision on level 1 and level 2 with differential pay for each category. Mr. Gamsky said this was a non-level job classification scale. He also said a rather elaborate scale was presented but it was not used in this and a more simplified version was accepted of level 1 and level 2. Senator Butz asked what happened to the student employment report that was sent. She also wanted to know why they went to two categories instead of following the proposal from the committee. Mr. Gamsky said there were many reasons for this, the committee's proposal was terribly complex, it had 7 categories, detailed descriptions of jobs and it would have been very expensive
to implement that complex of a proposal. There was no way to get any cost estimates on it. Mr. Belshe also said there had originally been money in the budget for a classification system of $140,000 but the Board of Regents cut it to $70,000 and the Board of Higher Education cut it down to $0. Chairperson Cook asked if we might defer discussing this matter at this time and President Watkins remarked that he would like to continue discussing it at this time to maybe try to clear things up a bit. Mr. Gamsky pointed out some of the complexities of the proposals. Ms. Butz asked if Civil Service had looked at it. Mr. Donahue asked why the students didn't find out about it except in notices to student employees. Mr. Watkins explained that the Federal Government had dictated that we raise the minimum wage and the second level was to provide for a reasonable increase over the wage of the supervisor in personnel, student personnel. Dr. Watkins said that we had real input from students who did not want to go to a minimum wage, they knew that a number of jobs would be cut back because of the increased cost. There was not much room to negotiate or to do much about it so we went to the two-scale classification. The Budget Team had pushed for the minimum wage for the last year, but due to student input, the budget team pulled back from this until July 1. It was also the economics of the situation, we did not have as much money to do what we would like to do. Mr. Gamsky said there was never any secret made of it, as a matter of fact, it was brought up publicly at the Budget Team meeting. All three observers, faculty, student and civil service workers, were at the Budget Team meeting when this was brought up. Mr. Donahue asked that the student wage classification be referred to the appropriate committee, possibly the Student Affairs Committee.

Student President's Remarks

Mr. Donahue announced that this was the second time in the history of the Senate that all the students have been appointed to committees and this is the first time that there has not been a duplication of students on committees. He also called attention to the revisions in SCERB. He asked that this might be considered as an action item at this meeting as it would be put into the Handbook right away.

ACTION ITEMS:

Committee Appointments (see appendix)

Mr. Jesse remarked that the Civil Service appointment for the Parking and Traffic Committee was not filled in as he had not received the name as yet. Mr. Jesse also pointed out certain typographical errors on the memo from his Committee which are recorded in the Executive Committee meeting minutes of this date. He also explained that the students are listed in the order that they were selected by the screening committee with the exception of the Honors Council where the first 3 people are reappointments and the exception of the Athletic Council because there were no recommendations proposed from the Elections Committee. Mr. Jesse remarked that the committee didn't know if that was intentional or just an oversight. Mr. Donahue remarked that those people would be screened and added closer to the elections by the constituent groups involved. Mr. Jesse said they did not screen to see if these persons were on other External Committees. A motion (Jesse/Kuhn) to accept the list of nominees from the Rules Committee with the proviso that a person that has a dual appointment be given a choice as to which committee he/she would prefer to serve on was made. Mr. Kohn asked if it was the intent of the Rules Committee that any person going on sabatical would give up the seat on the Senate. Mr. Kohn commented that he thought that the Rules Committee would have thought that over. Mr. Quane said if a faculty member was going on sabbatical he
was forced off the Senate. The author further clarified by adding to his motion: "that persons going on sabbatical would be deemed to have vacated their seats."

Ms. Kuhn accepted this addition. Mr. Conlon raised a question that certain persons are going on sabbatical and how were the women selected by the Athletic Council. No females had applied for the Athletic Council, so they went through the second preferences, according to the evaluation forms these persons were put on the Athletic Council. They did not apply directly for this committee, but they applied for other committees. President Watkins asked which committees was he to pick for and from. He asked how do the nominees receive the good news or the bad news whichever the case might be. Ms. Cook stated that her interpretation of that was that the ones the President selected, he informed and in turn informed the Senate of his selection and the ones that the Senate selected, the Senate informs. Mr. Erickson commended Ms. Gawel for all her help in setting up and assisting in the screening process for the external committees.

Proposal for Community Problems Resources & Research Center (3.10.78.2)

Mr. Carey presented this proposal along with a one-page summary. Mr. Carey said the vote on the Academic Affairs Committee was 3-0-1. A motion (Carey/Kennedy) to accept this proposal was made. Mr. Smith said that his remarks were not intended to be unfriendly, he also reminded us that the social science departments were given some extra money to reduce teaching loads in those areas. He wondered if the load might be going up again because these people might go to this center when the teacher student ratio can still be kept low otherwise. Ms. Dorothy Lee, Chairperson of Department of Sociology-Anthropology, explained how the center would be used. Some of the work of the Center would come from existing courses which are already being taught, i.e., population courses. Provost Horner responded that this is an attempt to augment research time for faculty, and reminded the senators that these are new positions asked for with new money and they were not being taken from the present teaching staff. President Watkins said that when he was interviewed for this job, he repeatedly heard from students and faculty that public service was a problem, this is an attempt to catch up in this area of public service functions. Our institution is the lowest in the state, 5% going into public service. We do not have the money to buy our time to engage in public service activities. We're going to keep at this effort for the next ten or fifteen years to increase this institution's financial capabilities to the point where our faculty can be released to do what they are able to do. Mr. Ritt said he asked Dean Rives in committee and Mr. Ritt wants to ask the question again: "Will these positions be again available, not in the departments named, but subject to the coordination of Dean Streeter?" Mr. Treadway said, yes. Senator Friedhoff asked the question previously, is this funded externally? In answer to the question, President Watkins said "no mun, no fun, we have gone through the budget process and reminded the Senate that this is a new program request. It will require $128,000." Ms. Gavin asked about the programs—10 to 20 internships. "Have any students been granted internships previously on this program?" Mr. Treadway stated that the original plan was to have certain practicum work in the courses, but, the matter of internships might be an alternate to the training in research techniques. There are about 6 persons involved in this at the present time. Ms. Gavin asked about the criteria that would be used for filling these internships. Dr. Treadway said it would be up to the various departments that participated about what the requirements would be. He said his feelings would be that these persons would be required to have a background in the statistics and research areas to qualify, but he could not for sure say what the requirements would be by various departments. Mr. Fizer asked where the center would be physically located. Mr. Treadway said it would administratively be in the College of Arts and Sciences, the physical location is one of the problems that has to be worked out. The motion to accept the proposal on Community Problems Resource and Research Center as presented by Mr. Carey was passed on a voice vote.
Committee Appointments

Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee  (see appendix)

All persons listed were elected to three year terms except Robin Carr, English; he was elected to an unexpired term.

Proposed Parking Regulations Policies  (see appendix)

Mr. Rosenbaum referred to memo of May 9, 1978. Secretary Morris and Mr. Greenseth were available to participate in the parking discussion. Ms. Escott of Professional & Technical staff was introduced as well as Ms. Dennis of Parking Services. Ms. Cook reminded us of the status of the Senate and our advisory capacity to the President and Dr. Morris. She also stated that the professional technical staff and the civil service had also made some recommendations on policy changes in the parking situation.

Mr. Rosenbaum explained the first proposal that persons have the right to appeal before they pay their fine. A motion (Rosenbaum/Friedhoff) to accept I, A of this proposal was made. Mr. Quane asked Mr. Greenseth what effect would this have if this policy was changed. Mr. Greenseth stated that he said at the last meeting that this would create some administrative costs and the Parking and Traffic Committee had recommended that the fine be paid before making the appeal. Mr. March said he didn't understand why the appeal process cost so much, since the secretary's work and the appeals committee serve the same. Mr. Greenseth said he didn't work in the office, he doesn't know that much about it. Ms. Dennis said this appeals process has caused the hiring of an additional temporary help to process them. She also said that many people graduate before we are able to collect the fines under the present system. Mr. Greenseth reminded the Senate that the time of the appeals committee is, in fact, costly to the University. Mr. Ritt said that he had heard a lot of appeals were made to be able to delay payment of fines and wanted to know if this was a matter of data, a matter of record, or what? Mr. Greenseth said it was a matter of judgement. Mr. Greenseth said that many people appeal because they say that that $25 is too much. Mr. March said that he must speak in favor and support of the amendment: some students are not able to come up with $25 within 7 days in order to be eligible for appeal. Senator March stated there must be some other way to do this. Ms. Cook ruled that Mr. March's remarks were out of order at this time, maybe later in the discussion they could be brought up.

Mr. Morris explained that previously the committee had recommended that certain appeals be made non-appealable and they were not successful in getting that policy through. Mr. Morris said this is an attempt to collect the money and avoid undue delay. Mr. Ritt suggested that maybe they should preemptorily declare certain appeals not appealable. Ms. Cook ruled that that should come up at a later time.

Mr. Donahue pointed out that there hadn't been any appeals this whole semester, so whatever happened to the concept of innocent until proven guilty. Mr. Greenseth replied to Mr. Donahue that if you parked on a city street and got a parking ticket, you had no right to an appeal. Mr. Carey asked if there was, if persons who have graduated while they were trying to appeal, this was not collectible. Mr. Morris said generally, those are uncollectible. Mr. Carey said there is a loophole in our system and he would like to see that loophole closed. A motion (Hicklin/Rosenbaum) to move to the previous question was made. The motion to close debate passed unanimously by voice vote. The motion (Rosenbaum/Friedhoff) passed on 23 yes 18 no on roll call.

Mr. Rosenbaum explained the parking decal increase. He explained some figures on the possible dollar increases and percentages were based upon the revenues necessary.
Mr. Rosenbaum said that the proposed was 11.7 increase in the fees, between 1½ or 12, although this was not in the motion, it was just for your information.

A motion (Rosenbaum/Fizer) to accept proposal I, B of the Parking Proposals was made. Mr. Ritt said last Senate meeting, Mr. Morris discussed the possibility of increasing the use of fee schedules to increase the use of peripheral lots as opposed to close-in lots. Mr. Ritt asked if Mr. Rosenbaum's committee had considered a policy or a practice that would have resulted in this. A policy that would not raise fees on perimeter lots in which there was some documentation of utilization. Mr. Rosenbaum deferred to Senator March. Mr. March said that it was difficult to determine what is a peripheral lot. Mr. Ritt said he would defer to Dr. Morris as to what peripheral lots are. Mr. March asked if all decal lots were considered "close in". Dr. Morris referred to a consulting firm that went to the quad and projected out 1500 feet or three blocks. Mr. Morris said the firm designated that this was a perimeter approximately College and Main and Locust Street on the north and Fell Street on the south. Dr. Morris also remarked that he would like to encourage people to use these areas, particularly north of Locust. We would like to establish the philosophy of those who park in the closest lots would be the highest premium. These are lots that are being used by faculty-staff and we do not anticipate that this would be changed. Lots outside this perimeter would become commuter student lots, there will continue to be some faculty-staff parking in those outside the perimeters. Mr. Morris said the committee was proposing to leave the commuter student lot decal at $25 to increase the use of these perimeter lots. He explained that the $120 is a base line. The $120 for Julian Hall was the top price and that $75 would be moved to $80 as proposed, would be for the 24 hour a day reserved lot. $25 is less than a third of the $120, it seemed that it would be about, roughly $40 or one-third of Julian Hall. Mr. Quane stated that he had some knowledge of this that had been made and he would like to propose, get some advice, as a professional, he said that one of the few tools that you have to encourage people to park in certain places is variable parking fees. Mr. Rosenbaum said that the administration's rationale was to raise money. He also stated that it somehow seems that everyone is benefiting from the general participation of the lots and the idea behind the motion was to require that all generally share the burden on a percentage basis. Mr. Morris said he didn't think that there was a sharing of that burden in an equitable manner. Mr. Quane asked Mr. Morris to comment on possible effect on us of the auditor general ruling that low carry-over can be maintained. Mr. Morris said that we already have $150,000 worth of land. Close cost accounting of the parking would show that we are ten's of thousand's of dollars in the red since we have contracted to buy lots and we have not increased the money. There is an open question about whether we can attain one-twelfths or two-twelfths of the funds in these auxiliary enterprises. Mr. Friedhoff asked if there was some other way to handle the perimeter groups to bring some kind of equalitarian idea of the campus.

Mr. Morris commented that it is most premature at this time to establish percentage increases across the board. Mr. Rosenbaum said he felt that this was a way to increase the fees but, still maintain a method of increasing fees in the future. Mr. Sanders said if we're raising it to 30% this year, then would it be 50% next year? Ms. Patterson reiterated that for the $25 we get a license to hunt, that is, that we will find a spot one time out of 3. She said it seems to faculty members that we have other uses for time than, it's not the covered or the uncovered parking but the availability. Mr. Rosenbaum explained the rationale for the proposed amendment, he related it to the shuttle bus service and said these amendments were based on changing costs of services in the category. A motion (Rosenbaum/March) to add to Section I, B of the parking proposals was made. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that he hoped a study could be made which would implement this. He also said this would
not have an effect on the fees for next year. President Watkins asked how the present fee structure was generated. Dr. Morris said the present fees were initiated by an administrative office and were concurred with by the Parking and Traffic Committee. Dr. Watkins asked if it would make any sense to postpone this until all things are squared away with parking. Why couldn't it be after everything is squared away and then the fees could be increased. There might be another way to go other than an amendment. Mr. Erickson said this was involving the Senate in administration. Mr. Quane and Mr. Rosenbaum said this was allowing the Senate to deal with policy affecting fees. President Watkins said he hoped Senator Rosenbaum or someone else would keep the Senate away from establishment of a specific fees structure. He does not know whether the motion is policy rather than specific fees. The President said he was here to get at the basic inequities of that amendment. What we need is a new fee structure which is equitable, once you find an equitable way to distribute parking you can apply it from then on. That is, an increase of percentages. Some people have a concern with policy versus fees. It seems to me a policy now instituted by the Secretary's Office, what's closest to the center of the campus, you should charge more, rather than more on a perimeter lot. Mr. Rosenbaum said that may be an appropriate policy. Mr. Rosenbaum changed the word "generally" to "policy" in #4 of I, B of the Parking Proposals. The question has been called for. The amendment passed on a voice vote.

A motion (Erickson/Conlon) to add new Section C to XIII of the present parking regulations was made. Mr. Wilson asked if the appeals could be handled by writing letters. Mr. Greenseth said it is and can be often handled by letter. Mr. Rosenbaum asked if this applies to appeals that are now pending, the 900 appeals, would this apply to the 900 appeals now pending? Senator Conlon said it was not the intention of the motion to be retroactive to the appeals now on file. Mr. Ritt asked if there would be additional records keeping caused by this policy. Mr. Morris stated that several bottlenecks cropped up and said that unless there is a provision to make that system work, this policy can have the effect of providing violators with free parking. Mr. Schmaltz said he just might be lucky and get through and avoid the fine altogether. Mr. March asked if last semester when the committee was fully staffed, did they keep up with the appeals? Mr. Greenseth said they kept up until about the point of Thanksgiving. He said that if they had enough people and with the expanded committee to take care of the appeal load. Mr. March asked if there was a possibility that they could handle it within 60 days. Mr. Greenseth remarked that if the appeals board were fully staffed, they would be able to keep current, but it does not depend on the committee. Mr. Hicklin remarked that all the other committee chairpersons usually ask when they're understaffed or if they have vacancies. Mr. Hicklin noted a peculiar source of communication breakdown in the case of the Parking and Traffic Committee and the Parking Appeals Board and hopes that in the future, the chairperson, if the mail is proven unreliable in getting messages to him, that he ask the Chairperson of the Senate or the Secretary of Senate's office for names on committees that had been filled. Mr. Hicklin reminded Mr. Greenseth that in two meetings with him in Executive Committee, no mention was made to the effect that the appeals process had come to a halt since there was a vacancy or a name had not been received by the committee. Mr. Hicklin noted that the Senate is housed in the same office with the Secretary's Office and personnel associated with the PTS are very close to the sources of data about committee appointments. Mr. Morris in answer to Mr. Hicklin, stated that it was not the responsibility of the Secretary's Office to see that a Senate committee was full of appointments.

Mr. Wilson said he didn't understand why anyone would be concerned about how many days as long as you didn't have to pay. He also said if you speed up the appeal process you also speed up the paying. Mr. Greenseth said he thought that the influence of the system had caught up, and that he thought the process could take place within
60 days. Mr. Conlon said he offered the amendment because the process was not happening and he was trying to alleviate that problem by expediting the process. The motion failed on voice vote.

Mr. Quane moved to strike Section X "Illinois State University Farm" from the parking regulations. The Chair asked Mr. Quane to come in with a sense of the Senate rather than a specific amendment at this time. Mr. Quane stated that the policy seems to be whether or not parking is really provided at the farm. The Chair ruled that this definitely dealt with the format of the regulations and recommended that it be incorporated and sent to an ad hoc committee if there is a committee set up to receive this. A motion (Rosenbaum/Fizer) to accept II of the Parking Proposals from the Administrative Affairs Committee was made. Mr. Barton asked how long this type of committee would be in existence. Mr. March made a friendly amendment to the proposal for ad hoc committee on parking policy as follows: "Upon submission of their recommendations, the committee shall be dismissed by the Executive Committee." A question was raised about what the relationship of this committee is to the Parking and Traffic Committee at the present time. A motion (Hicklin/Quane) to strike the words "Academic Senate" and substitute the words "report to the President or his designated representative" was made. President Watkins said he thought he might have a problem, no, but maybe the Academic Senate might have a problem. Dr. Watkins stated that if the report comes to him, he would have to set the policy. Mr. Hicklin explained that he was only concerned with the fact that there was a mixed constituency and if an ad hoc committee was appointed to report directly to the President rather than back to the Senate. Otherwise, the Senate, if it wants to study parking, it should keep its constituents within its own constituents. President Watkins said that he did not have any problem with this. Mr. Wilson stated that we had other committees with mixed constituents on ad hoc committees. President Watkins said he wanted the Senate to understand that if this is going to be the way we set policy okay, but he doesn't want a group of the Senate members second-guessing on the ad hoc committee. President Watkins commented, if we do it this way, he doesn't see any earthly reason to have a Parking and Traffic Committee on the senate. Mr. Carey stated that if we adopt this, it removes the parking from the prerogative of the Senate. Dr. Hicklin explained that, if in answer to Mr. Carey's remark, that this would remove the Senate from parking policy, then he would withdraw his motion if he could be assured that the Senate, in fact, was determinative in policy. Senator Hicklin said if the Chair assures us that we really have some determinative policy on parking, on the basis of the Chair's determination in that matter. Dr. Watkins said that he hoped that other constituencies, that could be added to the Senate PTC, to make it more representative. Senator Hicklin explained that if he could be assured that the Senate Parking and Traffic Committee was determinative in policy that he would withdraw his motion and his motion would be irrelevant but it was Senator Hicklin's understanding that there was an effort by some constituents to break the Parking and Traffic Committee loose from the Senate. Mr. Rosenbaum said that the Administrative Affairs Committee had been discussing this problem of breaking off. The President stated that if we could expand the committee to include professional-technical staff that he could not do that, that he would be in favor of Senator Hicklin's amendment. Mr. Kohn asked if this was only trying to expedite the setting of policy rather than a jurisdictional process. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that that was the intent. Mr. Smith stated that there almost has to be someone from Parking or they should be able to draw upon the expertise of the parking staff. Mr. Smith also said we need a fresh and objective look at the situation. Mr. Austensen said he thinks the Senate incapable of handling parking and we should vote for the motion. Ms. Escott said she was concerned and that it was unfortunate that the problem of shared governance has become
attached to the parking issues. She stated that the Professional-Technical staff has no present formal or informal input in parking. Ms. Escott remarked that she did not know what Mr. Hicklin referred to when he said the PTC was pulling away from the Senate and becoming a free-standing committee, but there was a discussion at one meeting about. Ms. Escott said that the Senate needs to stop discussing shared governance and parking together. Senator Hicklin withdrew his motion. Dr. Watkins said he assumed that since Mr. Hicklin's motion was withdrawn that the Academic Senate would get the recommendations and then they would be forwarded to the President. Mr. Hicklin's reply was that he thought that was the understanding of the present motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Schedule of Summer Meetings

Ms. Cook announced the summer meetings of the Academic Senate as being June 21, 1978 at 8:00 p.m. and July 19, 1978 at 8:00 p.m. Chairperson Cook then turned the meeting over to Vice Chairperson Erickson.

1978-79 Academic Calendar

Mr. Shailer Thomas, Assistant Provost, reported that the Academic Calendar is substantially the same as the calendar for the past year, reading dates and breaks, equal number of class periods, first and second semesters. 44 Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. 50 Tuesdays and Thursdays. The only thing that the committee did not respond to was a change in the Summer School schedule. Mr. Thomas said that the proposed recommendations would have shortened the pre-session from 5 weeks to 3 weeks. Mr. Ritt asked if various departments who utilized the pre-session had been consulted. Ms. Patterson said that if we shorten the calendar anywhere, we would probably have to go to competency tests much like the high schools have, as we are not getting the quality of term papers when they could use the Christmas break to work on term papers. Unless we are moving just to certification then we don't need to offer the shortest term. Ms. Patterson, referring to a Wall Street Journal article, stated that the students are going to catch on to the fact that they are getting shortchanged. Ms. Patterson said that she is disturbed about falling achievement and felt that she had to say something about this. Mr. Kennedy asked if the committee had any impression from the graduate students. Mr. Thomas remarked that the summer school market is no longer teachers coming back, but continuing students. Vice-Chairperson Erickson said that as long as the Dean of the College of Education said that as long as they have the flexibility of starting the courses whenever they could, that there would be no problem with attracting graduate students to any particular market. Ms. Kuhn asked what the concept of reading day was. Senator Hicklin explained that in a previous Senate meeting of last year, Mr. Christiansen pushed for a reading day and accompanied that by a resolution requesting that faculty members not give exams on that day. Mr. Thomas explained the discrepancy between the number of weeks in pay periods which would have fiscal impact of total number of dollars available for summer school if we change too much. He said it would lead to changes in planning between budget years.

Handbook Changes for SCERB

With Mr. Erickson presiding, Mr. Schwelle joined the table to discuss this proposal. Mr. Schwelle stated this matter had been hung up in Student Affairs for the past four to six months. Mr. Donahue explained the differences between the two proposals, one from Student Affairs and one from a compromise with Mr. Schwelle. Mr. Hicklin asked what problem were these proposals designed to solve? Mr. Schwelle explained that each proposal deletes the seventh voting member. The current Handbook provides
since the President has not appointed a Chairperson the last three years, they have been operating without the chairperson for three years and they feel that they can operate very well without him. The present policy does not require previous service on a grievance committee or hearing panel, Mr. Schwell feels that appointments to SCERB should have previous experience on a grievance panel. Mr. Conlon asked how the Executive Secretary gets there on SCERB? Mr. Schwell stated that he is Executive Secretary of SCERB by virtue of being Director of the Student Judicial Office. Mr. Schwell mentioned again about what the problem was, that there is a possibility that they would get inexperienced members and that since they had been operating without a chairperson he didn't think it was necessary. Mr. Donahue said that we need to act upon this in the next week or two, in order to get them in the present handbook. A motion (Donahue/Scharfenberg) to move this SCERB proposal to the action stage was made. Mr. Jackson, the Parliamentarian, cited the bylaws on this item. Mr. Kohn raised the question that why is this an emergency item? Mr. Kohn remarked that SCERB seemed to be working pretty well this way so far. Mr. Donahue said he sympathized with those sentiments. Mr. Schwell said that he did not think that there was that much of a change in this item, that it was a minor change and that the Senate could consider it at this time. Mr. Kennedy asked if there was a possibility that this could be an addendum to the handbook later. President Watkins said this is possible, but separate sheets like this had a tendency to get lost. A motion (Donahue/Gavin) to accept this SCERB proposal was made. The motion passed on 2/3 voice vote. 1 no & 1 abstention.

Communications (see appendix)

The faculty members of the Senate heard the following report. Mr. Horner reported that the previous salary plan for equity was rejected and the URC recommends another policy to the Senate. Mr. Horner stated that the URC requested the individuals from the departments, the Affirmative Action Office was also asked to submit names to the URC, just one individual from Affirmative Action Office that did not already appear on the list generated from the Academic Departments. Ms. Patterson asked if this report means, does that mean 10% set aside? Yes, was the reply. Another question from Ms. Patterson was, if it could be $1 or more? The Provost answered, correct. Mr. Friedhoff stated that this did not take care of the whole problem. Mr. Horner said that he could not respond to how he thought that the departments would react or how they would respond to this proposal. He hoped that the department would interpret it to be whatever portion of that ten percent that they chose. Mr. Carey asked why the differential between the library and the rest of them. Mr. Horner said that there's been a feeling that the salary equity is a different situation and the Federal Government has been involved and it is a special equity problem. Mr. Ritt asked if this report was passed at a meeting of the URC Committee? The Provost said yes, it was passed on Tuesday by a vote of 7 to 1. The Library should be getting 8.6 over the salary base. This would generate 20 percent of the salaries funds for equity. It's ten percent plus everything above what they get above 8%. In reply to a question by Mr. Carey, Mr. Horner explained the Senate distribution formula. The Senators moved the policy. Mr. Wilson asked what we would do if we don't get 8% in? Mr. Horner said we are assuming 8% and we can start all over again on all salaries if we don't get it. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Adjournment

A motion (Kohn/Ritt) to adjourn was made and carried at 11:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Cook, Chairperson
Charles Hicklin, Secretary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Motion 164</th>
<th>Motion 165</th>
<th>Motion 166</th>
<th>Motion 167</th>
<th>Motion 168</th>
<th>Motion 169</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amster</td>
<td>excused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belshe</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boaz</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bown</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butz</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitwood</td>
<td>excused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conlon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahue</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fizer</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedhoff</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamsky</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicklin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisse</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koehler</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohn</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy</td>
<td>excused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quane</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritt</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenbaum</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scharfenberg</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmaltz</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwalm</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sims</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillhof</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>excused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeigler</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Arrived late

Y=Yes  N=No  P=Present

Jackson P Parliamentarian
To: Members of the Academic Senate
From: Administrative Affairs Committee
Re: Parking proposals
Date: 9 May 1978

I. Parking regulations policies

A. Persons ticketed for violations of parking regulations shall have the right to appeal their citations before they have paid the fines associated with their citations.

B. If parking decal fees are increased, there shall be fee increases for decals in all categories, based on the percentage increase in decal fee revenues necessary. Exceptions to this principle are (1) fees for decals in new categories and (2) fees for decals for which no fees are charged prior to the year in which the fee increase will take effect (3) fee changes based on changing costs of service to persons in a particular decal category, and (4) fee changes based on Senate recommendations to change the fee structure generally.

II. Proposal for ad hoc committee on parking policy

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall establish an ad hoc committee for the purpose of studying and recommending University parking policy to the Academic Senate. The membership of this committee is to be constituted by 2 students, 2 faculty members, 1 professional-technical staff member, 1 civil service member, and 1 handicapped person (who shall be included in one of the constituencies mentioned above - total membership of six). Upon submission of their recommendations, the committee shall be dismissed by the Executive Committee.
Proposal #2

2. Student Code Enforcement and Review Board (SCERB)

A. Membership of SCERB consists of six voting members who are appointed by the President of the University, three students and three faculty. The Chairperson of the Board shall be elected by the voting members. The Executive Secretary will be a member without vote.

1. The Academic Senate nominates student and faculty members to serve on SCERB with preference given to those with Grievance Committee, Hearing Panel, or similar experience. Student members are appointed annually and faculty are appointed for three year staggered terms. Appointment to SCERB terminates membership on the Student Grievance Committee or University Hearing Panel.

2. If a regular member is unable to serve, the chairperson may designate an alternate from the Grievance Committee or Hearing Panel to serve temporarily as a voting member. The alternate must represent the same constituency (student or faculty) as the absent member of SCERB.

B. A quorum will consist of two students, two faculty members and the Executive Secretary or his/her designee.

C. The Board may designate a temporary chairperson to serve in absence of the chairperson.
For all academic departments except the library, we recommend that ten percent (10%) of each department's salary increment funds be set aside for equity adjustments within that department. The individual departments will be required to provide salary equity adjustments to all faculty identified in the department response to the Salary Equity Review letter (December 2, 1977), which has been submitted to the URC. While no one formula must be used by the departments, each department must document that each faculty member identified as having an inequitable salary has received a portion of the inequity funds. Any inequity funds not distributed in this manner should be distributed according to the department's Merit/Exceptional Merit formula. Each department's documentation for this process will be detailed in a formal correspondence to the CFSC and the URC.

We recommend that the library use all monies received above 7.2% for equity adjustment as determined by the DFSC, the Director of the library and the Provost using the recommendations of the DFSC, the Director of the library, and the ad hoc committee appointed by the Provost.
Nominees to

ETHICS AND GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE - Term 1978-81

Vote for 6

Jane M. Binkenholz - Special Education
Vincent Hazleton Jr. - Information Sciences
Patricia Monroe - Speech Pathology and Audiology
Lois Jett - Home Economics
Ruth Marilyn Kasa - Allied Health Professions
Ronald R. Pope - Political Science
Robin Carr - English

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE - Term 1978-81

Vote for 8

Charlotte P. Carr - Home Economics
George J. Gordon - Political Science
Robert G. Hathaway - Mathematics
Mildred Pratt - Sociology, Anthropology, Social Work
Robert H. Chasson - Biological Science
Raymond V. Whalen - Information Sciences
Michael Brunt - Speech Pathology and Audiology

Mark P. Bower - Special Education (declined)

William Linnehan - English
MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Senate Rules Committee
RE: External Committee Nominations
DATE: May 10, 1978

The Rules Committee submits the following named persons in nominations for the External Committees as listed.

Academic Planning Committee
(f) Ira Cohen, History, A & S (3 yrs)
(f) Harold Gregor, Art, Fine Arts (3 yrs)
(f) Normand Madore, C & I, Education (3 yrs)
(s) Marianne Blotch (1 yr)
(s) Karen Kerns (1 yr)
(s) Lynn Ann Ray (1 yr)
(s) Lori Foster (1 yr)
(s) Dan Mohan (1 yr)

Academic Standards Committee
(f) Anne Elder, Political Science, A & S (3 yrs)
(f) Morton Waimon, C & I, Education (3 yrs)
(s) Nancy Kramer (1 yr)
(s) Robert Homan (1 yr)
(s) Kathleen Pine (1 yr)
(s) David Driemeyer (1 yr)

Advisory Committee on Affirmative Action for Minorities
(f) George Cunningham, History, A & S (3 yrs)
(s) Arnold Johnson (1 yr)
(s) Salvadore Cheversia (1 yr)
(s) Brenda Jean Stanford (1 yr)

Athletic Council (The President selects 2 of the 6 faculty nominated and 4 of the 8 students nominated including at least one female student)
(f) Robert Young, Physics, A & S (3 yrs)
(f) Jonnie Kay Hufnagle, Speech Path, A & S (3 yrs)
(f) William Easton, Library (3 yrs)
(f) Jacqueline Bontemps, Art, Fine Arts (3 yrs)
(f) Ray Eiben, C & I, Education (3 yrs)
(f) Geoffrey Hirt, Finance, Business (3 yrs)
(s) James Slattery (1 yr)
(s) Ken Hanrath (1 yr)
(s) Rick Leiback (1 yr)
(s) Daniel Cotter (1 yr)
(s) Mike Schramm (1 yr)
(s) Bruce Mehl (1 yr)
(s) Lori Bertino (1 yr)
(s) Kathy Mervis (1 yr)
Council for Teacher Education
(s) Maureen Revane (1 yr)
(s) Lee Ann Godfry (1 yr)
(s) Mark Tate (1 yr)
(s) Yvonne Pfingsten (1 yr)

Council on University Studies
(f) Robert Hunt, Political Science, A & S (3 yrs)
(f) Arnold J. Insel, Math, A & S (3 yrs)
(s) Edward E. Martin, Gen. Stud. (1 yr)
(s) Veronica Ann Sestak, Early Childhood Ed. (1 yr)
(s) Sibyl Kobza, Special Education (Maladjusted) (1 yr)
(s) Clinton Irving, Corrections (1 yr)

Economic Well-Being Committee
(Civil Service) Evelyn Cobb (3 yrs)

Elections Committee
(f) Paul Dohrmann, HPERD, CAST (3 yrs)
(f) Gurramkonda Naidu, Finance, Business, Alternate

Entertainment Committee
(f) Barbara Hutchinson, Speech Path., A & S (3 yrs)
(f) Thomas Comfort, Foreign Lang., A & S (3 yrs)
(f) Glenn Reeder, Psychology, A & S (3 yrs)
(f) alternate Olgert Pocs, Sociology, A & S (1 yr)

Facilities Planning Committee
(f) Lynne Higgins, HPERD, CAST (3 yrs)
(s) Don McLean (1 yr)
(s) Norval Wiemken (1 yr)
(s) Cynthia L. McCloughan (1 yr)
(s) Pete Pomatto (1 yr)
(s) Carter Ness (1 yr)

Honors Council
(f) Wayne Truex, HPERD, CAST (3 yrs)
(f) Robert Cannell, Special Ed., Education (3 yrs)
(s) Carolyn Cullison (1 yr)
(s) Denise Johnson (1 yr)
(s) Frances Doherty (1 yr)
(s) Julie D. Goodlick (2 yrs)
(s) Terry Johnson (2 yrs)
(s) Susan Schwendtner (2 yrs)
Library Committee

(f) Carol Thornton, Math, A & S (3 yrs)
(s) Charles Garrett (1 yr)
(s) Marsha Lee Fosdick (1 yr)
(s) Joel Grigsby (1 yr)
(s) Wendy Macklin (1 yr)
(s) John Ward (1 yr)

Parking and Traffic Committee

(f) George F. McCoy, Psychology, A & S (3 yrs)
(f) Arnold Sabine, Ed. Admin., Education (3 yrs)
(Civil Service) (3 yrs)
(s) Tony Scott (1 yr)
(s) Terry Walker (1 yr)
(s) Terrence F. Conlon (1 yr)

Parking Appeals Board (The President may select one faculty member from the two listed for a 3 year term)

(f) William Linneman, Eng., A & S
(f) Earl Reitan, History, A & S

(The Senate suggests that the President reappoint Leon Schuman (Civil Service)
(Civil Service) Leon Schuman (3 yrs)

(The President may select one student from the list as his appointment. The others are recommended by the Senate.)

(s) Gina Hardy (1 yr)
(s) Michelle Adelman (1 yr)
(s) David Joseph Conrad (1 yr)
(s) Bruce Mehl (1 yr)

Reinstatement Committee

(f) Michael Shelly, Info. Sci., A & S (3 yrs)
(f) Frederick Noyes, Special Ed., Education (3 yrs)
(s) Mike Corcoran (1 yr)
(s) Paul Bruggeman (1 yr)
(s) Vincent Petrosino (1 yr)

Student Code Enforcement and Review Board

(f) Janice Neuleib, English, A & S (3 yrs)
(s) Eric Sloter (1 yr)
(s) Mary Mattimore (1 yr)
(s) Dennis Conley (1 yr)

University Hearing Panel (The President selects 5 from the 10 faculty named below.)

(f) Fay F. Bowren, C & I, Education (3 yrs)
(f) Alton J. Bjork, C & I, Education (3 yrs)
(f) Mary Natale, Metcalf (3 yrs)
(f) Robert Preston, Biology, A & S (3 yrs)
(£) Mostafa Hassan, Economics, A & S (3 yrs)
(£) Bryant Jackson, Library (3 yrs)
(£) Iris Varner, Business Ed., Business (3 yrs)
(£) Frank Chiodo, HPERD, CAST (3 yrs)
(£) Ruth Kasa, Allied Health, CAST (3 yrs)
(£) Benny Tucker, Math, A & S (3 yrs)

University Bicycle Advisory Committee
(£) Diane DeLong, Library (3 yrs)
(Civil Service) Jack Walter (3 yrs)
(s) Tim Regan (1 yr)
(s) Donita Leemon (1 yr)

University Curriculum Committee
(£) Ray Treadway, Sociology, A & S (3 yrs)
(£) Margaret Hayden, HEIT, CAST (3 yrs)
(£) Martha Bickley, Business Ed., Business (3 yrs)
(£) William Kennedy, Foreign Lang., A & S (3 yrs)
(s) John Sido, Business (1 yr)
(s) Michelle Deany, A & S (2 yrs)
(s) Jeff Jerdee, CAST (2 yrs)
(s) Peggy (Margaret) Wieland, A & S (1 yr)

University Forum Committee
(£) Samuel Hutter, Psychology, A & S (3 yrs)
(£) Robert Rumery, Psychology, A & S (Alternate)

University Union/Auditorium Board
(£) C. Louis Steinberg, Art., Fine Arts (3 yrs)
(£) Kyle Sessions, History, A & S (3 yrs)
(£) Vincent Hazelton, Info. Sciences (Alternate)