

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY EVANSVILLE

8600 University Boulevard
EVANSVILLE, INDIANA 47712

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Members

DATE: September 24, 1980

FROM: *Marlene Shaw*, Chairman, Faculty Council

SUBJECT: Faculty Council Meeting: Session #3

Tuesday, September 30, 1980
Faculty Reading Room
3:00 pm

1. Minutes of Sessions #1 and #2.
2. Date of next meeting.
3. Meritorious Recognition/Merit Pay: Presentation and Discussion of 1979-80 Faculty Council Subcommittee Recommendation.
4. Reports.
5. Old business.
6. New business.
7. Adjournment.

NOTE: Faculty Council members received a blue copy of this three-page document prior to session #1.

SESSION #3
MINUTES OF THE 1980-81
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETINGS

Time: September 30, 1980; 3:00 p.m. in the Faculty Reading Room

Members Present: Marlene Shaw, Chairman; Professors, J. Davis, E. Sprouls (for P. Bennett), W. Hopkins, Y. Fu (for D. Kinsey), D. Lux, H. Sands, H. Van Over, M. Waitman

Ex-Officio Present: President Rice, Vice President Reid

Others Present: Dr. Arp, Dr. Edwards, Dr. Mussard, Dr. Rivers, Mr. Robinson, Dr. Settle

1. The minutes of the September 9, 1980, Faculty Council Session #1, were approved as amended.

The minutes of the September 19, 1980, Faculty Council Session #2, were approved as amended.

2. Dr. Waitman suggested that Faculty Council alternates receive a copy of the unapproved minutes in the event that they may need to attend a meeting.
3. The next Faculty Council meeting will be Friday, October 10, 1980, at 2:00 p.m. in the Faculty Reading Room.
4. Meritorious Recognition/Merit Pay: Presentation and Discussion of 1979-80 Faculty Council Subcommittee Recommendations. The subcommittee consisted of Emmet Edwards, Richard Mussard, Paul Robinson, and Marlene Shaw. Dr. Shaw asked that Faculty Council Vice Chairman, Dr. Helen Sands, chair this portion of the meeting.

Dr. Shaw, in summarizing the recommendations, stated that the subcommittee had viewed merit pay within the larger context of recognizing meritorious academic performance. She pointed out that committee members were in general agreement on items 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 of the recommendations. However, two or three alternatives were presented for items 3, 7, and 8. These items include the issues of identifying meritorious individuals and whether or not merit pay should be given when salary increases fail to meet inflation.

Speaking to the process of selecting meritorious individuals (item 3), Dr. Mussard opposed alternative A because it permits the possibility of circumventing peer review. He favors alternative B which preserves this process University-wide. He compared peer review in merit considerations as analogous to the peer review process long established for promotion. Dr. Mussard read the following excerpt from the AAUP "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities".

"Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for

judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail."

Dr. Edwards favored that Faculty Council support a policy which would give flexibility at the Division level for selecting meritorious individuals. Division ought to have the right to decide whether a peer review committee would be established or whether the Division would vote that authority to its Chairman. He argued that it would be undemocratic and impractical for Council to force the peer review concept on a division that did not want it.

Dr. Rivers stated that a Division did not have the right to vote in a manner that would deny individual Division members the right to peer review. Therefore, a Division should not let its Chairman make merit evaluations solely by himself.

Dr. Settle responded that a Division, by vote of its faculty, did have the right to let its Chairman make such decisions. He said that Faculty Council has no right to insist upon a peer review process if a Division votes not to implement it.

Dr. Waitman stated that he regretted that individual rights to peer evaluation might be sacrificed by Division vote and asked Council to mandate the peer review process.

Mr. Robinson wished to direct attention back to the written document in which common-ground can be found. He urged that Council act upon this document rather than get embroiled in old problems. He said that a Division should have the right to choose a screening committee or forfeit peer review by giving selection solely to the Division Chairman.

Dr. Rice commented that in disciplines with only one, two, or three members the possibility of peer review is largely absent. In this situation Dr. Mussard emphasized that the persons best qualified to judge a candidate are those in the closest related disciplines.

Dr. Hopkins expressed concern for the "tyranny of the majority." Alternate 3B would give the chance for protection of the minority by broadening the base of participants in the selection process.

Dr. Sands said it would be advantageous to broaden the base of the selection participants so as to bring the greatest amount of information to the question of an individual's merit.

Dr. Fu emphasized the importance of intrinsic rewards such as the approbation of colleagues and students.

Referring to Item 7, Dr. Mussard stated that merit pay was unfair and should not be given when faculty is losing purchasing power.

Dr. Edwards supported the concept of merit pay but favored that salary increases and merit pay come from separate budget items. Dr. Shaw commented that the last sentence of Item 7C contradicted the justifications for merit pay given earlier in that alternative.

Dr. Rivers brought up the possibility that a group of instructors could be equally meritorious but not all receive merit increases.

Dr. Van Over replied that we must look at the other side of the issue--that those persons knowing that everyone will receive a particular increase may perform at less than optimum level.

In discussing the small dollar amount of recent merit pay, Dr. Waitman stated that two recent recipients had left ISUE and Mr. Robinson said the amount was too small to be bothered with. Dr. Settle said two persons that he lost cited the lack of merit recognition as a reason. He believes that both "profit and loss" should be differentially distributed.

In discussing faculty interest in meritorious recognition without merit pay, Ms. Lux, Dr. Davis, Dr. Hopkins, and Dr. Van Over found it acceptable and viewed it as a morale booster. Dr. Shaw urged a greater emphasis on the recognition of academic achievements such as teaching and advising. She suggested wider publicity in the local newspapers and 8600 University Boulevard for the Alumni Association Faculty Recognition Award for excellence in teaching.

Dr. Mussard said that even if the Council puts more emphasis on non-monetary recognition, it must still address Item 8 if the Board of Trustees mandates merit pay. Dr. Rice agreed. Dr. Rice commented that the Terre Haute campus has sent a consistent message to the Board opposing a major portion of their compensation increase going to merit pay. He continued that individual Trustee views range from preferring all merit to only across-the-board distribution. The Board has taken an intermediate policy position.

Dr. Davis moved that further discussion and a vote of this agenda item be deferred until October 21, 1980, so that Council members can discuss this issue with their Division members. Dr. Van Over seconded and the motion carried.

At this point the meeting was returned to Dr. Shaw.

5. Reports

President Rice reported that the enrollment for Fall Semester is 3,251. He also reminded the Faculty Council of the Ribbon Cutting Ceremony Friday, October 3, 1980 at the HPER Building.

Dr. Reid reported that he has met with Dr. Shaw and Dr. Arp regarding the Interinstitutional Exchange Program. He will report on their decisions at the October 10 Faculty Council meeting or to University Notes.

6. Dr. Shaw reminded the Council that Jim Baches, President of the Terre Haute Faculty Senate will be on campus Friday, October 3, 1980, and is planning to meet with members of the Faculty Council following the Board of Trustees Meeting.
7. Dr. Waitman noted that President Landini will be speaking on our campus Wednesday, October 1, 1980 at 3:30 p.m. in A-34.
8. Dr. Waitman raised the question of voting rights for Faculty Council alternates. He noted that Mr. Fredrich has voting rights in Mr. P. Bennett's absence, but that Mr. E. Sprouls (who comes on Tuesdays for Mr. Bennett) does not. Dr. Sands moved that Mr. Sprouls also be given voting rights as an alternate upon receipt of a letter of request from Mr. Bennett. Dr. Waitman seconded the motion and the motion carried.
9. Dr. Hopkins requested a clarification on the status of the first priority issue of the Council, that on Promotion recommendations. Dr. Shaw stated that it is her understanding that the 1979-80 Promotions Committee recommendations are now in her hands and will be discussed at the meeting of October 10, 1980.
10. Deborah Lux moved that the meeting be adjourned and Dr. Van Over seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Walter A. Hopkins

Walter A. Hopkins
Acting Faculty Council Secretary
10/10/80